U. S. Cong. Congressional record.

Appendix

Address of the Honorable Daniel J. Flood to the General Assembly of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, April 17, 1955, at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, United Nations Plaza, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

This evening gives me an opportunity to speak to the exiles from central Europe who have come to my country to work for the restoration of liberty in their subjugated countries. I see here my friends from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, and other central European countries.

All these countries have great political and cultural histories.

More than 1,000 years ago, the ancestors of the Czechs and Slovaks of present Czechoslovakia set up the great Moravian Empire that had its continuation in the ancient Kingdom of Bohemia known throughout the world for its famous rulers and statesmen, St. Venceslas, Charles IV, and George Podebrad, and for its warriors who braved the armies of all Europe.

Already in the 11th century the great Hungarian King Stephen introduced western Christianity and with it western civilization to his people. Hungary became the bulwark of this civilization and of Christian culture. Together with the other central European states she defended them against the invader until that moment in history when the great King of Poland stopped the invasion at the gates of Vienna.

The historical record of Poland goes back to the 10th century. From the 14th to the 17th century Poland was a great power which influenced the destinies of Europe for centuries. Poland's contribution to the formation of the ideology of national freedom was especially impressive. Torn asunder in the following centuries by three powers which stifled her national life, Poland never resigned herself to defeat and battled her way in repeated uprisings, through unfavorable condtions, to a new freedom and independence.

Yugoslavia, inhabited by the Serbs, Croats, and Slovencs has a long, heroic history of struggle for freedom against foreign invaders. The defeat of Kosovo Polé in 1389 marked but the beginning of the centuries long struggles that fortified the peoples of Yugoslavia to supreme national heroism.

A cruel struggle for national survival and independence has been the fate of the Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians throughout the centuries. The position of these countries and nations was most difficult. There was no neighbor, who was not far more powerful and who did not covet the rich commercial centers on the Baltic Sea, and who did not attempt to break up the organized national life of the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Nevertheless, the peoples survived and lived to see their freedom restored.

The cultural contribution of your Central European states and nations is even more impressive. One hundred and fifty years before Columbus discovered America, the University of Prague was founded and soon after, the University of Cracow. Central Europe has given us such great pioneers of human progress like Jan Amos Comenius. Modern democracy also had its root in these countries. A Czech statute in 1579, which underlined the concept of the "due process of law", was the predecessor of the American Constitution.

American democracy is especially grateful to men like Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski who came to our country to help us win our independence. From their long suffering homeland they brought with them an enthusiasm for liberty and showed by their deeds and sacrifices that human freedom is indivisible.

After World War I the countries of Central Europe renewed at long last their national states. They built up their internal democracies and were highly successful in their cultural and economic development. They contributed to international cooperation by their sincere support of the League of Nations and the legal system of postwar Europe.

Thomas G. Masaryk and Dr. Eduard Benes from Czechoslovakia were helpful in laying the foundations to international compulsory arbitration, disarmament, and the executive power of the world organization. In cooperation with other statesmen from Central and Eastern European countries, they created a network of international treaties which, if observed, would have stabilized Europe and guaranteed peaceful development. Unfortunately, this favorable evolution was broken off by Nazi aggression. After Austria came Czechoslovakia whose dismemberment at Munich was soon followed by the destruction of Warsaw and Belgrade and by the subjugation of the Baltic States and, in fact, of Hungary as well.

The victory of the Allies in 1940 liberated the Central European countries from the yoke of Nazi German imperialism. But their liberation was a sham. In fact, one totaliarianism, imperialism, and dictatorship was exchanged for another. And in this way ancient historic countries, the cradles of culture, the friends and allies of Western democracies that had played such an important role in the family of free nations, became captives of Soviet Russia.

We often ask how this was possible; how could it happen; what were the real causes of this so unhappy and catastrophical development. Our Congress has even investigated the background and causes that had led to the takeover and enslavement of the Baltic and Central European countries.

As in every phenomenon, this new subjugation of Central Europe may be attributed to a number of causes both internal and external. We may, for instance, speak of the errors committed by the leading statesmen of the Western democracies. We may censure them for Europe's division into military zones, agreed upon in Teheran and Yalta. We may question the Western negotiators for not realizing fully that a military zone in Soviet terminology means also a political zone and that democracy in Soviet terminology means a "people's democracy," actually the dictatorship of the Communist Party.

In this way, the central European countries, one by one, and finally Czechoslovakia became Communist captive states, the Baltic States were actually absorbed into the Soviet Union.

But it is not enough to stop at Teheran and Yalta. One must go much further in analyzing the past to discover the real cause of the subjugation of central Europe. It lies deep in the past policy of world democracy. Long before Yalta and Teheran, I would say immediately after World War I, the cause was laid which molded the conditions as they are today in central Europe. At that time, democratic Europe, born of the victory of the western democracies over the feudalistic central powers, should have been defended in time. Instead, Hitler's aggression against Austria and Czechoslovakia was not resisted by the Western Powers. Even before that came to pass, the Western Powers should have made it clear that the clauses of the peace treaty were meant seriously. An effective world organization should have been set up and all democratic states should have defended the legal system of the world and the sanctity of international treaties. But complacency set in. The slogan "Peace in Our Time" weakened the determination of the democracies and led to such an inflation of Nazi power that it could be broken only with the assistance of the Soviet Union. This unhappy development brought the Red army into the very heart of Europe, to the Elbe and the Vltava (the Czech name for Modlau).

I think it not only fair but wise to let these errors in the past be a lesson to us. The lesson is obvious. The political life of a country should be something more than the pursuing of everyday interests; it should be the implementation of a general plan based on objective thinking and moral law. Your platform of the Christian Democratic Union and the addresses of your officers emphasize this very important character of sound politics.

I am sure that if we stress logic and the moral law in political life we can avoid the errors of the past, those errors that led a considerable part of the world and within your countries to the present state of slavery. The demand for the liberation of central and eastern European countries will then be accepted as a logical consequence of a policy that is the result of both clear thinking and sound moral evaluation. For Americans this demand is Lincoln's creed on a world scale: That the world cannot be half free and half slave.

The liberation policy is, however, not only a logical conclusion of our American doctrine that the political life should be the implementation of a general moral principle, valid for all the nations and times. It is also in line with the political, economic, and strategic interests of the United States.

Our independence and our economy is closely connected with the conditions in Europe, I would say with a free Europe, in which a balance of power is maintained and economic prosperity is assured. Twice already in our generation we had to defend our political interests on the battlefields of

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Europe. For us it is obvious that a Europe subjugated by a dictatorship, aspiring to world domination, is tantamount to a constant danger to our shores. And an impoverished Europe is our concern, too. For such a Europe would be a spawning ground for social upheaval leading to a victory of negative and bellicose political trends.

I conclude that the liberation policy is the strength of democracy and the only guaranty to the free world against aggression and internal subversion from a totalitarian threat. We Americans have no other choice: We must be strong if we want to save peace and our freedom. And our strength is inseparably connected with the freedom of the world. Your Congress has for its guiding motto: "Freedom—a prerequisite of lasting peace." This motto is no less true for American foreign policy. We can be free only if our friends, too, enjoy freedom. Peace, like freedom, is indivisible.

How Free Is Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is taken from the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter, dated April 18, and entitled "How Free Is Free Enterprise?":

HOW FREE IS FREE ENTERPRISE?

The term "free enterprise" is an expression that is used quite often these days; but interpretation of what free enterprise really is, or what it has accomplished for America, seems to vary according to the philosophy of the individual.

That the American competitive enterprise system is a success cannot be refuted when we consider that 6 percent of the people of the world produce about as much industrial wealth as the other 94 percent combined. We own 6 times as many automobiles as the rest of the world and similar proportions of telephones, bathtubs, television sets or almost any of the many things that go into our standard of living. In addition, our economy supports more and better schools, churches and hospitals and we have more opportunity for spiritual and cultural development than any other nation in the world.

Each person in United States agriculture today, on the average, is producing 78 percent more than in 1940. And, in spite of some of the problems in agriculture that are always with us, the American farmer lives better, eats better, has better housing, sends more of his children to college and has more leisure, freedom, and opportunity than farmers in most other areas of the world.

The foundation for this unparalleled progress is the freedom, initiative, and opportunity of the individual in a society in which most property is (1) privately owned, (2) privately managed, (3) operated for profit, and (4) operated in a competitive economy.

Ours is a profit and loss system. Any time the possibility of loss is eliminated you can be as certain that the system has been destroyed as you could be if the opportunity for profit were no longer available.

In many countries the economic system appears to be similar to our own, but really is far different because competition has not been recognized as one of its basic principles. Cartel agreements, government programs, price controls, regulations, restrictive legislation—all designed to protect this group or that from the rigors of competition—have so regimented their economy that it has lost much of its vitality, its adaptability, and its competence to serve the needs of the nation.

We are constantly aware of the pressure of those individuals and groups that would destroy the basic principles upon which our economy is founded. Careful scrutiny of a number of bills in our legislature would reveal this situation. Nor is such action confined at the State level; it also is evident in our National Congress.

The most subtle and dangerous threat to our form of society is involved in the destruction of the competitive market system. It is most subtle and dangerous because it is always done with the avowed purpose of benefiting or protecting some segment of our population.

It is no accident that America has survived two world wars and a disastrous skirmish in Korea, and still has not only retained, but expanded, its productive capacity in addition to maintaining individual freedom. Only a glance at the economic and political situations in such countries as Italy, France, and Great Britain should be enough to give faith to our American competitive enterprise system. Yet there are those who would trade our system for that of the countries mentioned.

Truly the greatest war in America today is in the minds of men. When the final vote is taken will the majority be for following the path of historical success—or will it be a vote for a known system of failure? The individual still has the right to choose.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before Indiana Republican Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, in Indianapolis, Ind., on Saturday, April 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Craig, Senators Capehart and Jenner, and fellow Americans, in the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism? Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communists because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks we broke the 1948 Communist blockade of Berlin by the airlift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of that island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad? These have indicated that we must placate Communist countries when they get aggravated for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is no.

At Munich Chamberlain and Deladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have no further territorial demands in Europe.

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslavakian state.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression.

The guarantee given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia for by then they had lost their will to fight largely because they had lost their faith in the western allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa Straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory.

That these outposts have a military value no man can deny for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assault out of the harobrs of Amoy and Foochow as long as the free chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and elsewhere where people understand the true brutal aggressive nature of communism.

I again want to emphasize that in my opinion the morale value of Quemoy and Matsu is as high for Free China as is that of Western Berlin for free Germany.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as stepping stones toward Formosa and the Pescadores. What nonsense is this? When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-Lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts?

If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and they reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reinforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross your heart and hope to die assurance?"

In the light of the bald-faced violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

I was amazed and shocked by the speech of Adlai Stevenson on last Monday night. He not only appears to be giving the green light to the loss of Quemoy and Matsu, but he also cast reflection upon the future of the island of Formosa itself.

Less than 2 months after the Congress approved the Formosa resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 in the House and 85 to 3 in the Senate and after the ratification of our mutual defense pact with the Republic of China by a vote of 64 to 6, Mr. Stevenson stated that we should seek to get certain of our allies to line up with us in the defense of Formosa against any aggression "pending some final settlement of its status—by independence, neutralization, trusteeship, plebiscite, or whatever is wiser."

What a way to build confidence in our ally, with whom we have just entered into a mutual defense treaty.

There was no suggestion by Mr. Stevenson that there might be a plebiscite on the mainland of China to see if the Chinese are satisfied with their loss of freedom by Communist aggression supported by the Soviet Union.

Does not Mr. Stevenson know that the free people of China would look upon a United Nations trusteeship as only a form of multiple colonialism for such a trusteeship would undermine if not destroy the sovereignty of the Republic of China?

Certainly the Republic of China will not consent to a United Nations or any other type of a trusteeship over the island of Formosa.

What United Nations mouse is expected to "bell the cat"? In the first United Nations action against overt aggression in Korea only 17 members of the United Nations supplied any armed forces whatsoever. The 16 nations outside of the United States which made a contribution supplied only 45,000, whereas the United States of America contributed more than 450,000 and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Far Eastern theater during the Korean war.

Certainly neither Mr. Stevenson nor the members of the United Nations expect to have the United States of America supply the armed forces to disarm the defense forces of the Republic of China with whom we have just entered into a treaty of mutual security.

This would be such an obvious treachery that no responsible citizen of this country would tolerate it and no public official that advocated it would continue in office beyond the next election.

Would the trusteeship be established then by the United Nations members other than the United States of America? It could only be done by that organization committing an act of aggression against the Republic of China. Not only do we have a treaty of mutual assistance with free China, but does any responsible person believe that having only contributed 45,000 troops to resist Communist aggression in Korea that organization would now furnish a larger force to neutralize the approximately 400,000 who constitute the armed force of the Republic of China?

Or does Mr. Stevenson believe that India, which furnished only an ambulance unit in the Korean war, will be the one to do the job? Does he really believe that the free Chinese on Formosa would tolerate an Indian occupation of their island?

What sense does it make to on the one hand be building a collective security system in the Far Pacific and on the other giving consideration to the neutralization of one-third of the available non-Communist armed forces in that area of the world. During the early days of our Republic we had an expression "United we stand, divided we fall."

As a matter of national policy are we now to preach a doctrine for our friends abroad "Divided you stand until the Communists gain sufficient strength to make you fall?"

As one American, I get no satisfaction at all from a divided Korea, a divided Germany, or a divided Vietnam. I see nothing in either example that should want us to put our stamp of approval on a divided China which is the meaning of a so-called two China's policy.

Let's put ourselves in the unlikely position of facing the situation wherein Communist forces, by armed action supported by the Soviet Union, should be able to take over mainland America and our Government was temporarily forced to the Territory of Hawaii or Alaska. Would we accept a two-Americas policy? Would we give up the effort to restore constitutional government to our people and to our homeland? The answer is, of course, a resounding "No" on both counts.

There will never be an easy solution to the problems facing this country and the free world. Whenever a line is drawn there will be cogent reasons advanced for making it at some other time or place.

There are some who oppose the drawing of the line at Quemoy and Matsu who say that they would be willing to stand on the line of Formosa and the Pescadores, but would they really be willing to stand even there?

Will they not, like some of the British, Prime Minister Nehru, and Adlai Stevenson then being to throw doubt even upon the future of Formosa?

In a final desperate effort to avoid facing up to the realistic issue of Communist aggression, will they at that point urge that the problem be thrown into the United Nations?

There a combination of the Communist nations, neutralist powers, and some of our fair-weather friends presently tending toward a "peace at any price policy" could join forces in agreeing to a far-eastern Munich that will give to the Communists at a conference another substantial victory at the expense of the Republic of China.

The smaller nations of the world should stop, look, and listen before they join their voices to those of the other appeasers. If the Republic of China, with 9½ million people, can be sold down the river at a far-eastern Munich so then could the more than 30 independent nations having populations of less than that figure.

With the record of a quarter century of broken agreements by the Soviet Union, I have questioned the advisability of entering into another meeting of the heads of state until the Soviet Union has shown by deeds rather than words that they are prepared to respect agreements entered into.

Yalta should have been a warning signal to the American people that there is no moral right for large nations, including our own, to distribute the territory and the people of our allies such as was done with Poland and with China.

The rather dubious argument is advanced that the Soviet forces were already in occupation of Poland and would have been in a position to occupy much of China if we had not consented to their demands.

Since when has America come to subscribe to the strange new doctrine that if the bandit is in possession of the loot he should be given a clean bill of health morally and a legal title to the same?

Have we allowed international morals to fall so low that we now are prepared to accept the doctrine that might makes right?

I think not. Any public officials who in the future, regardless of the party in power, try to shackle the moral position of the American people in such chains will, in my judgment, be overwhelmingly repudiated.

Do we have a right to be concerned with the revelations of the Yalta papers? I believe we do from a constitutional viewpoint. The facts of the Yalta agreement were misrepresented to the Congress of the United States, a coequal branch of the Government, by President Roosevelt when he said in his official report to the Congress on March 1, 1945, regarding the Yalta Conference:

"Quite naturally this Conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe, and not with the Pacific war."

This was a false official report.

Do we have a right to be concerned with what went on at Yalta?

The record clearly shows that the Government of the United States was first advised regarding the connections of Alger Hiss with a Soviet espionage ring as early as the fall of 1939 and at several subsequent times before the Yalta Conference of February 1945.

Those who had some share of the responsibility in permitting Alger Hiss to go to Yalta have tried to cover up their dereliction by claiming that he had little more than office-boy status and at most limited his activities to United Nations affairs.

Now for the first time in the 1945 official papers of the Government of the United States, on page 91 of the Yalta papers, we learn that:

"At the Secretary's staff committee meeting of January 10, the Secretary asked that all memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15."

Does this even demonstrate a reasonable degree of caution for protecting the vital interests of this country? It was not necessary for Alger Hiss to carry on negotiations at a high level to do great damage to this Nation and to our allies. It was only necessary for the Soviet Union to have advance information as to the agreed policy positions that this Government would take, where we would stand firm, where we would be prepared to yield, and what agreements we would seek to get.

I see by the papers that former President Truman is in Washington tonight where he is scheduled to join in the attack on the Republican administration of President Eisenhower.

Perhaps he will clarify why he termed the congressional investigation of the Hiss case a "red herring."

Perhaps he will state why he wrote a letter of commendation for Harry Dexter White, another member of the conspiracy who played an important part in the pre-Yalta decisions.

Perhaps he will tell why his Secretary of State Dean Acheson in January of 1950 drew a defense line in the Pacific leaving Korea and Formosa on the outside. Many believe the Communists then determined they could take Korea without great risk.

Perhaps he will explain why the policy of his administration in 1945 and 1946 was to

put pressure on President Chiang Kai-shek urging him to accept Communists into his government when coalition with communism has been fatal wherever tried.

Perhaps he will explain why, contrary to the advice of his commanders in the field, MacArthur, Van Fleet, Clark, and Stratemeyer, he permitted the hands of our Armed Forces to be tied and the Communists to have the advantage of the Yalu River sanctuary.

Perhaps he may even explain on whose advice and why he neutralized the Formosa Straits and made it possible for the Communist coast defense troops to be safely moved to Manchuria and then to Korea where they were used against our own forces there.

Perhaps he will, but I doubt it.

Just recently I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. Frankly, I would much rather take his view on the dangers we face than I would the views of the 1952 Democratic candidate for President of the United States. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances, as well as those of my country and the entire free world, rest with the firm stop the Communist march movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain one island or one small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve, and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Patriots' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday April 18, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell Sun, of Lowell, Mass. Patriots' Day is a legal holiday in Massachusetts. It is good to recall our history and our heritages:

[From the Lowell, (Mass.) Sun of April 17, 1955]

CONCORD'S BIG DAY

On Tuesday, our neighboring town of Concord has its big day of the year as the State observes Patriots' Day, the anniversary of that famous battle which marked the beginning of the Revolutionary War.

On the basis of present-day military actions, the battle at the North Bridge in Concord would hardly rate as a "patrol encounter," but on April 19, 1775, the shots that were fired to stem the advance of the British raiders set off the explosion that eventually brought freedom to the United States from the yoke of Great Britain.

It took a great deal of courage for the poorly armed, inadequately trained but courageous American colonists to fire that shot at Concord which "was heard 'round the world." That shot brought into action the resources of the greatest power of that time against the colonists, and the war which resulted proved conclusively that a determined and liberty-inspired "little fellow" can defeat a heavily armed but lacking in determination "big guy."

The battle on that April 19 was fought in Concord, but taking part not only were colonists from that town but from Chelmsford, Billerica, Acton, and other towns in the area—Minutemen who had heard the warning given first by Paul Revere and William Dawes and repeated throughout the countryside by a group of messengers.

People come from all parts of the country to witness the historic scenes in the Concord area. Many who live in this section where the Revolutionary War had its start drive the dozen or so miles necessary to visit the monuments and the places of interest so plainly marked in Concord.

This is the ideal time to make such a trip, and anyone in the Greater Lowell area could make it for a Sunday afternoon automibile ride. It is well worthwhile to retrace the steps of the Minutemen, even though you do it in the comfort of a modern car whereas they took them on foot, and to consider the moral of their story—that victory does not always go to the "big guy."

Such a trip should be a "must" for parents of school children, for in this manner the youngsters could relive the history which they are studying in school and at the same time drink in the clean fresh air of the countryside—that clean fresh air of freedom which the Minutemen offered their lives to protect.

In the list of holidays, Patriots' Day does not appear near the top, but to the people of Middlesex County it is a big one, as it belongs to Middlesex County and its towns as no other one does.

House Joint Resolution 153

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775

Whereas the 19th day of April 1775 witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops, and the fighting that then occurred at Concord and Lexington, in Massachusetts, formed the prologue to the mighty drama of the Revolution and determined the character of its first campaign; and

Whereas the significance of April 19 in the history of our country is not to be measured by the extent of the military forces that engaged in local battle in 1775, but by the direction and strength of the intangible forces then set in motion which in due course established the United States of America; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this Nation arose, and a better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue his proclamation, annually, emphasizing the significane of the events that occurred on April 19, 1775, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all public buildings on April 19, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the patriots who laid down their lives for the cause of independence.

Watch Bandung

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Carlos P. Romulo printed in the Sunday Washington Star magazine This Week, under date of April 17, 1955.

I hope that every Member of this Congress has read this article. It contains statements of facts and a very penetrating analysis of what could happen at the conference of Asian and African nations at Bandung, Indonesia.

It is extremely important to the United States and to the free world that Mr. Romulo is a delegate to this conference. Those of us who have served in the House with Mr. Romulo know of his thorough understanding that our country has no desire whatever to promote colonialism, directly or indirectly, which was conclusively indicated when in 1946 we passed the law liberating the Philippines and thereby making them a free nation.

Because of his vast experience as a member of the United Nations and influence wielded as President of the United Nations Assembly, he has a deep understanding of the problems and the outlook of the verious peoples of Asia. Very important also is that he is an Asian who has a profound understanding of the United States and its policies. He knows that we are determined to bring world peace, if possible, not only for our own welfare but for the good of all the peoples of the world. He can talk the language of and understand the viewpoint of the Asians. He understands thoroughly that communism must be checked if we are to have world peace. He also knows that the colonial system is what developed hatred in the minds of Asians and Africans against the western democracies. As he says, nothing could be more terrible and ruinous than a war between whites and nonwhites.

He could be a key figure at this conference that might bring the understanding and mutual respect between the Americans and the Asians that is needed to weld the world together in respect and understanding. The small and explosive world of today cannot take another war without consequences that are terrible to contemplate.

The article referred to follows:

This Monday my country, the Philippines, will take its seat at a high-level diplomatic conference which some of our closest friends in the West initially urged us to boycott.

Thirty Asian and African nations, Communist China among them, have been in-

vited to Bandung, Indonesia, ostensibly to promote peace and cooperation. While this may sound like a fairly routine get-together, it actually can shift the course of history. Its effects a generation from now may be catastrophic.

Why is this meeting so ominous? For two reasons:

1. Here are the makings of a dynamic new alignment of political forces—an alignment which, if it solidifies, must make more and more difficult the free world's struggle to stay the advance of communism.

2. Here, too, are the makings of a broad racial alignment—more dangerous in the long run than the political. The roster of nations invited to Bandung is pointedly overbalanced with nonwhites. The meeting may prove to be the first important manifestation of a conscious, deliberate banding together of the nonwhite world against the white. And nothing would be more terrible than wars between whites and nonwhites.

Now Bandung—a city of elegant hotels, European-style residences and native shacks in the hills of West Java—is thousands of miles from Boston and Bakersfield. And though this is exclusively an Asian-African gathering, called by the Colombo powers (India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia), it is of tremendous importance to America.

It is because of my deep concern that the import of the Bandung meeting—the political and racial dangers it raises—may not have received sufficient notice that I have sought this chance to speak to you.

Our Filipino delegation, which President Magsaysay has asked me to head, is likely to be a minority pro-Western voice at Bandung. The reason my government was advised at first not to attend was that, since we were allies of the United States and vigorously anti-Communist, we would be embarrassed at a meeting bound to be largely dominated by the Communists from Peiping, not to mention the neutralists from New Delhi.

But we in the Philippines don't look at the situation that way. We are in Asia and of Asia. Not to attend a meeting of our fellow Asians, no matter how we may differ with some of them, is to make of ourselves outcasts in Asia. Also our belief in democracy is not timid. We welcome the chance to express our views to our fellow Asians, including the delegates sent by Mao Tse-tung.

WHAT THE FILIPINOS WILL DO

We expect to be outvoted at times. But we have hopes of exercising enough influence on the proceedings to prevent, at least for the time being, the solidification of the political and racial tendencies we feel would constitute a terrible threat to peace.

Meetings of Asians and Africans are nothing new, of course. The nations of these two huge, restless, underprivileged continents have been joining forces with growing frequency in recent years to promote a variety of causes, some good, some questionable. Asian and African nations took steps in 1948 for the worthwhile purpose of helping Indonesia shake itself loose from Dutch colonialism.

At the United Nations, the Asian-African group has occasionally played a useful role in spotlighting colonial and racial oppression in Africa. But more and more, of late, a core of influential members of the group has shown a disposition to take a neutralist stand in the East-West struggle.

Now at Bandung this group is being joined by Red China—the trophy of the Indochina deal dangling from its belt, its ego inflated by the Hammarskjold visit to seek release of United States flyers, its propagandists demanding liberation of Formosa. Consequently, the former neutralist coloration takes on an anti-Western tinge.

It is India's Premier, Jawaharlal Nehru, of course, who has been the apostle of Asian-African neutralism, though he shuns the label and argues that he merely opposes the creation of blocs on grounds that they lead to war. It is Nehru, too, who engineered the invitation to Peiping to come to Bandung.

In this respect, it is easy to go along with him in rejecting the label of "neutralist." On the other hand, he would probably dispute a charge that he has been unneutral. It would be politically naive, though, to imagine that it is neutral to invite one—and only one—of the protagonists of the cold war to a conference whose avowed purpose is to promote peace. Ironically, any increase in Red China's leadership in Asia must certainly be at New Delhi's expense.

What are the main issues that trouble our fellow Asians and the Africans?

1. COLONIALISM: ASIANS HATE IT

Last fall, I wrote in This Week that, as a free Asian, I was gravely worried that what was left to free Asian might soon follow north Vietnam into the Communist orbit. I argued that the basic reason some Asians were so cold to the propaganda of democracy and so vulnerable to Communist blandishments was that the so-called democracies, in times past, had brought them, for the most part, not democracy but colonialism. Not democracy but 5-cents-a-day wages and racial barriers. I have spoken to audiences in scores of American communities, and I find that a most difficult point to put across is the intensity of the Afro-Asian hatred of colonialism.

The United States, instead of exploiting territories over which it exercised sovereignty, has generally guided them peacefully toward self-government or outright independence. When the United States governed the Philippines, it dealt with a population that was basically content because it was being openly prepared to assume sovereign control of its affairs. There is a genuine friendship between Filipino and American, and Manila is considered by the fleet probably the most hospitable port of call in all Asia.

Nowhere has the United States dealt as a nation with its population grudgingly, bitterly submitting to the yoke of empire.

The American people have not grasped the real nature of anticolonial emotionalism. But it must be grasped. Otherwise, the United States cannot formulate workable policies to keep former colonial areas from being overwhelmed by communism's new and more ruthless colonialism.

Remember this: while it is true that the colonial powers have only shreds of their old influence left in Asia, the old bitterness remains. Urged by the Western Powers to join in resisting further Communist advance, many Asian nations are understandably wary. They are not sure it is to their interest to choose sides; they are not sure they have anything to gain by lining up with the West; and they would certainly have to make sure first that their former oppressors had really reformed.

It is the Asians' sensitivity to colonialism that makes Communist prattling about American imperialism in Formosa—false as it is—logical propaganda. Asians and Africans are watching to see if the powers controlling colonies in Africa follow a more enlightened policy there than in Asia.

Britain's bold experiment in speeding self-government in the Gold Coast is a plus mark for the West. There are reassuring signs in Nigeria. But Britain wins no confidence with its nineteenth-century repression in Kenya, home of the Mau Mau. A French premier tries to put across a policy of autonomy for North Africa and—for this and other reasons—he is overthrow.

2. RACISM: "CHINESE NOT ALLOWED"

Hatred of the white man is colonialism's legacy in vast areas of the world. Starvation wages would have been reason enough for hatred of the colonial powers, if that is all colonialism had meant. But it also meant signs in Shanghai parks: "Dogs and Chinese not allowed here." It meant rules barring all natives from admission to the white man's club. Racial scars left by discrimination take years, decades, generations to fade. Most of the nations gathering at Bandung bear still-fresh scars. Racial resentment is common ground for the fashioning of alliances.

Significantly, the invitation list for the conference emphasizes the racial aspect of the meeting. South Africa, carrying policies of race discrimination to especially revolting extremes, was not invited. The Arabs are coming, but they made sure Israel did not get an invitation. It may even be significant that Russia, an Asian as well as a European power, was not asked to come.

Armageddon between whites and nonwhites is not an immediate prospect. But limited, local racial wars are going on today. The struggle in Kenya is largely racial. How long will it be before South Africa explodes? In a generation or two, if current trends are not reversed, race war on a vast scale could shake the earth.

3. ECONOMICS: WHO'LL HELP?

The masses of Asia and Africa are impoverished. They are looking desperately for help from more fortunate nations. Whoever eases their misery—democracy, communism, the political system doesn't matter—will have their friendship and their trade.

4. PEACE: NO MORE BOMBS!

At a meeting of the five Colombo powers last year, a resolution was approved calling for an end to hydrogen-bomb and atom-bomb tests. Passage of the resolution was understandable. The injury to the Japanese fishermen (one of whom later died) by the radioactive fallout from an H-bomb explosion terrified masses of people in Asia.

But while the resolution to ban tests theoretically applied equally to East and West, it unintentionally reinforced Communist propaganda. The Communists, with their superiority in manpower, have been trying for years to eliminate atomic weapons from the world's arsenals. With the West's atomic deterrent neutralized, the Communists would be ready to march. Neutral resolutions are not always so neutral as they sound.

My fellow Asians and the Africans may adopt so-called neutral policies in hopes of staving off world war or staying out if it should erupt. But protestations of neutrality will not stop Communist imperialism. The only way to insure that the Communists dare not move is to help the free world build an unchallengeable defense.

At Bandung, the Filipino delegation will urge our Asian and African colleagues—those still uncommitted—to take that course. We will do what we can to expose the fallacy of neutralism. And, taking the longer view, we will try to prevent the nurturing of a racial alliance which could develop into an enormity that would convulse the earth.

We have been working hard in recent weeks readying ourselves to answer the Communists, and the neutralists, point by point; to counter their resolutions with constructive resolutions of our own. We fully appreciate the intensity of Asian-African suspicion of the West. But we are working on the assumption that the West intends to follow through on its promises, that it will share its knowledge and wealth with the world's less fortunate people, that it will hasten the day when all people will be truly independent.

Many specific projects to counter the dangerous drift in Asia and Africa have been blueprinted. But programs do not take hold unless the people who must put them into operation are made to realize with painful clarity how urgent they are.

The Bandung conference is a measure of that urgency. It will not get the news coverage of a Tachens evacuation or a congressional resolution on Formosa. But the free world would do well to watch it with as much attention—and guide itself by what it sees.

Misrepresentations in Billions, Blunders, and Baloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal about Mr. Castle's book, Billions, Blunders, and Baloney in which he strongly criticizes United States foreign policy generally and the foreign assistance and overseas information programs particularly. Mr. Castle has made a lot of noise about this book; he has promoted it through a lavish advertising campaign, and, at this opportune time, when USIA appropriations are being considered, he has sent a self-serving circular about his book to the the Members of the Congress.

Unfortunately, the charges in Mr. Castle's book have received some attention, although they are little more than an indiscriminate collection of epithets and invective. The overseas information program is just crackpot, and incredible baloney to him. The Voice of America is yackety-yak-yak; and the film program flicker foolishness. In passing Mr. Castle criticizes just about every feature of American foreign policy from both the Democratic and Republican administrations. He condemns the Democrats for losing China and the Republicans for giving away Korea with an equal hand.

Mr. Castle is against almost everything but he is mostly against the United States Information Agency. In his book he makes charge after charge to show that our information functions are ineffective, wasteful, and mismanaged and he urges that they be stringently curtailed. Mr. Castle's opinions would be worthy of more respect if he were more careful with his facts. Wherever I have been able to test the accuracy of Mr. Castle's charges I have found them wanting. Let me give a few examples.

Right at the beginning of his book Mr. Castle tells of a conversation with two Arab publishers named Amin, in Egypt. He sets forth what purport to be actual quotations of their remarks, all of which are highly critical of the USIA program in Egypt. Now, almost nothing that Mr. Castle said was accurate. First of all, he didn't even get the names of the Arab publishers right. Secondly, he said the Voice of America broadcast to Egypt comes in during the early morning so that nobody listens to it when in fact it has always come in during the best evening hours. Although Mr. Castle was ostensibly quoting actual remarks, he admitted to the Appropriations Committee that he had lost his notes of the conversation with the publishers and was relying on his memory.

And, finally, at the request of the appropriations subcommittee, a letter was obtained from the publishers in which they state flatly that Mr. Castle not only misspelled their names but their ideas, and they asked expressly that the distortion of the facts about their views be set straight.

Mr. Castle also took the United States Information Agency apart for the elaborate quarters it occupies in Europe. Yet when the charges are examined against actual facts very little remains. In Paris, for example, Mr. Castle accused the Information Agency of occupying three swank buildings—the Rothschild Mansion, the Cafe des Ambassadeurs and the Hotel Astoria. What are the facts? The Hotel Astoria is a seven-story building. The USIA library occupies a part of the ground floor. That is the only space in the building occupied by the USIA and that space is being vacated this summer. As for the Cafe des Ambassadeurs—the Agency does not now occupy this building and did so only for long enough to close down the operations housed there before it took over the information program. Except for the library, then, USIA operations in Paris are entirely housed in one building, the Rothschild house, and not three separate buildings as Mr. Castle would have it. As for the Rothschild building, it was purchased by the State Department a long time ago and was simply inherited by the USIA, which has been trying to get out of it ever since.

Another sample of Mr. Castle's charges is in his discussion of the USIA film program. Mr. Castle has some claim to being an expert on motion pictures and his opinions on the USIA film program would, therefore, seem to command respect. Mr. Castle inveighed in the strongest terms against the "flicker foolishness" engaged in by USIA and flatly asserts the ineffectiveness of this "movie madness." Yet in the recent hearing before the Appropriations Subcommittee Mr. Castle had to admit that he had only seen 1 out of some 12 or 13 of the pictures reecntly made by the United States Information Agency and which he had presumed to criticize so harshly in his book. Hard-hitting anti-Communist movies like Poles Are Stubborn People, Dance to Freedom, Rape of the Baltic, and My Latvia were dismissed by him as worthless with the same easy disregard for fact which caused him to dismiss Mr. Cecil B. DeMille's opinion on the brilliant and costly propaganda films being made by the Soviet Union. Members of the subcommittee who saw the Soviet film entitled "The Doomed Vilage" can testify to the need for a hard-hitting film program to combat effective Soviet propaganda of this kind.

In my opinion a good many of the charges in Mr. Castle's book are reckless and not founded on fact. I feel that it has been harmful to the interests of the United States.

AKHBAR EL YOM,
SHARIA EL SAHAFA,
Cairo, March 7, 1955.

DEAR MR. WEATHERSBY: We were surprised that Mr. Eugene Castle in his recently published book claimed he had interviewed us about the USIA in Cairo. He not only misspelled our names but also mispelled our ideas. The fact is that this gentleman met us for a few minutes before a luncheon given by Mr. Saba Habach in the Mena House Hotel. All what he attributed to us is what he said himself. We disagreed with him, but he insisted he was right. He said he had come to Cairo and have visited many capitals to prove what he actually was convinced of before starting off from the States.

Will you please try to use your influence and correct this distortion of facts.

Yours sincerely,

MOSTAFA AMIN.
ALI AMIN.

Public Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a growing groundswell of public opinion against the administration's policy on public power and protection of the people's resources.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange held in St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955.

The Farmers Union Central Exchange, which serves 350,000 farmers in 6 Northwest States, states its views in 2 resolutions, as follows:

PUBLIC POWER AND PRIVATE UTILITIES

Whereas the present policy of the administration in regard to private utilities and power development is:

1. To turn over to private utilities much of the Nation's public power construction and output, contrary to customary and legally established preference policies.

2. To permit a type of power construction by private utilities which will bring about the creeping destruction of multipurpose river development.

3. To compel electric cooperatives through so-called partnership agreements to consent to the expansion of private power while public power projects are being halted.

4. To subsidize private utilities by guaranteed profits and by various devices such as are contained in the Dixon-Yates contract: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., on February 28 through March 3, do hereby go on record as fully endorsing the valiant efforts of the State and National Farmers Union leadership to block the private power policies of the present administration.

DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Whereas the administration has seen fit to promote a contract authorizing the private power combine Dixon-Yates to provide electric power to TVA for use by Atomic Energy Commission; and

Whereas President Eisenhower ordered this contract signed over the disapproval of both the Chairman of TVA and the Chairman of AEC; and

Whereas the Dixon-Yates group was awarded the contract in spite of lower bids from other private groups, and in spite of the fact that TVA maintains that it could build steam generators and transmit electricity to AEC at a lower cost than private utilities; and

Whereas the administration has refused to present all facts to answer the charges of preferential treatment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That inasmuch as the administration's conduct in the Dixon-Yates case raised many unanswered questions and inasmuch as there are no apparent reasons justifying such a power contract, the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, do hereby go on record calling upon Congress to conduct a thorough investigation of the Dixon-Yates controversy by the proper investigating committee.

Treasures Money Cannot Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has set an example for our people by his regular church attendance and by his devotion to religious principles. Furthermore, he has surrounded himself with devout men and women of various faiths.

Visitors to Washington who have had contact with members of the Cabinet and other top officials have been impressed with the religious atmosphere prevailing here.

Faith in God is something that is beyond politics. No political party nor particular sect can lay claim to a monopoly on a faith in the Almighty. Devout leaders can stimulate that faith in the hearts of others by their example. By their daily lives they can create an atmosphere that will draw their associates and their fellow men to a closer walk with the Creator.

Recently while returning to California from Washington by airplane, Arthur S. Maxwell, editor of the Signs of the Times, a widely read religious journal, found himself seated beside a charming lady who, on learning he was a minister, readily discussed "many things pertaining to the kingdom of God," as the editor put it.

That lady was Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States. Impressed with her deep religious devotion, Editor Maxwell told Mrs. Priest he felt sure an article setting forth the spiritual treasures that money cannot buy might be a source of great inspiration to millions, especially if written by the Treasurer of the United States.

Treasures Money Cannot Buy is the title assigned to Mrs. Priest's article, which appears in the current issue of Signs of the Times, and I commend it to your reading. It follows:

TREASURES MONEY CANNOT BUY
(By Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States)

All the dollars in the United States Treasury taken together could not buy the dedication and devotion of people to the principles of freedom.

The irresistible, relentless progress that has given the United States the highest standard of living in the world was not purchased with money.

Money cannot buy patriotism, progress, or security. These are primarily spiritual things that live in the hearts of a people and cannot accrue to a government because of money or any material objects it gathers around it.

The price of our heritage was not money, but the ceaseless toil and prodigious efforts of those courageous pioneers who settled this land, tilled the soil, blazed the trails, extracted the minerals from the bounteous earth, and pushed the frontiers from the Atlantic to the far reaches of the Pacific. Then in their great generosity they bequeathed to the generations that followed, to us, the freedom that they purchased so dearly, the precious liberty which money could not buy.

Our American way is more than a treasure, indeed it is a treasure chest of treasures, for in truth it is composed of not one, but a multitude of related rights and freedoms, the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience, the freedom to experiment, to change, to seek knowledge wherever research leads.

By material standards our system has succeeded. It is giving the greatest outpouring of material wealth that the world has ever seen and is providing the most equitable distribution system yet attained.

By spiritual standards it is an even greater success, surpassing any philosophy of government ever put into practice. The spiritual power of our way of life is derived from the Bible. Faith in God's wisdom and in our own abilities to work out our problems with divine help are deeply embedded in the great American tradition.

Belief in God gives an inner peace and contentment that is beyond the power of money to buy. Faith in the precepts and commands of God nurtures faith in man and leads to fair dealing, inegrity, honesty, and understanding among all. Understanding lays the groundwork of confidence and cooperation and encourages a striving to help those less fortunate. It gives us the humility to learn from others, and stamina and strength to make our own decisions. It teaches us patience in the face of obstacles and encourages us to be generous enough to share our good wealth with others. It enables us to turn a smiling face to cares, to preserve a buoyant, hopeful, youthful spirit, to abide by rules of virtue, to shun folly, and keep uppermost in our thoughts the eternal things of life.

Money cannot buy education or character for growing youngsters; it cannot give them a wholesome assurance, a confident ability in their capacity to meet life. Character can only be built when the aspirations of youth are lifted beyond worldly goods to lofty ideals that challenge them to be and do their best.

Money cannot buy progress, which comes from asking, seeking, knocking at all doors before us, sometimes evolving slowly from plodding, patient research into the mysteries of the unknown, and sometimes leaping into life from flashing, brilliant insights.

Truth cannot be bought with dollars. Money cannot buy the peace and contentment that come from an understanding heart. Happy homes, education, character, confidence, self-respect, kindness, generosity, and peace—these different forms of worthwhile treasures money cannot buy.

Nor can they come to those sufficient unto themselves. These treasures come only to those who look to God for leadership, who tap the inexhaustible sources of strength in the Bible.

It is because we as a people have placed our faith in God's wisdom that we are strong.

The motto, "In God we trust," long engraved on American coins, and recently engraved on postage stamps, has always been deeply engraved in our hearts. It has enabled our forefathers to stand, figuratively, on their own two feet and pull their solid weight.

If we but resolve to rededicate our lives to Christan living, the treasures money cannot buy will continue to multiply and America will be invincible and secure.

Stevenson Appeals to Commonsense and Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Adlai Stevenson's speech on April 11 was a badly needed contribution to the public discussion of the questions confronting our country as we face the possibility of war in Asia. Mr. Stevenson actually opened up for discussion a broader course of action which can be of much help for the President in making the decision that is essentially his responsibility.

It is very unforunate, but perhaps systematic of the handicaps under which the President must operate, that Mr. Stevenson's speech has been the subject of partisan attack for only two reasons: First, because he raises some questions which can help prevent our country being drawn into a war, and, second, because he is a prominent Democrat. For a fair evaluation of the impression Mr. Stevenson's speech made on the rest of the country, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) State-Times:

WISDOM OF ADLAI STEVENSON—APPEALS TO COMMONSENSE AND MORALITY

As he so aften does when he speaks out constructively on a national issue, Adlai Stevenson has appealed to the commonsense and the moral precepts of America's President and public in consideration of the Formosan Strait situation. His thoughtfully worded and calmly spoken broadcast of Monday evening was completely in keeping with the loyal-opposition tradition, offered not for political gain but to serve the natianal interest.

The President, in the great loneliness of his office, has the sole responsibility for making the ultimate decision whether to defend certain Chinese coastal islands against an expected Communist attack, Mr. Stevenson said, "Yet in a democratic community he is entitled not only to the support but to the informed judgment of his fellow countrymen."

There was no suggestion of appeasement in the Stevenson address. He suggested at least one avenue to a peaceful solution and said if the Reds reject all such efforts, "then

at least it would be clear to everyone who the aggressors were." If they are bent on force, "then we would have no alternative but to meet force with force."

What he raised in a most pointed way were the questions which have been troubling so many Americans in recent weeks: Are Quemoy and Matsu islands, the nearest less than 5 miles from the mainland, of real strategic value to the United States? Are they the place for the stand, backed by arms, which could result in the catastrophe of world war III? Are they worth the risk of such a conflict, particularly when we stand alone in even considering them so?

The weight of the argument as to their worth to the Chinese Nationalists and thus to us as Chiang Kai-shek's guarantors is on the negative side. Their value is primarily psychological with some elements of worth as listening posts thrown in. They could not be used by the Communists as stepping stones in an attack on Formosa, since there still remains the 100 miles of open water between them and the big Nationalist-held island.

We have already pledged our might to defend Formosa. That is the main consideration in the area, and if defense of that last stronghold of the Nationalists becomes necessary, we had better possess all the strength we can muster for the test. To consolidate our position is sound military strategy; in this case, it is a virtual necessity if we are to retain support of our friends.

The division of the allies over the islands, Mr. Stevenson said, "the weakening of our grand alliance of free nations pledged to stand together to defend themselves is in my judgment a greater peril to enduring peace than the islands themselves." He is right, of course, for should war come—as it might, given the spark of conflict—"the maintenance of our alliances and the respect and good will of the uncommitted nations of Asia will be far more important to us than the possession of these offshore islands could ever be."

Mr. Stevenson suggests a firm and united stand by the Western nations on a basis for settlement for the situation, with Russia invited to declare its position. Only then will there be force potent enough to enforce an agreement.

Certainly, the issue is grave enough, the potentialities sufficiently terrifying, to warrant every possible effort for a peaceful settlement. And America's strongest position is that to be found in the company of its allies.

Family Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange in St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955.

The Farmers Union Central Exchange, I wish to point out, is a cooperative wholesale organization serving 350,000 farmers in six Northwest States.

There has been long a feeling on the part of the Nation's family-type farmers that the Congress of the United States should adopt a statement of policy with respect to family-type farmers. Bills have been introduced on this matter. The resolution adopted by the Farmers Union Central Exchange delegates expresses the views of farmers on the need for such legislation.

Following is the full text of the resolution which I recommend to my colleagues:

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin (H. R. 2000) and sponsored in the Senate by Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and MURRAY, of Montana, entitled the Family Farm Policy Act which sets forth the family farmers' bill of rights as a guide and standard for farm legislation and agricultural policy. This bill of rights embodies and enumerates the principles of the family-size farm and security, opportunity, and parity of living for farm families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates in attendance at this 24th anual meeting of the Farmers Union Central go on record in support of the principles of this legislation.

Surplus Grain and Jobless Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Roanoke (Va.) Times of Wednesday, April 6, 1955.

This editorial is in support of my efforts to supply our needy people in various sections of this country with flour and meal for bread through the milling of a portion of our surplus grains.

I wish to call the attention of the House to this editorial and to the need of legislation to see that this grain is used for our needy miners and others who are jobless:

SURPLUS GRAIN AND JOBLESS MINERS

Representative W. PAT JENNINGS, freshman Democratic Congressman from Virginia's coal-mining Ninth District, is putting up a fight for those of his constituents left nearly destitute by the depression in the coalfields. Associated with him are Congressmen representing districts in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania similarly hard hit.

To Mr. JENNINGS, it seems foolish, even cruel, to allow the continued deterioration of millions of tons of Government-owned grain, purchased under the price-support program and stored anywhere and everywhere that space can be rented, while many thousands of Americans lack bread through no fault of their own. He points out that 8,500 people in 6 coal counties of his district, deprived of regular means of livelihood by the shutting down of coal mining operations and by technological changes in the industry, were largely dependent upon surplus foods in March to stave off the specter of hunger.

He is asking that some agency of the Federal Government arrange for the milling of this grain and its distribution along with butter, shortening, beans, rice, dried milk, and cheese so that mine families can make bread.

"Perhaps if my district would secede from the Union and then make application for foreign aid," the young Congressman says pointedly, "the request would be approved."

The remedy proposed here by Mr. JENNINGS and his colleagues is at best a temporary one. Obviously, breadlines and other forms of emergency relief provide no long-range solution to the economic problems of the coalfields, but that does not render them any the less necessary when thousands of families are unable to earn an independent living and feed themselves. Mr. JENNINGS has faith in the ultimate revival of the coal industry, a faith which is shared by the Norfolk & Western Railway and many others close to the matter. He recognizes that other steps must be taken to establish new industry, to retrain or relocate those miners permanently displaced by technological changes.

In the meantime, he points out that "a hungry child can think only about his hunger, but the well-nourished child stands ready to understand and absorb the meaning of our American tradition of freedom and democracy."

We can understand the fears of Agriculture Department and Commodity Credit Corporation officials that their agencies might be plunged irrevocably into the relief and welfare business. This, however, is no more than a technical objection. The same applies to the contention that the distribution of flour and meal would put the Government in competition with commercial milling concerns, for the people who would benefit are not now in the market for these products for the simple reason that they have virtually no income.

The processing and distribution of the stored grain would simply be an extension of the present surplus food-disposal plan. It presents some difficulties, but these should not be insurmountable. The grain is there; the Government wants to get rid of it; American citizens because of a situation they cannot control need it desperately in the form of flour and meal to feed their families.

Congress should direct that the appropriate Federal agencies launch a temporary emergency program to put this food into the surplus distribution channels.

Problems of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a copy of a United States Information Agency magazine that is practically unknown in this country, but overseas, in the past 2 years, it has gained tremendous prestige.

The magazine is called Problems of Communism. It is published bimonthly in English, French, and Spanish, and monthly in Japanese.

Recent editions include articles such as:

Collectivization in China: A Story of Betrayal, by Richard L. Walker, No. 1, 1955.

Soviet Cinema: A History and an Elegy, by Dwight Macdonald, No. 1, 1955.

Poland After the Death of Stalin, by Jean Malara, No. 2, 1955.

Of this publication, Ost Europa, a magazine published in Stuttgart, recently said that it has "acquired a distinguished position among organs concerned with East European affairs," proving that "political orientation is compatable with factual treatment and high scholarly standards." In other words, the increasing prestige of Problems of Communism is proof that a highbrow magazine can have tremendous political weight if it adheres strictly to facts.

In further tribute to this United States Information Agency publication, several members of the French and British Parliaments recently requested that their names be put on the mailing list. Government officials throughout the free world have commented on its value in the fight against international communism. This little publication is proving important ammunition in the fight freemen everywhere are making to keep freedom alive in the world.

Incidentally, Problems of Communism is beginning to win recognition in the United States. Herbert A. Philbrick, of the New York Herald Tribune, recently congratulated the editors, declaring that "of all the material which I read and study concerning communism, problems of Communism is one of the most valuable sources of information available today."

In a letter to the editor, Fortune magazine called it "a most impressive set of documents from an impressive panel of authors."

The United States Information Agency, of course, has not made any effort in this country to build up circulation for the magazine. It is, however, available through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, at 35 cents a copy or $1.50 per yearly subscription. As Theodore Streibert, Director of the Agency, sees its job, it is strictly an overseas operation. The purpose of the entire program is to make friends of overseas for the United States and to influence people in other lands, not the United States.

Problems of Communism illustrates another point seen as important by the Agency. The Agency does not have, and does not expect to have the resources to compete with the Communists in volume of operation. It must concentrate on targets where its efforts will be the most effective. Problems of Communism, which numbers among its contributors scholars, specialists, topnotch political analysts and journalists, both American and foreign, that is, Lazar Volin, Soviet specialist at the Department of Agriculture; Merle Fainsod, famous Harvard University authority on Russia; Hugh Seton-Watson, British authority on Eastern Europe; Raymond Aron, distinguished French political analyst, and so forth, is written for opinion molders. It goes to Government officials, writers, educators, and, yes, students. This, as I see it, is intelligent. Unless we plan to put billions into our overseas information program we must operate on this theory.

I might add that the coeditor of Problems of Communism, Abraham Brumberg, writes with firsthand knowledge of his subject. In 1941, he fled from the Soviet occupied city of Vilma, Poland. Coming to the United States, he served first in the Army. Later, he studied at Yale University, where he received an M. A. in Russian studies. Mr. Brumberg has edited the magazine, in cooperation with Miss Therese Thompson, for the past 3 years. The lady is an expert in the field of Communist affairs and in stylisitic editing.

Speaking of his work with the United States Information Agency, Mr. Brumberg told me:

> I believe that there are many people throughout the world who have been misled by the promises and appeals communism has been offering over a period of years. It is our aim to reach these people with facts and irrefutable evidence, to point the gap between Communist promises and performances, myth and reality.

Mr. Brumberg came to Washington in 1952. Problems of Communism was then only an infant. It was taking its first faltering steps. It took the new coeditor only about a year to put the publication on its feet. Today, it is going places.

The Late William Sebastian Jacobsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, while on a short visit to Arkansas I was grieved to learn that a close, dear friend of mine—and a friend of the Congress—former Representative William Sebastian Jacobsen, of Iowa, had passed on.

Only the week before I left to visit in Arkansas I had received the tragic news of the passing of his sainted mother, and I had written to Bill expressing the sorrow of my family at his loss. Bill had continued to correspond with me after he had retired to Iowa from the Congress to resume his work as owner and operator of a radio station along with other extensive business enterprises.

When Representative Jacobsen came to the Congress for the first time, I had the pleasure of meeting him. He was familiar with the workings of the Congress because his father, the late Bernard M. Jacobsen, had served in the Congress. Indeed, Bill took his father's seat in the Congress.

Thus, through many sessions of the Congress, the fine people of the Second District of Iowa were represented by noble men of the Jacobsen family. Both gentlemen made outstanding records of public service.

Those of us who had the honor and privilege of serving with Bill Jacobsen will miss his friendship and his counsel. He was a fine man and one whose friendship I was proud to have. Iowa has been most fortunate in the fine men who have represented her interests in the Halls of the Congress, and Bill Jacobsen will take his honored place in the ranks of those whom Iowa will long remember.

To the present delegation who represent Iowa in these Halls, may I express my sorrow and sympathy in your loss.

The Career Compensation Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on a recent trip to my district in San Diego County, Calif., I found a great amount of enthusiasm for the recently enacted Career Compensation Act of 1955. Some of the predictions made about this bill seem to be bolstered by the favorable attitude of service personnel and by editorials and articles such as the following from the Navy Times of April 16, 1955:

LOOK LONG BEFORE LEAPING

The grass probably never was more green than it is in the Navy pasture this spring. What's more, the recent upsurge in reenlistments after the low point of last year is evidence that an increasing number of Navy men are aware of the advantages of service in this post-Korean Navy.

To those not so aware, a few reminders and some less-well-known facts—are perhaps in order.

The first obvious statement is that there has been a pay raise, effective from April 1. It is a substantial raise.

Almost as obvious is the fact that this raise will increase the already substantial reenlistment bonuses which Congress voted last year.

And most Navy men know that the raise also will show up in retired pay. Even under the old rates a man would have to put about $65,000 into annuities over a 30-year period to get what the Government will pay a serviceman from the day he retires after 20 years until his death. The new rates will further increase the value of retired pay. Another recent law, the Contingency Option Act, makes it possible to continue payment of part of retired pay to survivors after the serviceman's own death.

There has been talk of late that civilian industry has been adding fringe benefits which equal those which the services historically have offered. In some respects this is true, but no civilian retirement plan begins to approach the military plan in value. Apart from the fact that most civilian plans are contributory while the serviceman pays nothing, no civilian plan offers an annuity at anything close to 20 years.

As for fringe benefits, the unprecedented speed and unanimity with which the service-pay bill went through Congress is evidence that the legislators as a whole realize that the curtailment went too far. The benefits are substantial now. Prospects for future additions—in dependents' medical care and in more housing—are bright.

Dependent medical care even now, though spotty, is still better than civilians get. As for care of the worker himself there simply is no comparison.

It is amazing to hear protests on the one hand over the closing of commissaries and protests on the other that there is no real saving in buying at commissaries and exchanges. Only one of these protests can be valid. Both the exchanges and commissaries have figures to prove that their prices on the range of merchandise are lower. Of course, you can go downtown and find a few cheaper items. So what?

As for promotions, there's a terrible row on because a Navy cutting back in personnel has restricted advancement to the top two enlisted grades in some specified ratings. A study of the Navy's grade situation proves conclusively that the prospects of retiring as a chief petty officer are splendid.

For those few rates—and they aren't as many as the temporary freeze would indicate—which will be overcrowded for some years to come, the Navy is offering retraining. That's more than is available in most civilian industries with their innumerable blind alleys.

Of course, in a curtailed Navy, there is a surplus of chiefs. Many first-class petty officers immediately lament that they will have to retire as E–6's. And juniors fear they won't even get E–6 before retirement.

Here are the facts: On September 30, 1954, there were 47,800 chiefs. All but 5,023 had more than 12 years' service. Which means more than 40,000 of the chiefs are going to retire within the next 10 years.

Only 2,729 of the 47,700 had more than 22 years. That indicates—despite another fear of those below—that relatively few chiefs do stay on for 30. Right behind these 2,729 are 1,708 with 20 and 21 years and 26,375 with 14 to 19 years. The latter group includes 6,000 who are going to be out within the next 2 to 4 years.

Why, only 203 of the 57,434 first-class petty officers have 18 or more years in, and only 2,103 have 16 or more. There will be vacancies for practically all of these before they reach retirement.

And all along the line, the hump in each grade is far enough behind the hump in the next higher grade, to insure vacancies. It also should be remembered that extra credits have been given to enable the more senior man, if he can pass the tests, to be promoted.

Now we come to the last great gripe: Too much sea duty and too much rotation. It was the great turnover in personnel which required trained men to be shifted to fill vacancies. As the Navy stabilizes in size and as the proportion of career men increases, you can look for a remedy of this situation too. And the man who is at sea is going to find his ships increasingly more habitable.

All of these things should be studied well by a man who has a cruise or two behind him before he makes a decision he may come to regret exceedingly.

MAIL CALL—COUNT YOUR BLESSINGS

U. S. S. *K–1*: I have seen letters in Mail Call recently from some pretty good gripers.

They point the small, minor, inconsequential items that affect them personally. Then, they infer, these are the reasons men are going out.

Certainly, locker space is inadequate on some ships. Sure passageways are too narrow. I'll agree that some so-called specialists have to stand sentry duty.

These are real hardships. Did these men ever live out of a sea bag? Swing a hammock on a can or carrier? Sleep on a cot or torpedo skid on a sub? Are they a special class that they have no military duties?

Shipmates, you chose the Navy. The Navy didn't choose you. We are supposed to be the best damn fighting organization in the world. Let's keep it that way.

Naval architects today are planning ships the way your mother planned your bedroom. However, if that broad passageway decreases the fighting efficiency of your ship, it's your neck, not theirs. If that extra large locker blocks the ammo passer, look out. The enemy doesn't care if you can fix that plane. He just doesn't want you to be able to shoot back.

For putting up with these so-called hardships, the Navy offers you plenty in return.

You get: The best food money can buy, better than you'd buy at home. A place to sleep on clean sheets; it's up to you how clean. Pay day twice a month. The chance to obtain a college education for $2. Free schooling and training to advance yourself. Free medication and no loss of pay while hospitalized. A pension plan that would cost you $162 a month. Check with the insurance companies, if you can find one that will write the policy.

Check your buddies on the outside and see them paying income tax on their gross. They can't deduct food and lodging expenses. Money spent for schooling. Look around, shipmate. Think before you leap.

Remember that your last duty and your next one are always the best.

While you're patting yourself on the back for getting out, think of how many guys you've run into that have said, "Boy, you're in a good outfit; wish I'd stayed in. I could have retired by now."

Ask yourself, "Will I be one of those guys in a few years?"

Then make an honest appraisal of yourself. Just how good are your chances? Just what prospects do you have? Who'll take care of your family when you're sick, out of work, out on strike, or just too old to work?

If you don't have to worry about all these then, "Good luck to you." Your prospects are so good and have improved so much in the past 4 years it's unbelievable.

In 1960 I shall be able to retire and live on the returns of a $65,000 investment. I'll put up with the minor hardships, duties, sea cruisers, etc. But I'll be repaid. Will you?

JAMES WELBY,
TM1 (SS).

Pennsylvania's Wealth Can Be Multiplied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Mr. Paul Albert, of DuBois, Pa., is of special interest because it discusses the importance of water as a natural resource and is based on the personal observations of the writer, who is an industrial engineer with the Osborn Machine Co., DuBois, Pa., and one of Jensylvania's most ardent sportsmen:

PENNSYLVANIA'S WEALTH CAN BE MULTIPLIED

We in America are using up all of our resources at such a tremendous rate that time will eventually tell a story. Coal is taking a breathing spell at the present time on account of the production of gas and oil. Atomic power may help oil, gas, and coal eventually.

Among the metals iron, from which steel is made, and iron which along with coal has been the backbone of our great industrial economy will, in not too many years, be gone. High grade iron ores within the United States are just about used up now and it will be necessary to process low grade ores at a terrific rate to maintain our world position in war or peace. Canadian and South American ores could be cut off from us.

WATER

We never consider water as a resource, but after all the other resources are gone, we will find that water is the most important to sustain life. Human and animal life as well as vegetable life depends on water and the purer the water, the purer the life, physically, mentally and spiritually. Today we ruin our water the same as we are ruining all other resources.

Having lived in Pennsylvania for 57 years, I am naturally more concerned about the water that falls in Pennsylvania soil. Practically all water that falls can be conserved and put to use and a good share of the cost of the water conservation plan could be made to pay for itself.

As a youngster I saw some of the tail end of Pennsylvania's original natural beauty, and having been born in Clearfield County of parents whose ancestors settled there in the early 1800's, I have always had a love for the streams and forests. I have roamed over a great portion of the watersheds of the west branches of the Susquehanna and the Allegheny Rivers and have spent many days fishing on streams that are fast losing their original beauty. I have hunted over high plateau and basin lands on the divides and have noticed that good timber doesn't thrive there anymore. I began to notice the nature changes about 15 years ago and being selfishly concerned about trout fishing, I wondered if nature could be helped. She can be helped and we can all benefit.

We have all read and heard news items, accounts and statistics, etc. of floods. Likewise, we have read and heard accounts of droughts and water shortages. Many areas of Pennsylvania have experienced these conditions and they can be corrected.

I recall that fresh water springs, which used to abound throughout our countryside, are diminishing and disappearing. A clean fresh water spring could be found from a quarter to a half mile apart at any time of the year in my home locality about 30 years ago. The best one of these springs has survived but it is losing flow. Various conditions have caused this situation and many arguments about the causes could be had without solutions. The denuding of our land of the evergreens, etc., can account for some of the conditions. Has the thought ever occurred that other forms of vegetation, that took the place of the evergreens, dissipate more moisture than the evergreens? The evergreen carpet surely held more water in the ground than the leaf carpet does. However, the evergreens are gone but could be bountifully revived.

The removal of coal, gas, and oil from our ground has caused the lowering of subterranean water levels. Bear in mind that water always finds a level.

Our complex living of today demands that we alter or correct conditions that cause us trouble. Water causes us trouble in the form of floods, therefore, we do everything to get rid of it, then we don't have any and we hope and pray for rain. Creeks and steams have been straightened to hasten runoff and the building of highways has certainly helped to get rid of water. The major portions of highways are built along streams in valleys and are ditched, graded or sewered to put the water into immediately. No wonder we have flash floods, but we must have highways.

We spend money to advertise our State as a vacation land, but what is a vacation without water? Our streams are dry during the vacation months.

Let us keep water in our streams and take care of the floods. This can easily be done in many areas of the State.

While enjoying days on the streams and days of hunting on the high tablelands in the hills, I have studied the contours and noticed that there are hundreds of natural basins atop the mountains. A great number of these basins used to be more or less swampy, but now they are dry. These basins were formed by erosion and glacial action centuries ago and vary in size from about 10 acres to possibly 500 acres or more.

Many of these basins extend to the brow of a range of hills and are drained by a gulley down the side of hills to streams below. Many of the basins have a relatively narrow outlet that could easily have a dam breast constructed across them, making tiers of dams, if necessary, to hold water to an average depth of 3 feet with a dam-breast height of possibly 10 to 14 feet. These breasts could be easily constructed with bulldozers, shovels,

etc., and should be so built that from the maximum rainfall the water would never run over the top of the breast of the dam.

Various means, depending on ground contour, could be used to effect seepage from these dams. The seepage features would be simple but important to the operation of the system of water conservation and control, and are as follows:

1. Plateau basins which extend to the rim of a valley have gulleys through which they drain. Dam breasts, built across the drainage side of the basins at the head of the gulleys, could be built. A series of holes could be drilled back of the breast line to a depth of approximately 80 feet paralleling the slope of the valley sides beyond the dam breast. Charges of nitroglycerine put down the holes and exploded to loosen the earth strata would effect seepage. Some water would naturally seep through the earth, as our alternate seepage holes could also be drilled into the earth on the dam-breast line and the holes connected with pipe extending from the drilled holes to a suitable point within the dam to allow water to enter the pipes and then into the drilled holes. The breast of the dam would be constructed after seepage is prepared. Erosion of the dam breasts would be reduced by the above means of seepage. Earth-boring tools capable of boring 800 feet of 6-inch-diameter holes in 8 hours in most Pennsylvania earth are available.

2. Where the contour of the earth below the breast of a dam would be too flat to allow seepage by deep-drilled holes, seepage lines similar to the principle of septic-tank dissipation could be used. A syphon system could also be employed.

Any of the dams could be drained by using cast-iron pipe drains through the breast. The size and quantity of the pipes would be governed by the size of the dam so that water collected in the dams would drain out slowly. None of these drain pipes should be placed at the lowest point in the dam so that some water should always remain within the dam. Masonry should be placed around the pipe on the inside face of the dam breast. Flat stones or concrete splash surfaces should be prepared under the discharge end of the drain pipes.

Water held in these basins, with proper seepage, would produce springs and maintain a normal flow of water in our streams year by year.

The drainage area surrounding a basin could possibly be 5 to 10 times greater than the maximum dam area so that a dam area of 100 acres could serve a drainage area of possibly 500 to 1,000 acres. The water held here is going to do more towards flood control than our present methods, as it is my opinion that the water coming out of gulleys which drain mountain-top basins is what finally puts streams over their banks.

If the basins are dammed, the hillsides are left to drain into the streams. Naturally, the water running off a hillside is uniform in flow, but from a basin it builds up into a stream and from what I have seen in hundreds of gulleys off the mountains in Bennetts Valley, First Fork of Sinnemahoning Creek, the West Branch of Sinnemahoning Creek, and other large streams, after a hard and prolonged rain it amazes me that we don't have greater floods. Remember, we are helping the runoff.

The water held on the tops of the mountains should produce more evaporation which would result in rainfall somewhere and as a result, there would be cleaner air, which the Creator meant that we should have. We pollute our air, and this could help clean it. As I mentioned, the basin dams would supply a normal flow of water, which would dilute the pollution from industrial waste and sewage and should mean better health. Towns, whose reservoirs go low in the summer, would be able to count on a good water supply. Industry should be pleased to have more and better water to work with.

I know of a town whose sewerage is discharged into the stream running through the town, but downstream from the town itself the neighboring town, 4 miles downstream, has an almost unbearable odor condition through the hot, dry summer months when the stream is low.

Imagine having to keep your home closed tight for weeks when the air moves from the wrong direction. A normal flow of water would improve this situation and may correct it. This condition exists in many areas of the State.

Evergreens on the hillsides below the basin dams would grow to such an extent that in 40 years the cost of the dam above could be paid for in good pine timber. Property values along good streams would multiply to such an extent that the taxes from real estate would bear a great share of the cost of the dam construction.

It may be possible to create a State or Federal authority to launch a water conservation and timber plan that would pay for itself.

The State of Maine took a venturesome step years ago in barring stream pollution. They lost some industry but gained much more in tourist and vacation trade. Pennsylvania could do this job and gain industrially and develop a tourist and vacation trade second only to Ontario, Canada, whose largest industry is vacationing. I have just about given up fishing in Pennsylvania and go to Ontario every year along with 5 or 6 other men, where we usually leave about $1,000 every year. There are many, many men and their families from Pennsylvania doing this every year because of the water. I have been doing this for the past 13 years. Pennsylvania could develop something better to offer in time but it would take some action.

I can picture people buying land, building tourist accommodations and serving tourists by the thousands but we need water. My selfish scheme for lots of water for fish would be satisfied and we could truly advertise our State as a great vacation land and build up a tourist trade to equal any State in the Nation, but we do need the water, and we can have it.

Coal and minerals naturally lay under some of these basin areas but the State owns enough land to work with. I have never seen good timber growing in any of the basin areas, and if a question is raised about mosquitos, they can be controlled. Fill these basin dams with lily pads and we can stock moose 50 years from now.

I feel that the same amount of money that is spent for flood control dams could accomplish better results floodwise and give us a great return for our money from a vacation and timber angle, as well as better health from sewerage dissipation. The whole Delaware watershed could be treated in the above manner for the benefit of the Delaware Valley and Philadelphia and the New York reservoir's watersheds likewise.

It would take time but would be an investment to hand down to our future generations.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an article by Arthur V. Burrowes, editor of the St. Joseph News-Press, St. Joseph, Mo. The News-Press is an outstanding newspaper in the Midwest, and Mr. Burrowes, the author of this article, is one of the prominent civic leaders in Missouri. Not only is he active in community affairs, but he is a prominent Catholic layman and an outstanding Christian gentleman, who puts into daily practice his great faith in Christianity. I sincerely believe that this article, published on Good Friday, is appropriate to the title of the column in which it appears, Timely Observations:

When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar He said, "It is finished," and He bowed His head and gave up the ghost. It is consummated. The work for which Jesus Christ came to this earth was accomplished. And today the Christian world in reverence commemorates once more the story of Calvary. This is Good Friday, climax of the life of Christ, Who suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. This is Good Friday everywhere from the tomb itself in the Holy Land to the tiniest church and kirk in northwest Missouri.

The story of that Jesus is 2,000 years old. But forever new. The beloved disciple, last of the apostles was John. He was the only one of the true 12, not to die a martyr. He opens his gospel with magnetic words. Those words have held the mind and the heart of learned theologians and poor peasants—of the mighty and the little. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him and without Him was nothing that was made."

This is Good Friday of 1955 of Holy Week when Britain's greatest Prime Minister resigned. That Prime Minister once said he did not become the king's first minister to liquidate the empire. People of Britain and all continental Europe, of Asia where the great religions were born, and of the New World, turn from world affairs this day. They turn to contemplate the climax to the most tragic trial in all world history. Christianity is older than Britain or her premiers. And that same Christianity shall outlive that magnificent empire on which it once was said the sun never sets.

A television speaker recently told of that trial of Jesus. Prefacing his recital, he named other famous trials, Socrates, in Greece; Alfred Dreyfus, the Frenchman; Robert Emmet, the Irishman; and Aaron Burr, the American. All dwindle into insignificance to the trial of the Son of God. That Word born as all Christians truly believe, of the Virgin Mary, through the omnipotence of Almighty God.

And today in the Holy City, old Jerusalem, pilgrims from north, east, south, and west, visit those 14 stations, the Way of the Cross. Each reverently prays at the sacred spots: Jesus is condemned to death, Jesus takes up His cross, Jesus falls the first time, Jesus meets His blessed mother, Veronica wipes the face of Jesus, Simon of Cyrene helps Jesus carry His cross, Jesus falls the second time, Jesus meets the women of Jerusalem, Jesus falls the third time, Jesus is stripped of His clothes, Jesus is nailed to the cross, Jesus dies on the cross, Jesus is taken down from the cross, Jesus is laid in the tomb. Via Dolorosa that leads to Heaven's gates.

From the sixth hour to the ninth hour, that is from noon to the hour of three, Jesus was hanging on the cross. He spoke not too much. But His Father in Heaven permitted His Divine Son to retain consciousness. So that all the suffering necessary for the redemption of mankind would be visited on Him. A God had been affronted. Only a God could save mankind. It is the old, old story that has sent holy men to seminaries and theological schools, some Presbyterian, some Catholic. Yes, sending forth men of all creeds to God's ministry to keep men on

the right path. To a blessed eternity with Him.

Few were the words on the cross. "I thirst" said He. He committed His mother to John the beloved, and charged John to prize his charge. He gave us on the cross our knowledge of one great act of true penitence. And its reward. That was when He promised the thief: "This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise."

That the terrible sense of His sacrifice might be given Him, God let that Son utter those words that have mystified theologians for centuries. "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" What sermons could be preached on those few words. Then "Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit." As He died, the skies darkened, the earth quaked, graves mysteriously opened, and the dead appeared to many. Even the Roman soldier there as guard, cried aloud, "Indeed this was the Son of God."

From that blackest Friday of all time to this very day men and women have not had to see the miracle the Roman soldier saw. There have been millions who without seeing have believed. And the life and death of Jesus today is the greatest single event in time's long annals. From the very antiquity of ages, buried eons before man could leave a record, to this day of modern science. The story is in the Bible. And that Bible remains the world's greatest book. As it must forever.

The McCarran Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the following article by George Sokolsky on April 15, 1955, in the Washington Post is a good one. It is reasonable and fair:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)
THE M'CARRAN ACT

The Corsi affair again brings to public attention the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and the Refugee Relief Act which have to do with immigration into this country. This is an emotional issue over which there is bound to be controversy because involved is the question of racial, national, and religious equality before the law. No group is willing to agree to a formula which makes it less acceptable than any other group.

From a strictly American standpoint, the basic question is whether there is to be an unlimited or a limited immigration. No one proposes a system that stops all immigration. If it is to be a limited immigration, no one has ever proposed a formula for limitation which has had universal approval.

The McCarran-Walter Act undoubtedly requires some revision to remove whatever inequities experience with it has disclosed. Senator Pat McCarran once told me that he saw some points that could be improved upon. That is a function of Congress.

Opposition or support of these laws generally does not answer the fundamental question as to whether or not the American people want to increase the population of this country by taking in the surplus populations of other countries. Premier Mario Scelba of Italy made the interesting observation that the difference between the United States and Soviet Russia is that everybody wants to come to the United States and nobody wants to go to Russia.

But the United States cannot take in everybody. There was a long period in American history when this country needed population, when industrial companies sent agents to European countries to recruit immigrants. We were then short of labor.

That day is gone. The United States has a population of over 160 million people and by the present rate of increase, it will not be many decades before we shall have a population of 200 million.

Along with the increase of population, we have developed a remarkable method of production by labor-saving devices, to a degree that automatic or semiautomatic methods prevail. While in the past, it was held that machines made jobs, we may be approaching a period when new types of production will not make new jobs.

When that point is reached, the United States will have a surplus population; that is, more men and women than can be profitably employed. Whereas during the depression years that situation was regarded as abnormal and was met by putting part of our population on the dole; what are we to do about it should, let us say, between 3 million and 5 million employees be permanently unemployed and therefore surplus population?

This is the essential problem in immigration. It is not so much who gets in and who stays out, as how many are to come in and what kind of people.

Those who push these arguments aside can only answer that large numbers of people who are unhappy where they are want to come here. They would be more unhappy here, with our high cost of living, if they were unemployed because the United States suffered from a surplus population.

The questions then are: How many people can the United States employ; how many can we afford to admit as immigrants during the next decade; what is a better formula than the present quota system to determine who comes in and who has to stay out? These are not questions for a curbstone or prejudiced opinion.

Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following address titled "Our National Security" was delivered by Adm. Arthur Radford, United States Navy, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staffs, before the annual meeting of the Macon (Ga.) Chamber of Commerce, April 6, 1955:

Tonight, I should like to discuss with you one matter that is most important to all of us: The security of our country. I hope that you will join with me in considering some of the important problems of security—and some of our hopes for the future.

First of all, why do we want security? The answer is: We want to live in freedom and truth. Such an answer goes back to the ideas brought to the eastern seaboard by our adventurous forefathers—and to the principles upon which our country was founded.

Later, these ideas were set forth for all to know, in our Declaration of Independence. The purpose of the Declaration, said Thomas Jefferson, was "not to find out new principles * * * but to place before mankind the commonsense of the subject."

Then, once the shooting phase of the American Revolution ended, General Washington and the Congress set about building the Nation and providing for its future safety. There seemed to be two fundamental ambitions in their hearts and minds:

First, they wanted to perpetuate freedom and preserve a large degree of individual liberty.

Second, they wanted to build a strong nation, able to withstand aggression from outside and factionalism from inside.

This Nation lives today as a testimonial to the foresight and wisdom of those early American patriots who realize that freedom and strength would have to march hand in hand if our Nation were to long endure.

Today, we have strength—great national strength. The President outlined some strengths in his state of the Union message at the beginning of the year—natural resources, a growing economy, good health, and national defense.

The President also pointed out in this same report to the Congress, that foremost among the broad purposes of government is our support of freedom, justice, and peace.

Yes; our overall national purpose is to provide for the welfare and security of the United States through peace—not war. This is a national decision, based on our entire national experience, and is worthy of our best national efforts.

Everything we are doing—our treaties with other nations, our current defense program, our assistance to other countries—is the result of our determination to work for peace and security.

But it is harder and more dangerous than we would like it to be because of the apparent refusal by two large nations to carry out the spirit and principles which must underwrite a real and lasting peace.

One is the Soviet Union. It is abundantly clear that Moscow schemes to create one Communist world with all that it means—one giant Red world with slavery and subordination for all.

The other is Red China. Red China wants one completely Red Asia, one which includes Formosa and the Pescadores. They have so stated, not once, but many times.

And the danger is made more acute because of the alliance these two countries have with one another.

This danger of which we speak is not theoretical. It occupies space and derives its power from the resources of that space.

From the military viewpoint, the spectacular aspect of Communist strength is its combination of a vast land area, a huge supply of people, and very large armed forces—including an increasing strength in air forces and nuclear weapons. Their massive military machine is an important part of their continuing effort to dominate and intimidate free nations on their periphery.

This in no way, however, describes the full scope of the Communist threat. Subversion, infiltration, persuasion, indoctrination, and nonviolent techniques of control also are important tools of the Kremlin. These more silent weapons can be just as lethal as cannon.

The result is that free nations are faced with a very real threat. The threat is many-sided. It is clearly a global problem. And because of the provocative attitude of the Chinese Communists, it seems somewhat more threatening than in previous years.

All in all, their evil forces have applied great internal and external pressures against all things we hold right. In 1949, the Chinese Communists conquered China. In 1950, they openly invaded North Korea with large forces; and in 1951, they seized Tibet. For years, they have supported guerrilla operations and sabotage in Indochina and Malaya, and have sworn to seize Formosa. And they may be expected to try to infiltrate other countries in southeast Asia.

It is useful, I think, to remind ourselves that the major purpose of Communist strategy appears to be to break apart ties with allies, isolate free nations from each other, and prevent us from moving ahead to build

collective strength on which our safety depends.

Communists like to pick off free nations, one by one. They do that to build up the idea that the march of communism is irresistible. They think if they can spread fright and hopelessness, then we will become rattled, and some free nations will move in one direction while we move in another.

As it has happened before, so can it happen again. The creeping militant expansion of communism backed by guns and bombs and several millions of troops—unrestrained by a solemn agreement, or moral restraint—is the primary long-term challenge to every one of us.

Now, in such a world, there is much that we in the United States can do to meet the challenge. The conduct of foreign affairs is of course a civilian responsibility, and the role of the military is to give advice on defense matters. However, our foreign policy and our military policy have certain common basic undertakings.

First, and this is our foremost line of action—we can protect and maintain our freedom, our form of government, and our way of life against any challenge. On this point, we recognize no limitation of expenditures or exertion.

Why do I put a strong defense of freedom first in priority? Because in my judgment, it is fundamental to our way of life. All other lines of action flow from it. Our natural resources, our prosperous economy, and our way of life could go for naught if we did not have the burning, fighting faith to protect them from danger.

Francis Bacon said this rather well in his essay on the Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates:

"Walled towns, stored arsenals and armories, Goodly Rases of Horses, Charriots of Warre, Elephants. * * * Artillery and the Like. All this is but a Sheep in Lion's skin except the Breed and Disposition of the people be stout."

I wish it were possible for me to tell you whether or not another shooting war will be forced upon us; and if one is, exactly where, when, how, and in what form it would take place. If I knew—my own job would be less difficult.

Obviously, our country does not want war, as our enormous patience clearly attests. We will not provoke a war against anyone. And we will not wage a so-called preventive war—even against an enemy. But neither will we surrender the principles which made our country great.

Unfortunately, another aggression could be initiated secretly almost any place, anytime—by a handful of men whose only allegiance is to themselves, and who have no Christian standards to govern their actions.

This being the case, then what should be the pattern for our Armed Forces?

Well—we do not pretend to have all the answers, but it certainly looks as if we must have Armed Forces which are ready for tremendous counteroffensive blows in event of a global war; and also ready for lesser military actions when and as directed by our Government.

Accordingly, based on these requirements, and the current world situation, the President decided that our defense program should be geared to the provision of a flexible but sturdy military posture—one which could be maintained over an extended period of time—and one which would take advantage of technological developments.

If we should be confronted by hostile aggression, naturally it would not make sense to let the enemy pick only those battle conditions and weapons which are best suited to him.

Consequently, in defense planning, we consider it important to have a capacity to retaliate—to counter an aggression—at the proper place by whatever military means are best suited to the situation at the time. One of the best safeguards for peace is the possession of such power that a would-be aggressor knows his aggression will be countered, and that he will receive far more devastation than he gives.

This is not a new defense policy this year. Nor is it a policy that commits us to atomic retaliation against all forms of aggression. It is not a "solve-all" nor is it a "do-everything" answer to the Communist menace. Nor has it ever been.

Sometimes one hears the question: Are we concentrating unduly on a certain weapon or type of warfare?

Here, I might take just a moment to emphasize, as I did in an address a year ago this month, that: Our military planning does not subscribe to the thinking that we can rely exclusively on one weapon, or one service, or that we can anticipate just one kind of war.

Actually, undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to some other. No one form of military action could be considered sufficient to meet all our modern security needs.

As time passes, changes do take place in our Armed Forces. We would not prepare to fight a next war with exactly the same weapons and methods as the last. Nor would we prepare to fight a next war with "wonder" weapons alone. We cannot base our defense on pushing a button, and then dreaming that the menace has vanished.

Instead, our program for defense is based on a realistic and continuous assessment of the world situation. It is based on the maintenance of forces which could be used in a variety of situations whenever and wherever required. And should there be some fundamental change in the situation, for better or for worse, then military requirements for security probably would change too.

It is my personal conviction that our present defense program—the one submitted by the President to the Congress—provides the right combination of forces and facilities. The program maintains a flexible combination of land, sea, and air forces with a wide variety of weapons and capabilities, including nuclear.

Today, we have strategic air forces and carrier task forces which are unmatched by any other nation, and we are going to keep them strong. Our country is particularly well suited for providing these two vital elements of the free world's capacity to counter an aggression.

We also have modern jet tactical air forces which can carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending upon what the target requires. We have naval forces which can clear the sea lanes, and Army and Marine Corps forces which can do their part toward the accomplishment of military decisions when and where required. We have armored, airborne, amphibious, and other modern forces, all of which are important to our national defense.

In fact, the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful forces, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. The fact that we have these ready forces, and that we have them with flexible nuclear capacities, should make it possible for free peoples everywhere to sleep a little safer at night.

At the same time, accelerated emphasis is being given to continental defense measures, to improving the readiness of our Reserve forces, and to continuing close cooperation with our friends to strengthen collective allied defense arrangements overseas.

Speaking of allied strength, it would be the greatest folly for us to drift back into weakness and disunity. Now is the time to pull together. Our great American poet, Mr. Longfellow, once wrote:

> "All your strength is in your union
> All your danger is in discord."

These words are true today; for when bound together in a pact, individual nations gain strength from close ties.

Gentlemen, just as in many aspects of business, we never seem to reach a point where we can feel sure we have all the answers. We do know, however, that the basic ideas of freedom are right and they are definitely worth defending.

The crux of the problem for free nations is that we are confronted with a large Communist menace whose aggressions should not be rewarded, ignored, or appeased. Communism would control all of us if it could.

Therefore, collectively we must have an inner strength and unity, and with this must go unselfish solidarity. We must never be afraid to fight intelligently and purposefully for life and honor against the vicious, ruthless enemies of freedom.

When all is said and done, one unassailable fact remains: Now, as never before, real preparedness is vital.

Truman and Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 18, 1955, is so diametrically opposed to its usual treatment of anything concerning former President Harry Truman that I thought it should be made a part of the RECORD:

TRUMAN AND RAYBURN

In paying his tribute to Speaker RAYBURN on Saturday night, former President Truman said: "Your place in history is secure, not only because you have served longest as Speaker of the House of Representatives, but because you never yield to partisanship on the basic issues affecting the welfare of the Nation." When Mr. RAYBURN arose to speak, he underlined the Truman compliment by the tone of his remarks. "We Democrats," he said, "have conducted ourselves with the highest repsonsibility toward the President in his direction of the country's international relations." Then speaking pointedly about the gravity of the times, he continued:

"I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to the life and death of all men. Let us guide our debates with wisdom and inform our hearts with righteousness, lest we fall into shame and so into oblivion."

Before Mr. RAYBURN had had a chance to demonstrate his statesmanship anew, however, Mr. Truman lashed out at the Eisenhower administration and at the press in the unrestrained manner that became so familiar when he was in the White House. He accused his successor of playing political tricks with the grave and serious issues of both foreign and domestic policies. He went so far as to accuse the press of distorting the facts so that no Democratic adminis-

tration could do right and no Republican administration could do wrong and said there is no sense in having the press free under the Constitution and not having it free in fact.

Allowance must be made, of course, for the fact that the former President was speaking at a great Democratic rally. But this does not excuse his reckless and unwarranted attack on the press, which, in many instances, has been more alert in pointing out mistakes of the administration than the Democratic Party has been. Nor does it explain why a former President, who might wield a powerful influence in the role of a sage elder statesman, prefers to rant and throw bricks in the most delicate area of national policymaking, even when the campaigns are more than a year away. His attitude stands out in sharp contrast to that of Speaker Rayburn, Senator George, and Adlai Stevenson. Unfortunately, it cannot be said of him that he has never yielded to partisanship on the basic issues affecting the welfare of the Nation.

Hookup for Industrial Logistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on industrial mobilization.

This subject is very pertinent at this time, and I am sure it will be of interest to many people.

This article is an extract from the January-February issue of Signal, by Mr. J. Lewis Powell:

THE HOOKUP FOR INDUSTRIAL LOGISTICS

(By Mr. J. Lewis Powell)

Are you a manufacturer, technician, or member of the Armed Forces? In event of war, what you do, and what you do it with, depends largely on lists of items known as the preferential planning list or departmental lists. Attention was focused recently on the preferential planning list when an article appeared in the New York Times of December 10. Business papers and trade journals have regularly talked about the list, yet few people are familiar with its use.

The formal preferential planning list of the Department of Defense and the informal departmental lists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force spell out the military items on which industrial mobilization planning is being concentrated.

Collectively these lists are all working parts of the revised production allocation program of the Department of Defense. (This program was drastically revised on January 26, 1954, by Department of Defense Directive 4005.6. This directive, which corrected the errors of Korean planning, is just now beginning to be felt by industry.

The production allocation program, as revised, is the principal plan by which the Army, Navy, and Air Force plan our industrial backup in the event of war. The logistics of modern war demands that military might and industrial might be synchronized for defense.

For obvious security reasons the preferential planning list and the departmental lists are classified, and detailed information about them is not readily available. However, in broad terms every present or potential manufacturer of military items should know how the lists affect him. Similarly, commanding officers should know how the lists will affect their supply lines in an emergency.

Just as the strongest man is not necessarily the best boxer, the nation with the greatest industrial strength is not necessarily the nation best prepared to defend itself. The boxer must have the skill and coordination to suddenly translate his strength into punches. The nation must have the mobilization plan that will quickly translate its industrial might into weapons for its armed forces.

Never again will there be time to bungle it through, to have too little, and be too late, yet win; the days, when we could mobilize, using trucks as make-believe tanks, and brooms marked rifles, have gone with the wind of the H-bomb.

Modern weapons eliminate time and space as the outer bulwarks of our defense. We may not have time to mobilize while the battle line is held at some distant outpost. These same weapons which destroyed our get ready time have multiplied tenfold our dependence on communications and electronics. If war comes, we must be prepared to produce an avalanche of modern equipment.

War, like fire, is a disaster. Just as we remain prepared to fight the fire which we hope will never happen, so we must be prepared to fight the war which we hope will never happen.

In case of fire your town immediately uses its domestic water supply as a weapon against fire. In the same manner an industrial nation must be able to quickly change mass production lines, into war production lines.

Just as you can't organize a volunteer fire department after the siren sounds, it is too late to organize war production after the shooting starts.

For years on shipboard in the Navy every sailor has had an assigned battle station. In an emergency he knows where he is to go and what he is to do. The same kind of commonsense now dictates that potential defense production plants should also have battle stations. These plants should always know what they are supposed to do in event of war. They need to know what they are to make, whom they are to make it for, how much and how fast.

COMBINED KNOW-HOW

Under the production-allocation program, as revised, each day more of industry learns its probable production assignment in event of war. Daily, key personnel of the Army, Navy, and Air Force meet with industrial executives as teammates. Working together they combine production know-how and military logistics to develop tentative orders for production if war threatens. These tentative mobilization production schedules represent stockpiled know-how, ready for defense. In an emergency these preplanned schedules can trigger our production lines in to all-out production immediately.

Here is how it's done. Semiannually the Department of Defense (Army, Navy, and Air Force) publishes for its internal use a book in three volumes known as the Alphabetical Register of Planned Wartime Materiel Suppliers. These volumes are the who's who of industrial mobilization, currently they list approximately 34,000 manufacturing plants. The Army, Navy, and Air Force select facilities with whom production schedules will be developed. This selection is based on the nature and quantity of the plant's potential output, plus the capability and know-how of its management.

PROGRAM IN ACTION

When a firm is selected with whom planning is not already in progress, the following steps are taken. First, the military agency wishing to plan requests the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Ligistics) to register the firm. This request results in the firm's being listed in the Alphabetical Register and in the assignment of an Armed Service Procurement planning officer. These men are commony called ASPPO's by both military and industrial personnel. Actually, an ASPPO is the commanding officer of a military office having industrial mobilization planning responsibility. As ASPPO, however, he represents all of the Armed Forces (Army, Navy, or Air Force) regardless of the service to which he personally belongs. When acting as an ASPPO he is, in effect, a field representative of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) office.

His function is to act as liaison between industrial management of the plants assigned to him and all of the Armed Forces. In this way all of the bureaus of the Navy, all the technical services of the Army and all of the offices of the Air Force have equal access to industrial management. But this access is on a coordinated basis which prevents management from being burdened by repetitious requests for similar information.

As soon as an ASPPO is appointed, he or his principal assistant for planning arrange a meeting with industrial management to intiate planning. At this meeting industrial management is asked to designate one of its members as industrial preparedness representative. This member of management serves as an opposite number to the ASPPO. He represents the firm's management in the same way that the ASPPO represents all of the armed services. Working together the ASPPO and the preparedness representative assure that planning is sound and realistic both from a logistical and a production standpoint.

One of the first things they do is to prepare a survey of the plant. They list its machine tools and production equipment, describe its location and facilities, and summarize its potential capabilities as well as its present operations. The fact that this plant is now listed in the Alphabetical Register of Planned Wartime Suppliers is a signal to all military offices of the Army, Navy, and Air Force that a plant survey is, or will soon be available for their use, and that this firm wishes to plan.

Usually the first military agency to respond to the plant survey is the service which originally requested registration of the plant. This service and all other interested military agencies develop and submit for plant management consideration proposed tentative mobilization production schedules for the manufacture of specific military items in event of war. These schedules are submitted through the ASPPO to plant management.

When the proposed schedule has been worked into practical form by the plant representative and the ASPPO it is returned to the military agency that originated it for final consideration. If the revised schedule is then satisfactory to both the military and plant management, it is made out formally as a tentative mobilization production schedule.

As evidence of good faith this formal document is signed both by the representatives of management and industry. In event of a war emergency production of this item could start. There would be no need for the manufacturer to hunt a military customer or for the military agency to search for a producer. It is important that this production schedule has resulted from across-the-table planning between the consumer and the manufacturer. They were both talking about definite scheduled quantities of a specific military item for which plans and specifications were available.

ASPPO's are usually appointed from the military office nearest to the plant which has technical familiarity with the item being planned. Thus while a textile plant might

have an ASPPO from the Quartermaster Corps of the Army, a shipyard in the same city might have an ASPPO form the Navy, and a producer of communications equipment would probably have an ASPPO from the Signal Corps. The important consideration is that the ASPPO be familiar with the industry and its nomenclature. Any firm in the program may request any branch of the service that is planning with it to act as its ASPPO.

While a company with only one plant needs only one ASPPO, multiplant corporations sometimes need more than one ASPPO. The Department of Defense will appoint as many ASPPO's as necessary to service a corporation. It will parallel the operation pattern of the management of the company, appointing ASPPO's on the basis of individual plants, manufacturing divisions or one ASPPO for the entire corporation if that is appropriate.

Three points to remember are:

1. ASPPO's should be appointed so as to parallel the operating management pattern of the corporate structure.

2. The ASPPO represents all of the armed services and is their liaison for planning with your organization.

3. After a company is registered, ASPPO responsibility may be transferred, at the firm's request, to any branch of the military service that is planning with the firm.

REGULATING CRITERIA

Production allocation planning is primarily concerned with manufactured or assembled items which are made to the military specifications. Under revisions now going into effect, mobilization planning under the production allocation program, is now being limited to carefully selected items which meet the following criteria:

1. No production allocation planning will be done for items which "are solely for the purpose of comfort, convenience, or morale."

2. Except as modified by 3 and 4 below, no production allocation planning will be done for all other common shelf-type items which do not present difficult production problems or which can be procured on the open market without undue delay.

3. Production allocation planning procedures will be limited to items which in war are necessary for:

(a) Survival and retaliation.
(b) Maintenance of health.
(c) Combat efficiency.

4. In addition, items must meet one or more of the following criteria:

(a) Require either a long lead time or involve a long manufacturing cycle.
(b) Are not currently in production or will be required in quantities for in excess of peacetime production.
(c) Require the conversion of any industry or of a number of plants within an industry.
(d) Involve materials or techniques essentially different from those in current use.
(e) Involve items on which industry does not have production experience.

RECENT DIRECTIVE

Items meeting this criteria are divided into two groups. Thousands of items which are approved at the individual level of the Army, or Navy, or Air Force are placed only on the respective list of the military service which approved the item. These lists are known informally as "departmental lists." Planning for items on a departmental list is optional with each of the military services.

On the other hand a highly selected group of approximately 1,000 items considered particularly critical and important from a planning standpoint are placed on a formal list known as "the preferential planning list." Items on this list are the aristocrats of planning. They take precedence and priority over all other planning. A manufacturer scheduled to produce items on the preferential planning list is a member of the first team.

Planned producers are regularly invited to bid on peacetime procurement, and specific considerations are applicable to aligning current purchasing practice with schedule mobilization production. (See Defense Mobilization Order VII–7 as amended, and Department of Defense Directive 3005.3, dated December 7, 1954, which applies to items on the preferential planning list.)

Mobilization planning eliminates unnecessary wartime competition for production capacity by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. As a result of this planning, military stockpiles of munitions are backed up by alerted production lines ready for conversion to war production. In the event of war this means continuity of logistical support to the military and continuity of operation to management.

What should a manufacturer do to find out where he fits in the scheme of industrial readiness? If he is making or has the capacity to make important military items in event of war, he should follow this suggested program.

First, find out if his plant is listed in the Alphabetical Register of Planned Wartime Materiel Suppliers. He does this by going to the nearest Army, Navy, or Air Force procurement office. These offices are located in principal cities throughout the country. There he identifies himself and his official status with his company, after which the industrial mobilization staff of that procurement office will advise him if his firm is listed in the register. If it is listed, they will tell him who has the ASPPO responsibility for his firm. (Although the alphabetical register is a classified document, properly identified representatives of management may be shown the entries pertaining to their own firm.)

REVIEW NECESSARY

Once he knows that his firm is listed the manufacturer should contact his assigned ASPPO for further information. He should review the listing with the ASPPO in order to determine if it is accurate. He should reconcile his firm's records with those of the ASPPO to see if both their files are complete and currently accurate.

On the other hand if a firm finds that it is not listed in the register, it should reevaluate its war production potential to determine if it could produce military items needed by the Army, Navy, and Air Force in a war emergency.

The firm that can produce military items in significant quantity should bring this potential to the attention of industrial mobilization planning officers. Here is how it's done. The firm should obtain from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 2 very helpful pamphlets for 25 cents each. The pamphlets are known as How To Sell to the Department of Defense, and Purchasing Items and Purchasing Locations of the Department of Defense. (Remember, Department of Defense means Army, Navy and Air Force.) In other words, these books tell you which military office buys what items. The office which buys is the office which plans. By using these booklets a manufacturer can tell whom to contact regarding either current business, or future business in event of war.

Once the manufacturer knows whom to contact, it is up to him to sell the desirability of planning with his firm. The manufacturer should bring to the attention of the planning officers the advantages of his facilities, he should state succinctly what his plant can do, he should outline its capacity, the kinds of tooling and equipment it has, the kinds of work it has done, and demonstrate why he thinks planning with his company would strengthen industrial preparedness. If the manufacturer successfully demonstrates the wartime value of his plant with respect to specific items, the planning officer can then have the firm entered in the alphabetical register and an ASPPO appointed, as described earlier in this article.

Production allocation planning should not be confused with the industry studies being made under the sponsorship of the Business Defense Services Administration. Those studies are primarily concerned with component production capacity. They deal with overall ability of a total industry to meet the combined essential military and civilian wartime demand, for categories of common components. Production allocation planning is consumer-producer planning with a direct across-the-table relationship between the potential buyer and the potential seller. It is concerned with the ability of a specific individual manufacturer to meet an agreed on mobilization production schedule for a specific item. This item may be an end-item, subassembly or peculiar component for a particular military purchaser.

Industry studies made by the Business Defense Services Administration and specific mobilization production schedules developed under the production allocation program are complementary to each other. Each deals with an equal, but different, aspect of industrial readiness. Both are part of the pattern of preparedness.

Just as our colonial ancestors lived with the constant threat of surprise attack by marauding Indians, we of this era have to face the threat of surprise attack by marauding aggressors bent on world conquest. Just as the village blacksmith turned from shoeing horses to forging weapons, the modern industrial plant must be ready to turn from making peacetime products to wartime necessities.

Commonsense requires that the technology of the engineer, and the production know-how of the American industrialist must be among the weapons stored in the arsenal of democracy.

A Leader Who Leads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., of April 16, 1955:

A LEADER WHO LEADS

The Democratic Party will tonight pay well-deserved honor to Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

The Speaker, however, will not merely listen to the nice things that will be said about him. And he will not content himself with responding to compliments with pleasantries.

Speaker RAYBURN has a definite and affirmative philosophy of government. He is expected to expound that philosophy and relate it to the situation in which this country now finds itself in his address. Those who attend the dinner will be well rewarded, as will those who listen on their radios.

Mr. RAYBURN has been in Congress for 42 years and has served the last 19 years as either Speaker or floor leader. During all that time he has been a leader who led, and his speech tonight will be that of a leader worthy of a post of leadership.

Speech by Hon. George S. Long, Member of Congress, Eighth District of Louisiana, Over Radio Station KSYL, Alexandria, La., April 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Friends, this is your Congressman, GEORGE S. LONG, speaking. I would like to thank this station for making it possible for me to bring you this message at this time.

I have been your Congressman for almost 3 years. I feel that I can say with pardonable pride that I have done a good job. I have one of the best voting records of any Member of Congress of the United States House of Representatives.

The record of my first session was 99 percent. During the second session I had to make a campaign and that voting record was not so good, but it was better than 85 percent. This time I expect to make it 100 percent.

May I say that I am on the job all of the time; that you have no trouble reaching me at any time, either at my office or at home. I have a telephone at home and can be reached there during the night if anyone cares to call me. I earnestly invite each and every one of you, if and when you come to Washington, to call me, come by and give me the benefit of your advice. If it is at night, do not hesitate to call me at home. I am always glad to hear from anyone from my district.

Many years ago the Congress wisely provided its Members with the franking privilege. One important reason for this was to afford Members of Congress a measure of protection against those who would mislead the public regarding their activities in Congress. Another reason was to insure that the public had correct information on activities and issues of interest and of importance to the people.

By distorting statements, twisting meanings, omitting pertinent parts, etc., it is possible to change the meaning of a comment or statement into something it was not intended to be. Some newspapers, either through carelessness or through deliberate intent, all too often present misleading and distorted information to the public. After all, it is well to remember that the voice of a newspaper is actually the voice of a single individual and not the infallible consensus of an informed group. The issues of a newspaper are just as much subject to personal and individual opinion, to bias, to display of that individual's likes and dislikes as the views of any individual. The main difference is that they have the advantage of using their newspaper to serve as their personal sounding board—to circulate their personal views.

As pointed out above, the Congress wisely afforded the public a measure of protection against those who misrepresent and distort the views and policies of Members of Congress, which are issued for the information and enlightenment of their constituents. No apologies are necessary in connection with the franking privilege for by its use can we more completely insure real freedom of speech and a well informed public. By use of a Member's frank his position on matters affecting the welfare and best interests of his constituents can be presented without distortion and misrepresentation.

The Alexandria evening newspaper complained of my sending out so many speeches under my franking privilege. Had I not mailed out these speeches to you, you would not have had the truth because this newspaper so distorted what I had to say that you could hardly recognize it.

I am only sorry that I have not been able to send you more speeches and official information about the doings of Congress, but my secretarial staff only permits me to send a limited number each year. But you may rest assured that I promised you when I went to Congress that you would hear from me and when you receive one of my speeches or information from my office, it means that I am carrying out the promise I made—that you would hear from me.

This same newspaper carried an article recently branding as socialistic prospective government participation in a hoped-for project which would be of immeasurable benefit to many of our citizens. Is the effort to secure a fair share of Government benefits for our taxpayers to be branded socialistic? Would it brand as socialistic the policy of the Government to help the aged and the needy through our fine and humanitarian welfare program? Would it brand as socialistic the participation of the Government in our highway program, our agricultural conservation program, our flood control and drainage program, and the many other useful and beneficial programs which return to the people something worthwhile for the taxes paid? The possible utilization of portions of Kitsatchie National Forest for worthwhile purposes has merit and fits into land development and reclamation which are important to our citizens and to our Nation.

That same article was critical of a delayed-payment plan. Is the financing of your home or automobile or electrical appliances in any way un-American? Such installment-plan financing makes possible many necessities and conveniences which otherwise would be financially impossible to many.

Further, that writer, who has the earmarks of being antisocial and contrary to the betterment of the individual, appears opposed to a realistic tax reduction which would reach every taxpayer. About taxes there has has been much said, and the load has increased through the years. The relief so far afforded has gone to the big man. The proposed $20-per-person exemption is exactly what it says—it will provide $20 relief for every person. Thus a family of 5 would benefit by $100 tax relief. Most of us consider $20 to be $20, and $100 to be $100. If that much relief can be obtained from the tax load, it will help all by that sum.

The public should understand that through the years everything changes. For example, insofar as a Member of Congress is concerned, the scope of his activities has broadened to the extent that he is called upon to perform many functions beyond the field of legislation. This is as it should be, and in order for a Member to do a creditable job certain expansions and improvements must be worked out.

Outlined below are certain items which accrue to every Member of the United States House of Representatives, 435 Members in all. Recently the evening newspaper criticized me because of what they called the trimmings I am receiving. These extras do not accrue to your Representative alone, as this newspaper would have you believe. They said, if I remember rightly, that I get 2,700 minutes per year for long-distance telephone calls in order that I may talk to my constituents on official business, if necessary. That is right. That I get 1,800 words per year for telegraph service; that is true. That I get $900 per year district office rent. I do. That I get $1,200 yearly for stationery allowance. That is right. That I receive $200 per year airmail and special-delivery stamp allowance. That is so. An office is furnished each Member, with sufficient furniture and equipment to enable his office to function properly. Your Representative maintains a staff of competent employees, both in Washington and his district, to enable him to fully care for your requests and interests. But, my friends, all this they complain about does not increase my salary or the money that I take home one dime. Nor will it increase any of the salaries of the 435 other Members. All Members of Congress receive exactly the same salary and benefits that this newspaper has complained that I receive.

It is my aim to always fight for progress and reform; never to tolerate injustice or corruption; to always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers; to never lose sympathy with the poor; always to remain devoted to public welfare; never to be satisfied with merely printed news; always to be drastically independent; never to be afraid to attack wrong.

I have said in many of my speeches and I repeat here that I wanted to be elected to Congress, and it was my purpose to speak on the floor of the Congress and elsewhere when opportunity permitted for those who have no one to speak for them. This pledge I am carrying out to the best of my ability.

The Farming Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include four editorials:

[From the New York Times]

HOW FARES THE FARMER?

A cheering note was sounded by Agriculture Secretary Benson in his recent testimony before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. This year the Secretary envisages considerable stability in farm income as compared with last year's 10-percent decline. To Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, however, this was not cheering, for, he charged, the farmer's income is being stabilized "while he's at the bottom of the well." Since the specter of rampant poverty on our farms is being used as an argument for rigid price supports and against flexible price supports, it is worth while seeing whether the farmer actually is "at the bottom of the well." Let us look at the facts.

In 1935, when some recovery from the depression had occurred, net cash income from farming amounted to about $3,100,000,000. In that year our total farm population was over 32 million persons, so that per capita income from farming was about $95. In 1953 net cash income from farming was over $11 billion, while farm population had declined to 25 million persons or less. Per capita income from farming in 1953, therefore, was about $440. This is roughly a fivefold increase. Even allowing for the rise in prices since 1935, these data can hardly be held to support the notion that the farmer is "at the bottom of the well."

The truth would seem to be instead that our farm economy is still prosperous, as measured by any long-term historical standard, though not as prosperous as in the boom

years during and immediately following World War II. The adherents of high rigid support prices are pursuing a delusion if they think such means will guarantee permanent boom prosperity for farmers. Such rigid supports mean rather intensified Government control over farmers, the accumulation of ever more burdensome surpluses at great cost to our Government, and the reduction of consumption for farm products over what would be possible with more flexible, lower price supports.

For the longer run, a victory for the farm bloc could well be pyrrhic since it might lead to such a national revolt against the exhorbitant cost of high support prices—a cost paid by all of us through our taxes and in our grocery bills—that the whole fabric of price supports might be ended. It is the long-run interests of our farmers and our Nation as a whole which President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have in mind when they back retention of the flexible support program for farm prices.

[From the Washington News of March 28, 1955]

THE HARVEST COMES IN

As a taxpayer, you own a big share of a great hoard of farm products. Altogether, United States taxpayers have an investment of more than $7 billion in this hoard, and by summer Agriculture Department officials think the investment will reach $8.5 billion.

And that isn't all.

Judging by crop estimates for this year, as against expected consumption, the Government hoard of farm products may run even higher. The danger of this is so great that the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles these surpluses, may have to ask Congress to raise the $10 billion ceiling on how much it can invest.

In the natural law of things, of course, there is only one objective of production, whether it is agricultural or industrial. That objective is consumption.

Yet, for many years now, the Government by law has been promoting farm production for storage. The Government, of course, pays the storage costs—which means the taxpayers pay them. That, by itself, is a tidy little item of around $700,000 a day.

One of the painful harvests of this kind of political-economic monkey-business is the current slump in farm prices. American farm products, for instance, have been priced out of the export market. Exports of the crops the Government subsidizes have dropped off almost a third in the last 3 years.

It's the same way here at home. If we had the same per capita milk consumption, for example, we had in 1945, we wouldn't have any surplus of dairy products.

Yet, in the face of all this, there is an insistent bloc in Congress which wants to keep right on piling up farm surpluses. They are the advocates of the same kind of high, fixed Government subsidies which brought on the present plight in agriculture.

It is the old, deluding theory that the cure for a hangover is another spree—even if it merely leads to a worse hangover.

COTTON COMMENT—EASTLAND IS FIRST TO SPEAK OUT FOR NEED OF COMPETITIVE PRICES FOR COTTON AT HOME AND ABROAD—RAYON AND FOREIGN GROWTHS TAKING MARKETS

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, is the first of the Cotton States Senators or Representatives to have the courage to speak openly against the present high, rigid price support program.

In his talk before the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute in Florida last Saturday he recounted the ills that have fallen upon cotton. He detailed the increase in production of foreign growths. He elaborated on the growing competition of rayon. He suggested sale of surplus stocks at world prices for a short-term program, but had an entirely different view of the long-term need.

Speaking of the situation he said:

"Let me tell you where the trouble lies. Long-standing policies of the United States Government are at the root of the problem."

PRODUCE FOR CONSUMPTION

"In the long run, farmers can produce only so much as is consumed in this country or sold abroad. Any farm program that is based solely on price with complete disregard of its attendant effect on consumption is doomed at the outset. When farmers lose their markets, they lose their farms, just as you will lose your mill when you lose your customers. Just as you must, farmers must meet squarely their competition on three fronts: price, quality, and sales promotion. They cannot stand on any 1 or 2 of these factors, any more than they can stand on a 2-legged stool. Eventually they are bound to go down unless they compete on all three fronts."

There has been a growth of thinking along the line expressed by Senator EASTLAND in recent months.

SAYRE EXPRESSES VIEWS

Only the day before Senator EASTLAND spoke, Dr. C. R. Sayre, president of Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss., made a similar representation before the convention of the Southern Cotton Shippers Association in Memphis. While Senator EASTLAND suggested only that prices must be made competitive with foreign cotton abroad and with rayon at home, Dr. Sayre had some specific recommendations on how the reduction could be brought about. He suggested a cut of as much as 20 percent in price over a 5-year period. Like Senator EASTLAND, he urged the same of present surplus stocks at world prices.

There is another recent talk that has much the same view taken by Senator EASTLAND and Dr. Sayre. Don Paarlberg, assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, spoke before Texas Cotton Association less than a month ago. He, too, stressed that cotton must compete in price, in quality, and in sales promotion. He indicated, however, that the Department favored the flexible price-support program as a means of determining the price factor.

It is interesting to note that all three are agreed on the need—their differences being in the matter of adjusting prices.

[Agricultural letter No. 295 from the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago]

The imbalance between production and consumption of milk has been popularly labeled the dairy problem. For the past 3 years, gains in consumption have not kept pace with production. The surplus gap has narrowed somewhat, however. Consumption of dairy products has increased 2 percent since 1953 while milk production has recently been running slightly below last year's record pace.

Lower milk prices and income have caused many farmers to reexamine their dairy business. In the heart of the corn belt the number of milk cows declined as much as 6 percent during 1954. On many farms in this area, cash grain, hogs, and beef cattle offered more attractive alternatives.

However, in the main dairy belt the alternatives typically are less profitable than milking cows even though milk prices have declined. In this circumstance farmers have intensified their search for cost-cutting techniques.

Better cows and improved feeding have increased output per cow and reduced costs of producing milk. Output per cow has been boosted about 15 percent since the end of the war, and further increases are being made due in part to the wider use of good sires and artificial breeding.

Roughage consumption per cow has been increased by about one-fifth, and the composition of the forage fed has changed substantially. In 1945 about 40 percent of the hay fed was classed as alfalfa; last year the proportion was nearly 60 percent. These changes also have worked in the direction of lower costs.

Mechanization, to increase the amount of work a man can accomplish, is also playing an important role. The installation of barn cleaners, bulk handling equipment for milk and improved forage handling equipment has either displaced high-cost labor or has made it possible to handle more cows with the same labor force on many farms.

In 1950, 77 percent of the farms milking cows in Wisconsin had fewer than 20 cows; in Michigan, 95 percent. The shift toward fewer and larger herds has no doubt already changed this pattern substantially, and the shift will probably continue in the future.

One study shows that, if recent trends toward larger herds and increased output per cow continue, 3 percent fewer cows and 15 percent fewer dairy farms would be needed in 1965 than now. It is expected that the reduction in number of dairy farms would come largely in the Corn Belt where other alternatives are attractive and through the consolidation of small units to gain the benefits of cost-cutting techniques.

If milk consumption is to be increased significantly, additional changes within the industry will probably have to be made. The National Grange recently released a report in which they cite a number of "obstacles to increased milk consumption."

They note, for example, that "a set of man-made barriers is interfering with increased milk consumption"—some of these are in the form of regulations, laws and ordinances, others in the form of attitudes toward milk and milk marketing.

Weak merchandising is tagged as "one of the most important of all impediments to increased consumption." In some instances, according to the Grange, "resistance to change" has contributed to the continued production of products in forms not desired by consumers. It is noted that milk fat continues to be emphasized in the pricing of milk at farms while consumers are showing more interest in fluid milk and nonfat milk products.

In some areas, sanitary regulations "have been adopted that go beyond the need for protection of the public health," the Grange reports, and semi-monopoly conditions that restrict the milk supply and the adoption of more efficient marketing procedures have probably caused consumer prices to be higher than would otherwise have been the case.

Restoration of balance within the dairy industry will not occur easily. Adjustments on the production side leading to increased efficiency point toward larger and more specialized dairy farms. On the consumption side, the removal of any real "obstacles to increased milk consumption" would also help achieve the desired balance.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the finest appraisals of Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the tenth anniversary of his death was written by Jonathan Daniels for the New York Times, and also appeared in his own news-

paper, the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer.

The Daniels family, through a distinguished career in our Government spanning two generations, has had an opportunity to measure the greatness of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy under Wilson, was F. D. R.'s first boss in the Federal Government when he served as Under Secretary of the Navy. Jonathan Daniels, his son, served as administrative assistant both to F. D. R. and President Harry Truman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an appraisal of F. D. R. by Jonathan Daniels from the editorial page of the News and Observer for April 12, 1955, the tenth anniversary of the death of Franklin Roosevelt, as reprinted from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPRAISAL OF F. D. R. A DECADE LATER

Ten years after his death on that warm April afternoon in 1945, all that is left of Franklin Roosevelt is off the main traveled roads. Much traffic which used to go by—and often stop at—the library, the home, and the grave on the old Albany Post Road has been diverted to the Taconic Parkway to the east and the New York Thruway across the Hudson on the west. Not so many people come now as at the beginning of the decade when new grief was combined with the first relaxation of gas rationing. Some like to see in that a sign that the man is almost as forgotten now as the gas rationing—or the grief. And others are sure that so little real change has been made in the New Deal and the new internationalism that they now seem less the policies of a man than the normal, fixed directions of America. Certainly the alterations in America which Roosevelt attended seem today too deep-rooted to be related to a grave only 10 years old.

Ten years is a long time in the remembrance of man. It is a short time for the growth of the lasting image of any hero in history. The covenants of recollection grow as slowly as national monuments. George Washington had been nearly 90 years dead before his shaft, which rises higher than any other in the Capital of the Republic, was opened to the people. Jefferson had been dead well over a century before his memorial was completed. Even Lincoln had fallen—in an April of victory, too—nearly three score years before the classic marble building around his realistic statue was dedicated under Warren G. Harding in 1922.

It will take more than 10 years to fix the meaning of Franklin Roosevelt in either memory or marble. It is a characteristic of Americans, however, that they want as early information as possible on the judgments of history or the outcome of a horse race.

I am a poor one, it seems to me, to try to measure the Roosevelt meaning to a continuing America on this 10th April anniversary. I was where I could see him best before he died and I was among those most surprised when the incredible news came. Of course, I should not have been surprised. In retrospect now I can count his dying clearly, not from April 12, 1945, but from a time weeks before when the Army Signal Corps flew back photographs it had taken of him at Yalta. The Yalta pictures look as tragic in terms of the man as the disintegration of the victory which his enemies have since charged that he let take place there.

It was my job to screen those pictures and to release to the press only those least marked by the deadly, haggard weariness of the Commander whose face, like his voice, had so long been a symbol for confidence in depression and war, and for the future, too. I held back the most shocking pictures. And certainly I should have been warned by them. I was not. I had, as I think all those close to him had, even when they worried most about him, almost a sense of his immortality. I may be mistaken once again. But 10 years after his death I am confident that his memory will be eternal—though not entirely sure what that eternal memory will be.

It does not seem to me 10 years since that dark Thursday afternoon in April. Such periods always pass swiftly. It may help to compare it with another such decade after the death of another President who died in April at the end of another war in which the central question was whether democracy could endure. Such a comparison, of course, cannot presume the approximation of Roosevelt's greatness to Lincoln's. It does point the similarities and the difference in two meaningful Americans in two not so different American centuries.

Certainly it must have seemed to those who spent it a very short, crowded time from the assassination of Lincoln (almost 4 score years to the day before Roosevelt died) to the 10th year thereafter when, with Lincoln's greatest general in the White House, the divisive forces were already gathered to produce the fears of a new civil war over the bitterly contested Hayes-Tilden election the following year.

Federal troops then were still quartered in the Southern States to uphold Republican governments—and some hoped to teach Yankee know-how to the recent rebels. Lincoln's last hope that all vindictiveness might be laid aside and the southern people leniently treated was as long dead as Lincoln himself. It was not until the 10th year after he died that the image of his life began to be creatively put together by John George Nicolay and John Hay, who not only knew him well but brought remarkable talents to his remembrance.

Roosevelt's remembrance has been less well served. He was not made a martyr by an assassin. There was in Washington when he died in 1945, when lilacs were blooming again, no such minor bureaucrat as Walt Whitman to put his grief and his commander into such poetry as "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd."

In the case of both there were the swift biographies and books of recollection. But the 10 years after Lincoln's death were not over before Robert Lincoln had broken with his father's law partner, William Henry Herndon, because of Herndon's efforts to keep Lincoln a human individual and save him from uncritical legend making.

The transition from Lincoln's liberalism to the long rule of those who knew what they wanted for themselves took place within Lincoln's own party, which piously preserved his legend while it perverted it. The good image of Lincoln was served by the succession of the hated Johnson and the corrupted Grant. Harry Truman, who undertook to carry out Roosevelt's program, was tougher or luckier than Andrew Johnson. President Eisenhower has preserved the halo of his military glory in civilian office a good deal more successfully than Grant did.

Yet, strangely, even with the change of political parties, Roosevelt's programs have been kept more intact and in practice than the purposes for a reunited America which Lincoln outlined to his Cabinet on the last day he lived. Roosevelt's New Deal has the often-spoken scorn of many of those who hold the power in the Government today. But it has certainly not been abandoned by a new President who urges the extension of reciprocal trade, the broadening of the base of social security, the increase of minimum wages. That new President, indeed, has been charged within his own party, and by the wing of it which hated Roosevelt most, of going further to the left in a similar period than Roosevelt did.

Undoubtedly a new isolation grows in some quarters. The old notion of staying at home has been advanced by some to a proposal to go it alone far from home, too. But Roosevelt's present successor in the White House has upheld his United Nations. Even the stern policy with Russia was shaping before Roosevelt died. The strange line of his critics is that his tactics betrayed us while he created the policies, the instruments and the programs upon which we depend—and in terms of both the effective democracy we rely on at home and the devices of security which he organized in the world.

In such a situation the 10-year-old image of Roosevelt is as controversial as was the living man. And the image is the more confusing because I suspect that many of the changes which have taken place in the details of the Roosevelt policies would have been as great if Roosevelt had not died and the American people had maintained their established habit of re-electing him. He would still have been 8 years younger than Churchill, who alone of World War II's big three survives, or than Herbert Hoover, who remains the embodiment of faith in discarded policies which he is sure Roosevelt and America should not have altered.

It needs to be remembered that Roosevelt himself once said that it was time to dismiss Old Doc New Deal. He later hoped to be able to permanently dispense with young Dr. Win-the-War. As was his habit with many officials, he probably never would have got around to actually firing either of them. He was a man whose emphases would have changed with the times. That certainly may add to the difficulty of evaluating him for eternity.

But evaluation begins. Personal jealousies and private profits among the inheritors of the Roosevelt tradition may forever prevent the creation of such a team in memorabilia as that of Nicolay and Hay. It is almost a comic item in the decade since Roosevelt's death that, while no such official biographers appeared, a young, unknown history teacher at Vassar, Dr. Frank Friedel, drove down the road to Hyde Park, casually began the job, and has become the standard biographer of the dead President.

His volumes have deserved the respect they have received. Even Friedel's scholarship, however, is too slow for some who want swift, precise appraisal.

This year we have one answer to the demand, specifically asked and provided for by a Philadelphia businessman, one J. Brooks B. Parker, who in 1951 left $25,000 to finance a contemporary appraisement of the influence Roosevelt had upon his time without fear, favor, or prejudice of any kind whatsoever.

Some Roosevelt friends may feel that such objectivity could hardly have been expected from a director of the Herbert Hoover Library, Dr. Edgar Eugene Robinson, who was chosen. Dr. Robinson, however, spews no prejudices. Neither has he abandoned the philosophy of Robinson in the evaluation of Roosevelt. He concludes that Roosevelt did incalculable harm to the American people.

That harm, however, he says, was done with the consent and approval of the American people who even now are probably not prepared to admit that their decisions and directions were divergencies even if Dr. Robinson thinks they were wrong. In effect, his appraisal of Roosevelt amounts to an identification of Roosevelt with their democracy.

And that, I think, Roosevelt would have been the last to disavow.

"It is clear," says Dr. Robinson, "that the identification of the leader with the people had reaped its natural harvest. The level of national responsibility, of national life in general, was that of a majority of the American people."

I suspect that identification of the leader with the people in the case of Roosevelt, as of Lincoln, is as firm a basis as exists for the immortality of the hero. Aloofness does not generally seem to be the firmest basis of legend. Also it is a strange thing how the lasting legends and the durable heroes are not generally created by those who most dutifully guard their ashes, but by those who examine them with something less than piety. Herndon's reports added much more to the humanity of Lincoln than his son, Robert, did by hiding many of his papers from 1865 to 1947.

Those who defend Roosevelt's fame from the possibility of fault are equaly foolish. He prided himself on his sense of history. He wished it to remember him well. As a collector or hoarder for history, he saved not only papers and a 40-foot iceboat, but items which he could not have felt would preserve any impeccable portrait of an impeccable man.

He industriously collected and preserved the evidences of his own human frailties—much better than the energetic Herndon did after Lincoln's death. And, as in the case of Lincoln, they will help make his identification with the far from perfect people more complete—and more appealing.

It is, of course, much too soon to measure Roosevelt's greatness in terms of his policies. He himself liked to quote Woodrow Wilon as saying to him, "Ninety-nine out of one hundred matters which appear to you and me today as of vital administration policy will be completely overlooked by history, and many other little things which you and I pay but scant heed to will begin to be talked about 100 years from now."

His New Deal may be not merely whittled away but finally and forthrightly rejected. On the other hand, he may come to be regarded, as the brusque, radical O. K. Bovard, famous managing editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in his lifetime called him, as merely the Kerensky of the American Revolution.

His New Internationalism, as embodied in the United Nations, may be a failure—even a menace, as some say now. It could be the instrument he hoped to make it when he clearly wanted to become its first director as well as its designer. He felt then as Lincoln felt when he said that he hoped the kind of reconstruction he sought might grow from the first postwar State governments in the South: "Concede (that they are) as the egg is to the fowl. We shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it."

One thing about Roosevelt will be remembered: He was the man whose boldness, extravagant readiness with the country's cash, and easy fascination with fantastic ideas brought about the practical development of the power in nuclear physics.

That might give him only bitter remembrance among the ruins. It could mean a place for him as the activator of a new, glorious age on earth. One or the other will be remembered longer—if man lasts to remember—than the fact that he once wanted to get some old men off the Supreme Court bench, or that he tried to purge some pestiferous politicians in the Senate, or even that he seemed a traitor to his class.

In America the certainty is that those who want him to be forgotten earliest labor most enregetically to make certain that he will be remembered longest. In order to prove the damage he did to American tradition in the past, they have secured a constitutional amendment requiring that he remain unique in the future as the American President whose identification with the people, by the people, will, lasted longest.

It is illegal now for any American to receive the repeated approval of the people as many times as Roosevelt did. That may affect contestants for greatness in the future. It emphasizes by constitutional amendment the preeminent popularity of Roosevelt in the history of the Republic.

Ten Aprils are still too few to fix the image of Roosevelt which will attend the already obvious long remembrance of Franklin Roosevelt. In many ways the future and not the man will determine that. And certainly in the complexity of his character, in both the playfulness and the implacability of his personality, in the petty things to which he gave concern and in the great causes to which he devoted his life, there are materials for the making of many legends—or almost any legend—about him.

The only inescapable item in all of them will be the strange but certain identification of the man with the people in the long dozen years in which he was the unquestioned leader of America who became the almost equal leader of the world.

In that identification of man and people on the 10th anniversary of Roosevelt's death, the question which most needs answer by his grave and on this earth is not that of his dimensions in history. History will answer that. The greater question after 10 Aprils involves the dimensions and the image of the people he led. A dead hero can wait for history. The remembrance of Roosevelt's compelling leadership will not hurt the people who must make history now.

JONATHAN DANIELS.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before Society of Business Magazine Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Society of Business Magazine Editors in Washington, D. C., on April 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, tonight with your kind indulgence, I should like to talk about the American economic way of life—and the deadly peril it faces.

Before I conclude, I hope to arouse in each of you the evangelistic fervor so badly needed to persuade millions of Americans their greatest hope for the Good Life lies in our competitive private enterprise system.

It is a marvelous machinery when you stop to think of it—delicate and sensitive to change—yet remarkably strong and sturdy. It is not perfect by any means, but it is far superior to any other system yet devised by man to satisfy his wants and needs and still allow him to call his soul his own.

You and I already know all this—or we wouldn't work where we do. We'd be with the ADA'ers and the Walter Reuthers, and with the rest of the left-wing pack now hotly fighting tooth and nail to destroy the very system which has made America at once the marvel and the envy of the world.

Whether we like it or not, those who would build a new social order based on the iron fist of Big Government have gained considerable ground through a calculated campaign of deceit and demagoguery. Already they have enlisted millions of gullible folks in the battle to overthrow the economic freedom we all enjoy and the political freedom that goes with it.

Make no mistake, gentlemen, this is a life-and-death struggle between two ways of economic life as different as night and day.

Under the private competitive system, the amount and kinds of goods produced are determined in the marketplace by the decrees of fluctuating consumer prices. Countless individuals decide what they will buy and what they will pay. Government acts as referee to prevent excesses on the part of any one group at the expense of other groups. Government itself avoids excesses of power.

Under the Reuther-Keyserling system, Government decrees determine the amount and kinds of goods produced. Herein consumers are economic captives—and likewise political prisoners. Government no longer is the referee. Government is the boss.

In essence, this is what the battle today is about.

Old stuff, you say?

Gentlemen, I submit that it is as new as tomorrow's headlines. And the consequences of the proposed social reforms are as potentially devastating as the hydrogen bomb.

As a matter of cold reality, the battle is already upon us. Enemy snipers man the firing lines 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Only a few weeks ago, they came close to winning a major contest. I refer to the recent tax fight in Congress.

There is no neutral ground in this battle. There are no innocent bystanders.

If you sincerely believe—as I do, with all my heart—in the fundamental rightness of the private competitive system, you must be willing to fight for it.

You may recall that following the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin was questioned about the results. "What have you given us?" someone asked.

"A Republic," he replied, "if you can keep it."

Gentlemen, we of this generation were given another precious inheritance—the private competitive system. The question is, "Can we keep it?"

Before we can launch a counterattack to keep our way of life, we must first size up our enemies.

Strong in numbers, they are firmly entrenched in powerful associations—political parties, some labor organizations, some farm groups, the egghead clans, and in the press. They are well-financed and even now are fattening their war chests. Clever and unscrupulous, they wage relentless war—day and night, Sundays and holidays—under the rules of jungle warfare: No holds barred and no quarter given.

Nevertheless, there is one thing in our favor—they telegraph their punches. We have advance notice of their intentions.

Less than a month ago in Washington, D. C., Americans for Democratic Action penciled out their blueprint for America. After much clackety-clack about preserving the free-enterprise system, they outlined their domestic policy recommendations, which, if actuated, of course, would torpedo the free-enterprise system.

Less than 1 week ago the United Automobile Workers, under Walter Reuther, convened in Cleveland and went down the line for a program that is a dead ringer for the ADA plan.

What the Keyserling-Reuther boys advocate is prosperity through greater Government spending, coupled with lower personal-income taxes for the poor, and higher taxes

for the rich. They demand heavier taxes on so-called excess profits and surplus savings of business and people.

They want more Federal ownership, more Federal development, more Federal operation, more Federal bureaucracy, more Federal debts and taxes, and more Federal controls.

This is the same eyewash that was peddled to the country in the thirties and forties. It wasn't good for us then, and, I submit, it isn't good for us now.

Starting in 1932 the New Deal spent billions of dollars to increase purchasing power, and Federal bureaucrats pulled the strings in every major field of endeavor. Yet in 1937 the country was down to 1932 levels. In 1939 there were 9 million unemployed. And that doesn't count the part-time unemployment, which Mr. Keyserling now insists on using to exaggerate present unemployment.

The butterfly economists struck out time and again. But they are still in the game pitching, anticipating another turn at bat.

They, and their political-empire-building brethren, have just staged a grandstand play in the Congress. The Reuther-Keyserling wing of the Democratic Party tried for a double play, votes for Democrats at $20 a head and a black eye for Republicans who opposed that kind of tax relief at this time. It was a close play, but the majority umpires in Congress called them out.

This is not ancient history, gentlemen, this is now.

On the floors of Congress, the Nation was told that the way to economic health was to increase purchasing power of low-income people, who in turn would spend most of the tax cut. This would stimulate demand for consumer goods, which would increase production and employment and eventually factories would expand and new jobs would open up.

This was called the percolate-up theory.

The trouble with the percolate-up theory is that you keep adding water to the bottom of the pot, but you don't put coffee in the top.

At the same time, we were urged to kill off tax policies which encouraged people to risk their savings in business investments so production can expand and new jobs result.

The policies that would prevail should the Reuther-Keyserling crowd run the Government were never more clearly revealed than in the political, hypocritical tax proposals submitted to the Congress this year.

Despite the existing Federal debt, despite an anticipated deficit for the current fiscal year, despite the danger of inflation, per capita tax cuts were proposed without offsetting revenues to pay for them.

To make up the loss in revenue, the Government would have to borrow money and pay the interest charges.

So what the Democrats really proposed was increased purchasing power for consumers achieved with borrowed money, printing press money.

Well, if this is valid for a small increase in purchasing power, why not let the Government borrow without limitation, print a lot of money and increase consumption even more?

Obviously, no nation can long endure by this process. Yet this is what the left-wingers proposed.

The per capita tax cuts were not only unsound and irresponsible, they were vicious in their impact. Instead of being based on ability to pay, they were across-the-board reductions. Had the proposal been to increase taxes by a flat amount, there would have been howls of anguish heard around the world.

Incitement to class warfare marked the impassioned speeches of tax-cut sponsors. "Soak the rich" was an underlying theme. But elementary arithmetic shows it can no longer be done. Taxes have already squeezed all but the last remaining drops of juice out of this source. The Tax Foundation says that if Uncle Sam grabbed 100 percent of everyone's income over $10,000, he would collect less than $5 billion—not enough to run the Government for a month.

No, the great middle-income class in this country is the only remaining source for substantial tax revenues. And that is already heavily tapped.

Certainly, no one today will argue that our tax laws have not whittled down the upper-income classes.

Are the middle-income classes to be likewise whittled down and eventually destroyed through oppressive taxes?

In these wonderful United States, we have managed to avoid division of our people into two income groups—the very rich and the very poor—a characteristic of many other nations of the world and one which we do not wish to acquire here.

Instead of yawning chasm between the immensely rich and the poverty-stricken in the United States of America there is a strong, broad bridge of middle-income families. The Commerce Department tells us more than 40 percent of American families earn over $5,000 a year. Fifty-five percent of the families in the United States have incomes of $4,000 or more a year.

These are the people who keep this country going—who run the factories, who till the soil, who sell the goods—who buy what is produced—and who pay the taxes that support the Government.

And these are the people—the Reuthers and Keyserlings notwithstanding—who own shares in American business.

Available studies disclose some 6 to 7 million individuals hold stocks in publicly owned corporations; some 3 million individuals, in personal holding corporations. How many own both types, we do not know, but undoubtedly there is some overlapping.

In addition to individual stock ownership, institutions also hold shares. The extent of institutional stock ownership is not available, but there are at least 1,000 such institutions. Through them, untold millions of Americans have an interest in stocks as a result of their equities in life insurance policies, pension plans, and the like.

What happens when the power to tax is used to wipe out the middle class? The wheels of industry stop turning, and Government steps in to manage the economy.

This is not idle speculation. Just a few years ago Mr. Truman seized the steel mills, claiming he had inherent power to grab private property. If the Government can seize business property, it can also take individual property. The social reformers have shown their hand—there can be no doubt as to their intentions should they regain power.

Socialism never worked in other countries and was a miserable flop when tested in the United States.

Why then can the Reuthers and the Keyserlings continue to capture ground with this proposition?

Why indeed?

In the first place, of course, they disguise their proposals in sheep's clothing. The wolf fangs don't show to the uninitiated.

And that's where you and I, and everybody else who recognizes the Reuther-Keyserling scheme for the hoax that it is—have fallen down on the job.

We have failed even to get this simple message across. If it is true that Government should have more responsibility—in other words, more control—over the economy so people can have more freedom, then those pitiful masses of humanity behind the Iron Curtain should be the freest in the entire world.

We have failed to convince the workers of America of their personal stake in our system of private ownership and production where opportunity beckons to those willing to work to progress.

We have failed to rally our forces in every walk of life to spread the golden gospel of opportunity for all.

Opinion Research Corp., at Princeton, N. J., conducted a poll of high-school seniors in 86 communities throughout the country. When asked "Is the theory 'from each according to his ability, to each according to need' a valid basis for an economic system," 55 percent replied "Yes."

Over half the high school seniors—the citizens of tomorrow—accepted the very theory that is the basis of Marxism.

Sixty-one percent said the profit motive is unnecessary to the survival of our system. Think of that.

Sixty percent said owners get too much of the profits.

Eighty-two percent of the pupils said we do not have competition in business. Do you people here in this room thing there is no competition in your business?

Seventy-six percent believed that owners get most of the gains from new machinery.

Sixty percent said a worker should not produce all he can.

This, gentlemen, gives an idea of what we are up against.

How fertile is the soil for the Reuther-Keyserling propaganda.

Well, how shall we counterattack?

Let's steal a page from the enemy's book. Let's live our convictions in everyday life. The enemies of freedom seize every opportunity to discredit our sytem—let us seize every opportunity to lambaste theirs.

We can begin in our own homes with our own children to extol the virtues of private ownership of property and to explain the benefits of competition. There are countless examples of everyday products and services used in the home which, because of competition, have increased in quality while dropping in price. Television is an outstanding example.

In our daily work we can spread the gospel and at the same time expose the Reuther-Keyserling hokum that is bewitching and bewildering our people. We should constantly show up the concept of more personal freedom under more Government control as a hoax—a snare and a delusion.

Every day in every way we should cite chapter and verse where socialism—the real name for the Reuther-Keyserling program—has failed.

The greatest socialist experiment in world history is Soviet Russia. It is a gold mine of examples to turn our people away from the honey-poison ideas of the Reuthers and Keyserlings and the other leftwing socialists. Russia is first and foremost the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It should be so identified to our people who think of it only as a Communist political government.

Should the Reuther-Keyserling socialist movement win out in the United States, business editors would soon go the way of Russian writers—urging the poor devils on the production line to greater efforts, rationalizing the inevitable failures under the socialist system, and rewriting history to suit the purposes of political ruling bosses.

We can bend every effort to get business people to set aside a portion of their advertising budgets to preach the gospel of the free, competitive way of life.

Enlightened management is already moving in that direction. Every now and then I notice an advertisement in a national magazine dedicated to informing workers and consumers how the profit system benefits them. But so far we are using only BB guns—when the battle demands heavy artillery.

We need spokesmen who understand our system and can explain it to the man on the street. At the same time, they must also counteract the Reuther-Keyserling pol-

son that has already infected a great body of people. We need advocates for our cause on radio and television programs, on discussion panels in church and educational groups. We need writers in our newspapers and magazines who will help us carry the ball. We must make meaningful to various groups in the country—the teachers—the miners—the farmers—the factory workers—the college students—the big stake they have in the private economic system—and what they stand to lose under Socialist schemes so ardently and artfully peddled by enemies of economic freedom. How many union members realize that when Government operates business, the right to strike evaporates. By law Government employees are forbidden to strike.

It is not enough just to talk with each other. We must reach those who are falling for the Socialist line because they know not what they do.

The big showdown will come in November 1956.

What will be decided is not just the future of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party.

The free way of life as we have known it is at stake. The system which offers the greatest opportunity for individual advancement according to ability and the greatest rewards for effort is under attack by enemies who are playing for keeps. Their burning arrows have already set the house afire.

I for one am not going to stand idly by and let it burn to the ground.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on last evening, April 17, I made a broadcast over station WMCA, of New York City, on 2 subjects which in my opinion are of the utmost importance to the people of the United States. First and foremost is the question of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands, the question of war or peace. Second is the case of Edward Corsi. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The past month, since I last reported to you, has been another eventful one. There has been no great activity here in Congress. We had a 10-day recess for Easter. But there has been no recess on the world front—no recess in the Formosa Straits. And there has been no recess in developments of national political interest.

Two subjects have been the main objects of attention in Washington: First and foremost, the question of Formosa, of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands—the question of war and peace, and second, the case of Edward Corsi.

President Eisenhower has often referred to his administration and to his Cabinet as a team. If they are a team, it is the strangest team in history because it seems to make plays which have no relationship to the signals being called, in public, by the quarterback. President Eisenhower makes fine public statements, with many of which I agree, but his team continues to act as if they had never heard these statements. The Eisenhower team seems to be playing on a different field, in a different game, under a different set of rules, than President Eisenhower himself. For this he must be credited with full responsibility. It is his team.

The 1A test example of incredible conduct on the part of the Eisenhower administration is the case of Ed Corsi, former industrial commissioner of the State of New York, former Republican candidate for the United States Senate, and until very recently, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on Immigration Matters.

As everybody knows, Mr. Corsi was fired by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles—kicked out of his job—because we was trying to do a job—the job he was assigned to do.

Mr. Corsi took the job at the request of the White House, to try to unsnarl the red-tape and to clean up the mess involving the refugee relief program. Under this program, enacted in 1953, the United States was going to admit 209,000 escapees and refugees from Europe and elsewhere into the United States. Well, to date, almost 2 years later, about 1,000 actual escapees and refugees have been admitted, along with a number of relatives. The entire program has turned out to be a fraud and a failure.

So the White House called in Mr. Corsi, who has a considerable reputation as an administrator, and who is known as a friend of immigration. Corsi's job was to break the administrative logjam. He was to see to it that as many refugees and escapees as possible were admitted into the United States in the remaining months during which the Refugee Relief Act is still in effect.

But in Washington, Mr. Corsi made a critical mistake. He took his job seriously. He pushed, he scolded, he insisted that the red-tape be cut and that refugees be admitted into the United States. He even spoke out against the racist and discriminatory McCarran-Walter Act and urged its drastic amendment.

In Congress, powerful elements committed to the discriminatory principles of the McCarran-Walter Act attacked Mr. Corsi. They went over his past with a fine-toothed comb. They made veiled allusions to vague organizations he had belonged to 20 or 30 years ago. The witch hunt was on.

Secretary Dulles, Mr. Corsi's boss, reacted to the attack against his subordinate by beating an inglorious, shameless retreat. He announced publicly that Mr. Corsi was being investigated for security, and that anyway, Mr. Corsi was in Washington on a temporary 90-day appointment only.

This was news to Mr. Corsi, who had come to Washington prepared to stay and see the refugee program through.

Secretary Dulles had more news for Mr. Corsi. He announced subsequently that Mr. Corsi was no longer to be special assistant for immigration problems. In short, he was fired.

It was not a question of Mr. Corsi's loyalty, Secretary Dulles said. It was just that Mr. Corsi was such a poor administrator.

Mr. Corsi has accused Secretary Dulles of lying. Secretary Dulles has suggested that Mr. Corsi is not telling the truth.

In the light of this development, and of these charges and countercharges, I felt a congressional investigation would be a good thing. I urged that such an investigation be instituted. It is now in progress. I trust and hope that the facts will be brought out.

There is one fact, however, which is perfectly clear without further investigation. That is the fact that the refugee relief program has been a tragic disappointment and a dreadful failure.

You may be interested to know that I am preparing to introduce a set of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. Those amendments would eliminate the unwise and unsupportable provisions of the present refugee law. My amendments would make the refugee relief program easier to administer. My amendments, if enacted, would make it possible to admit most, if not all, of the 209,000 refugees and escapees authorized to be admitted under the basic terms of that law.

But, no matter how good a law, its purposes can be totally frustrated by unsympathetic and obstructive administration of the law. In reverse, even a bad law can be made to work by liberal, sympathetic, and intelligent administration of it.

I do not know whether we can get this kind of administration of the Refugee Relief Act from the present regime in Washington, even if my amendments to the law are adopted. Mr. Corsi tried, and you know what happened to him.

The question of Mr. Corsi is not the only one troubling Secretary Dulles and the Eisenhower administration these days.

There is a far more explosive problem to be dealt with—and far more important for the United States. That is the question of Formosa, of Quemoy, and Matsu.

Quemoy and Matsu are, of course, those little islands directly off the coast of China, within the very tidewaters of the Chinese mainland. The administration has half-committed the United States to defend those islands, which are now occupied by Chiang Kai-shek, if the Red Chinese attack them.

Maybe we will defend those islands. Maybe we won't. One week we hear in Washington that the administration is prepared to go to war over those islands. The next week we hear that the administration definitely will not go to war over those islands. It is a war of nerves. The chief victims of this war, however, are the American people and the people of the free world.

The chief of naval operations, Admiral Carney, is reported to have predicted that Red China would attack Quemoy and Matsu by April 15, and that by that date we would be in war.

Admiral Carney has denied that he made the prediction. It was another incident in the war of nerves.

But make no mistake about it. The experts in and out of Washington are agreed—they have no doubt—that the Red Chinese are planning to attack Quemoy and Matsu, and are only waiting for the most opportune moment.

What will we do then, when and if an attack is launched, against these islands which have always belonged to the Chinese mainland and are part of the Chinese mainland?

Military experts tell me that there is no way to defend these islands except by bombing the Chinese mainland. There is little question of what would happen then. That would mean all-out war with China. Would it be an atomic war? I do not know. I suspect it would. Red China may not have atomic bombs, but Red Russia has. Are we going to risk atomic war, with all its frightful, world-shattering implications, for the defense of islands which we have no legal right to defend under international law?

Let us not deceive ourselves. In such a war we would fight alone. Alone in the world, with not a single major ally at our side.

We are, of course, committed—I do not question that commitment for a moment—to defend Formosa against a Communist attack. That is what we should be concentrating on—the building up of strength and free-world solidarity for the defense of Formosa. We should be trying, with all the means at our disposal, to associate as many allies as possible with ourselves for the defense of Formosa against aggression. We cannot, and should not, try to do it or go it alone.

A united world front in defense of Formosa against aggression will surely deter the

Red Chinese, if anything can deter Red China.

Let us ask ourselves: What is Red China really after? Is it Quemoy and Matsu or Formosa? No; these are only tidbits—means to an end. What Red China really wants is the domination and control of all Asia.

Quemoy and Matsu offer Red China such an opportunity, if we defend them. The masses of the people of Asia are convinced that Quemoy and Matsu should belong to Red China. They believe Red China would be justified in taking possession of these islands by force if necessary. And this same view is held by the vast majority of the peoples and governments of Europe, too.

If we, the United States, undertake to defend these islands against a Red Chinese attack, and thus initiate a war with Red China, and possibly with Russia, too, it will be a war under the best conditions for the Communists, and the worst for us. If we make it an atomic war, we may win temporarily in China, but we will lose permanently in the rest of the world.

We dare not contemplate this prospect. On the contrary, we should make clear, immediately, that we have no such thought in mind. We must make clear that we not only seek peace, but we seek to avoid war.

Formosa represents a point where we can rally the free world; yes, even the peoples of Asia.

I am not trying to run the foreign policy of the United States. That is President Eisenhower's responsibility. But he shall have my views when I honestly differ with him, as I do now, and my support when he is following what I consider the right road.

This is an obligation I owe to you, the people of New York State, whom I represent in the Senate, and to my country. It is an obligation I owe to my conscience.

Thank you, my friends, for listening to my latest report from Washington.

The Conquest of Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in regard to a recent great accomplishment of international value, namely, the development by Dr. Jonas E. Salk of the antipoliomyelitis vaccine. The editorial appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of April 13.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONQUEST OF POLIO

The report on the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine presents the world with one central fact of overwhelming importance: Man now has in his hands the weapon that will conquer polio the killer, the crippler. There is every reason to believe that this weapon will be used well, and that the conquest will come swiftly.

Achievement of an effective polio vaccine is a triumph with many facets. It is, of course, a great personal victory for Dr. Jonas E. Salk, the modest and dedicated man who took the final step. His labors have won him an enduring place in medicine's Hall of Fame.

Dr. Salk would be the first to point out, however, that his research, brilliant and painstaking though it was, merely brought the work of others to fruition.

The fight against polio has been going on for decades. But one needs to go back only to 1949 to show how the work of each man has been a stepping-stone for those who followed. In that year a group working at Harvard University propagated polio virus in nonnervous tissue after countless previous efforts had failed. This meant that if a polio vaccine was developed it could be produced safely in large quantities.

Two years later, teams of researchers at four universities had narrowed the search for a vaccine by finding that only three types of virus cause polio. By 1952, scientists at Yale and Johns Hopkins had learned that the disease can be attacked in the bloodstream. Then a worker at the University of Pittsburgh demonstrated that antibodies formed under stimulation by the virus actually would protect against polio.

Dr. Salk's development of a workable vaccine is based on those previous discoveries. His work would not have been possible without them.

The conquest of polio, in short, beautifully illustrates the scientific method. It is a classic example of the way in which numerous researchers, working in widely separated laboratories, can pool their knowledge and make a concerted attack on problems that confront mankind. At a time when the scientific community has been under attack from various quarters, this success is a reminder that science is man's most effective tool for mastering his environment.

Achievement of the polio vaccine also is a heartening reminder of what can be done through the cooperative effort of ordinary citizens. They, millions of them, poured out the flood of dimes and dollars that enabled the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis to finance both medical treatment and research.

The vaccine is a triumph for Dr. Salk and those others who have hunted dread polio to its lair. In a larger sense, it is a triumph for the community of man.

State of Israel Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 2, our able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] made a speech at a trade-union dinner in the interest of the Israel bond drive. It was a most interesting and thought-provoking speech. It was a heartening speech to those interested in the welfare of Israel. I feel that the Senator's speech should be widely read. It should certainly be made a part of the RECORD of the United States Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ISRAEL BOND SPEECH AT TRADE UNION DINNER BY HON. PAT MCNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., APRIL 2, 1955

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, officers, brothers, and sisters in the trade-union movement, fellow Americans, this is the first time since the voters of Michigan decided the time had arrived to send a member of organized labor to the United States Senate that I have had the pleasure of addressing a large gathering of the representatives of labor—A. F. of L., CIO, and independent unions—all together in one place. It is a very great privilege indeed to be here and to know that this meeting is symbolic of the unification of organized labor that is now in process.

This gathering is of special interest to me, for if it had not been for the strongly concerted efforts of practically all groups of organized labor, I would not be addressing you tonight as the Senator from Michigan. Let me point out that I am only the third Democrat in the history of Michigan to be elected to the United States Senate. It is clear that the allegiance to the GOP of that rock-ribbed Republican State is crumbling.

How did this happen? It happened because Michigan has become an industrial as well as an agricultural State; it happened because the workers of Michigan rebelled against the reactionary policies of the Republican Party; it happened because the working people of Michigan joined with the disillusioned farmers and the disappointed business people to send to the Congress a Senator who would do his best for all the people. They had become tired of seeing their State represented by Senators who consistently voted wrong. Today, they have at least one Senator who tries to see their problems as a whole and who votes according to his conscience in what he sees as the best interests of the entire State.

I must confess that there are times in Washington when I feel somewhat frustrated. But this is part of the process of democracy; many times we must make haste slowly. But we must make sure that we are going forward, not backward. I see it as my job to keep trying for better things for all our people, and that's what I am endeavoring to do.

You will forgive me, I hope, for discussing politics a little in my remarks, because, I am sure, you have wondered how it happened that PAT MCNAMARA, from the pipefitting trade, reached the United States Senate. It was improbable, but it happened—not because of the particular merits of myself, but because the times are changing, and people are changing with them.

In addition, I can say honestly that my campaign for election was, in my belief, one of the cleanest campaigns in the Nation. There were no personalities. My opponent, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, ran on his record, and I attacked his and his party's record up and down the State. We fought it out on the issues, and the Democrats won.

I have a Jewish friend back in Michigan who used to say he had his own definition of a Jew. He told me: "PAT, I'm going to give you an answer that an Irishman will understand. The Jews are that branch of the human race who just won't take 'no' for an answer." The more I hear about Israel and its people, the more I can see the truth in my friend's remark.

I want to tell you a little about the story of Israel, not just because I want you, as Americans, to further the sale of Israeli bonds, but because I want you, as Americans, to understand how I see this business of refusing to take no for an answer.

Here we are gathered, you and I, in this important meeting of organized labor. I am here because of my position as a Senator of the United States—but my position as a Senator of the United States is due to a lifetime in the ranks of organized labor. You and I know why we are here. We are here because all along the line of bitter opposition to labor unionism, there were men who wouldn't take no for an answer. I thank that almost every man is here because in the battle for human dignity and workers' rights, each of us refused to take no for

an answer. That refusal to take no for an answer built America; it brought the workers who built America into a movement that will build America into something far greater than anyone has ever dreamed.

If there is one place in the world where that same spirit exists and permeates the life of the country and its people to an even greater degree than in the United States, that place is the land of Israel.

It took us generations of struggle and education to forge the mighty organizations which are our labor unions. It took determined effort and bitter conflict to gain for organized labor its rightful place in this country, and this is the remarkable thing about Israel that should make each of us feel a sense of partnership with that country and its people—they founded their country on the principles that we still are struggling for in America. Their labor organizations are the dominant economic and political forces of Israel, operating through the great Histadruth, their central labor organization. They have proven that the desert can be made to bloom, that the swamp can be drained, that men can accomplish the impossible where men have the will and faith to accomplish the impossible. Believe me, my friends, if Israel had the resources that America has, in the same proportion, there would not have to be the struggle or the threat of struggle to achieve the reasonable aims of its people.

What they have accomplished in Israel and what they are now accomplishing in the face of great hardship must arouse the admiration of every man who knows the meaning of struggle against odds. Even if we were not informed Americans, recognizing our kinship with them for their democratic ideals; for their indomitable courage; for their role in history past, present, and future; we would, just as good sports who like to see a man get an even shake, rise and cheer them on.

My friends, that is just what we are being asked to do. Israel is small, a little guy, fighting nature, fighting enemies, racing against time to build up an economy based on equity, learning his job while he is producing, welcoming the stranger and sharing his crust with him—such a guy needs friends. He needs friends as America needed friends during the Revolution. This little guy saw 6 million of his brothers and sisters wiped out in the world. He has memories of his people burned and stabbed and plundered in many parts of the Old World. Without allies, he has only himself and his eternal faith in God. He must do today at all costs what dare not be left for tomorrow. I tell you, my fellow Americans, it would be a poor kind of American who wouldn't admire that little guy and who wouldn't be cheering him on in his fight against such odds.

We are being asked to lend him some of our strength. America was in that same position during the Revolution. Abroad, we went to France for help. At home, that great American Jewish patriot, Haym Salomon, a Philadelphia banker, bankrupted himself in the cause of the independence of the United States. In our own wars, we go to our own people for assistance to our country through bond purchases. Israel, with its limited resources, must have outside help. I do know this: Every American who, whether through sentiment or for hardheaded business reasons, invests in State of Israel bonds has a fine, sound investment. Whether you are investing in a private business or in a country, your investment is safest when it is made with people who won't take no for an answer. And you are asked to invest—not in war bonds—these are bonds for peace. Jews are not a warring people.

Imagine a little country with half a million people at the end of a struggle for independence absorbing over a million refugees within a few short years. It was impossible—but they did it. Imagine a tiny nation having to break the soil and establish industries while fighting for independence. It was impossible—but they did it. So now you have a million and a half people, today neither at war nor at peace, building frantically because they know that events in the world may soon make it necessary to bring in another million refugees whose very lives are at stake in other parts of the world. It seems impossible—but they are doing it. Whole new industries are springing up. A vast chemical industry, construction, cement, plastics, machinery, roadbuilding, consumer goods, agriculture, shipping, aviation—these and many more are making the land of Israel throb with the urgent vitality that is so characteristic of America. It is only a question of time before their example revitalizes the whole Middle East and helps millions of the Arab peoples make progress in the civilized world.

But time is on the side of the people of Israel only if we give the people of Israel what they need to work with—right now and in adequate measure. The chemical and other industries which are needed cannot be built on a piecemeal basis; you cannot build part of a chemical plant today and another part the year after next. If you are going to build at all, you must build that plant all at one time. The same thing goes for all the other industries that have to be created right from the ground up. The people of Israel must have the tools they need—now. Otherwise, the year after next may find them worse off than they are today.

We are told that it took 6 days for the creation of the world, and only after it was all done were man and woman created to inhabit it. But in Israel the people are already there, and a new world is being created around them while they must be fed, clothed, and educated. It is this new miracle of creation under most difficult conditions that has earned the awe and respect of the other people of the world. It is in this miracle that we are being asked to invest.

You see, my friends, it is not just Israel you are investing in. You are making an investment in civilization itself. You are investing in the human spirit. The same people who, a thousand years ago, carried to the rude medieval Christian countries of Europe the first philosophy and learning and devotion to democracy and freedom nurtured in the eastern world, have now returned to the east, bearing with them the science and the productive arts of living of the 20th century west.

These are not just bonds for Israel—they are our bonds with Israel. One could not understand America without understanding the part that the Jewish idea of one God, through the teachings of Christianity, has played in the founding and the history of America. Ours is not just a debt to repay, not just an acknowledgement of spiritual kinship. This is an act by which the common man in America declares to Israel and to all peoples of the whole world: "Wherever men fight the good fight for political and economic democracy; wherever men struggle to raise the levels of living and dignity of the common man; wherever men, against whatever odds, refuse to take no for an answer—to that place and to those men the people of America will send their private help, their personal encouragement, their ringing message of the unity of all good men in a good cause."

In conclusion, my friends, let me say that there could be no more fitting group than this to give emphasis and leadership in the bonds for Israel campaign. You represent the working people of the San Francisco area. You are asking your people and your friends to make possible the success of a democratic working community far away in the Middle East—so that from their toil and their sweat they may make for themselves a prosperous and free homeland; and so that their success may shine as a beacon and an ideal for all the oppressed and poverty-stricken and disease-ridden and hopeless people who are their neighbors—as well as creating in that vast desert country an oasis of democracy, with kinship for all the freedom-loving nations of the world.

So, the beachhead is well established. I am sure you here tonight will want to see it expand, not only that a great people may find refuge from oppression but also that future generations will, with God's help, have a chance for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which is man's rightful heritage.

Competition in the Rubber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated March 25, sent by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, to Mr. Paul W. Litchfield, chairman of the board of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. I want to clearly associate myself with Mr. Burger's comments.

It is my intent to watch with keen interest the activities affecting private management of the synthetic rubber plants, in order to determine whether small business and free enterprise will have an opportunity to develop.

As all Senators know, this subject was of deep concern to many of us when we voted on the question of disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants; and I am deeply concerned lest some of the aspects of competitive enterprise may have been damaged by the action taken by Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 25, 1955.

Mr. PAUL W. LITCHFIELD,
Chairman of the Board,
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.,
Akron, Ohio.

DEAR MR. LITCHFIELD: I read with considerable interest the announcement of your company over your signature appearing in the New York Times of today, "An announcement by Goodyear of importance to every manufacturer of rubber products."

I have reviewed your statement very carefully and it is our hope and trust that, for the good of our Nation's welfare, the pledge enunciated in the statement will be carried out to the fullest degree. I was especially interested in your statement: "Today a new and stimulating ingredient—free enterprise—is added." That has been our position in all messages we have sent to Congress, not to oppose private operation of the synthetic rubber plants, but rather fearful that after the plants went into private ownership a squeeze play might take place.

You also state: "It is a challenge in that it provides the opportunity to prove again the advantages of private enterprise." This will, we sincerely hope, come true because if it doesn't private enterprise in the big brackets will be on trial.

A very important declaration by you, of great importance to all small users of synthetic rubber, is your statement that "Through the sale of a sufficient portion of our production to ensure free and fair competition within the rubber industry" is how you propose to meet your new obligations. Our position is that we will expect free and fair competition in the sale of synthetic rubber and that the smaller users of this product will get a fair and equal break with all other customers of the owners of these plants.

Finally, when the day arrives in which free and fair competition enters the rubber tire industry, it is my belief that such action will maintain the present efficient independents in that industry, particularly in the distribution field, and will offer an attraction to youth to enter this industry which offers great opportunity for individual ownership in the distribution field.

Having close to 50 years of experience in the industry, it is my hope that for the good of the industry itself, this pledge will be carried out in full, not alone by your company but by all other new owners of these Government plants. If this is done, there will be no complaint from small business of this Nation, but it is a safe conclusion that from this moment on the Congress will be watching all developments in the private ownership of these plants. Of this we are certain.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Thanks From an Italian Immigrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I want to offer to my colleagues an unsigned letter which recently appeared in the Public Pulse column of the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald. This heartwarming tribute to the United States comes from an Italian immigrant who achieved the full fruition of American citizenship. His letter is a challenge to all of us to pause a moment and reflect on our blessings. It is a directive to those who serve here to preserve our great institutions and freedom of opportunity, in order that succeeding generations of Americans may be equally rewarded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE UNITED STATES, THANKS

OMAHA.

I want to say "Thanks to the greatest country in the world, the United States, and one of the finest companies in that country, the Union Pacific Railroad."

In 1913, as a man of 24, I came from Italy and settled in Omaha. Two days after I arrived I started work at the Union Pacific. After more than 40 years of service, I was retired.

Words cannot express how much these years in this country and with this company have meant to me. My four children are now grown and have unlimited opportunities available to them. I can enjoy my retirement as would not be possible anywhere else in the world.

Only in a democracy, such as we have, could an uneducated man like I was, come in as a stranger and be welcomed to live a life of freedom and accomplishment.

A. L.

The Colonels' Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Colonels' Report has an important bearing upon the incredible Yalta papers. Although this document, which was prepared by G–2—Military Intelligence—prior to the Yalta Conference, was published as a part of the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, yet it has not had general attention. It is a complete answer to the argument advanced that our delegates to the Yalta Conference were not apprised of the military point of view.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the so-called Colonels' Report as it appeared in Human Events of April 2, 1955:

The Colonels' Report: The almost incredible Yalta papers as now published do not include one highly illuminating document, which we reproduce below. It may serve as a warning, just at this juncture, of the carelessness of statesmen who rushed into a Big Four conference and appeased an arrogant foreign power, without weighing decisions in the light of professional military advice.

The document was known in G–2 (Military Intelligence) as the Colonels' Report, for it was prepared by a group of veteran intelligence officers, most of them Regular Army colonels. Preparation was started about the time the Four Bigs set out for the famous Black Sea conference. It reads as follows:

"INTELLIGENCE REPORT

"1. The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would be a political event of world-shaking importance, the ill effect of which would be felt for decades to come. Its military significance at this state of the war would be relatively unimportant.

"2. Many military experts believe that the United States and Great Britain without further help possess the power to force unconditional surrender upon Japan, or to occupy the islands and mainland possessions.

"3. It may be expected that Soviet Russia will enter the Asiatic war, but at her own good time and probably only when the hard fighting stage is over.

"4. The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war at so late a moment would shorten hostilities but little, and affect only a slight saving of American lives.

"5. It is not believed that any diplomatic action we either take or fail to take, or any concessions we make now or in the foreseeable future, will influence Soviet Russia to speed up or retard entry into the Asiatic war.

"6. Strong enough to crush Japan ourselves, the United States should make no political or economic concessions to Soviet Russia to bring about or prevent an action which she is fully determined to take anyway.

"7. The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would destroy America's position in Asia quite as effectively as our position is now destroyed in Europe east of the Elbe and beyond the Adriatic.

"8. If Russia enters the Asiatic war, China will certainly lose her independence to become the Poland of Asia; Korea, the Asiatic Rumania; Manchukuo, the Soviet Bulgaria. Whether more than a nominal China will exist after the impact of the Russian armies is felt is very doubtful. Chiang may well have to depart and a Chinese government may be installed in Nanking which we would have to recognize.

"9. To take a line of action which would save few lives now, and only a little time—at an unpredictable cost in lives, treasure and honor in the future—and simultaneously destroy our ally, China, would be an act of treachery that would make the Atlantic Charter and our hopes for world peace a tragic farce.

"10. Under no circumstances should we pay the Soviet Union to destroy China. This would certainly injure the material and moral position of the United States in Asia.

"11. It should be reiterated that the United States Army is by no means united in believing it wise to encourage the Soviet Union to enter the Asiatic war.

"12. The President of the United States would be well advised, before he made any commitments to Russia in Asia which would clearly have dire political and moral consequences for the United States, to consult that particular American field commander who is steeped in every phase of the Asiatic war and in the political background of that struggle.

"Recommendation: General MacArthur should be summoned to Washington immediately. The President should consider the all-important matter of Soviet Russia's entry into the Asiatic war with General MacArthur eye to eye. All other political and military personages should be excluded from the conferences."

The above document is, and has been for almost 4 years, a part of the published record of the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, and was introduced into the record by Senator STYLES BRIDGES in June 1951 (vol. 4, pp. 2916–2917 of the hearings of that committee, known as the MacArthur hearings, since the group heard testimony from General MacArthur (following his dismissal by Truman) on his conduct of the war in Korea).

This report was prepared and written by Cols. Joseph Michela (leader of the group), Truman Smith, Harvey Smith, Edmund Delaney, Hugo Kenyon, Ivan Yeaton, Peter Vischer, and other area specialists of Military Intelligence. The report was dated April 12, 1945, over 2 months after Yalta, although it had been under preparation for some months previously. The secret agreement made at Yalta to bring Russia into the Asiatic war was not known to G–2 at the time, and indeed was only revealed in 1947.

The motive behind the preparation of the document was a desire to put before the high level a realistic view of the developing Asiatic situation. From about September 1944 and increasingly as the months went by, the colonels felt that Japan was beaten and that the only practical course was to try to arrange an unconditional surrender or some other diplomatic means to take Japan out of the war. The colonels were appalled at the prevalent view of the high level that it was necessary to get Russia to enter the Asiatic war in order to finish the conflict against Japan. If they had been consulted by the high level before Yalta, the above advice would surely have been given—according to those members with whom Human Events has talked.

Colonel Michela presented the report to General Marshall in April and briefed the Chief of Staff on it. Marshall reportedly said little, but discouraged Michela's hopes that action along the above lines would be taken.

Tomorrow's Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I should like to include a most interesting article by Mr. Carroll Kilpatrick entitled "Tomorrow's Leaders," which appeared in the April 1955 issue of Nation's Business.

The fine work being done by the National War College, situated not far from Capitol Hill, is perhaps not sufficiently publicized. I feel sure that this article will be of considerable interest to my colleagues:

TOMORROW'S LEADERS—THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE, LITTLE KNOWN BUT VITAL IN OUR SECURITY PROGRAM, GROOMS CANDIDATES FOR TOMORROW'S TOP MILITARY AND CIVILIAN POSTS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Every tourist in Washington knows the location of the White House, the Pentagon, and the Capitol. But not many know where the National War College is located or the part it plays in their own security.

In spite fo this anonymity, the college is one of the country's most impressive and important institutions. There are a number of proposals to expand it or to use it as a model for the creation of similar institutions.

The National War College is one of the youngest educational institutions in the world. Here each year 130 of the most promising men in the foreign and military services are trained for top command and ambassadorial posts.

The military has long understood the need for such advanced training.

A plaque on the wall at the National War College says that in 1927–28, when the building was occupied by the Army War College, D. D. Eisenhower, major of infantry, received instruction in advanced concepts of war. One of his instructors was G. C. Marshall, Jr., lieutenant colonel of infantry, on assignment from the Army's War Plans Division.

President Eisenhower, in addition to his training at West Point, is also a graduate of the Infantry Tank School, the Command and General Staff College, and the Army Industrial College. Other generals have had similar advantages. Our success in World War II was the direct result of this intensive schooling.

But similar training was not available for civilians.

Among the men who saw this as a national weakness were the late James V. Forrestal, Adm. William F. Halsey, and Vice Adm. Harry W. Hill.

It was Admiral Hill who, in February 1946, asked General Eisenhower, then Army Chief of Staff, to turn the building of the Army War College at Fort Leslie J. McNair in the District of Columbia over to a new school for training of civilians as well as military men.

General Eisenhower knew from his own experience the value of such adult education. While Admiral Hill was still in his office, he telephoned Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations, to make sure of his approval since the new school was to operate under the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Admiral Nimitz was enthusiastic, and General Eisenhower promptly ordered the building which had housed the Army War College to be turned over to the new institution. The Army War College was moved to Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and the first class of the National War College was enrolled in August 1946. It had distinguished leadership. Gen. A. M. Gruenther, now NATO forces commander, was deputy commandant and George F. Kennan, later to be Ambassador to Russia, was deputy for foreign affairs.

The purpose of the college is to prepare military and diplomatic officials for high policy and command and staff functions, to train them for strategic planning duties, to promote the development of understanding of the agencies of government, to survey the factors of power that are essential to a national war effort, and to show how the strengths of the Nation may be harnessed to achieve a desired end. Its purpose also is to train the various armed services to work with each other and with the civilian agencies as they must do in the National Security Council, in a foreign embassy, or at an important military base overseas.

There is no longer any sharp dividing line between military and civilian responsibility. A commander of an American airbase in north Africa is in a real sense an American ambassador also. The director of the military assistance program in Spain must be an expert in business as well as in diplomacy.

Military students at the college—mostly Army and Air Force colonels and Navy captains—are introduced to the complexities of national policymaking. Their daily contacts with civilians, and the civilians' daily contact, with them, make for broader appreciation of each other's duties, needs, and thinking. One naval officer in this year's class has had almost nothing but submarine duty, but he has obvious qualities of leadership and the War College will give him a needed opportunity to broaden his outlook by study and association with men of varying points of view.

The year does much to bring the three services together. Friendships are formed which are invaluable in solving day-to-day problems. John D. Hickerson, now Deputy for Foreign Affairs, tells how, when he was Assistant Secretary of State, a problem arose involving the Army: "One of my assistants said, 'I know Colonel Smith, who was with me at the War College; I am sure he can help.' Colonel Smith was not involved in this particular problem, but in a matter of hours these two men worked out a difficult matter to everyone's satisfaction.

Each year's students are carefully chosen because they show potentialities of leadership. There are approximately 30 officers from the Army, 30 from the Navy (including 6 Marines and 1 Coast Guardsman), 30 from the Air Force, 30 from the State Department, 3 from the Central Intelligence Agency, and normally 1 or 2 each from Treasury, Commerce, Budget Bureau and Foreign Operations Administration.

Their term is for 10 months—from August to June. The faculty is composed of about 15 officers, some of whom are graduates of the college, and 5 or 6 civilians, some of them university professors on leave. Lt. Gen. Howard A. Craig of the Air Force is commandant—the third since the college was founded. He serves for 3 years, and the commandant's position rotates between the Army, Navy and Air Force. Under General Craig are two deputy commandants—Maj. Gen. Clovis E. Byers of the Army and Rear Admiral Chester C. Wood of the Navy (a graduate of the college)—and Mr. Hickerson.

Since in Government work the heavy load of detail and administrative responsibility makes serious reading and study almost impossible, the chief object of the course is to start the students thinking about the overall problems of national policy. Every effort is made to jar them loose from stereotypes peculiar to their particular branch of service.

The first step, therefore, is to create an easy and informal atmosphere. Car pools are encouraged so that the students have opportunity for informal discussion while riding to and from their homes. Service identifications are lost when the student dons civilian clothes—required except for members of the faculty. Social and sporting events are encouraged.

The college does not offer courses of study in the usual sense, because these men are assumed to have had a good education already. Rather, every effort is exerted to stimulate the students' interest, imagination and intellectual curiosity by making available the best books, lectures, films and study materials.

"The administration of the college," the outline of work this year says, "tries to place on each individual student the burden of responsibility for his own development. Guidance and advice are offered but are not forced. Encouragement and stimulation are always present but what each individual takes away from the college will almost entirely depend upon what he himself has put into the group effort."

The result is much cross fertilization. The average age of students is 42 years and many are experts in several fields already. During the uprising last winter in Costa Rica a student just back from service there was able to explain the political and military situation in detail. When a lecturer spoke on military problems in the Mediterranean area, he was cross-examined by several men who had served in Turkey, Greece or Italy and knew the political and military problems at first hand.

A number of the officers and several of the diplomats now enrolled served in Korea during the fighting and are intimately acquainted with problems facing the United Nations command.

The 10-month program is divided into 2 semesters of the school.

The first is devoted to a study of contemporary international affairs and American responsibilities and commitments. In 1954–55 this included work on the sources and elements of national power, the United Nations, problems of international law and military forces. There followed a series of area studies—on the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth, Africa and the Middle East, the Far East, and the Western Hemisphere.

Emphasis in the second semester is on the development of a national security policy in accord with current realities and the development of the military, political, and economic policies necessary to support it.

At the end of the year, the school is divided into four groups for flying trips overseas. One group this year will go to the Middle East, another to northern Europe, a third to Latin America, and the fourth to the Far East. The trips take 3 weeks, and the students visit military installations, American embassies and other points of interest. Since the men making these trips have spent the preceding months carefully studying the military and diplomatic problems of the area, they are well equipped to profit from on-the-scene visits. The trips are an appropriate climax of the year's study.

After the return home, the last few days are devoted to comparing notes and discussing the lessons learned from the overseas visits.

The normal day at the college begins at 8:30, with the first half hour set aside for reading the New York Times or the Washington Post and Times Herald. Newspaper reading is essential because only by following news developments can a student take part in daily discussions.

At 9 o'clock students and faculty attend a 45-minute lecture. Here the speaker may

be a member of the faculty but usually is a visitor. This year's list has included the British and Dutch Ambassadors in Washington; James Burnham, the author; Prof. F. S. C. Northrop, of Yale; Senator John J. Sparkman, of Alabama; David Lawrence, editor; Charles Burton Marshall, former State Department policy planning officer; Harry Schwartz, New York Times specialist on Russia; Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Clare Booth Luce, Ambassador to Italy; James B. Conant, Ambassador to Germany; the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and most of the Cabinet officers. The lectures are off the record to encourage frank speaking. At the end of his remarks, the speaker submits to questions from the floor for about 30 minutes. Since some of those in the audience are almost as expert on the subject as the speaker, a lively debate often develops.

After the question period, the students are divided into 11 discussion groups to continue a probing of the lecture subject. These are informal discussions over coffee led by faculty members with the visiting lecturer usually attending one of them.

Before the lecture, the student has prepared himself by reading assignments and using the excellent maps, graphs, and other illustrative material the college provides. The visual aids branch may also prepare charts and maps for the lecturer's use, and sometimes illustrative films are shown. An Army lecturer, for example, might show secret films on guided missile experiments.

True to good military tradition, the physical side is not overlooked. From 11:30 to 12:30 there is a break for sports. Each student is encouraged either to play golf on the nine-hole course surrounding the college building, or squash or handball in the basement gymnasium. Tennis courts also are available, or the student may sit on a bench by the river and think.

All persons assigned to the college have the privileges of the Fort McNair officers' club and most of the staff members and students go there for lunch.

Afternoons allow some time for reading in the excellent library but the major criticism of the college is that it does not leave the student enough time for reading and research of his own. Students read at home at night and on weekends but nearly all of them have the usual family demands on their time. Opportunity for leisurely reading in the library is limited.

Part of the afternoons is taken up with committee work. The student body is divided into 20 committees with the services equally represented. Each committee has its own room and a specific assignment. As a unit, it prepares a "position paper" of about 4,000 words every 3 weeks. This joint effort of the group deals with some important foreign or military policy.

For example, one committee recently was told to assume that it was the staff of Chou En-lai and was responsible for preparing him for talks on Formosa at the United Nations. Another committee prepared a briefing paper for Russia's Molotov, another for the British and another for the French representatives. Other committees prepared papers for use by the United States delegate.

There is much banter over what an unsuspecting FBI agent might think if he found in someone's brief case these carefully prepared papers for Chou or Molotov. But the college knows that only when the opponent's point of view is appreciated and ably stated can the American case be argued persuasively.

After the faculty studies these papers some of them are read before the student body and criticized.

Every 3 weeks the committees are reshuffled so that, in the course of a year, each student has a committee assignment with almost every other member of his class.

In addition to the committee papers, each student is required to submit by the end of the year an individual thesis of approximately 20,000 words on some subject of his own selection relating to a national security problem. These are similar to a university thesis submitted by candidates for a master's degree and each student makes an oral presentation to a faculty group on the subject of his thesis.

The War College is not concerned with the mechanics of staff operations, tactics, or routine history or geography courses. The three services all have their schools for tactics and strategy. The National War College emphasis is on grand strategy, or national strategy, and the object is to force men to think critically about the basic problems facing the United States. It is training men for jobs that require statesmanship as well as technical skills.

According to this year's outline of study, the class is asked this basic question: "Accepting the world condition in which we live, what are the national objectives of the United States and how can we best achieve them?"

From the beginning the college has insisted on absolute freedom of discussion. There would be no difficulty here in debating whether the United States should recognize Red China—or whether preventive war would be desirable. Indeed, there is no place in Washington where the atmosphere is freer or where men are more deeply committed to a search for truth without regard to prevailing prejudices.

One of the chief faculty members in uniform said he would rather see the school closed than to retreat 1 inch from the position of complete freedom of discussion and inquiry. This is part of the tradition that has been developed in the 9 years that the college has been operating.

The very location of the school away from the center of the city helps create the academic atmosphere necessary for objective study. Elihu Root, Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of War, was the real creator of the Army War College and of the fine building that housed it from 1907 until the National War College took over in 1946. The lobby has a plaque telling the story:

"Because of the special interest of Elihu Root, Secretary of War, creator of the General Staff of the Army, this building for the Army War College was authorized by acts of Congress approved June 30, 1902, and April 23, 1904. Cornerstone laid February 21, 1903, building occupied June 30, 1907."

The building stands at the south end of the parade ground at Fort McNair, formerly Fort Humphreys. It is on a peninusula at the junction of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers. The fort is the home of the Army Band and is used for training of officers and men who guard the Washington area and participate in ceremonial functions. There are homes for faculty members on the fort but students live in their own or rented homes in various parts of Washington.

One of the oldest buildings on the fort—a red brick house near the center of the parade ground—was the scene of the trial of the Lincoln conspirators. Mary Surratt and three others were hanged in the yard of this house, then a military prison, on July 9, 1865. The body of John Wilkes Booth was brought here and buried under one of the cells until removed to Baltimore.

The need for "a governmental school of foreign affairs for civilians in government which would develop men and women capable of insuring civilian domination in the conduct of our foreign relations," has been stressed by many people, among them John J. McCloy, now chairman of the Chase National Bank, former Assistant Secretary of War and High Commissioner to Germany. "Some form of institutional training should be edvised to stimulate the qualities needed by our Foreign Service officers," Mr. McCloy has said. "The breadth of thinking in political matters at the National War College is impressive. But the State Department ought to have a similar institution where the primary emphasis is civilian and to which the future generals may repair to receive training in political and economic studies."

Great Britain established its war college nearly 2 decades before the United States did. The Imperial Defense College, started in 1927, is the prototype of the National War College and of similar institutions on the continent and in Canada.

Another proposal has come from Eugene Zuckert, former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, who has drawn an extensive plan for a National Administrative College similar to Britain's Administrative Staff College at Henley-on-Thames. Mr. Zuckert wants an institution near Washington "for improving the management of our large Federal Government by improving its managers and potential managers."

To this institution he would send top-level civil servants below the rank of Presidential appointment, military men of general and flag rank, a few Members of Congress and a group of businessmen who might be called on for Government service in an emergency.

The gravest shortcoming at present in the view of many Washington officials and of the Wriston committee which studied the State Department for President Eisenhower, is in the training of Foreign Service officers. As former Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith said, the training of special aptitudes for the Foreign Service, such as languages, has "reached a sort of all-time low," and the service in general is "a little below rock bottom."

An improved Foreign Service Institute, which gives technical training on the level of the Armed Forces tactical colleges, and a new higher institution on the model of the National War College would improve morale and help prepare civilian leaders for the long cold war that seems to face the Nation.

The National War College has pioneered in this field.

It has given 130 men a year an opportunity to study and think about the policies which our peace and security demand.

Miss Ouida Pattison, Public-School Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many of our public-school teachers across the Nation are making outstanding contributions in the field of education. Too often, however, their deeds go unrecorded and without the proper recognition. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Edgefield Advertiser, of Edgefield, S. C., dated April 6, 1955, praising one of these deserving teachers, Miss Ouida Pattison. Miss Pattison, with her diligent work and untiring devotion, is rendering an outstanding service for her community in the field of musical education.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TINY, TALENTED MISS OUIDA TAKES THE BOWS OF EDGEFIELD PEOPLE

Miss Ouida Pattison is deservingly taking the bows of the people of Edgefield for the performance of superb merit last Friday evening at the Edgefield High School auditorium.

Tiny Miss Ouida, without what most of us consider, in this stepped-up age, the indispensable automobile, and without what by any measure would be called rewarding compensation, but with diligence and courage and devotion, with a wonderful ambition for her pupils, with love for her community, and a very deep appreciation of her subject, goes and comes from school to home, early and late.

Miss Ouida works very hard and imparts to her pupils that determined quality so necessary in the career of music.

She pursues advanced studies regularly in the country's most noted schools of music, and this section is most fortunate to have one of her outstanding attributes connected with its public-school system.

A wonderful well done, Miss Ouida.

City of Los Angeles Asks Congress To Provide Legislation That United States Government Pay Assessments Levied Against United States Property in Connection With Local Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the attention of you and all by other distinguished colleagues the text of a letter and resolution received by me from the city of Los Angeles. A small portion of the great 23d District, which I represent this my ninth year in this great legislative body, extends over into the city limits of this great city of Los Angeles. In fact, it extends to within about 20 blocks of the city hall of that great city.

The text follows:

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 12, 1955.

Representative CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the meeting of the Council of the City of Los Angeles held April 12, 1955, resolution was adopted that the Senators and Representatives of the State of California again be requested to initiate Federal legislation to provide that the United States Government will assume and pay assessments levied against United States property in connection with local improvements.

A certified copy of said resolution is enclosed for your information.

Yours very truly,
WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.
By A. M. MORRIS,
Assistant City Clerk.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the United States Government refuses to pay assessments levied against property owned by it in connection with local improvements made adjacent to said United States property, and

Whereas by the Federal Government refusing to contribute its share of the cost of said local improvements, an undue burden is placed upon the remaining private property in the improvement district: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of California again be requested to initiate Federal legislation to provide that the United States Governmen assume and pay assessments levied against United States property in connection with local improvements.

Pro and Con of Proposed Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker I note that Senator BRICKER is again proposing a constitutional amendment which might affect the matter of treaties, executive agreements, reciprocal trade agreements, and in fact any dealings we might have with foreign countries, no matter what their purpose or intent might be.

The Commonwealth Club, of California, is an organization that studies controversial governmental problems, including national as well as State and local problems. It not only studies these problems, but it takes a stand on the problem by a vote of its membership.

Under leave granted to me, I shall include certain statements which might be helpful to Members in trying to decide what to do about the Bricker amendment should it be submitted to the House after passage by the Senate.

The first comment is an introductory statement of the general problem the proposed amendment poses. It was written by the editor of the Commonwealth, the official publication of the club. It follows:

BRICKER AMENDMENT: PRO AND CON

Has the power of the President over foreign affairs so expanded that some constitutional curb is today needed? Is there danger that domestic law in this country will be radically changed by international agreement without the approval of the people's elected representatives? Are the actions and proposals of our new world organization—the United Nations—and its sub-groups threatening the American Bill of Rights? Does the development of the U. N., something our Founding Fathers of course could not foresee, warrant a new look at the protections they endeavored to write into our Constitution?

These are perhaps the questions on which the campaign for the Bricker Amendment is based—issues on which proponents and opponents of the amendment are certainly in diametric disagreement. Other questions, too, are asked: Are these chimeras, rather than real dangers? Would the Bricker amendment alter the checks and balances fundamental in our Constitution? Would its provisions prove troublesome in conducting international relations?

To examine these great questions and correlative issues, the international relations section of the Commonwealth Club of California, under the distinguished leadership of the Honorable Addison E. Southard—lifetime diplomat and former Minister to Ethiopia—some 18 months ago opened a series of meetings in which foremost exponents of both sides were heard. The section's thoroughgoing report from all sides was presented to the club's report meeting of January 19, 1955. With the arguments pro and con presented to that meeting as condensed by the editors, the report appears in the following pages. We urge that every member read both sides at once, for a club vote will be taken almost immediately.—THE EDITOR.

THE CASE FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(By Edward A. Hogan, Jr., vice dean, Hastings College of Law)

The United States Constitution is called a flexible document. Its purpose is to secure the fundamental rights of American citizens. To better carry out the purposes for which it was framed, its authors provided for change. Thus it becomes necessary, from time to time, to reexamine the Constitution to determine the need for amendment. The record of 165 years of existence discloses 22 amendments. One principal reason for amendment has become obvious. The general and beautiful language of the Constitution is not always adequate to protect, in times of crisis, the fundamental rights of Amercans.

The Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments, was adopted when the fresh strength of the Federal Government was newly asserted. The 13th and 14th amendments, outlawing slavery and more specifically defining due process, followed the war in which certain States engaged in a contest of strength with the Federal Government. The 22d amendment recently was adopted so that no future crisis could demand that an American president serve in that exacting office for more than 2 normal terms.

The recent demand for precise language in the Constitution which limits the tenure of office of the President may indicate that Americans believe that more precise limits should be placed on the President in his conduct of foreign affairs. Today's thinking puts more emphasis on the language of the Constitution than it does on its underlying and unrevealed spirit.

Even the opponents of the Bricker amendment acknowledge the existence of an undercurrent of feeling that the language of the Constitution is too general for present world conditions. Arthur Dean, in a splendid article in the 1954 Stanford Law Review, although an opponent, recognizes three causes for popular dissatisfaction with the present state of the Federal Constitution on the subject of treaties: (1) The change in international affairs, even in so short a period as the last 25 years. Scientific assaults on time and space have diminished the size of the world and increased the importance of the United States. The United States is now a member of 75 different international organizations and an even greater number of councils and commissions which emerge from these organizations. (2) The broadened use of the executive agreement on such subjects as the Yalta Pact, among others, has raised a question of the adequacy of the restraints which the American system of Government imposes upon the President. (3) Developments within, and proposals arising out of, the United Nations suggest the possibility that foreign methods of government, particularly in judicial activity, will replace traditional American practices.

DEMAND FOR CHANGE

The broad question, therefore, is: Should our Federal Constitution limit more specifically the power of the President in international relations? The term "Bricker amendment" is a symbol of the demand for a

change. In this discussion there will be omitted any reference to the language difficulties related to the proposed amendment because the many revisions of Senators KNOWLAND, GEORGE, and others will ultimately result in verbiage appropriate to their thinking.

The three proposed more specific limitations to be placed in the Constitution are these:

1. On a conflict between the provisions of a treaty and the Federal Constitution, the Federal Constitution must prevail.

2. The internal law of the United States will not be altered by treaty, unless appropriate legislative action is taken within the United States.

3. The executive agreement will be subject to the control of Congress as well as the constitutional limitations imposed upon the treaty power.

My task here today is to review briefly those matters which have created a belief that the treaty provisions of the Federal Constitution may not be adequate to safeguard the integrity of other provisions of that Constitution.

IS COMMERCE CLAUSE SUBJECT TO SEIZURE POWER?

My first reference will be to the so-called steel seizure case, *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*. In that case the President of the United States ordered the seizure of strike-threatened steel plants in order that international commitments, to which he believed that he was bound, might be fulfilled. The President chose to disregard existing acts of Congress which appeared to have relevancy to the problem and relied entirely on his powers as Chief Executive for authority to seize. So far as is known, none of the so-called international commitments were formal treaties or implementations of acts of Congress. Through many anxious days, Americans awaited the opinion of the courts of the United States as to the authority of the President to solve, by international agreement, a problem of labor relations in interstate commerce. The Constitution in article I, section 8, has expressely placed the commerce power in Congress. The majority of the Supreme Court called the Presidential order an unconstitutional order but the vigor of the dissent leaves a possibility that the case could well have been decided the other way. The case does not answer the question whether the President would have been acting constitutionally if a formal treaty was the source of his international commitment. It is still possible that the commerce clause may be subject to and be subordinated to the treaty power.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OVERRULED BY EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT

There is before the Supreme Court at this very moment a case which involves the right of the President, by executive agreement, to disregard the Agricultural Act of 1948 in regard to the importation of potatoes from Canada. The President, in disregard of the provisions of the Agricultural Act, authorized the importation of seed potatoes from Canada. The question before the Supreme Court is whether a court of appeals is correct in its ruling that the President acted unconstitutionally. The omission from the Federal Constitution of express language on executive agreements leaves in doubt the meaning of acts of Congress, enacted under their constitutional powers.

During the prohibition era, President Coolidge exempted British vessels from the rigors of the 18th amendment through a treaty with Great Britain, the effect of which was to permit those vessels to carry liquor stores, under seal, into United States ports, American merchantmen hurt by this type of competition, tried in vain to litigate the constitutionality of this treaty. Perhaps more specific language on the treaty power would have left unimpaired the express language of the 18th amendment.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TREATY AND AGREEMENT

The difference between a treaty and an executive agreement appears to be less wide as a result of judicial decisions of recent years. The Senate once was known as the graveyard of treaties when all important international agreements were submitted to that body for approval. But a change of practice by the President, following important judicial decisions, has transferred out of the Senate much of its power to commit international agreements to the graveyard. Today most international agreements are produced by Executive agreement. The U. S. News & World Report for February 5, 1954, has a chart which shows the change of practice. In the 150 years between 1789–39 there were 800 treaties and 1,200 published executive agreements. In the 15-year period from 1939 to 1954 there have been 200 treaties and 1,400 executive agreements. Secretary of State Dulles is credited with a statement that unpublished executive agreements since World War II have run into thousands. In the light of this changed practice and increased involvement in international affairs, including secret agreements, those sympathetic to the Bricker point of view are asking for a revision of the constitutional provisions on treaties.

NEW YORK LAWS OVERRULED

The law on executive agreements has developed suddenly in a way most favorable to unrestrained executive action. In *United States* v. *Pink*, the Supreme Court approved an executive agreement with Soviet Russia by which the assets of a privately owned Russian insurance company were recognized as collectively owned—contrary to the law of the State of New York as found by the New York Court of Appeals which had been declared to forbid an expropriation of private property by a decree of a foreign government. The power of the President, by executive agreement alone, to make applicable the treaty provision of article VI, or the supremacy clause of the Constitution, was thus established.

NO SEPARATION OF POWERS IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The view of the Supreme Court in the Curtiss-Wright case that the President, in international relations, is as free of the effects of the doctrine of separation of powers as was the King of England at the time of the American Revolution, must offer great encouragement to a strong executive but arouses the fears of lawyers who subscribe to the constitutional theory of a government with checks and balances. These lawyers seek, through the use of more precise language in the Constitution, to restore or establish, as the case may be, some checks on the President in international relations.

Judicial language, not necessarily majority opinion in State court decisions, has plainly indicated that the treaty power may be used to eliminate alien land laws, restrictive covenants, restraints on miscegenous marriages, succession to property by alien heirs, admission to the professions which had hitherto been reserved to citizens and other so-called social advances which would never be granted by local legislatures. The legislature of California on June 4, 1951, requested the United States Senate to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution in view of what it supposed was a threat to its alien land law through the treaty power.

WILL U. N. ADHERENCE CAUSE FREEDOM OF SPEECH SUSPENSION?

Our adherence to the United Nations may cause, although the state of the existing treaties does not require it:

1. a suspension of the guarantee of the first amendment to the Constitution through the Covenant on Human Rights in that the covenant provides for restrictions on freedom of speech, press, and assembly as are necessary to protect public safety, which may turn into a form of peacetime censorship;

2. through the Genocide Convention, by establishment of an International Criminal Court, the guarantees of the fourth, fifth, and sixth amendments may be suspended by provisions of the convention which eliminate trial by jury, trial in the vicinage and may well eliminate the provisions against unreasonable search and seizure, confrontation of witnesses and assistance of counsel;

3. through treaties or agreement similar to the Migratory Bird Treaty, an invasion of rights reserved to the States under the 10th amendment. Although the effect of the Migratory Bird Treaty is to give jurisdiction to the Congress when the Constitution has not done so, the principles of the Federal Constitution may be as much subverted by a transfer of power to the Congress, when the power was not meant to be there, as when similar power is transferred to an international organization;

4. more formal agreements than those which the President made at the time of Korea may threaten the provisions of the fifth amendment on the taking of property without due process of law as Chief Justice Vinson and two associates were prepared to say to the steel industry in *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*.

The changed condition of the world in the past quarter century, the judicial opinions so favorable to the use of the executive agreement in international affairs, the development of the United Nations and related international organizations, the doubt that exists as to whether express provisions of the Federal Constitution may be canceled through international commitments, the doubt as to whether State rights are as secure as they were before the decision in *United States* v. *Pink* made the rule that the supremacy clause applies to executive agreements—are a few of the reasons why the principles of the Bricker amendment are entitled to your serious consideration.

THE CASE AGAINST THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(By Prof. Joseph Walter Bingham, professor of law, emeritus, Stanford University)

Although the argument on the Bricker amendment is essentially political, the real question is juristic and should be free from politics.

I sympathize with many of the distressful feelings of Bricker amendment proponents for what has gone on in government in the last 25 years, but I do not believe you can curb the political tendencies of the American people by writing nuisance clauses into the Constitution.

PROHIBITION SHOULD HAVE TAUGHT US BRICKER FOLLY

The old American tradition that if you don't like a thing, you solve it by passing a law against it, is thoroughly unsound. We had a recent experience of that sort. We wrote into the Constitution a provision against the traditional habits of the American people in consumption of intoxicating liquors. That experience should have taught us that any such attempt as that being made by Bricker amendment advocates to write their views of political policy into the Constitution, is bound to be mischievous.

There is a very small percentage of professional advocates of the Bricker amendment who are both honest and have a measure of competence on the subject. Almost all the men who know this field, who have worked in it for their professional lives, are centered in associations like the Inter-American Bar Association, the American Society of International Law, the International Law Association, and similar organizations in New York City, in Washington, and the professional teachers of the subject throughout

the universities of America. Not more than 10 percent of those men are not earnest opponents of the amendment, a fact assiduously concealed in the propaganda.

What I say does not apply to such men as Dean Hogan but to the kind of argument as expressed in the story of the Bricker amendment by Frank E. Holman, an ex-president of the American Bar Association, which is the official pamphlet of the organization supporting the Bricker amendment.

PRO-BRICKER ARGUMENTS TERMED LEGALLY INCOMPETENT

I have written a past president of the American Bar Association a letter in which I have said that the Bricker amendment propaganda is a black disgrace to the American legal profession, both because of the legal incompetence displayed in the arguments for it and in the incompetent drafting of the proposed amendment.

There is not a single point in the Bricker amendment proposals that is not unqualifiedly false. I think Dean Hogan has made an argument as free from prejudice as possible, but the cases he brought up have been misconstrued insofar as their application to this argument is concerned.

YALTA WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN AFFECTED

The Yalta agreement is brought forward. If the Bricker amendment had been in the Constitution, the Yalta agreement would not have been affected by it, nor will any similar agreements in the future be affected.

The case of treaty agreements with France and Japan concerning the respective jurisdictions of American military administration and the local courts with respect to our armed personnel are outside the scope of the Bricker amendment. Yet those treaties are offered as cogent reasons for adopting the Bricker amendment.

Without these treaties, France and Japan would not consent to our troops being stationed there. They don't affect the internal law of the United States at all. Yet they're prime arguments advanced for the Bricker amendment.

NO ENCROACHMENT ON STATES' RIGHTS UNDER TREATY POWER

The argument has been made that, by recent decisions, there has been an encroachment under the treaty power on States' rights, as preserved by the Constitution. That is an unqualified falsehood.

In the Constitution, as framed and intended by the founders, exclusive jurisdiction over foreign affairs was handed to the Federal Government and expressly denied to the States. And the prime purpose of the clause in article 6 respecting the "supreme law of the land" was to do exactly what the Bricker amendment people say is contrary to the original intent of the founders—that is, to make treaty law supreme and effective against State law in the range of international affairs over which the Federal Government has supreme and exclusive control. If you read the clause, that is quite evident. It provides:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

SALIENT PART OF CLAUSE OMITTED

The purpose of that provision is careful omitted by Bricker amendment advocates. To give a false impression they omit the salient part of it which reads, "and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Obviously, the purpose of that clause was not to put the Constitution and congressional acts and treaties on an equal basis. It was to put all forms of Federal legislation, especially in the international field, supreme over conflicting State laws and judicial decisions.

Anyone can read that and see it. Still it is denied by Bricker amendment advocates.

There is nothing more reprehensibe professionally than that grabling of article 6 in the arguments for the amendment. Any lawyer who acted that way in a case in court would be called to account at once, and if he repeated it, would be guilty of contempt of court, and if he made a habit of doing it, movements for his disbarment would be at once in order, on the ground either of professional incapacity or dishonesty in conduct of his profession.

CIVIL WAR DECIDED ISSUE

Not only have advocates of the amendment gone so far as to cut off the last part of the provision in their arguments, but they also in some instances quote only that "treaties are the supreme law of the land," thereby closing up their argument that treaties are superior to the Constitution.

We had a Civil War over the question of superiority of the national Government as against the States and the decision was directly against some of the arguments of Bricker amendment advocates.

They also complain that treaties become internal law without the consent of the House of Representatives. It is only the self-operating parts of treaties that are internal law. Furthermore, a treaty requires the assent of two-thirds of the Senators present. If you can get two-thirds of the Senate in favor of a contested treaty, it will be a rare case when the House would be unwilling by a majority to support the treaty. Almost all important treaties require congressional implementation. The House of Representatives has to appropriate money or take some other action. Any treaty may be overruled by congressional legislation. If a treaty is objectionable, a maximum of 6 years will suffice to carry the question to the people and get a Congress and an administration to nullify the treaty.

Nevertheless, I am in accord with Bricker proponents to this extent. I think it would be a great improvement if we required for confirmation of a treaty a majority of the Members of each House of Congress. That would get rid of the argument that treaties may make internal law without the consent of the House of Representatives.

Resolution of City of Manchester, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to vigorously oppose restrictions regulating the importation of residual fuel oil and crude petroleum into the United States, which was passed to be enrolled by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of Manchester, N. H., on March 15, 1955:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO VIGOROUSLY OPPOSE RESTRICTIONS REGULATING THE IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL AND CRUDE PETROLEUM INTO THE UNITED STATES

Resolved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Manchester as follows:

"Whereas the restriction of importation of residual fuel oil and crude petroleum would work to the disadvantage of the city of Manchester and the State of New Hampshire, both by increasing the cost of fuel oil for industrial purposes, besides causing injury to nations which are a good customer for New Hampshire products; and

"Whereas domestic refining processes are providing a decreasing supply of residual fuel oil: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Manchester wish to be recorded as opposing vigorously any proposal to freeze at present levies the importation of residual fuel oil and crude petroleum or any other action which would tend to limit the supply of or increase the cost of fuel for Manchester, N. H.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the members of the New Hampshire delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That this resolution shall take effect upon its passage."

JOSAPHAT T. BENOIT,
Mayor.

Relief From Active Duty of Reserve Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "ROA Asks Burgess To Delay Reserve Officer Forceouts," published in the Army Times of April 2, 1955. The article deals with the relief from active duty of Reserve officers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROA ASKS BURGESS TO DELAY RESERVE OFFICER FORCEOUTS

(By Steve Tillman)

WASHINGTON.—Deeply concerned about the steady drop in morale of Reserve officers being relieved from active duty, and about their uncertain status, Col. C. M. "Count" Boyer, of the Reserve Officers Asociation, has written Defense Assistant Secretary Carter L. Burgess asking that the scheduled release of officers by April 30 be held up pending reconsideration of the problem. These officers are scheduled to be dropped if they are 55, for lieutenant colonels or below, and 58 for colonels. They also will go if they cannot make retirement under title II of Public Law 810. This calls for 20 years' active duty, 10 years of which must have been served on active duty as a commissioned officer.

Some of the officers have been relieved from active duty within a few months of qualifying for retirement. The Reserve Officers Association letter is in protest against this callous treatment.

Colonel Boyer told Secretary Burgess that his organization was not asking that mediocre officers—Regular or Reserve—be retained on active duty. But if it takes the Army 19 years and some months to find out that any specific individual is mediocre, and that officer has only a few months to go to retirement, there is certainly something radically wrong with the Army's handling of its officer personnel.

Boyer also pointed out that the matter of the readjustment pay for involuntarily separated officers has been under study by the Department of Defense since last June.

"But as of this date," he said, "this bill has not been introduced in the Congress and it is doubtful whether we will be able to get it on the statute books before the April 30 deadline.

"The proposed readjustment bill however does not relieve the Army, or the other services from their responsibility when they take 12 to 17 of the best years of a man's life and then arbitrarily relieve him from active duty at an age when it is very difficult for him to reestablish himself in the civilian economy."

SOME ARE STAYING

A reevaluation of the records of 260 Army Reserve officers scheduled to be dropped April 30 has resulted in 50 of these officers being scheduled for retention.

It is whispered at the Pentagon that the others actually will be dropped because they do not measure up to the standards expected of an officer. To be polite about it, Army will say that the elimination is due to other reasons.

CONGRESS KNOWS

The policy of the Army in dropping Reserve officers from active duty after as much as 17 years of active duty or when they are within a few months of completing the required 10 years' active duty—has not passed unnoticed by powerful Members of the Senate and House.

The officer being eliminated could be within a few months of eligibility to retirement, say as a lieutenant colonel.

Because of his elimination he must wait until he has completed either 20 years' active duty and 10 additional years in the Reserve, or a total of 30 years of active duty, and then be advanced on the retired list to the officer grade that he held prior to June 1946. This probably would be in the grade of captain.

One result of this policy is that Members of Congress are giving serious consideration to amending title III of Public Law 810 to provide immediate retirement for most of these officers.

The present law requires that the officer be 60 years of age before he can qualify for Reserve retirement. The proposal under discussion would lower the age to 55 for all officers involuntarily separated from active duty or from the Ready Reserve.

In discussing the proposal, Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, Alabama, one of the more powerful Members of the Senate, told me that he was "deeply interested in seeing reservists accorded equitable consideration in regard to retirement provisions," and that he is going to discuss the matter with Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia, and other members of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Senator HILL added that he was "advised that the Armed Services Committee continually seeks to study the effects of the retirement law' and that he would, in this connection, 'urge the committee's earnest consideration of the proposed amendments.'

Developments in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a few days ago I received from a constituent a most interesting letter which might well be termed an essay on self-reliance. I should like to offer to my colleagues an opportunity to study this thought-provoking message. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDGAR, NEBR., *April 2, 1955.*

SENATOR CARL CURTIS: I am an American. How I wish I could have written that as proudly as I proclaimed it to all and sundry in bygone days. I was born in Dawson County, Nebr., on March 15, 1893. My parents were sturdy, free, and independent pioneers who taught me things which youngsters are apparently no longer taught.

At the age of 15 (5 feet 11 and 168 pounds) I went to Enid, Okla., and followed the grain harvest and threshing through to Canada. I worked, as did all the harvest followers, 10 to 14 hours a day for wages ranging from $1.50 to $2.50 per day. It was hard work. Perhaps you have tromped a header barge, shocked barley, or pitched bouquets of wheat at the sun. But what did we care? We were eating fried chicken, etc., doing all right for ourselves and helping to make a great Nation greater.

Not one man in hundreds of us but would have gladly dropped his pitchfork to shoulder a gun for his country if need arose. He would have done it without a draft and for $15 a month—nor would he have expected his country to transport his family to wherever he was sent and supply their needs also. Had the United States become entangled in war with hell, he would have carried Old Glory into the nether regions to plant it on the smoking slag—knowing that if he fell one of his comrades would have finished the job.

Moreover, Senator, every man would have gone into the campaign confident that if he was captured and held in a satanic prison as a hostage after hostilities ended the President would have promptly sent an ultimatum, "Pvt. John Doe alive or Lucifer dead." And the ultimatum would have been delivered by sufficient of his country's might to enforce it. But that was then.

In those days, Senator, labor was not considered degrading. The hired man might—and frequently did—marry the daughter of his boss. We made, each for himself, an agreement with the boss and lived up to it. We hired to do what the boss wanted done—not to run his business. We did not join organizations dedicated to that end. This was because every one of us knew that he could, if he so desired, become a boss by the simple method of working and saving. If you doubt this, check up on what we migratory workers did to the IWW bums who tried to sabotage our jobs in the Dakotas.

We believed in strikes, certainly. One-man strikes. If you don't like your job, quit—and let any man who wants it have it. If you don't like working for somebody else, save your money and go into farming or some other business for yourself. Of course, Senator, in those days the Government did not grab a large portion of our wages for income and other taxes and social security. We secured our own futures—or thought we did. More later about that. Now back to the harvest trek.

I returned from the harvests in October. I had left Nebraska without baggage and with $3 in pocket. I came home with a new blue serge suit ($12.50 in Minneapolis), a bull hide suitcase, and $219. I was affluent. Mind you, that money was all mine. I could do as I pleased with it and need not make out forms in triplicate concerning how I earned it or what I did with it. I was getting along toward becoming a boss.

I strutted my stuff around home for a fortnight. Then, like thousands of others, I went out to husk corn. That year we were paid 2 cents a bushel and board. Days were short in cornpicking time. The boss never had to wake us up; we awakened him. We frequently got to the field with 5 or 10 minutes to wait until it was light enough that we could find the ears. We scooped off our final load of each day by lantern light. Nuts to 8-hour days and 5-day weeks. There was corn to get into the crib before snow buried the field. We got it in. We worked hard. We played hard. Did you ever drive 20 miles to a dance and get home the next morning just in time to put your buggy horse away and hitch up your work team to the husking wagon before you went to breakfast?

But we were free men—independent men—engaged in private enterprise. We sought charity from nobody—and would have spurned it if offered. No burdensome or unjust taxes were imposed upon us. Congress would not have dared. Government began where it should—at home with the town and township boards. Those fellows were our neighbors. We knew how to quiet them down when they needed quieting.

I could elaborate further, but it would not be news to the majority in Congress. However, Senator, mine eyes have seen the glory. So have yours. If I have any hope of ever seeing it again, that hope is exceedingly dim. What became of the glory? Who destroyed it? I think you Members of Congress know. If you don't, ask me for details.

I shall devote the rest of this to what mine eyes see now. In the land of which I was once so proud, I see millions of once sturdily independent men and women reduced to a state of bewildered and involuntary dependence. These people range in age from the 60's to the 90's. The dollars they earned at the rate of two or less by long days of hard work and put away in amounts that should have assured them comfort and ease in their declining years are gone. Why? Because each of those dollars has long since become worth 20 cents or less.

Do not answer that with statistics, Senator. You must know that a statistician can be as big a liar as any other man or woman—especially when his fat job depends upon providing figures to please bureaucrats and professional politicians. Here are facts. During my teens and early 20's, I could buy for one thin dime the pound ring of baloney that now costs 57 cents. A box of crackers which now costs 30 cents was then priced at a nickel. My father, now 86, has the first dollar he ever earned. He had better have spent it when it would have bought a pair of overalls and a work shirt. Or it would have then bought 20 pounds of pork ribs or a dozen nice hens.

If you doubt my word on this, Senator, I will direct you to newspaper files for verification. The point is that these people have been betrayed into penury and dependence by their Government. What are you gentlemen going to do about that? Don't answer, Senator. We are pretty sure we know.

What else do my sad eyes see, Senator? I behold a land in which the old axiom of every tub on its own bottom has been forgotten. I see a people trained by bureaucrats and politicians to believe that they are entitled to—and can—expect to live off the Government. Have they forgotten who is the Government? If we all live off the Government, who is going to supply the funds—and who is going to produce something to be bought with those mythical funds? Let all who believe this theory have a lusty try at lifting themselves by their bootstraps.

I could go on at length, Senator, but if what I have written thus far does not cause some of you in whom we have placed our trust to think our gray matter is ossified any further effort would be useless.

Hopefully,

SVEN ANDERTON.

Resolutions Passed by the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 59th State Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a series of resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution at its 59th State Conference in Milwaukee, Wis., on March 24, 25 and 26:

Resolutions passed by the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 59th State Conference, Milwaukee, Wis., March 24–26, 1955:

BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are the highest peak of human accomplishment in mankind's struggle for freedom; and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements may override the Constitution and cut across the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights; and

Whereas unlimited treaty power poses a continuing threat to the Constitution, this threat having been recently augmented by the fact that four Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States actually held that the U. N. Charter—a ratified treaty—supersedes our Constitution: Therefore be it

Resolved, that the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, reaffirm its previous support of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) and petition the Wisconsin State Legislature to submit a resolution recommending to the Congress of the United States the adoption of this legislation.

REVISION OF THE U. N. CHARTER

Whereas revision of the United Nations Charter is presently under consideration; and

Whereas efforts are being made, through suggested amendments, to convert the United Nations into a world government from which there would be no escape; and

Whereas the United Nations Charter cannot be amended without the consent of the United States so long as the veto power is retained: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, opposes surrender of the veto power in the United Nations, and reaffirms its previous opposition to any revisions or amendments which will enable the U. N. organization to usurp any part of the individual sovereignty of member nations or lead to any form of world government.

NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Whereas the NATO Status of Forces Treaty to which the Senate of the United States gave its advice and consent on July 15, 1953, deprives American servicemen and their dependents when stationed abroad of the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution and the laws of the United States; and

Whereas our boys in uniform, many of whom have been drafted and are stationed without their consent in approximately 40 foreign countries for the first time in American history are subjected to criminal procedures, punishment and penal conditions radically different from those provided for in the Uniform Code of Military Justice and thus are stripped of the protection of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas on the same date, July 15, 1953, the Senate of the United States advised and consented to two treaties granting sweeping immunities and privileges to foreign diplomatic personnel and experts assigned to NATO and to its military headquarters: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, do again earnestly petition the Members of Congress to rescind this treaty provision.

AMERICAN CAPTIVES IN RED CHINA

Whereas an unknown number of American servicemen are being held captive in Red China; and

Whereas any individual who enters the Armed Forces and is willing to make the supreme sacrifice should be enttiled to the full protection his country is able to give: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, urge Congress to take all possible steps to procure the release of these servicemen.

RED CHINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, reiterate their unalterable opposition to the recognition of Red China by the United States, and to the admission of Red China to the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That if Red China is seated in the United Nations, we urge that serious consideration be given to the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations organization.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES LEGISLATION

Whereas the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, recommends promotion and passage of antisubversive legislation at a State level; and

Whereas Wisconsin as a State government does not have an agency which legally can collect facts and prosecute subversives; and

Whereas the State Assembly Judiciary has introduced bills to create a permanent committee to investigate subversive activities: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the Revolution, in convention assembled, urge the State legislators to pass suitable legislation to control subversive activities in Wisconsin.

M'CARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

Whereas as a result of 3 years of intensive study and hearings, in which the visa and passport divisions of the State Department, and the Department of Justice participated, the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act became the law of the land December 24, 1952; and

Whereas a campaign has been organized to misinterpret this law in an improper, and even false manner toward the end that it be literally destroyed: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, reaffirm their approval of Public Law 414 and urge Congress and all patriotic Americans to resist any change, weakening amendments, or private bills which would destroy its effectiveness.

GATT

Whereas under the Constitution, Congress is charged with the responsibility of regulating tariffs; and

Whereas the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, an international organization known as GATT, allows for the review, revision, and exploitation of United States tariff laws and policies, thus giving foreign powers the right to indirectly regulate our industries; and

Whereas the avowed objectives of such international organizations are to divide the resources of the world among all people, which policy would ultimately impoverish this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will prevent this country from participating in multilateral trade agreements within the framework of GATT or any similar international organization.

ATLANTIC UNION

Whereas there is a formidable body of opinion which supports the contention that the North Atlantic Treaty, to which the United States is a party, now authorizes NATO to merge the economic, defense, and foreign policy of the United States with the other countries of NATO, and

Whereas on February 9, 1955, Senate concurrent Resolution 12 was introduced into the Senate favoring Atlantic Union, and calling upon the President to call a convention of the member nations of NATO for the purpose of exploring the possibilities of uniting the countries of NATO "federally or otherwise," and

Whereas, there is no veto power in the North Atlantic Treaty, and the creation of a super Atlantic Community Agency to merge the economic, defense, and foreign policies of the United States with other countries would be a surrender of our sovereignty and would destroy our Constitution: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, reaffirms its previously stated opposition to Atlantic Union.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Whereas the as yet unimplemented Universal Military Training and Service Act calls for peacetime conscription of American youth for national military or civilian service as the President may prescribe; and

Whereas this act will destroy the militia and National Guard which are protective forces of the individual States as provided for in our Constitution and our Bill of Rights; and

Whereas such conscription tends to regiment, not only the bodies but the minds of our youth; and

Whereas by giving the President such exceptional powers, we are opening the door to possible military dictatorship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, go on record as opposing the furtherance of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

FOUNDATIONS

Whereas the excellent work of the Reese committee has brought to light the questionable uses to which the funds of some large American tax-exempt foundations are being directed into fields of world government and the promotion of collectivism: Be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, go on record as commending the work of the Reese committee and urge that the findings of this committee be used as a basis for legislation to encourage these organizations to promote our American way of life.

MOTION PICTURES

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, go on record to urge the motion-picture industry to produce more films containing true and accurate historical and patriotic backgrounds to the end that the American people be better informed regarding our past history and that loyalty to our country be further stimulated.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Whereas observance of September 17 as Constitution Day was abolished during the Truman administration, and the name changed to Citizenship Day, and

Whereas this action tends to minimize the importance of the Constitution of the United States in the minds of the American people, and to emphasize the citizenship idea, which falls into the world citizen plan of propaganda; be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled, petition the United States Congress to restore the name of Constitution Day to the date of September 17, that all Americans, on this anniversary, may rededicate themselves to the basic principles of this great document.

Respectfully submitted.

Mrs. FREDERICK BRAUN,
Antigo, Wis.
Mrs. JAMES BRAY,
Sheboygan, Wis.
Mrs. HOBART OLSON,
Milwaukee, Wis.
Mrs. MILTON SHOEMANER,
Madison, Wis.
Mrs. CARL J. KOHLER,
Chairman, Kohler, Wis.

A Living Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by Dr. Robert L. Kincaid, president of Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn., before the Lincoln Group of Washington, D. C., Lincoln Museum, Ford Theater, April 17, 1955.

This splendid presentation on the beginning of a great institution of learning in the South is worthy of consideration and reading by every Member of Congress. This fine school offers an opportunity to the young men and women of the area to obtain an education which might not otherwise be possible.

I commend the reading of this fine address to all of my colleagues:

A LIVING LINCOLN

(Address by Dr. Robert L. Kincaid, president, Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn., before Lincoln Group of Washington, D. C., Lincoln Museum, Ford Theater, April 17, 1955)

Ninety years ago, April 15, 1865, at 7:22 a. m., the earthly life of Abraham Lincoln came to a close across the street from where we are assembled today. All about us are intimate physical reminders of his life and deeds. Because it was in this room where he had his last conscious thoughts, we feel his presence as though he were still in our midst. We accept the reality of his death which took him out of the world, but what he did and thought and felt is projected down the ages. So today as we meet on the 90th anniversary of his passing, we think of him as a living Lincoln whose work will never cease to bless mankind.

Across the centuries Lincoln's fame glows in undimmed splendor. His words lives in the hearts of all who cherish individual freedom and opportunity. His deeds encourage and inspire new generations to further conquests in the emancipation of mankind from the slavery of ignorance, the paralysis of fear, and the thraldom of oppression. His policies and principles are timeless in their application toward the complete attainment of what he called the last best hope of earth.

As a grateful people we have followed the conventional way of preserving the memory of our great leaders. We build temples, cathedrals, shrines, and memorials to capture their deathless spirits. We enshrine them in bronze and marble and sketch their features and deeds upon giant canvasses. We describe their achievements in countless books, erect colossal shafts to them, and give their names to mountains in an effort to provide fitting symbols of their greatness. As Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "it is altogether fitting and proper we should do this."

Our Founding Fathers, trailblazers, and empire builders in the formative years of our Republic have their memorials—Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson, to mention only a few of our early statesmen. But now, in the 90 years since Lincoln lived, he leads all the rest in shrines, monuments, and places dedicated to his memory. No other world leader is so affectionately remembered and his words and deeds so devotedly cherished. In the multitude of monuments to Lincoln is the recognition of his true greatness. His influence is worldwide. His name is a symbol of hope and inspiration for all mankind. His credo of liberty and opportunity is spoken in every tongue. His philosophy is based on enduring truth. What he lived for, what he accomplished, what he left to the world have become the heritage of all peoples.

I am told that more people make a pilgrimage to the magnificent Lincoln shrine here in Washington than to any other temple, monument, or shrine in all the world. This is not for worship but for inspiration. No one can walk up the steps of this temple and look upon the silent, brooding, and majestic face of the "man who belongs to the ages" without being stirred with emotions of gratitude and hope and a renewed dedication to the ideals he lived for. So in a similar way we feel the presence of Lincoln wherever we come upon a stone, marble, or plaque which commemorates some event in his life.

Lincoln's path to greatness is well marked with these appropriate memorials. The temple at Hodgenville, Ky., enshrines the little log cabin in which he was born; the Nancy Hanks Memorial Park in Indiana shelters the place where his mother sleeps; the reconstructed village of New Salem, Ill., shows where he walked and talked and studied, developing the common touch and formulating his political ideals and philosophy; the Springfield home portrays how he reared his family, entertained his friends, and lived as any ordinary citizen; and the memorial at the tomb where his body lies is grand in its dignity and simplicity. Each of these memorials is unique and appropriate in its own way. To travel this path from the log cabin in the wilderness where Lincoln was born, "ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed," to this place where he passed from us is to witness the true miracle of America. You encompass it all in this awe-inspiring experience. You can never be the same again. You feel you walked with the living Lincoln and your heart burned within you.

Memorials to Lincoln are not confined to the central points where he worked and lived. Twenty-seven cities and many counties are named for him; a trans-continental highway bears his name; one of the tallest peaks in the Colorado Rockies is Mount Lincoln towering 14,287 feet in the sky; carved in granite at Mount Rushmore, S. Dak., is the message head of Lincoln, along with Washington, Jefferson, and Theodore Roosevelt, the most colossal and enduring monument ever chiselled out by the hand of man. More than 120 statues of Lincoln stand in public places or buildings throughout the Nation and foreign lands. Public and private Lincoln museums and libraries are located in many States, and these are growing daily. Books and pamphlets on Lincoln continue to come from the press, until today there exist more books and material on Lincoln than any other historical figure. If we could estimate all that has been invested to preserve the memory of Lincoln, we would have an incomprehensible figure.

But not all the important monuments to Lincoln are in marble and bronze. There are "living memorials," educational institutions where young people are brought in conscious contact with the spirit of the great humanitarian and emancipator. There is a Lincoln University in Pennsylvania for the education of the Negro; a similar institution in Missouri. There is a junior college for white students in Lincoln, Ill., named for him with his consent shortly before his assassination. Also there is Lincoln Memorial University in the Deep South, at Harrogate, Tenn., which I represent as an alumnus and president. It is about that college, inspired in the heart of Lincoln, I am pleased to speak in more detail.

To begin my story I must go back to September 26, 1863, when President Lincoln had a conference in the White House with a Union general, Oliver Otis Howard. Howard was still a young man, a graduate of Bowdoin College and West Point, but he was already a seasoned veteran, had taken part in many battles, and had lost his right arm at Fair Oaks. He was in command of the 11th Corps of the Army of the Potomac, and had recently been a central figure in the fighting at Gettysburg. Now his corps was being sent to reinforce Grant at Chattanooga. President Lincoln sought a conference with Howard about the situation in the South.

For an hour the two men talked. President Lincoln dwelt at length with the problems facing the Union forces west of the mountains which had recently been placed under the command of General Grant. He spoke warmly of the mountain people of east Tennessee and southeastern Kentucky. It had been his concern since the beginning of the war to give aid and support to the people of this great island of loyalty in the highland South. The President pulled down a roll map on the wall, pointed to Cumberland Gap, where Kentucky, Tennessee and Virginia come together, and which had been captured by General Burnside. Lincoln referred to the great gap as the "key to the situation."

General Howard, who later repeated the story many times, described how Lincoln turned to him and spoke with deep emotion and tenderness of the loyalty of the people around Cumberland Gap. Near the close of the interview, he said:

"General, if you come out of this horror and misery alive, and I pray to God that you may, I want you to do something for those mountain people who have been shut out of the world all these years. I know them. If I live I will do all I can to aid, and between us perhaps we can do the justice they deserve. Please remember this, and if God is good to us we may be able to speak of this later."

Lincoln gave General Howard his map, took the General's own field map, and they bade goodby to each other. It was the last time General Howard saw Lincoln, but the President's words and concern for the people of the southern highlands he never forgot. The time would come when he would carry out this last assignment from his commander-in-chief.

The further career of General Howard is well known to all history students. After reaching Chattanooga with his corps, he

remained with Sherman until the close of the war; commanded the right wing of Sherman's army on the march to the sea; and was called to Washington after Lincoln's assassination to head the Freedman's Bureau for the rehabilitation of the 4 million slaves who had suddenly found themselves free. In this difficult and revolutionary task, with no pattern to go by, he performed a service unique in the annals of the Nation, despite criticism and opposition from extremists in the North who wanted him to move faster, and violence and bitterness in the South where many selfish and vindictive subordinates nullified much of his efforts for the education and rehabilitation of the distressed freedmen. His lasting contribution was the establishment of Howard University in Washington and the strengthening of other institutions for the education of the Negro.

After the work of the Freedman's Bureau was closed, Howard spent the rest of his active military career in the West, principally in quelling outbreaks of Indian tribes and acting as an understanding agent of the Government in dealing with the Indians. At last, in 1895, he retired from the Army, settled in Burlington, Vt., devoted much time to writing, and made frequent trips for addresses before religious, military, and historical groups.

Meanwhile, down in the Cumberlands in Kentucky was a congregational preacher, the Reverend A. A. Myers, like a prophet of old, going about doing good. Trained at Hillsdale College in Michigan, he had gone into the southern mountains as a home missionary, founding churches, starting Sunday schools, and doing educational work. In his journeys, he came to Cumberland Gap, in 1890, where a big industrial boom was in progress. Here he built a little church and started a private school in the basement. These quarters were soon inadequate for the fast-growing school. An abandoned hotel was taken over. Soon it was going as a full-fledged academy, known as the Harrow School. Myers began to enlist the interest of philanthropic people in the North and East in his missionary program. Learning that General Howard was soon to make a lecture trip through the South, Myers invited the general to include Cumberland Gap in his tour and speak to his students.

We do not know what memories were awakened in General Howard when he got off the train at Middlesboro, Ky., where he was met by a student from the school. In the school carriage, they crossed from Kentucky to Tennessee through the famous pass in the Cumberlands, where the scars of the Civil War were still visible. The old Union veteran must have recalled the story of the struggle around the historic pass; the activities of Zollicoffer before he was killed at Mill Springs; the remarkable conquest of the Union general, George W. Morgan, in June 1862, and his evacuation 3 months later when he was forced to withdraw; the brilliant march of Gen. Ambrose E. Burnside from Kentucky to Knoxville, Tenn., in August 1863, and his investment and final capture of the gap on September 9; and, at last, Burnside's predicament when he was surrounded at Knoxville by Confederate forces under General Longstreet.

And that brought General Howard again into the presence of the lonely man in the White House when Lincoln had pointed his long, bony finger at Cumberland Gap and said, "General, that is the key to the situation!"

Filled with such memories, as the buggy rolled and jolted along the rough road over which contending armies had passed, General Howard came down to the little school at the foot of the pass on the Tennessee side. Here he was greeted by Brother Myers, Mrs. Myers, and two visiting guests, the Reverend P. B. Avery, an Episcopal preacher from Cleveland, Ohio, and Darwin R. James, a banker and Congressman from New York City. We have no record of what he said when he spoke to the students packed into the small auditorium of the school building. Perhaps it was about Grant, who had spent the night at Cumberland Gap on January 6, 1864, when he was on an inspection tour of the Wilderness Road.

But we do know what immediately followed. General Howard, Mr. Myers, the Episcopal rector, and the New York Congressman were seated on the front porch of the school. Mr. Myers talked. He told of the earnest boys and girls attending his school, of the forgotten and neglected people hidden away in the surrounding hills, of his desire to give them an educational opportunity, which had so long been denied them. His warm brown eyes glowed with a burning fire, and his words kindled a sympathetic flame in the hearts of his listeners.

General Howard could not long remain silent. He rose impulsively, and strode up and down the veranda in a moment of reverie, his empty right sleeve flapping in the breeze. Then he turned to the men and said: "Gentlemen, I want to tell you a story." His listeners sat enthralled as he told of his last interview with Lincoln. It was as though the Great Emancipator were speaking. Across the way was the face of the rugged Pinnacle Mountain, gaunt and gray with the weight of the centuries. Along the face of the mountain was the thin line of the road which reached over into Kentucky and the Great West, which Captain Abraham Lincoln and little Tom had traveled a century before. It was a moment of fulfillment, a final linking of events which were to lead to still mightier consequences.

General Howard at last paused in his recital and said to Brother Myers:

"If you will make this a larger enterprise, as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, I will take hold and help."

He was accepting his last assignment from the peerless leader whom he had served so faithfully in the tragic sixties.

It is not known whether any audible prayers were said on that occasion, but I know how Brother Myers, in his rejoicing, must have shouted inwardly, and how the hearts of Dr. Avery and Mr. James must have been strangely moved. The four men made a covenant on that historic day with the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, which each of them was to keep until they were called for their final bivouac in eternity.

So it was that the words of Lincoln to Howard in 1863 had their fulfillment in the establishment of Lincoln Memorial University. The four men talked over plans for an enlarged Harrow School which should bear the name of Lincoln as a living memorial to the Great Emancipator. Brother Myers told of an abandoned hotel property nearby, at Harrogate, which he believed he could secure for the new institution. General Howard made arrangements to send his booking agent, Cyrus E. Kehr, an attorney of Chicago, to Harrogate to assist in the details of the larger organization. Promotion work began immediately. Howard continued his lecture tour but kept in close touch with the men in Harrogate. A charter for the college was drafted, incorporating General Howard's idea. It was signed by the local incorporators, headed by Brother Myers, on February 12, 1897. The primary function of the institution was "to provide education for the children of the humble, common people of America among whom Lincoln was born." The college colors were blue and gray. A college flag was adopted, consisting of a golden "L" in a field of white, the "L" standing for "Lincoln, love, loyalty, liberty, and labor." An abandoned sanatorium on the newly acquired hotel property, used as the first building, was called Grant-Lee Hall.

General Howard soon became chairman of the board of the newly founded institution, and a Confederate veteran in the community, Capt. Robert F. Patterson, who had surrendered with Lee at Appomattox, was elected vice president of the board. The first school work on the new location at Harrogate was begun in the fall of 1899. This was to be the college department, and the Harrow School continued at Cumberland Gap as the academy.

I wish it were possible to give in detail the story of General Howard at Cumberland Gap from February 12, 1897, to his death on October 26, 1909. As Gen. Robert E. Lee laid aside the faded gray uniform of a lost cause to devote the rest of his life to the youth of the South in perpetuation of the name of Washington, so a Union man gave his last full measure of devotion to a similar service in the name of Abraham Lincoln.

It was not my privilege to know General Howard. His service for the college was before my time. But I have reveled in the stories which I have collected from various sources about the kindly, gray-haired, one-armed general who visited with the students, ate with them in the dining hall, talked to them in chapel, and rode on many missions into the surrounding hills. Not long ago I talked with an old man who was the lad who had driven the general to the Cumberland Gap school for his first speech. A few months I listened to another man, a rural school teacher trained at Lincoln Memorial University, who accompanied the general on a long horseback ride through the Kentucky hills. Another former student described the dramatic occasions when the old veteran would inspire the students by his chapel talks, sometimes using the stub of his right arm in forceful gestures. On one occasion the general pulled a small flag from his pocket and waved it triumphantly to illustrate a point in one of his patriotic addresses.

General Howard had one friend in the Harrogate community whom he always visited when he came to the college for official meetings. He and Capt. Robert F. Patterson, the Confederate veteran who became the vice president of the board, would indulge in many pleasantries as they recalled events of the past when they were fighting on opposite sides. A deep affection grew up between them. Among the Howard papers is a letter from Captain Patterson which reveals the cordial spirit of that rich friendship. Captain Patterson had no particular purpose in writing, except to express his gratitude for what the general was doing for the young people in the Cumberland region. Listen to a part of that letter:

"MY DEAR GENERAL: I have been thinking for sometime to write you a word of appreciation and encouragement in your undertaking to establish a * * * university in memory of Mr. Lincoln at Cumberland Gap. It is generally estimated that a man's best work is done on the sunny side of 60; but if you succeed in this enterprise (as I believe you will) then the shady side of 60 will be to you the harvest time for golden honors. Your life has been a busy one and you have given your best service to your country, but public honors have not blinded you to the intellectual and moral needs of your less fortunate countrymen. * * *

"I cannot imagine a more desirable end to a long and successful life of an old soldier than to see him still in the saddle, booted and spurred, with sword in hand, battling against ignorance, intemperance, and irreligion—enemies more dangerous to our liberty and to peace of society than any armed foe. It is gratifying also to remember you have undertaken this enterprise with the instincts of a true commander. You have not sent out Aide or Pickett to report, but you have reconnoitered the field in person, and I cannot see where you would have

selected a better position for the university. I believe that Mr. Lincoln himself would take you by the hand and tell you that you could do him no greater honor than to erect a university in his name which would educate the descendents of the old mountain soldiers who left their own State and stood by him for the Union during the Civil War."

But I must turn back to the Lincoln heritage in the Cumberlands, the final culmination of the diverse and unrelated little events which, unified and enlarged, led to vast consequences. Lincoln, talking to a one-armed general; a preacher with a pick, building a church; a covenant of four men sitting on the front porch of a little school; a dream of a great memorial to a martyred President for the service of humanity. Little things, indeed; but from them has come a powerful educational force which has spread throughout the mountain region of the South. Where there has been darkness in the hollows, there has come light. Where there have been poverty, isolation, and defeated ambitions, there have come happiness, courage, and hope. At the Lincoln shrine in the Cumberlands many thousands of young people have been touched by a holy fire. Their hearts have been lifted, their horizons extended, their lives enriched and ennobled.

I cannot speak of this without being profoundly moved. My testimony is personal. I go back to the first day when I attended a chapel service in the old, rambling, temporary auditorium built in General Howard's day until funds could be secured for a better one. The first thing to attract my attention was a large painting on the wall, back of the lectern on the stage. It showed President Lincoln standing in his study with General Howard, pointing to Cumberland Gap. Nearby, on the wall, was a large plaque containing the last words of Capt. Guy Howard, son of the general, who had been killed in the Philippinees in 1901. Bold and impressive were the words: "Whatever happens to me, keep the launch going." Fire long ago destroyed the painting and the words of Guy Howard, when the old building burned, but not that vivid memory of mine and of thousands of others who met daily in that chapel. Some things are deathless.

It has been 46 years since General Howard passed from the scene of his labors at Cumberland Gap. But his spirit and his ideals still live. The little institution which he started has grown into a splendid physical plant with beautiful surroundings. More than 500 young men and young women come each year for their college training. They pursue liberal arts courses, but they get something more than mere knowledge. They touch the lives of Lincoln, of Howard, and of other great Americans whose careers challenge and inspire. Woven into their lives, consciously and unconsciously, are strong, compelling forces which come from their daily association with a living Lincoln.

Soon after registration day each fall, we take our freshmen on a tour of our buildings as a part of their orientation program. We close the tour with a visit to our Lincoln Room where we have our vast collection of Lincoln books, pamphlets, pictures, statuary, and manuscripts, one of the largest in the world. The students browse through the room, examine rare documents, and leaf through priceless books. They look upon the display of all the photographs of Lincoln and inspect valuable relics connected with his life. Then they sign a register, seated at a desk used by Lincoln when he was a member of the Illinois legislature. They come into conscious contact with the personality whose spirit will brood over their lives while in college. A little thing, perhaps, but there flows into their consciousness an intangible and inspiring influence which will help shape their thoughts and ideals. It is a good begining for their college careers.

In the foyer of our hall of citizenship we have a beautiful Volk bust of Lincoln on a pedestal. Not long ago I noticed a pile of books which some student had temporarily deposited on the base of the bust. On top of the pile was his textbook on American history entitled "Land of the Free." I stood for a moment before Lincoln and the book at his feet. It seemed to me here was revealed the real significance of our institution. Lincoln and the land of the free. Lincoln living in the hearts of youth soon to accept the responsibilities of leadership in a world "half slave and half free."

From the young people who daily walk in the presence of Lincoln we can take increased courage and hope. From them and others like them throughout the Nation, trained and inspired by his leadership, we can build a better society and a stronger civilization. In our own small and limited way, that is our mission at Lincoln Memorial University.

New Colored School in Edgefield, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Colored School Among Finest in the Nation," published in the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser of March 9, 1955. The editor of this newspaper is one of the ablest editors in the State of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW COLORED SCHOOL AMONG FINEST IN THE NATION—WAS OCCUPIED MONDAY BY COLORED PUPILS OF AREA

The new school plant that was recently completed is one of the finest to be found in South Carolina and perhaps in the Nation.

It was officially occupied Monday morning when some 800 pupils from Edgefield and adjoining areas made their way to the expansive educational plant located a mile from the court house, north, near the Crest Manufacturing Co.

Last Friday the white people were invited to look over the buildings and Sunday afternoon the colored people were invited.

Supt. R. O. Derrick, who heads the school system of Edgefield, with Mrs. Derrick, and members of the board of trustees, had worked with Principal S. K. Dean and his faculty in making the occasion noteworthy.

Constructed at a cost of more than $600,000, the architectural design was drawn by LaFaye and LaFaye, and Fair, of Columbia, and the contractor was Craig-Robinson. The work was completed in approximately 10 months.

The general plan is a central combination gymnasium and auditorium with wings on each side. A court yard at the back is bounded by other wings that begin at the ends of the front structure. Construction is of brick and concrete, the interior walls of concrete blocks painted pale green. Floors of the corridors and classrooms are covered with plastic tile in tan and green; "blackboards" are green; lighting, effects are the latest types in fluorescent lights in the rooms; and there are picture windows throughout. In each class room is a lavatory with chrome fittings. There are steel lockers for each child located in the corridors with special numbers and combination locks. Desks are of light oak, single and adjustable to suit the size of the pupil. Doors are of metal with bronze knobs, with a small pane of glass in the upper center.

Skylights over the corridors give maximum light during the day. Along the sides are radiators for conducting heat throughout the buildings.

Door plates are used in the administrative section as well as special departments, such as cafeteria, home economics, typing, shop, first aid, etc.

The home economics department is beautifully equipped with electric and gas stoves, electric refrigerator, deep freeze, large sinks on each side with built-in cabinets surrounding them. Several dinette sets of yellow plastic and chrome ,and modern tea carts are among the furnishings.

The cafeteria and kitchen are equipped in the most modern style, with expensive machinery for preparing, cooking, and serving, and the follow-up of dishwashing.

The shop is well equipped with machinery for such things as welding, planing, sawing, drilling, that will be of practical use to the student especially on the farm.

The gymnasium is naturally the largest unit with a ceiling that reaches to a height of two stories, and equipment for basketball and similar games. There is ample lighting, highly polished oak floor, spaces for seats on the sides, and one elevated side that will be used as a platform when the main space serves as an auditorium. There are locker rooms for girls and boys with showers and toilets.

The front and rear courtyards have been leveled off and planted in grass. A tall flagpole is in front from which the Nation's colors fly.

During the open house hours members of the faculty received in their respective rooms and courteously explained their courses of study, and in some cases displayed work done by the students. Some of the girl students served as guides in the different parts of the building—a wise procedure since one might easily become lost in the vast expanse of corridors and rooms.

The building will care for pupils from the primary grades through junior and senior high schools. It is the main high school to serve the colored people of Edgefield County, and most of the elementary schools. There will be only four other schools next year in the county which will remain in use for colored pupils. It is estimated that approximately 1,200 pupils will enroll during the next school year.

Booze Broadcasting Is a Beast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 4627, which is a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic

beverages. It is my hope and desire that my colleagues will study this bill carefully and then act favorably upon it for the sake of a more spiritual citizenship, a more stabilized American home, and a more serious-minded youth of tomorrow.

There are some things that should be strictly regulated while they exist or else put in complete subjugation among civilized peoples, for example, the rattlesnake, the brothel, the stalking murderer, the insidious thief, the troublemaker at home or abroad, and the nice, genteel advertisement of booze in whatever form may be best calculated to make strongest appeal to our boys and girls. You say it is a legal subject matter. So is the rattlesnake. You say freedom of speech and of press are inviolable. Yes; but under exercise of police power we do not allow the free-speech man to use indecent language in the public square nor do we allow the free-press man to publish obscene pictures in the Daily Times. Morals, health, and welfare may be, ought to be, and must be closely and firmly regulated under the police power concept breathed into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers more than a century and a half ago.

In the dusty annals of bygone history, there once lived a king named Belshazzar. He was "a man of distinction." So much so that one night he had a great feast and invited 1,000 of his lords, not to speak of many princes, wives and concubines that also came along in great numbers. Now it looked like everybody wanted to be a man of distinction and get on a big binge on that occasion. I suppose the 1,000 lords about all got tanked up and doubtless we have derived our current expression, "drunk as a lord," from the unseemly condition of Belshazzar's own lords at that famous festival when wine flowed like a mountain stream after a hard shower in the springtime. Strange handwriting suddenly appeared on the plastered wall, old Belshazzar took a bad case of delirium tremens and on that very night the drunken king was killed and a new and sober administration came into power under King Darius. Of course, the Belshazzar wine was perfectly legal. None whatever thought it should be regulated. "Let it flow freely," said everyone from the king on down. "Let it come into the very home of the king and let its free intercourse be unmolested in the name of complete liberty." But before that fateful night was over, there was some free writing on the wall, some free delirium tremens among the men of distinction, some free rigor mortis on the regal throne of Babylon.

In 1871 the Chicago fire raged over the city unregulated and caused $196 million in damages.

In 1889 the Johnstown flood surged down the valley unregulated and cost 2,200 lives.

And now, unrestrained and uninhibited, alcoholic advertising may well, in my humble opinion, cost much more than all the damage and loss of life of both the Chicago fire and Johnstown flood combined and then multiplied by two.

During my own lifetime my good State of Kentucky has continuously stood at the top of the list of alcoholic producers and has frequently bragged about this, and yet during that same lifetime span I notice that whereas Kentucky once stood 11th in population among the States, it now stands 19th in the list of States. Cause and effect? Well you be the judge. The same handwriting that was once on the plastered wall of Belshazzar may now be appearing on the plastered wall of Kentucky or on that of America if we persist in going ahead without total indifference toward the harmful influences that come within our homes and about our hearthsides in the form of alcoholic advertisements.

Twenty million people in America are offended every day by the alcoholic advertising that comes to their homes consistently and continually without even knocking at their doors, entering the very impressionable minds of boys and girls with the obvious purpose of making more customers for an industry that destroys, dooms, and damns human personality as it rolls along.

We would not think of allowing an offending beast to come into the American home unrestrained and uninhibited. Yet, booze broadcasting by TV, radio, or publication is a beast and it sorely offends millions every day in the American home. It is now time to illegalize it in interstate commerce. It may be later than we think.

Shinner Small Farm Plan—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks in two instances to include the entire text of an article by E. G. Shinner, one of my most distinguished constituents, in the New Leader of April 11, 1955. It merits the thoughtful reading by my colleagues. Mr. Shinner, a businesman of large stature, is the originator of what has come to be known as the Shinner agricultural plan, the basic principles of which have a strong advocate in the great statesman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, and which has been widely discussed throughout the Nation. The first installment of Mr. Shinner's illuminating article follows:

TOWARD PERMANENT FARM PROSPERITY
(By E. G. Shinner)

America's No. 1 industry—agriculture—has come upon troubled days. Yankee ingenuity in making 2 blades of grass grow where but 1 grew before has hoist us on our own petard. In a sense, we are the victims of our own genius. The use of revolutionary power machinery, the development of hybrid plants with high resistance to weather and disease, the elimination of pests, and the scientific use of fertilizer have all greatly contributed to raising our per-acre yield to unprecedented heights. As a result, we are possessed of a glut of farm products. The orderly distribution of this farm surplus has become a problem which has baffled the most ingenious and analytical minds.

In producing this surplus, ease of production has been coupled with the inducements offered by the Federal Government in the way of a guaranteed market for unlimited quantities of agricultural products. We are now producing food and fiber clearly beyond the capacity of both the domestic and foreign markets to absorb.

There are other complicating factors in the present dilemma of our farm economy. The development of synthetic fibers and foods (for both human and animal consumption) can no longer be ignored. Such formidable giants as rayon, dacron, nylon, etc, are making tremendous inroads in the use of cotton, wool, and other natural fibers. In addition, the use of silicon in the treatment of fabrics is producing fantastic results. The life of natural yarns so treated can be increased, in some instances, as much as ten times. Public acceptance of new synthetic fabrics is a fait accompli.

Less well known is the successful use of stilbestrol and urea in the feeding of cattle and sheep. Estimates of the savings in grain which result from the use of these miracle drugs range from 10 to 40 percent. One should also mention the increasing use in the human diet of oleomargarine, saccharin, sucaryl, various extracts, etc.; this type of chemical competition with natural farm products will undoubtedly increase as time passes. Also increasing is the national consciousness of the waistline; the persistent recommendation by expert dieticians of the desirability of reducing the intake of sweets, fats, and starches establishes an effective roadblock in the way of greatly increased food consumption.

While it is true that there are still several million people in the United States who are undernourished, it is difficult to see how the farm problem can be solved in any permanent way merely by improving their diets. We must rather effect a reasonable balance between production and consumption if we are to have a permanently healthy agricultural economy.

Lest there be any question about agriculture's importance, the following figures compare the gross annual output (in millions) of our five leading industries (construction figure for 1954, the rest for 1953):

Agriculture	$35,430
Construction (plant and residential)	26,100
Oil (estimated refined products)	23,000
Automobiles	13,984
Steel	12,433

Not only must we protect and stabilize our leading industry; we must protect and stabilize our huge farm investment, the aggregate of which is over $150 billion. While farm indebtedness is, percentagewise, comparatively small (roughly $18 billion), it is nevertheless true that many farms are mortgaged up to 50 or 75 percent of their current market value; hence, it becomes an elementary economic necessity that farm values be maintained at or near their present level. Our vital long-term mortgage investment can easily be impaired, or even destroyed, by either deflation or inflation of any significant magnitude.

The importance of a healthy agricultural economy can hardly be overestimated. When agriculture falters, there is no other sector of the economy capable of taking up the slack. Farm recessions, as we have learned by bitter experience over the last three decades, quickly infect other sections of our economy. The farm situation today is not healthy.

Per capita income is perhaps the best means of measuring economic wealth. In uniform 1953 dollars, per capita nonfarm

income was $1,921 in 1946, $1,970 in 1953, and $1,926 last year. For the same 3 years, farm income was $851, $709, and $688, respectively. By the end of 1954, the per capita farm income of $652 was about a third of nonfarm income; it was about 44 percent just after World War II. Moreover, while nonfarm income now is slightly higher than just after World War II, farm income has shrunk by almost 20 percent.

Notwithstanding this sharp decline, our concern is more for the farmers' future than for their immediate present. If conditions in the industry were stabilized and would not in the foreseeable future grow worse than they are today, there would be comparatively little cause for alarm. Unhappily, the end of the farm decline is not in sight.

The present farm price-support program is both inequitable and ineffective. It falls far short of its major purpose—stabilization of the farm economy. Just a casual glance at the distribution of the money spent for farm support readily reveals the inequity and futility of the present program.

The latest census figures indicate these startling facts:

One and nine-tenths percent of the Nation's farmers received more than 25 percent of the total price-support benefits.

Nine percent received in excess of 50 percent of the benefits.

Nintey one percent of our farmers received less than half of the price-support payments.

Price-support loans, for example, to the 5 largest cottongrowers in California averaged $649,335 in 1953; the overall average was $1,731. The 5 largest wheat loans in Montana and Oregon that year averaged $176,000 each, against an overall average loan of $4,000 in Montana and $6,293 in Oregon. The 5 largest corn loans in Iowa averaged $98,000 against an overall average of $2,154.

While it is true that even this inequitable distribution of public support has made some contribution to the farm economy, it is inconceivable that it be continued as permanent Government policy. In common justice, we cannot continue to pay huge sums of money to factory-in-the-field type of operations, and at the same time permit only a dribble to reach the vast majority of our farm population.

Since 1935, the number of farms of 1,000-or-more acres has increased 37 percent. These farms now contain a total of 494 million acres, or 42.6 percent of all United States farmlands. The trend toward gigantism and the factory-in-the-field type of farm is astonishingly rapid.

When we moved armies of occupation into Italy, Germany, and Japan, among our first acts was to break up the great feudal estates. Right now, we have a Government land expert in Indochina engaged in a similar program. In our eagerness to promote and develop democracy in agriculture abroad, we have seemingly neglected to protect our own agricultural economy against the growth of a kind of creeping feudalism.

My approach to the present farm problem would be to abandon completely our present system of purchasing and/or providing nonrecourse loans on farm products. I would substitute for it a system of direct production payments to the individual farmer, in an amount sufficient to give him and his family a reasonable basic income. Furthermore, I would limit the amount of production payments which any individual farmer could receive to a maximum of $2,000 annually. I would allow the individual farmer full parity on his production up to $7,000 of gross annual product and stop all payments at that point. Prices of farm products would be permitted to seek their own level in the open market. Production payments would consist of the difference between the parity price and the price the farmer received in the free market.

The total gross income of farmers in the record year of 1951 was $37 billion. That was, roughly, $7,000 per farm, the figure which I have arbitrarily used as a limit of income on which production payments would be made. The following example will more clearly illustrate my plan:

Farmer A raises 10 bales of cotton (5,000 pounds), which he sells for, say, 25 cents a pound in the open market, realizing $1,250. The parity price is, say, 35 cents a pound. He would be entitled to a subsidy payment of 10 cents a pound, the difference between parity and market, or a net total payment of $500.

Farmer B, a plantation owner, raises 1,000 bales of cotton (500,000 pounds), sells it for 25 cents a pound, for a total of $125,000. He, too, is entitled to a subsidy payment of 10 cents a pound on the first $7,000 of gross production (in this case, the first 20,000 pounds), but not more than $2,000. In this case, the difference between market and parity would exactly equal the $2,000 maximum.

If certain wealthy individuals and/or corporations wish to engage in farming as a business, let them do so by all means. But they should depend on the open market rather than on the Government for the sale of their product. Vast production of wholly unneeded products for sale to the Government should cease forthwith.

Similar production payments would be made or any and all products which Congress might see fit to include under the price-support system. It would seem feasible, however, to exempt sugar and wool from the above program. The present regulations appear to be getting reasonably satisfactory results on these products.

It has been urged that my figure of $7,000 is too low; that $10,000, $12,000 or even $15,000 would be more realistic. It has also been suggested that a graduated support system might be established with the payments, lowered by stages, up to a total of $15,000 of gross annual production. I regard the figure as less important than the principle, but whatever figure may finally be adopted should not be so high as to defeat the objective—to effectively divert price-support benefits away from the wealthy 9 percent who do not need them, to the 91 percent of small farmers whose need is vital.

Such a farm program would simply do for the small farmer what is being done for the worker by labor unions and by the minimum-wage law. It would serve as a floor—an assurance that if the farmer makes the effort, he can get a reasonable return for his labor.

Certain economists have suggested a food-stamp plan as a means of disposing of our unmanageable surpluses. I regard food stamps as un-American in concept, basically a form of charity rather than a fair reward for labor. To be reasonably effective, a stamp plan would involve a gigantic problem of administration—bureaucracy previously unknown to us in peacetime. Furthermore, it would become a badge of pauperism, publicly displayed throughout the retail markets of the Nation. Our people don't want charity; they want the opportunity to earn the money with which to buy food, and at prices which they can afford. A stamp plan is, at best, only a palliative. It does not attack the roots of the farm problem.

One of the most serious aspects of the farm problem is the constant drift of the farm population into the industrial labor market. Since 1930, the farm population has shrunk by over 8 million, while the overall population of the Nation has gained by 41 million. Over the last 10 years, an average of 77,000 families has made the exodus from farm to city each year. If each family represents approximately 1.5 workers (the actual figure is a bit higher), we are augmenting our city labor force by roughly 115,000 workers every year.

This exodus from the farms means that small towns and villages are suffering a similar fate. The shrinkage of farm population means a comparable shrinkage of the small-town population—professional men, merchants and a great variety of service tradesmen. It is safe to estimate that our urban labor force is being annually augmented from this source by another 30,000 or 40,000 workers.

All of this should cause labor leaders to take heed, especially in view of the fact that urban production and employment are constantly yielding to technological improvements. Government figures show that in January 1955 the factories of the Nation were employing 400,000 less people than they employed in January 1954, notwithstanding an overall increase in production of some 8 percent. Factory employment in January 1955 was a cool million and a half below that of January 1953. The lesson is clear: Factory production is rising, while employment is steadily on the decline.

Labor groups increasingly pressured by the annual addition of 140,000 to 150,000 displaced rural workers must also face some startling facts about industrial automation. It is reliably reported that the Western Union Telegraph Co., through the adoption of automation, has reduced employment by more than 30,000 persons since 1945 and by some 18,000 since 1952. The advantage the company has gained from this curtailment is apparent; operating costs were reduced some $4 million for the first 9 months of 1954, compared with the same period in 1953; earnings per share were $7.50 in 1954, compared with $6.77 in 1953, $1.04 in 1952, and $4.85 per share in 1951.

While estimates of the effects of automation on the Nation at large are, at best, educated guesses, students of the problem believe that insurance and communication companies, public utilities, and similar concerns which have a high degree of repetitive clerical operations will, within the next 2 or 3 years, install much automatic equipment. By so doing, they can easily reduce their working force by literally several hundred thousand persons annually.

A certain group of economists and some businessmen contend that this process will simply release these people for more constructive work elsewhere. (Benjamin Fairless of United States Steel expounded this theory in a recent speech before the Johnstown (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce.) Apropos of this argument, there is a story that Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, was displaying the newest automatic machines to CIO President Walter Reuther and asked: "Walter, how are you going to collect union dues from these guys?" Reuther was not at a loss: "How," he asked, "are you going to get them to buy cars?"

Admittedly, automation has created a new industry; but I am unable to find where it has increased employment in any of the so-called basic industries. Automation is here to stay, and a process of intensive study should be directed toward meeting this challenge, without delay. I had a feeling of frustration and deep disappointment when I read the President's 1955 Economic Report and found not a word on this all-important subject.

I know of no better place to start attacking the problem of automation than on the farm. All the facts of the urban labor situation point to the conclusion that we should seek to improve and conserve rural life by every means possible. We should keep the door of opportunity open not only for the small, family-sized farm but for the business and professional men of the small towns and villages, who depend for their livelihood upon a healthy farm economy.

Shinner Small Farm Plan—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the second installment of the article by E. G. Shinner in the New Leader of April 11, 1955, and a discussion of the international ramifications of Mr. Shinner's proposals by Oscar Schnabel, whose four decades of activity in international trade and finance included organizing the Austrian Grain War Office in World War I.

The concluding installment of Mr. Shinner's article follows:

TOWARD PERMANENT FARM PROSPERITY—Continued

(By E. G. Shinner)

What are the overall benefits to be derived from a program such as I have outlined? The first is obvious: lower food prices. These would amount to an automatic wage increase for the entire economy.

Second, the farmer would be free to operate his farm in accordance with his own judgment. He would be freed of the burden of providing storage, conforming to acreage allotments and all of the many regulations to which he is now subjected.

Third, we would once more be in a position to compete in the markets of the world for our just share of foreign trade without fear of ridicule or criticism. We could no longer be charged with dumping by the various nations of the Western World whose good will we so earnestly need and seek. (See the accompanying article by Oscar Schnabel.)

The question of the cost of such a program is, of course, proper. But, in evaluating its cost, let us bear in mind the health of our agricultural economy and its proper priority in relation to other major governmental expenditures. We are currently spending some $40 billion annually on national defense. It is now proposed that the Federal Government contribute some $2.5 billion a year to assist in improving our educational facilities, and, in addition, sponsor a highway program to cost $101 billion over the next 10 years. I submit that, in order to meet the cost of these programs (all of which, for the purpose of this discussion, may be accepted as necessary), a sound and healthy national economy must be maintained. And our economic history is replete with indisputable evidence that the basis of our prosperity depends at all times on the degree of mass purchasing power which we are able to maintain.

Here we have an opportunity to improve the economic status (purchasing power) of some 20-odd million of our farm population and, to a lesser degree, help the entire population through a reduction in the cost of living which must inevitably follow the restoration of a free market on agricultural products. All of this can be accomplished to the slight disadvantage of only 1.9 percent of our farmers (the group currently getting 25 percent of Government support benefits).

While it is impossible to state with any positive degree of accuracy exactly what the program might cost, the most intelligent estimate that I have been able to obtain would place the maximum annual cost under $3 billion; it might run as low as $750 million a year. But this program would take the Government completely out of the picture insofar as buying, selling, and storing farm products are concerned, and would accordingly permit it to start an orderly process of liquidating the $8 billion hoard of products now on hand. Therefore, it is conceivable that the money derived from liquidating the present surplus would completely finance the new program for at least 2 or 3 years. During this period, we would gain the necessary experience upon which to predicate a permanent program. It would be presumptuous to suggest that the factor of trial and error can henceforth be completely eliminated.

Administration of such a law should be relatively simple. The Bureau of Internal Revenue could easily amend its tax forms to show what products a farmer had produced and sold, for how much, and the amount of payments due from the Government, settlement to be made annually at the earliest date feasible after filing of the income-tax return. This showing of payments due would permit the farmer to establish immediately the basis for a bank loan of a comparable amount, as his needs may arise.

I am aware that certain economists will declare that this program penalizes efficiency. They will say that factory-in-the-field farms, whether operated by individuals or corporations, are most efficient. Even assuming this is correct, I would like to call attention to the phrase in our Declaration of Independence which speaks of our inalienable right to "the pursuit of happiness." And I contend that there is much more happiness on the farm than there is in the city slums to which many of our displaced farmers must migrate. The pursuit of dollars—efficiency, if you please—is not mentioned in the Declaration or the Constitution.

Since colonial days, the American farmer and the family-sized farm have been the very backbone both of our free-enterprise system and of our political democracy. Our present farm-support program has substituted a high degree of regimentation and an insidious type of creeping feudalism, both of which are utterly distasteful to the rank-and-file of our farmers. Because the present support program is also economically unsound, a new approach to the farm problem seems very much in order.

The analysis by Mr. Schnabel follows:

THE FARMER AND AMERICA'S ALLIES

(By Oscar Schnabel)

Deeply concerned about our highly involved agricultural problem, E. G. Shinner proposes that we abandon our present system of Government purchasing and/or nonrecourse loans on farm products. He would replace this with direct subsidy payments to individual farmers. The farmer would be entitled to the difference between the market price and the parity price on the first $7,000 of gross production, with a maximum subsidy of $2,000. This program would stop subsidized overproduction by big farms and, at the same time, protect the purchasing power of the bulk of our rural population. Such a program would not only pave the way for a better balance between production and consumption of our agricultural products, with numerous advantages for our national economy; it would also have a healthy influence on our economic and political relations with our allies.

Abroad, we preach the blessings of free enterprise and induce our friends to facilitate international trade. We strongly object to import restrictions, as well as to unsound promotion of exports by subsidies and by dumping. But what are we doing? For all practical purposes, we have eliminated the free market in our largest industry, agriculture. We promote overproduction through Government subsidies, and our Government agencies try to sell our surpluses abroad at prices far below those on our home markets. And we continue to accumulate these surpluses at a fantastic rate, holding them like a Sword of Damocles over the economies of our allies.

The United Nations Statistical Year Book for 1954 reveals the situation that has developed as a consequence of our present farm policy:

Our population increased from 129 million in 1937 to 157 million in 1952 and 159.6 million in 1953—that is, by 21.8 and 23.8 percent respectively. Our wheat production rose from 874 million bushels in 1937 to 1,299 million bushels in 1952 and 1,167 million bushels in 1953—increases of 48.7 and 33.7 percent. In other words, in a 15 or 16 year period, population grew by 22.7 percent while the wheat crop rose by more than 41 percent. But even these figures do not tell the whole story.

Per-capita consumption of wheat amounted to 198 pounds in 1937, only 163 pounds in 1952. This means that the total human wheat consumption in 1952 was the same as in 1937—namely, 426 million bushels. Assuming that there is no further decrease in our per-capita consumption of wheat, our present productive capacity is adequate to meet tha needs of a population of 220 million (currently projected for 1975) after allowing ample reserves as insurance against wars, droughts, floods, or other emergencies.

In 1951, we exported more than 460 million bushels of wheat and flour. In 1953 (the last year for which figures are available), we exported only 265 million bushels, or 195 million bushels less, largely because we reduced our foreign aid. Thus, the projected increase over 20 years of our domestic human consumption of wheat will be less than the decrease of our wheat exports in 2 years. (To avoid misunderstanding, we should note that the needs for seed and feed are not included in this discussion. About a sixth of our wheat crop is so used—10 percent for feed, 6 percent for seed.)

Since the end of the last war, the recovery of European agriculture has made great progress, even compared with prewar days; agricultural production has risen in free Europe (including the United Kingdom) far faster than population has grown. At the same time, per-capita wheat consumption shows a steady decline in Western Europe, while the intake of calories (with the exception of Italy, whose per-capita wheat consumption is second largest in the world) is practically the same as that in the United States.

Therefore, it is hardly likely that Europe will step up her wheat imports; in fact, she might reduce them. Furthermore, on the European market we face the competition of other wheat-exporting countries—primarily of Canada. In 1953, our wheat and flour exports totaled $589.5 million; this was 2.75 percent of the value of all of our exports, less than 0.2 percent of our national income. Canada's wheat and flour exports amounted to $670.1 million—16 percent of her exports and 3.5 percent of her national income. If, in sharp competition with Canada, we captured a quarter of her wheat and flour export, we would decrease her income by approximately $170 million, or nearly 1 percent of her national income. Since Canada buys $800 million worth more from us than we buy from her, such inroads would automatically lead to a reduction of our exports.

We need no further details to show that, on a commercial basis, there is no foreign outlet for our wheat surplus. We will be fortunate if, in the years to come, we can sell as much wheat as we sell now, without endangering export markets for our industrial products.

Nor can we substantially increase commercial export of our dairy products without hurting allies. Holland, for instance, exports dairy products in order to pay for her wheat imports. If we keep Dutch dairy products off

our markets, and deprive Holland of other markets by dumping our own dairy products on them, we will lose Holland as a buyer of our wheat. Denmark is in a similar predicament; to her, dairy and pork exports are literally of vital importance.

Our cotton consumption in 1953–54 was 22.5 percent higher than in 1939. Because of the population increase in that period, this means that per capita cotton consumption did not change at all. Improvement in our clothing was provided primarily by the use of synthetic fibers. But our cotton production rose during this period by more than 39 percent. Cotton exports, which in 1950 amounted to 5.7 million bales, fell to 2.8 million bales in 1953, again chiefly because of the reduction in our foreign aid.

We must now realize that the free world's postwar predicament, and the aid we provided to overcome it, postponed an explosive situation in our wheat and cotton production. The postwar predicament is now over and done with, and we must now recognize that commercial exports cannot take care of these surpluses.

There is a widespread belief that the best way to get rid of our agricultural surplus is to give it away to needy countries, thus mixing charity with good international politics. Giving away food in case of an emergency, as after the west European floods last year, certainly makes sense. But giving away unwanted surpluses regularly will misfire politically. Hostile propaganda can easily convince the beneficiaries of our gifts that we are more interested in dumping our surplus than in aiding anyone. Yet even the continuation of a politically unsound and obviously inflationary give-away policy could reduce our annual surplus only to a very slight extent. It could not avoid the further building up of new agricultural surpluses.

We must begin to consider the revolutionary change since 1914 in both our economic and political relationships abroad. Before World War I, we were a debtor nation, which imported manufactured goods and exported farm products. World politics was made by the then existent six big powers without much consideration of our country's isolationist policy. During World War I, we repaid our foreign debts and started on our way to become the world's largest creditor nation. Simultaneously, we began to change the whole structure of our economy. We are now by far the most industrialized nation in the world, and could, if necessary, provide our population with practically all the manufactured goods it needs or wants. The magnificent growth of our urban industries has been accompanied by an equally steady increase in our agricultural production, the latter far exceeding the need of our growing population even after adequate allowance has been made for our steadily rising standard of living.

Parallel with the growth of our economy has been the increase of our political influence upon the free world, now challenged by the Communist bloc. To meet this challenge, we need the cooperation of the other countries of the free world—most of all, of Western Europe. Europe is at the same time the seat of the Communist powerhouse and the home of twice as many free and culturally advanced people as we have in our own country. If we want to keep these people on our side, we must consider the impact of our economic policy on their economies. Now, the United Kingdom and Western Europe must import raw materials and part of their food supply. They can do so only by paying with the proceeds of their exports, mostly of manufactured goods. In other words, they must barter the products of their industrial labor for food and raw materials. The less we are open to such barter, the more they must trade with other countries that open their gates to European exports. Obviously, Europe will cover her food (as well as cotton) needs in countries which provide a market for her manufactured goods—that is, in Asia, Latin America, etc. Dumping our agricultural surpluses on Asian markets, therefore, would bring about a major disturbance of the free world's economy without greatly increasing our exports.

There is another angle to all this. Our policy of subsidizing over-production is a major source of inflation. The more we permit our price level to rise, the more we increase the difficulty of liberalizing our foreign trade policy; we must cooperate with our friends to reduce the gap between our price level and theirs in order to make increased trade possible. Acceptance of Mr. Shinner's suggested program would be a major step in the direction of a liberal foreign economic policy.

Dean of Pan-Americanists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of a letter written by Dr. Persio C. Franko which appeared in the column Letters to the Star of the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., April 5, 1955, and which article is entitled "Dean of Pan-Americanists" and deals with Dr. Emilio Bello Codosido, of Chile, and his outstanding work for Pan-American unity.

WASHINGTON, *April 2, 1955.*

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING STAR:

Dr. Emilio Bello Codesido, of Chile, is the dean of Pan Americanists. He is the oldest and most outstanding human symbol of Pan Americanism living. He is a great American who is truly a citizen of the Americas.

In September 1944 it was discovered, as a result of a thorough inquiry made by me, at the Pan American Union, the Department of State and the Latin American embassies in Washington, that all of the delegates to the First International Conference of American States had died and that of the delegates to the second conference only three were then living: Dr. Federico Henriquez y Carvajal, Dominican; Dr. Francisco Antoni Reyes, Salvadorean, and Dr. Emilio Bello Codesido, Chilean.

The first Conference was held in Washington October 2, 1889–April 18, 1890. Eighteen countries took part, represented by 37 delegates.

The second conference was held in Mexico City October 22, 1901–January 22, 1902. Nineteen countries participated, represented by 46 delegates.

Dr. Francisco Antonio Reyes, of El Salvador, who was also a delegate to the third conference, held in Rio de Janeiro July 21–August 26, 1906, died April 3, 1951, in this country. He was born there on October 10, 1860.

Dr. Federico Henriquez y Carvajal died in the capital city of the Dominican Republic on February 4, 1952, at the remarkable age of 103 years, 4 months, 19 days. He was born there on September 16, 1848.

Dr. Bello Codesido has had a long and brilliant public career. He has held among a long list of high public offices, the following: President of the Junta that governed the Republic in 1925; Minister of Foreign Affairs, of Justice and Public Instruction, of Public Works, of the Interior, of Defense; delegate to the Fourth International Conference of American States, held in Buenos Aires July 12–August 30, 1910; presidente of the house of representatives; president of the Chilean delegation to the League of Nations; president of the Chilean delegation to the International Labor Conference held in Geneva in 1925; Ambassador of Chile in various countries; member, designated by Honduras, of the tribunal formed to arbitrate the very old boundary dispute existing between Honduras and Guatemala, president of which tribunal was Charles Evans Hughes, then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and whose decision, issued on January 23, 1933, put an end to the dispute. In connection with this act of arbitration, Dr. Bello Codesido published in 1939 a book entitled "El Arbitraje y la Equidad."

Dr. Bello Codesido is a grandson of the eminent American Andres Bello, of Venezuela, who lived in Chile for many years and there performed part of his great intellectual work. He was born in Santiago de Chile on July 31, 1868. He married in 1893 Miss Elisa Balmaceda y Toro, daughter of President Jose Manuel Balmaceda; she died on January 3, 1943. They had no children.

Dr. Bello Codesido retired several years ago to private life.

I have just addressed a communication to the President of the Council of the Organization of American States suggesting that Dr. Emilio Bello Codesido be invited to come to Washington to receive, in the Hall of the Americas in the Pan American Union building, the homage of the American peoples. I believe that if he were invited and came it would move the conscience of all men and be a contribution toward the creation of peace among all peoples of the world.

PERSIO C. FRANCO.

A Great Democratic American and a Great American Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my happy privilege to join with many thousands of fellow citizens and fellow Democrats last Saturday night in paying a well deserved tribute to a really great man, the Speaker of this House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

It is now my privilege to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made on that occasion by former President Harry S. Truman as follows:

TRUMAN SPEECH

I assume that it is no longer "top secret" that I am an early riser. It runs in the family. My father was always out of bed at about 4 a. m. My mother used to sing a song to my brother, sister, and me about the sluggard who liked to lie abed and what awful things happened to him. Solomon and Ben Franklin, too, had things to say about late sleepers.

Anyway—the other morning a neighbor caught up with me on one of my regular walks. There was a touch of spring in the air, and I was up earlier than usual. I missed some of the neighbors who usually join me on my walks and who talk with me about everything under the sun.

These good people are so typical of Americans throughout this wonderful land. They

are friendly, alert, and inquiring and vigorous in their questions.

On this particular morning, my walking companion said: "I hear you are going to Washington to make a speech. What are you going to talk about?"

I said: "No, I am not going to make a speech. I am making this trip to join in the honoring of a great American, my friend and former colleague, SAM RAYBURN."

RECALLS ROOSEVELT'S DEATH

No doubt you remember, SAM, that meeting which took place in your office on the 12th day of April, 10 years ago last Tuesday. I came to see you to get an agreement between the Speaker and the Vice President on certain legislation and to discuss the domestic and world situation generally.

While I was in your office, I received a telephone call to come to the White House as soon as possible. When I arrived at the White House, Mrs. Roosevelt informed me that the President was dead.

Just 10 years ago last Tuesday one of the greatest of the Presidents of the United States passed away.

Mr. Roosevelt, in my opinion, was one of the few great men of the ages whose interest and life were devoted to the welfare of the everyday man. You and I, SAM, missed him very much at the time. The country and the whole free world missed him. And we will continue to miss him as long as it is necessary for someone to look after the interests of the common people who make up the population of this country and the world. I did my best to continue the policies he advocated for the welfare of this country and for world peace.

SAM, you have set an example for conduct and leadership in the Congress and in political life that has earned you the affection and the respect of the entire Nation, regardless of party. Your place in history is secure, not only because you have served longest as Speaker of the House of Representatives, but because you never yield to partisanship on the basic issues affecting the welfare of the Nation.

So, it is well that we remind ourselves tonight that if the United States is a world leader among the nations today, you will find that SAM RAYBURN played a large part in helping our country to achieve this leadership. If the United States today is a leader in democracy for its enlightened social legislation, you will find that SAM RAYBURN in Congress had a large role in shaping that legislation. I know of few Americans who symbolize the good deeds of this country so much as SAM RAYBURN. It took something more than ordinary talent and courage to look over the horizon beyond the interests of his own district and his own State to the broader view of this country and the world.

CRITICIZES PRESS

That is why I am so glad to be here tonight. (You know I have been working hard lately to put together the important facts about our own administration so as to set the record straight.)

In paying tribute to SAM RAYBURN we are taking this opportunity also to remind ourselves and the world of the reasons for America's great achievements and leadership. At this time, when many of us are worried, and even fearful, about what is happening in this country and abroad, let us not forget how soundly and securely we have built this country so that it has even been able to withstand some pretty bad management of the Government during the last 2 years.

A most remarkable display of publicity and cooperation from the newspapers has tried to keep much of this bad management from the people. There has been no parallel in our history to the cloak of protection thrown about this administration by so much of the press.

You know, we have heard a good deal about a slogan intended to impress our enemy—and that slogan is: massive retaliation. Well, the Democrats know something about massive retaliation. It's the kind of press the Democrats get everywhere, all the time.

Future historians will be puzzled when they come to judge our times, when they see how so much of the press distorted the facts so that no Democratic administration could do right and no Republican administration could do wrong.

What the press and radio commentators said about me never worried me personally. But I have always felt that there is no sense in having a free press under the Constitution and yet not have it free in fact. The people should not be limited to what the publishers choose to tell them. The people are entitled to all the facts and all the news.

There is only one rightful purpose for a government to use publicity, and that is to inform the public of all the facts and the whole truth. But publicity is no substitute for performance. Yet never in the peacetime history of this Nation has there been such a vast volume of persistent publicity to praise and extol an administration.

We know that in certain sections of the world this is an automatic practice.

I ask you, why the big buildup in this free country? Why?

I, for one, am glad that SAM RAYBURN is again Speaker of the House. Sam is an old and experienced hand in sensing what the real issues are. He knows what is best for all the people and how to attend to their interests in Congress. He is not easily deceived by ballyhoo. And when the security of the Nation is involved, he always rises above partisan politics.

He is a remarkable example of that courageous statesmanship which this Republican administration would do well to emulate. For this administration has been playing partisan politics with our security, with our foreign policy, with our civil service, and with our Nation's resources.

I regret to say that we have not seen such cynical political behavior in any administration since the early twenties. The price of compromise with the extremists within the Republican party has led this administration to surrender on basic principles on foreign policy. It has resulted in confusion and disturbing the American people and in frightening our friends and allies.

The administration has talked about an "agonizing reappraisal" of foreign policy. I can well understand their agony. After repeatedly getting into trouble with their own policy, it must be agonizing indeed to realize that sooner or later they must reverse themselves and return to the sound policies of the Democratic administration.

There is no room for partisan bickering over the great issues of national survival. Our foreign policy ought to be the foreign policy of the United States and not the foreign policy of 1 Senator, or 1 general, or 1 admiral, or 1 party. The Democratic Party understands this.

The Republican administration has repeatedly played political tricks with the grave and serious issues of both foreign and domestic policies.

CITES MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

The state of the Union address by the Republican administration in 1953 launched this business of conducting foreign affairs for domestic political advantage. It was in this address that the administration announced it was unleashing Chiang Kai-shek to attack the mainland of China. They announced they were moving the Seventh Fleet, which was there only to protect Chiang. Anyway, it was a serious blunder, and they had to put the fleet back.

The Republican administration must have known that the picture of an unleashed Chiang Kai-shek invading China was a barefaced political fraud. But the idea behind all this was to attempt to discredit the sound policy of the Democratic administration which was carefully designed to limit the conflict in the Far East.

And now the Republican administration is desperately trying not only to limit the conflict in Asia but to get a permanent ceasefire there. I fervently hope they do. But the administration, by this unfortunate political maneuver in its state of the Union message, has enabled the Communists to picture us as instigating and preparing an attack on China and has embroiled us in controversies with almost all our allies in Asia and in Europe.

If we are face to face in Asia with the prospect of war, a war which the administration says may have to be fought with atomic weapons, nobody is going to get any political advantage out of it. If we are pushed into the abyss of a new war, the whole world may tumble into that abyss with us.

I suggest that as Americans, working together in good faith, we ought to back a national bipartisan foreign policy with these simple fundamental aims:

First, let us keep the free nations together for a common purpose, and that is to defend our common freedom.

Second, to uphold the principles of international peace and order, the principles that are embodied in the United Nations.

Third, to strengthen in every way we can the weaker members of the free nations of the world and to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world so that all may have enough to eat, enough to wear and a decent place in which to live. Our aim is not to make people fight for us, but to win them over to freedom and to a peaceful and prosperous world.

Fourth, we must keep our country strong in every way, militarily and economically.

ATTACKS SERVICE CUTS

And we cannot keep the country strong militarily by cutting the Army and the Navy. We must keep our Armed Forces in line with our military commitments. Important as atomic weapons are, there is as yet no substitute for men. It takes men in the Armed Forces to make even a pushbutton war work. In fact, in atomic warfare, it takes more men, better-educated men and better-trained men than in preatomic warfare.

These are the basic elements of a foreign policy on which the whole nation could unite. We ought to be giving all our attention to this task instead of trying to make political capital out of the dangers and difficulties of world affairs.

The Republicans ought to know that the best hope of avoiding ultimate tragedy depends upon the full and free cooperation of the Democratic majority in Congress and the majority of the people in the country.

The times are critical, and we face serious decisions. They demand the best that is in us. They require leadership of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you many more years of life and good fortune and of service to the Nation. And my best wishes to you, Senator JOHNSON, and to your colleagues in the Senate and the House.

Help for the United States Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, our fourth arm of defense—the American merchant marine—is also one of our greatest assets in peacetime. Efforts to preserve and strengthen our essential maritime industries, have received a varying degree of support through the years. But foremost among the advocates of a strong and positive national maritime policy has been the American Legion. The leadership and constancy of this fine, virile organization of veterans has contributed effectively and immeasurably to the growing public awareness of the nature and importance of the American merchant marine to our national security and national economy.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding and comprehensive article by Seaborn P. Collins, national commander, the American Legion, entitled "Why the American Legion Favors Help for the United States Merchant Fleet," which appeared in the April 1955 issue of the American Legion magazine.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the printing of the article in the Appendix will require two and one-third pages, at a cost of $187. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix, notwithstanding that fact.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE AMERICAN LEGION FAVORS HELP FOR THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT FLEET

(By Seaborn P. Collins, national commander, the American Legion)

Since its 1921 national convention in Kansas City, Mo., the American Legion has continuously urged that the Government of the United States support the American merchant marine—by favorable legislation, by financial assistance, and by other means.

In addition to a broad policy of Government support for our privately operated, oceangoing cargo and passenger ships, the American Legion favors a number of specific steps by which our merchant marine may receive help.

Why a merchant marine policy? Why a policy of assistance? What the goals and what are the limits of this policy? What are the steps to the goals? Where do we stand now?

To answer the last question, briefly, before the others—we are not in good shape. Our merchant marine is shrinking in size and becoming outmoded in design—after two shots in the arm from World War II and the Korean war, and in spite of some welcome, but piecemeal, Government supports without which the patient would already be dead.

Why a merchant-marine policy for a veterans organization?

The American Legion is interested in the vital part that the merchant marine plays in our national defense picture and as an instrument of national policy. Our merchant marine is made up chiefly of those ships which, in peacetime, carry dry cargo, passengers and liquid cargo. In time of war they would carry war materiel, troops, and liquid fuel to and from war theaters, and bring to the United States materials needed for war industry, many of which must be gotten overseas. Shipping in wartime is a matter of life or death for our Nation.

Time and allies saw us through our shipping crises (at great dollar cost) in World Wars I and II. The outlook for the future does not even permit thinking of time to start a shipbuilding program after hostilities begin, in the event of another general war. A peacetime shipping program based on minimum wartime needs, at the very least, is a necessity.

Why does our maritime industry need help?

Unassisted, our merchant marine cannot survive in the free competition that exists on the high seas among all seafaring nations in peacetime. American labor costs, based on American living standards, are the ruling factor. An American able-bodied seaman earns more than 4 times as much as a British seaman, 3½ times as much as a Norwegian seaman, 18 times as much as a Chilean seaman. You cannot survive in free competition if your costs are from 3½ to 13 times the costs of your competitors. Unaided United States shipping is not surviving this competition. In the last 5 months of 1954, 67 unsubsidized United States ships went over to foreign flags.

The goals of the American Legion's policies regarding an American merchant marine include:

1. Size: A merchant fleet large enough to meet all immediate shipping needs upon the outbreak of a war, and able to serve as a nucleus for a wartime program of additions.

2. Usefulness: Ships designed and built to meet conditions imposed at any time by war. This means having a modern fleet in being at all times, with a constant program of replacement for worn-out, and out-of-date ships. It means a fleet with defense features built in, however uneconomic they may be to peacetime operators.

3. Skilled manpower: A merchant fleet that supports in peacetime enough skilled seamen to handle our immediate shipping manpower needs upon the outbreak of a war, and to see us safely through a wartime shipping-manpower build-up.

4. Shipbuilding capacity: A merchant fleet that supports a peacetime shipbuilding industry able to serve (in size, modernity and skilled manpower) as a mobilization nucleus for a wartime program of additions.

Those are the chief goals. There are also limits to such aims:

1. The Legion does not propose Government ownership or operation of the merchant fleet. Unlike a shooting Navy, a merchant marine has self-supporting features. Government need not foot the whole bill as it must for an adequate Navy. It need only foot that part which makes it possible for our high-priced ships to compete on even terms with cheap foreign competition, in numbers and quality suitable to sound defense needs.

2. The Legion does not propose a Government-sponsored shipping race with other nations. It is true that a sensible merchant shipping program would vastly increase the number of modern American flag vessels on the seas. But Government-sponsored expansion should stop at the point where national security needs are soundly met.

We have encouraged our allies to go after most of the ocean business, so that today we only carry 28 percent of our own foreign commerce. That figure is falling. In a build-up of our own fleet, we should let friendly maritime nations understand our intention of stopping at the point where our own defense needs are met.

II. THE WRONG WAY

Twice in recent history the United States built huge cargo and transport fleets entirely out of public funds—in World War I and again in World War II. The World War I fleet was not finished until the war was over, and most of it rotted away unused thereafter.

The vastly larger World War II fleet cost us $19 billion, a fantastic figure. The Liberties, Victories, C2's, C3's, and C4's were vital to the winning of the war. But they can't last forever and we can't count on them again.

We have saved some of our World War II ships. The Government put some of them in cold storage and found good use for them during the Korean War at a cost of about $100,000 to break each one out.

Others are hauling Government freight for our Military Sea Transport Service.

Others are being operated on scheduled freighter lines by private companies, helped by Government subsidies.

United States owners bought still others and operated them as tramps, without subsidies. The tramps managed to make money during the shipping shortage right after World War II and again during the Korean War. But recently—under "normal" competitive conditions—many of them have been driven to the wall or have fled to foreign flags.

Still others of our World War II cargo and transport fleet were sold, under the Ship Sale Act of 1946, to foreign owners at one-third the construction cost.

The entire fleet is now out of date for future defense needs. But it exists, and its existence has led us into the temptation of relying upon it and doing too little about a continuous replacement program.

In large measure we are repeating the phenomenon of block obsolescence, depending for security needs upon a huge fleet that was built all at once and has gone out of date all at once. A few facts of security bring home the meaning of block obsolescence:

1. Nuclear weapons have outmoded giant wartime convoys of cargo and troop ships. A mass of ships in one convoy would make a perfect target for a nuclear bomb. Ocean transport in future wars calls for ships dispersed into small groups. This in turn means that naval support for payload ships must be spread thinner, leaving each ship more on its own to escape submarines. Speed of ship is called for.

2. Russia probably has more than 400 snorkel subs capable of doing at least 20 knots under water.

3. Of 629 privately operated United States freighters and passenger ships engaged in foreign commerce (or only temporarily inactive) at the end of 1952, 558 were Victories, Liberties, or C-type ships. Of these, 159 Liberties could do 9 knots, 59 Victories could do 14 knots, 340 C-types could do 17 or 18 knots.

4. By going to the reserve boneyard, we could dig up a total of more than 3,000 ships, including tankers, and put them to sea. A modern submarine could run rings around most of them without surfacing.

Naturally, a part of the American Legion's merchant marine policy urges "a long-range ship construction program to provide replacements and avoid block obsolescence of our aging merchants ships."

III. HOW ABOUT SUBSIDIES?

You don't speak of Government help for shipping without thinking, right off, of direct cash subsidies to shipowners.

Part of the American Legion's mandate on shipping urges policies that will "More fully implement the sound principles and procedures of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936."

That act provides, among other things, for direct Government payments to shipowners, both for the operation and building of ships. The Legion approves of these subsidies, and

implies that they should be used to build and operate more ships than they do now. This does not mean that ships that are already subsidized should get more money from the Government, except in cases where it is necessary to meet foreign competition.

It is too easy to think of subsidies as a lush gift of the taxpayers' money to the capital and management of a shipping firm, and to muse that it must be nice to be the owner of a subsidized line of ships and have the taxpayers guarantee you a successful business.

Such thoughts, which are entirely natural, have weakened both public and congressional support of an extended subsidy program. But they are baseless.

Suppose you are the lucky owner who gets an operating subsidy.

If you carry general cargo in a subsidized ship that sails between San Francisco and Tokyo, your irreducible operating costs might be $18,000 a month more than those of the Japanese vessel that docks beside you in both ports and bids against you for cargoes.

As an American vessel, yours must carry an American crew while you rival could carry a low-paid Japanese crew. No matter whom you compete against, the same problem plagues you. Differences in labor costs between United States and foreign vessels ranging from $10,000 to $19,000 a month are commonplace. The average operating cost difference between all subsidized United States ships and their closest foreign rivals is close to $15,000 a month.

In times of tough competition (which has come to mean whenever there is no war) your Japanese competitor could page his rates at a level where he'd earned $1,000 a month. If you matched him in order to get an equal share of cargoes, you'd lose $17,000 a month, if you had no operating subsidy.

But you have a subsidy. How does it work?

The Maritime Administration bases your subsidy on a strict comparison between your necessary costs and the costs of the Japanese ship which is your closest rival. If it agreed that the difference is $18,000, that would be the amount of your subsidy, no more.

If the Maritime Administration considered that some of your costs were unwise, it would disallow them. The subsidy equalizes necessary costs, it does not pay for your business mistakes.

Suppose you accept the subsidy, yet are shrewd enough or lucky enough to earn a pile of money this year. Do you keep $18,000 a month of the taxpayers' money on top of your own earnings? The Maritime Administration will subtract from your subsidy half of all you earn above 10 percent on your investment, up to the point where you have repaid the whole subsidy.

Between 1947 and 1953, 28 percent of subsidies accrued by our ships was recaptured by the Government. We had an average of 300 ships subsidized each year during this period. Gross subsidies came to about $54.8 million a year. Recaptures from good operations and some good times brought back an average of $14 million a year. The same ships paid taxes averaging $11.8 million a year. The net cost of this program, as a nationally sponsored venture, was a little lers than $29 million a year on what looked offhand like a $54.8-million-a-year subsidy program.

The subsidy does not pay you a profit. It does not cover your losses. It puts you in the scrap for ocean business on an equal footing with your foreign rival. It lets you fail or succeed with the Japanese or English or Dutch or Greek operator on the same basis that one American businessman competes with another. The advantage of the subsidy is that it lets American businessmen fight for the ocean trade without being overly penalized for flying the American flag, buying American and hiring American.

Who benefits? The Nation benefits to the extent that your operation helps maintain the nucleus of ships, shipbuilding and the shipping manpower the Nation needs.

Who else benefits? The bulk of ship subsidies actually goes to American labor, rather than to capital and management. The payments are chiefly based on the cost of American labor. They permit the employment of seamen, shipyard workers and other shipping labor at rates of pay that are consistent with American living standards. In effect, an American level of wages is guaranteed by the subsidy, but profits must come from successful business competition.

This is a proper statement of what the shipping subsidies add up to, in the face of a rather easy suspicion that the subsidies are a form of handout to management.

This subsidy principle is the one that is approved by the American Legion, other national organizations, and the Congress. It is the subsidy principle of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The Legion believes that private capital is ready to increase our merchant fleet if the penalties of flying our flag are not too great. Thus a present program to provide $173 million of Government aid for shipbuilding and overhaul is expected to attrack $227 million more of private investment funds.

Exactly the same principle applies to shipbuilding subsidies as applies to ship operating subsidies. Your subsidy to build a ship in an American yard cannot exceed the saving you could make by building it in a qualified foreign yard. It makes up the extra cost that you have to pay for building an American ship in an American yard with American products and American labor.

IV. HOW ABOUT A PROGRAM?

The Congress has done a great deal to encourage revitalization of our merchant marine in the last year. Henry C. Parke, of Brooklyn, N. Y., chairman of the American Legion's national merchant marine committee, represented the Legion well, and tirelessly supported favorable shipping legislation in the Congress. He was ably supported by a strong and representative committee. Compared to other years, 1954 was productive. Some of the achievements:

1. The ship operating subsidy appropriation was increased.

2. A plan to repair and improve our laid-up cargo ships was adopted. This was done not only with the thought in mind of updating the reserve fleet to some extent, but to help maintain the shipyards. The mothballed cargo ships of the reserve fleet were put away in the condition in which they came out of World War II. Recently 57 of them were in the shipyards for renovation, including 4 guinea-pig Liberties which will be remodeled in an attempt to improve upon the performance for which they were designed.

3. A blanket law was passed requiring that at least half of all Government-financed cargoes shipped overseas must go in American-flag vessels. This is called the 50–50 law. Such a provision had been written into individual bills for foreign aid in the past, but it had not been a general law applying to all Government-financed cargoes.

This reasonable law, by assuring cargoes for American-flag vessels, is a costless way of improving earnings and thus reducing the need for direct grants to United States shipping.

The 50–50 law is under indirect attack by foreign shipowners.

Since no other shipping nation permits as much as half of its entire foreign commerce to travel on any ships but its own, and since our own shipping is far below national safety requirements, the American Legion is continuing to support the 50–50 law and will fight any attempt to repeal or weaken it.

4. Construction of 10 new supertankers has been privately financed as a result of a trade-in-and-build program, with an assurance that the Government would have cargoes for them for many years. Fifteen more such tankers will probably be built in the not too distant future.

5. An addition of about 20 modern dry cargo and passenger ships to our merchant fleet seems likely as a result of plans now afoot. These would include new ships and remodeled ships.

Yet all of this good news is not a progressive plan to achieve definite goals.

The Navy's estimate is that we need at least 214 new freighters, tankers, and transports, capable of 20 knots or more, right now. The 25 tankers and 20 freighters and passenger ships mentioned above do not approach this goal. They add up to 45 ships, many of which are in the "maybe" stage.

The realities call for a bold, intelligent plan.

Such a plan would fix a sensible objective and provide the necessary steps to bring it into being and to keep it in operation.

Such a plan would provide a steady means of modernizing some ships and replacing others as fast as they become outmoded or worn out.

Legislating out of desperation, without any real plan, must forever keep our shipping at a level far below the limits of national requirements.

A plan that goes after what we need would be "bold" in terms of a merchant marine. But the boldness should not particularly frighten anyone. It is the same method by which me maintain the Navy, Army, and Air Force that we need, except that the Nation need not foot the entire cost of a merchant marine.

Most of the ships to which we are giving operating subsidies today are Victories and C-type ships. We aren't getting our full money's worth in terms of usefulness to the national defense. These ships would be helpful in a Korea-type emergency in which we would have absolute control of the seas. They are already out of date for any situation in which modern enemy subs, planes, or ships would challenge us.

Our subsidy dollar is keeping seamen employed and keeping shipping industry operating to a certain extent. Those are two goals. It is buying us very little in terms of the other goals: shipyard capacity, fleet usefulness in war, or fleet size. Each dollar of operating subsidy would be better spent if it were helping a fleet of the right size and right design.

With no planned shipbuilding program, we are lagging behind in ship design. The new supertankers are large, speedy, and modern in every sense. So are our three big, fast, new passenger ships, the *United States*, the *Constitution*, and the *Independence*. But no basic change in the design of the bulk of the ocean-going fleet has occurred since World War II, except for the new mariner class.

Thirty-five new mariners have been built. They are beautiful, fast cargo ships, but were unfortunately designed to be Navy auxiliaries, without enough thought to their peacetime operation.

The design of the Mariners requires such big crews that, as they came off the ways, few operators would undertake to sail them commercially. Twenty-six of the brandnew Mariners went directly into the tiedup reserve fleet. Seven are privately operated with subsidy, the Navy is using one and one has been lost at sea.

Now, two more of them will be remodeled for operating efficiency and put into the passenger trade. Those 2 are part of the 20 cargo and passenger ships included in the schedule of tentative new shipping above.

The Federal Maritime Board has asked for $102 million for 1956 to help up-date our merchant fleet and the President included this sum in his budget message to Congress.

The American Legion will support this and other specific steps aimed at improvement.

However, this and the other encouraging recent actions are not aimed at a positive goal. They are, rather, emergency measures to patch up a bad situation that has reached a critical stage.

Within a few years nearly all of our merchant ships will be outdated not only for defense purposes but for commercial use. Of our 405 privately operated tankers, for instance, 85 percent need replacement now.

Today it is recognized that replacement cannot be put off any longer without reaching a point where we will have to send the bulk of our ships to the graveyard all at once, in a very few years from now. To replace even the equivalent of our present fleet then would be beyond the capacity of our yards.

A merchant marine program with a goal would be something other than a fill-in to ease a crisis. We would ask, How many ships of what types does the Nation need? We would establish the answer and build the ships. We would ask, On what routes can we operate them? We would commit more ships to more routes, and support their operation as much as necessary. We would ask, What replacement rate need we employ steadily to keep the fleet up to date and to keep the shipping industry stable at a safe level? We would schedule a continuing replacement program and end the era of recurring crises.

Neither now nor in the past have we made a shipping program on the basis of these questions and answers—and our failure has been rather more costly than less.

The cost per ship would almost certainly be less under a planned program than under a mend-and-patch policy. Sound planning would, among other things, encourage bolder management and more adventurous enterprise on the part of operators.

The absence of dependable planning in an industry that requires Government support has made timidity and caution characteristics of our shipping industry.

It is most likely that if the industry were placed on a sound and dependable basis, bolder attitudes would appear, would pay off, and make overcautiousness unprofitable.

The cost of an enlarged, coordinated, shipping program could also be reduced by more measures—such as the 50-50 Act—that encourage more shipping in American bottoms.

A great deal remains to be done to give United States shipping more of the United States cargoes. If all such steps were taken, they would reduce the amount of Government support needed to maintain a sound merchant fleet and would reflect to the advantage of every American taxpayer.

V. A LITTLE HISTORY

Few Americans seem to have been aware of the tremendous cost difference between operating American ships and operating foreign ships. The idea that American-flag ships would be driven off the seas without Government support seems to be one of the best-kept secrets of the last century. It has been in fact nearly a century since United States shipping has been able to hold its own, by its own.

In the early years of our country we were a seacoast Nation, struggling to make out in the world. Shipping was the very first major industry in which we rose to a position of world importance.

The success of our ships, between 1780 and 1860, caused many of our troubles and battles of those years, including, of course, the British acts of repression against our enterprising ships that led to the War of 1812. The American Revolution, in earlier years, also sprang in part from Britain's efforts to hold down the American shipping that was giving Britannia a merry race.

But America ceased to be a seacoast Nation as it opened up the wilderness at its back. Millions of Americans went west, away from the sea, and took with them a memory of their country as a world leader on the high seas.

The memory still lives. Yet from 1860 onward, except in times of war, our merchant fleet was dying. Up until 1860 we maintained about 4 tons of shipping for every $1,000 worth of foreign commerce. After 1860 our commerce spiraled upward, but our shipping fell off.

What happened? Wealth gained inland raised the American standard of living. Inland workers were protected by tariffs from having their wages or employment itself knocked down by the importation of too many products made by cheap labor abroad. Naturally, American sailors would not put to sea for wages that were inferior to the standards of their country. United States maritime wages rose, although shipping had to compete against foreign costs without benefit of tariff.

The result was that fewer and fewer shipping operations could survive. Foreign ships got more of the business, United States ships got less.

In 1825 American ships carried 92 percent of our foreign trade. In 1860 they carried 66 percent. In 1901 they carried only 8 percent.

In a crisis, America still carries the goods. A few years ago, as a result of the World War II shipping shortage, United States ships that we built for $19 billion carried more than 70 percent of our foreign trade. Today the figure has fallen off to 28 percent and is diving back toward the 1900 level.

Because unaided shipping is a losing business in America, there is no point in going after the ocean trade with Government help just to lead the parade. But since shipping is a vital instrument of national policy and a vital necessity for national safety, there is every reason to achieve intelligently that level of shipping which the realities of national welfare dictate.

A basic policy of the American Legion, reaffirmed in nearly every year since 1921, urges that we make and keep a stable merchant marine on that level.

Addresses Delivered Before Annual Meeting of Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on February 22, in Philadelphia, Pa., the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association was held. At that meeting addresses were delivered by my distinguished colleague [Mr. DUFF] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; by the dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, and by the distinguished Member of the House from Indiana, Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK, as well as an address delivered by myself. I ask unanimous consent that these addresses may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

I was thrilled, as I know you were, when the young man who just spoke to us created a picture of the businessman of the immediate future. I could not help but think of how this young man has been favored above many others who are in colleges today and who are getting their learning out of books only. He has been privileged to get some learning by practical experience with businessmen, and he expressed it so nicely when he said that he learned in effect that businessmen are not ogres, but on the contrary do try to get along with their employees.

And I say to you, young man, you have come to a group of Pennsylvanians who have made it a business for many years to provide jobs in Pennsylvania and they have done that by helping to create a healthy atmosphere in which business might thrive, and only as business thrives are there jobs for your neighbors and mine.

In Washington we have been told for some time that the Democrats and the Republicans would get along very nicely, be highly cooperative and bipartisan, and that the day had come when it didn't make a great deal of difference—this was after the election—whether the Republicans controlled the House and the Senate or not. Before that date we urged the election of Republican Congressmen, and if we had them we would, not be in the mess we are today. But we didn't get them.

Then we began to listen to the will-of-the-wisp, the people who told us, "Well, the Democrats are pretty good guys anyway," and you could take their word and they would cooperate with us and give our great President the kind of legislation he wants and the cooperation he needs.

Not being on the inside, I cannot speak conclusively, but having read the newspapers and having listened to the Democrats talk, I know that the Democrats did come offering honey gifts and words, seeking to tie the hands of the Republicans and to pretend a close cooperation for Mr. Eisenhower's program. And what are we getting? Has the Democratic Party changed its spots and is it today any more willing to cooperate with Republicans than it has been in the past? Well, we have thus far had at least two instances in Washington which belie any such claim.

One was a bill purported to be the same as the administration had requested a year ago when the Republicans were in the majority of the Congress, a bill dealing with the foreign trade. It was handed to Mr. COOPER of the Ways and Means Committee for introduction. Between the time the bill left our party's leadership in Washington and the time it was introduced, it was changed, and things were written into it which were not in the administration bill a year ago, a bill based upon the Randall Commission report.

Now, the bill had been sold to the country on the basis of cooperation, on the basis of an agreement made with the Democrats because this was an international matter and it was believed that the legislation would go through unanimously. But the Democratic Party breached the faith that our party had placed in it even in that international field and only confirmed what I have said frequently and what I repeat: You cannot trust the Democratic Party in Washington to help us make a good record for our President. Certainly you cannot trust the Democrats in this year immediately preceding a Presidential election, for they are out to lick Dwight Eisenhower and elect their own man as President. I hope that we won't fall into their trap again.

CITES SECOND DECEPTION

The other instance became apparent only a day or two ago—and both of these examples

involved the committee upon which I serve, the Ways and Means Committee. Less than 10 days ago the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said to all the members: Can we get an agreement that there will be no hearings held in connection with the bill providing for continuation of the present corporate tax rate and extension of the present rates on certain of excises due to expire in April? The matter was discussed by our committee and I said, "I assume this means that there will be no amendments made to the bill." An equivocal answer was given and I became suspicious, but inasmuch as the Democrats have a majority of 15 to 10 upon the committee, we did not argue because we didn't have the votes, and it was decided not to have hearings.

Well, you recall how last week, after disposing of the trade extension bill in the House without warning, and frankly without much careful thought on the part of the Democrats, they suddenly announced that they were going to amend the tax bill by a proviso that every taxpayer might deduct $20 for himself and his dependents from the tax which he figured he owed the Government.

We challenged them in the committee as to why they had told us one thing and done another and received an answer to this effect: "Well, we fooled you fellows; you'd better make the best of it."

A DISHONEST PROPOSAL

It is a dishonest proposal. It comes at a time when the President has assured us that if we continue with the very sound financial policies that we have been following for the past year or two, we will be able to next year make a tax reduction, in the absence of war, which will be sound, of a greater amount in my opinion, and a kind of a tax reduction which will not have to be replaced by a new tax in the immediate future for it won't tend to increase the national debt.

The Republican Party under President Eisenhower has given this country something we have not had for a generation, a sound Government, a Government in which we are endeavoring to make the outgo and the income match, a Government in which we have stabilized the value of the dollar so that the dollar you pay today for your social security, or for your life insurance will, if we maintain our policies, be, when you get it back, worth at least as much as it is today. That is what the Republican Party stands for, a country where a businessman can look ahead 1, 2, or 3 years and know that, if these policies are continued under a Republican administration, there will be a healthy climate under which his business can prosper and grow. That is what we stand for. That is why I am proud to tell them in Washington that I believe with Dwight Eisenhower as our nominee for the President, Pennsylvania will get back in the Republican column, and for another generation at least will stay there.

You businessmen owe an obligation not only to your business, but to your country and to the Republican Party, which is the medium through which you can express yourself. I would like to call upon each of you as you go into your respective counties to persuade others to get out and work the Republican ticket, and endeavor to get others who should be in poltics as candidates to become candidates, and to sponsor in every way you can good government through the Republican Party.

If you do that in the next 2 years, there is no doubt but that Dwight Eisenhower will be our President for another 4 years and the Republican Party will again be in the ascendency here in Pennsylvania.

Thank you.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

MASON and DICK, my colleagues of the Congress, members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, and friends, I am happy to be here and I would like to say that as a Republican from Indiana I haven't any allergy for men who are successes in business. It would be good for the country, for everybody, if people in business had no allergy for us who are in politics, because politics, my friends, is getting to be a right important business.

As I say, I come from Indiana and am a Republican, but this is going to be a nonpartisan Republican speech. We take our politics pretty seriously out there in Indiana. They say the first words spoken by every child born in the State are these: "I am not a candidate for any public office, but I promise if nominated and elected I shall serve to the best of my ability." And that is really the way we work at it.

MASON, you said I have been your longtime friend. I have. You had me come to Tioga County in 1936, I think it was, to speak to a Republican meeting, and I was glad to come up there from Washington, but the opposition darned near wrecked the meeting. We had it out in the ballpark at Mansfield, and darned if the WPA didn't move in and put brand-new green paint on all the seats in the grandstand the day before we were to hold the meeting. But we went ahead and held the meeting anyway.

MASON, you have been a stalwart fighter in our cause for a long time.

DICK SIMPSON, I just want to say to you in the presence of these people from Pennsylvania that I have never ceased to be happy for what little I did to bring about your election. I have been happy to play and work on your team because you are the great kind of a fellow that we need.

I was at the White House this morning for our conference. It was stepped up by the reason of certain developments, principally this $20 deal. And are they going to give a mule with that or not? I don't know. I got out a copy of the Corrupt Practices Act. You know it says in there if you spend money to buy somebody's vote, that is a violation of the criminal law. I don't know whether technically this is such a violation, but certainly it is a violation of the spirit of the Corrupt Practices Act.

They also stepped up the meeting a little so that I could come up here, and the President was happy to do it. And as I left he said, "Good luck, CHARLIE. I am glad you are going up there to Philadelphia to talk to those folks."

If you could have been with me this morning and heard the President's expression on some of the problems that immediately beset us, why, there wouldn't be one of you who would not go out of there and say, "I am willing to go down the line on that program."

Now, I do want to say a few things about this program. First of all, folks, I don't care whether you are running a business or whether you have an association like this, you have got to have managers to run it.

NEW SET OF MANAGERS

A little more than 2 years ago the people of this country called for a new set of managers to operate their Federal Government. This change in political leadership resulted from a growing public discontent with the manner in which the country was being run. Not the least of the reasons for this discontent was a deep-seated conviction that America was being pushed toward socialism. Progressively bigger Federal spending programs, higher taxes, controls, competition with private enterprise, grandiose schemes for public power, and attempts to regiment medicine and agriculture were all part of the socialistic pattern.

The trend toward centralized government, with emphasis on the authority of the executive at the expense of Congress, was another alarming feature of the campaign to substitute government "over" the people for government "of" the people. Inflation and the illusion of "free money" from Washington were devices designed to perpetuate a political dynasty. Scandals and corruption were a natural byproduct of cynicism in high places. Even foreign relations were used as a tool to accomplish radical ends. Employing a "crisis psychology," previous administrations were quick to seize on events in the international picture as an excuse for new controls and regulations, new spending, and greater taxes.

No new management could have done a better job of giving the American people the kind of government they wanted than has the Republican administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower. In spite of inherited commitments involving upward of $80 billion, for which no provision to pay had been made by the old set of managers, we have succeeded in achieving substantial budget reductions. Economies in the Federal household have made possible the largest tax-cutting program in the Nation's history, amounting to $7.4 billion on an annual basis.

Controls were ended as one of the first orders of business.

Sound fiscal policies have halted ruinous inflation.

The Ewing plan for socialized medicine and the Brannan plan to do the same thing to agriculture have both been sunk without a trace.

RESTORING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

The new managers on the Washington scene are restoring public confidence in private enterprise as the best system mankind has yet devised for steady progress toward better living for all Americans. Two years ago that confidence was at low ebb because for two decades business had served as a convenient whipping boy for radicals. The climate has been changed from one of hostility toward important segments of our economy to one of friendly cooperation and fair treatment for all segments. This change results from a fundamental belief in our system on the part of this new political management, in contrast to the attitude of hot-eyed extremists who hoped they could make America over into something completely foreign.

The trumped-up Dixon-Yates controversy betrays the anguish of public-power advocates, especially in the Tennessee Valley area, who are afraid the gravy train is running out. The basic issue at stake is whether this Government is going to enter into a fair and equitable contract with private enterprise or soak the taxpayers of this Nation $100 million to build another steam generating plant to subsidize low-cost power. The contract itself confirms this administration's respect for the principle that government should encourage private enterprise wherever possible and practicable.

This administration is further demonstrating its faith in private enterprise by moving to get Government out of business activities where it has no right to be.

President Eisenhower's respect for constitutional processes is reflected in his cooperative attitude toward the Congress, which he considers a partner in the business of Government operation.

We are also moving steadily toward the restoration of rights and responsibilities to States and communities with carefully considered aid programs that call for greater participation at the local level and less control at the Federal level.

We are getting more government back home, where it belongs.

The farm program adopted by the Republican 83d Congress marks a sure-footed approach to the problem of getting agriculture out from under the staggering burden of unmanageable surpluses which had built up under the rigid parity system. It is a major move toward the release of American farmers from the bondage of ever-tightening controls and restrictions and brings agriculture closer to the goal of 100 percent parity in the market place.

Handling of the Formosa incident is in striking contrast to the manner in which a previous administration met a situation in Korea. In the case of Korea, members of the Congress learned that American troops had been committed to armed conflict by reading the news in the Nation's press. In the case of Formosa, President Eisenhower called on the Congress for support of his policy in advance of action. Instead of the confusion and misunderstanding at home and abroad which characterized United States policy toward Korea, the American people, as well as our friends and potential enemies, know exactly where we stand on the issue of defending Formosa.

Beyond that, the calmness with which the Eisenhower administration has pursued its foreign policy, the absence of alarms and fanfare, has resulted in a quiet confidence on the part of our citizens that we now have managers at the helm who know what they are doing. This consistent and courageous policy may well prove to be one of our most effective weapons for safeguarding the peace of the world. Certainly the manner in which it has been developed, with forthright debate in and overwhelming support by the Congress of the United States, is our best guarantee of national unity.

GOALS OF ADMINISTRATION

The goals of the Eisenhower administration during the next 2 years will be to continue the gains we have made toward the establishment of a sound prosperity based on a just and lasting peace. Avoiding extremes of political philosophy, we are charting a course to which an overwhelming majority of Americans can subscribe. It is a course that calls for conservative policies where the people's money is concerned, but for sympathetic attention to the problems of human needs, where the public good requires Federal action. It is a course that minimizes government interference in matters properly the concern of private enterprise or of states and communities. It is a course which emphasizes the responsibility of the individual to do those things for himself which are the traditional responsibilities of free American citizens.

This new set of managers strongly believes that incentive is the great motivating force in the American economy and that honest interpretation of the law, together with fair and impartial treatment for everyone, are foundation stones of good government.

Pursuit of such policies and principles during the past 2 years has created a wholesome attitude of public trust in government leadership. This faith, together with sound, forward-looking management of the Federal operation, has brought the Nation through a difficult transition period with a minimum of dislocations and adjustment. The prophets of gloom who were so loud in their predictions of a serious recession not so long ago have been shamed into silence by accumulating evidence that ours is a vigorous and expanding Nation.

Those who think the battle has been easy, or that it is won for all time, should be forewarned:

The radicals, the spenders, the socializers, the crisis-manufacturers are no longer in power, but they have not given up hope of returning. They are waiting in the wings. They are ready to come in. And believe me, they will come in if we don't win.

I can't believe the people of this country want that to happen. It won't happen if citizens in all walks of life who believe in our system and who want to help make it work better than ever before will take a continuing interest in Government at all levels. As manufacturers, you well know that any quality product starts with quality materials. By the same token, good Government in America is the end product of good citizenship. Good citizenship begins here—in this room—with you.

That is the way I feel about it. And if you feel about it the way I do, believe me you are going to do something about it. And if you do, then I am very, very sure that we are going to win through to the greatest period of peace and happiness and prosperity that this Nation ever saw.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES H. DUFF

This is a magnificent audience and it is a great privilege to be here.

I would like to tell you of an experience I had at noon today at Independence Hall during a meeting on the Voice of Freedom. There was a young man there every one of you would have been pleased beyond measure to hear: Polish Lieutenant Jerecki, who had joined the Communist Party in Poland because he thought that was his best opportunity for service.

He happened to be the son of a Polish officer who had been executed when the Russians took over. Had they known that, he said, he would not have been trained for the air force in Russian Poland but would have been sent to Siberia.

Only 21 at the time, he became flight commander of a crack squadron of MIG's under Russian control in the land where his own government had been destroyed, where personal property had been confiscated, where the women had been violated, and where the people had been deprived of their civil and religious liberties.

He risked all for freedom, fleeing from behind the Iron Curtain so he could tell the people of America what it was like to be under the iron foot of communism.

As everyone here knows, and as he pointed out, the experience of Poland will be the experience of the world unless something is done about it.

I think that the challenge to our generation was never greater than it is today, with this country the sole roadblock between freedom and the overrunning of the world by the most vicious and evil and godless force that has ever attempted to conquer a country.

At such a time, we are favored beyond imagination in having as President one of the great diplomats of our time and one of the greatest soldiers in the history of America—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

And finally, as a Republican, believing in Republicanism and believing that the control of this Government by Republicans is necessary to keep it on the track and to guide our destinies in the most serious period of our history, I am confident that Dwight D. Eisenhower will again respond to the call of the people of this country and next year will be reelected President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN

It is an inspiration to come to this historic center of patriotism on the birthday anniversary of George Washington.

Here, in the city of William Penn, freedom of the individual took root and flourished for the first time in the world. Here American independence was proclaimed and the world's greatest charter of freedom, the Constitution of the United States, was framed and adopted.

With that great tradition in mind I would like to discuss briefly our duty to our country and the dangers we must overcome to preserve our sacred heritage of liberty and independence.

I have in mind also the great good that can be accomplished by the influence and example of the distinguished group of leaders in business and industry assembled here tonight.

The stability of our Government, the economic strength of the Nation, and the continuance of the American way of life depend upon men and women like you.

The Founding Fathers, meeting here in Philadelphia, erected a great landmark in world progress when they proclaimed that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are divine endowments bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe. They framed a new concept of self-government by free men.

Their plan embraced the fundamental proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. They established the principle that government has no power over the individual beyond that granted by the people themselves.

The knew from their profound study of history that great democracies of the past had failed because the moral fiber of the people had become undermined by greed and corruption. They knew that tyranny and dictatorship have always overwhelmed free people who ignored the sound principle that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people.

I would like to direct your attention to three great dangers that threaten America.

First. Big government and government doing things that we should do for ourselves.

The vast expansion in the size and cost of government at all levels is leading us away from the ideals of the Founding Fathers. The people are constantly demanding more and more services. Under that pressure Government has become involved in too many functions in which it does not properly belong. The result has always been excessive taxation and the steady flow of power from the hands of the people into centralized, bureaucratic authority and government control.

Second. Too much private and public debt. Too many of our people do not seem to be concerned with the ever increasing burden of debt which is growing bigger and bigger at a sickening rate.

Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today. It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us that the American people now owe a total of more than $600 billion, three times as much as the debt 15 years ago.

Twenty years ago, when we were fighting the worst depression we ever had, the Federal debt was less than $20 billion. Today it is $278 billion, an increase of $20 billion since the end of World War II.

The debts of State and local governments have increased 16 percent in one year alone, reaching a total of $38 billion on June 30, 1954.

If for any reason we should be forced into a decline—even a slight decline in business activity, jobs and income—this staggering burden of public and private debt could prove too much for our economy to sustain and could bring us to disaster.

Please bear in mind that more nations have been destroyed by debt and taxes than by invading armies.

Third. Too little interest in government. It is unfortunate that so many of our people have forgotten that taking part in government is a patriotic duty. We cannot expect clean and economical government unless we take a real part in it.

There will be disloyalty and communism in government unless the people really demand loyalty. Greed, corruption, and disloyalty can destroy the strongest nation.

We must know our Government. It was President Woodrow Wilson who said, and I quote:

"Freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their government."

Our people should be taught in schoolrooms, in our colleges, in union halls, and in business meetings, from the lecture platform, the pulpit, the legislative halls, and the courts, the difference between our republican form of government and the communistic system of Soviet Russia. The blessings of individual freedom and human dignity should be compared with the terror and tyranny under which millions of people are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain of godless communism.

We must emphasize that freedom of the individual as ordained by God is the firm foundation of our national strength. It is our responsibility to keep alive for future generations the freedoms and the opoprtunities that made the United States the greatest nation on earth.

It is a great honor to have as our guest the brilliant and forceful Senator from Illinois.

He is a great American statesman. He has deep patriotic and religious convictions. He knows and loves America. He is proud to be an American.

In World War I he enlisted as a private in the Army and was commissioned second lieutenant in the field. He served overseas for 17 months.

He came to the Senate after eight consecutive terms of outstanding service in the House.

It is an honor to present to this fine Pennsylvania audience the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

ADDRESS OF HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

I am delighted to be your guest and I trust you will settle yourselves comfortably in those comfortable chairs. I have just been advised that the train doesn't go until 11:20, so we have lots of time. [Laughter.]

I have come frequently to this great municipality and you have treated me with the utmost courtesy and hospitality, and on each recurring occasion I feel a good deal like the two Army Chaplains who were lost on the Western Front when I was a soldier in World War I. They had become detached from their respective military organizations and were floundering around in the mud and water of the shellholes in the darkness. After hours of fruitless wandering they heard a rich voice from an invalided friend say, "Who in the devil led the Ace of Spades?" They got up and embraced each other and said, "Thank goodness we are among Christians."

That is the way I feel when I come to your great commonwealth.

I want to say first of all that as I get around the country I find some confusion. I find some bewilderment in the minds of people and bewilderment and confusion so easily lead to frustration. And frustration in turn often develops a sense of misdirection. Frequently, then, we must get back to a solid orientation as citizens of the greatest Republic on earth.

When Lincoln was in the Legislature in Illinois long ago, they had a judge over across the way in Kentucky who had a fondness for corn liquor. He would sit on the bench all day and dispense equity and justice and puff on a pipe that never had any smoke curling from the bowl. But in the afternoon he was in what they call down in Kentucky a slightly mellow condition. That is where you fall on the ground and hold on to keep from rolling off.

It so happened that he had a rubber tube going from a bottle in his inside pocket up to his pipe. And that was the reason for his condition. He came out of the courthouse in the afternoon and threw the saddle on his horse and unfortunately he got the saddle on backward. A young lawyer observed it and he said, "Hey, Judge, you got the saddle on backward." And the Judge looked at him with that withering contempt that only our judicial friends know and said, "Well, how in the devil do you know in what direction I am going?"

THE CITADEL OF TRADITION

So we have got to have a sense of direction and know where we are going. And in an hour of misdirection and bewilderment there is no better place to go than the citadel of American tradition.

Now, that is a lovely mouth-filling word, but when all is said and done tradition is the great tapestry of America; it consists of individuals, great achievements and incidents, sweet things and little things and noble things.

Who can think of this country and not think of the Pilgrims, or the men who stood at Valley Forge, or Thomas Paine, or Samuel Adams, or Thomas Jefferson, or Abraham Lincoln? And all those other hallowed personalities who are a part of the cavalcade.

When we think of great events in the panorama, there come quickly to mind the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation.

When we think of great men, we think of George Washington.

In my judgment, there is nobody in the whole history of mankind whose record of achievement can even approximate that of Washington. That is not a statement out of a story book. I think it can be established. For if we look at Washington's 3 great accomplishments and then at the accomplishments of Caesar, Napoleon, Bismarck, and Alexander, we find that theirs do not begin to approximate Washington's quality, in dimension, and in durability.

First, we think of independence when we think of Washington. He was 43 when he assumed command. He had a great farm situated on many lovely acres of land. He could have commanded preferment from the King. He had a family. He could have lived in ease and luxury. Why did he assume the responsibility and the unquenchable devotion to independence when life could have been so lush and easy for him? He had a bickering and reluctant Congress that would not provide supplies and munitions and equipment. He had the knife of conspiracy in his back as he looked upon trusted officers who tried to displace him. He had to listen to criticism.

What a load he carried. What frustrations must have stricken his heart at times. But, with unfailing fidelity to the cause, he remained with it until the sword went back into the scabbard. And to Washington more than to any other individual we can ascribe the freedom which we as legatees and beneficiaries are privileged to enjoy in this, the one great free remaining country on God's footstool.

His second achievement came here in your great city. What an amazing convention it was that started in May of 1787. What an outstanding complexion it had. The youngest man was 33 and the oldest man was 81. Every kind of diverse temperament was represented there, and it was Washington's restraint, his wisdom, and his patience, his capacity to inject cooling periods that finally resulted in an organic document which is the oldest writen Constitution in the whole wide world.

His third achievement was to breathe life into a new government, the first great experiment in free government on the face of the earth. He gave it form. For 8 years his steady hand was upon the helm and guided it through those days when the British were still fomenting Indian uprisings, when there was much caustic criticism because we were not on the side of the French in their war with the British, and when there were many other problems.

A LEGACY AND A CHALLENGE

So Washington, by his wisdom and kindly counsel and by his firmness, gave this organism of government the life necessary to have it march from infancy into the sunlight and achieve a majesty unmatched in any time or generation.

Those were the accomplishments. But out of the accomplishments he left us an inheritance. He left us a problem. And he left us a challenge.

The problem in this feverish and tumultuous age is, can a country conceived in liberty endure? That is it. Very simple. Why, it seemed academic 20 years ago. People would scoff at the idea, then. I say to you tonight that in my considered judgment the endurance of this country is no longer an academic matter.

We must clarify that. I don't mean that it is going to disintegrate. Not even the mightiest cobalt bomb can do more than destroy a portion of the physical substance of this Republic. The mightiest bomb might smite and skill a few million people, but there will be others, scores of millions remaining. When I speak of survival and the endurance of the country, I am speaking of a concept. I am speaking of a mode of existence under which we are still free to pick and choose, under which we are still free to buy and sell, under which we are still free to reject or accept, under which people are the masters and not government, a mode of life that is a spiritual adventure and not merely a project. That is the thing that is in danger.

What are the dangers? At the very top of the list I would write socialism.

What is socialism? Control. Harold Laski, the late great British socialist, put it simply: "The essence is control, not ownership." And we had better remember that, because when government moves beyond the lines of reasonable regulation into the field of control, look out for the freedom of your country. You cannot have socialism and freedom in the same land.

I think the second danger is what I call a delusion of form. Isn't it astonishing that a President of the United States could seize the steel industry and get three Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to concur in that action? But the fact of the matter is that the due process clause is still in the Constitution.

Isn't it amazing that a Secretary of State should send a message to the Congress some years ago and say—and I quote him accurately—"Constitutional doctrine is molded largely by practical necessity. For example, the power of Congress to declare war has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance." The exclusive power to put this country into war has been vested in the Congress by the Constitution. The form is there, but carry out that doctrine by a Secretary of State and what happens to the substance of this document? You see, we may be deluded by the form while the substance is being torpedoed.

I ask you very simply, how long can this blessed freedom last under circumstances like that?

There are people who do not regard communism as a particular menace. Frankly, ladies and gentleman, I do.

Remember Lenin's premise of conquest: "First, we shall dominate eastern Europe. Then we shall dominate the masses of Asia. And then (and I quote Lenin accurately) we shall encircle the last bastion of capitalism in the United States, and, like overripe fruit, it will fall in the basket."

He has come pretty close to his timetable, with Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain and this brutal ideology moving in the Orient and elsewhere. And if it were not so, our warships and air carriers would not be in the Pacific tonight, and brains would not be furrowed, and brows would not be agitated at the dangers that are inherent.

Again we can be grateful to a President for firmness in this rather critical hour, because it is easier to drift into war than to go into it with your eyes open.

But let us not discount this force that has been moving across the world since 1917.

Malenkov, Khrushchev, and Bulganin are interested in only one thing, and that is to destroy the concept that has ennobled America and brought it to its present high state. There has been no retraction from that thesis. It is a grave danger.

THERE'S FISCAL DANGER, TOO

Senator MARTIN alluded to the fiscal danger. Nearly every country that actually lost its freedom went down the fiscal drain first. It is the hardest thing in the world to dramatize, and I am afraid we have gotten rather accustomed to a deficit situation. Your Government and mine has been in a deficit position for 23 years out of the last 26.

I think of a young man who filled out an application for an insurance policy. One of the questions was, "How old was your father when he died and of what did he die?" His father had been hanged. The son didn't like that. So he wrote, "My father was 65 when he died. He came to his end while participating in a public function when the platform gave way." [Laughter.] A wonderful way to say it—you disarm the severity of the circumstance.

So you speak about deficit financing. It means going in the hole. And when you go in the hole you toy with the inflationary fever that has destroyed so many countries. Oh, for the power of somebody or other to dramatize it and to bring home to people the necessity for the solvency of their Government under every circumstance, because when solvency goes out the window, it takes a frightful toll. It means that freedom goes out with it.

Let me allude to one other force, and that is indifference. There are 100 million potential voters in the United States. In November 1954—and mind you, I am not talking as a partisan—in November 1954 roughly 75 million were registered and qualified. How many voted on election day? Just a little fewer than 42 million. What happened to the other 33 million? They weren't interested enough.

The ballot is the symbol of freedom. And the way to lose freedom is not to use it.

Our hope of survival lies within ourselves and our hope of progress lies in preserving freedom.

I have said that on the 16th of July 1945, two ages were born when that bomb exploded in New Mexico. The atom age was born and the age of fear was born. But fear is a poor substitute for reason. And whenever it transcends reason there has been generated another force that can jeopardize and destroy the freedom of the country.

One thing will save freedom: when free men speak up, no matter what the sacrifice.

When the Apostle Paul was being prepared to be scourged, even though he had not yet been condemned, he said to the centurion: "How is it that I, a Roman citizen, uncondemned, could be scourged?"

Then the centurion asked: "Are you a Roman citizen?"

And Paul replied: "With a great sum I obtained this freedom."

This freedom that we enjoy is no academic thing. It came at a great price. Those men without shoes at Valley Forge, this man Washington, whose heart must have been broken at times by the frustrations that were attendant upon his task; this man Lincoln who could see 3,500 crosses from where he stood on the speakers' platform in Gettysburg in 1863—they are just a few of those who helped to pay the price for what we have. And as successor trustees in these long, endless generations of Americans we too must pay the price in proportion.

SPEAK OUT FOR FREEDOM

The spirit of freedom expects us to talk up so that we can be found, found in a critical hour of the history of our country.

When I was campaigning in Illinois in 1950, I heard of a man who went down to a pet shop and bought a parrot. The proprietor said, "This is a fine, healthy, smart bird; speaks eight languages." The man said, "I will take him." He paid $35 for the bird and cage and said, "Send him out to my house and be sure he is there when I get home from work tonight." And when he got home he bounded up the steps and the door opened and there was his beloved wife, Mary. He said, "Mary, did the bird come?"

She said, "Yes, he did."

"Where is he?"

"In the oven."

When the husband regained his composure he said, "In Heaven's name, woman, that was a smart bird and could speak eight languages."

And Mary said, "Well, why didn't he speak up?"

Speak up for freedom.

Honoring Our Mr. Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of paying a grand tribute to that grandest of men, our Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, last Saturday night, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson, spoke as follows:

STEVENSON'S SPEECH

We are here tonight to honor a man we all admire and love. For over 40 years SAM RAYBURN has embodied the ideals of the Democratic Party here in Washington, a period during which the Nation's history has been enriched by our party's creative and constructive contributions in adversity and prosperity, in war and peace.

The man we honor tonight came to Washington as a young Congressman in the time of Woodrow Wilson, a great Democratic President.

He first became Speaker of the House in the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, another great Democratic President.

All Americans who love freedom and justice joined this week in mourning on the tenth anniversary of the death of your great husband, Mrs. Roosevelt. And so they will as long as men care deeply about liberty and social progress.

Our guest of honor also served in the administration of another great Democratic President, Harry Truman.

Harry Truman proved again that the genius of American democracy is that it can produce plain citizens who, when the times demand, can scale the lonely heights of courage and vision.

PRAISES DEMOCRATIC FAITH

Probably the oldest political organization on earth is the Democratic Party of the United States. And it has survived the bitter tests of time and adversity because for the most part it has met the challenges of each new generation with boldness, imagination and faith in Government by consent of the people, all the people—a faith that stretches back to Thomas Jefferson; and that will stretch on into the shadowed future, so long as men continue to care about representative government and the freedom of the individual.

No one better understands and has fought more valiantly to vindicate our Democratic faith than our guest tonight. And I hope he would agree with me that the Democratic Party must stand for three basic things if it is to be true to itself.

The first is social progress. In our century the Democratic Party has led the way in domesticating the industrial revolution so that it has become an instrument, not of greed and exploitation, but of abundance for all. Although our opponents fought them every inch of the way, the great national reforms that commenced with Woodrow Wilson are now imperishable landmarks along the road to a society compounded of opportunity and responsibility.

The second thing we must stand for is civil freedom. With Jefferson, we as a party have sworn eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man. And we believe that a free society has no meaning if there is not equality of opportunity for all. We have not forsaken the old Jeffersonian Maxim: "Equal rights for all, special privileges for none."

CALLS PEACE "MOST URGENT"

Finally, we must stand for peace—which is the most urgent business of the 20th century, the hydrogen age. Woodrow Wilson gave his life blood to the fight for the League of Nations. Franklin Roosevelt spent his last energies planning for the United Nations. Both dared accept the horror of war to save the Nation worse horrors—but only in the conviction that out of the agony of war we could pluck a new resolve to win peace for all suffering mankind.

As I say, no one knows the meaning of the democratic faith in this century better than our beloved guest.

When President Wilson fought for the wise Government regulation of banking and industry and for the League of Nations, he was there.

When President Roosevelt led the Nation through the worst depression and the most terrible war of our history, he was there.

When President Truman called for the new social advance at home and rallied the free world against the menace of Communist aggression abroad, he was there.

And, Sam, we count on your being there for a good long time to come.

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, he is here—the Speaker of the House of Representatives—the Honorable SAM RAYBURN of Texas.

Atomic Power Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, during the recent atomic tests conducted in southern Nevada, dozens of our colleagues traveled to my State to learn firsthand the amazing achievements of our nuclear scientists in the field of warfare. I know they discovered that Ne-

vadans are proud of the substantial contribution our State has made to national defense through these tests.

It is also true that many Nevadans feel somewhat of a proprietary interest in the fields of fission and fusion because of their proximity to the famous testing grounds at Yucca Flat. This familiarity with the force of the unleashed atom has also given rise to another feeling in my State—a realization of the tremendous potential of nuclear energy in the field of industry.

I wish at this time to include in the RECORD a very excellent editorial from the Las Vegas Sun which gives clear expression to this growing belief of many people to whom the flash and the sound of the exploding atom are a common experience, this growing belief that the peacetime, commercial development of atomic energy holds great promise for us all:

ATOMIC POWER HERE?

It was recently announced that the Atomic Energy Commission has given the go-ahead to locate the first nuclear powerplant in New York. We wonder if southern Nevada officials have considered applying for such an installation here.

There is no question about the impact of a source of limitless power on future industrial development of this area.

It remains to be seen what advantages Clark County might have economically and geographically that would make location of an atomic powerplant here a natural. We think there are some good arguing points for any campaign to bring atomic power here, if anyone is interested in campaigning.

The first consideration is the location of a powerplant, we believe, is the creation of healthy industry where there was none before, and the alleviation of a power shortage in highly industrialized areas. Southern Nevada is in the unique position to be supplying power to the heavy industries of metropolitan Los Angeles—and not enough at that—while being in the critical position of having to discourage industry because of a shortage of electric power here.

The Southern Nevada Power Co. no sooner started construction on its Whitney steam turbine plant than it announced plans to build a second unit to take care of a backlog of industrial power applications which it will not be able to handle until at least 1957.

Transmission lines from an atomic plant could supply electric lights and operate manufacturing concerns throughout southern Utah, Arizona, and southern California. Much of the desert wasteland which at present is good only for scenery could be converted to manufacturing use.

The Nation's economic planners have been following a policy of industrial decentralization since before World War II. Southern California particularly has felt the effects of this decentralization.

If there is to be industrial expansion in the continental limits of the United States, the planners have indicated, it would be better to move westward to more sparsely populated areas.

Nevada has the smallest population per square mile of any State.

Conditions of climate, cheap land (much of it owned by the Government), easy access by motor, rail and air transport and a nearby labor force—in southern California—are potent factors to consider by the persons selecting a site for a nuclear powerplant. They are likewise important items for major industrial concerns to consider.

Hazards of Carrying Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with the postal pay-increase bill about ready for House action, it is appropriate to call attention to the following article which appeared in the April 1954 issue of the Postal Record, official organ of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

HAZARDS OF CARRYING MAIL—FACTS PROVE THAT IT'S A TOUGH JOB

During the hearing before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, President William C. Doherty made the statement that carrying mail was the most hazardous job in the Government service. Congressman MURRAY of Tennessee challenged the statement and inquired as to whether or not it was more hazardous than the FBI. President Doherty declared that without a doubt it was, and statistics completely bear out this statement.

In the year 1952, the number of fatal chargeable cases recorded by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation were 14 in the Post Office Department—5 were from the carrier-special delivery messenger group, and 4 were in the rural mail service. In the Department of Justice, there were 3 fatal cases—1 in the United States marshal's office, 1 in the FBI, and 1 in the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In the Treasury Department, there were 2 deaths in 1952—1 in the Comptroller of Currency Office; and 1 in the Secret Service. There were none in the Bureau of Narcotics.

The Bureau of Employees' Compensation publishes a study of casualty statistics. This report shows the frequency which represents the number of disabling injuries per million man-hours, and also the severity which measures the number of days lost per thousand man-hours. The frequency for the entire Federal service is 8. The infrequency in the case of the Department of Justice is 4.3. In the Post Office Department it is 12.8. However, the frequency rate in the case of carriers is 22.1, compared to 2.7 for the FBI. In other words, the frequency of injury in the case of carriers is 8 times greater than the FBI and almost 3 times greater than the average for all Federal employees.

The severity rate for the FBI is .33, while for carriers it is .54.

Carriers compelled to carry mail in all types of weather and under all street hazards have an increasingly difficult job. Fry & Associates have never been confronted with the task of descending 20 steps covered with ice, handicapped by a load of heavy mail; they have never been faced with the necessity of crossing and recrossing heavily traveled highways burdened with a load of mail. Perhaps they have never been soaked to the skin by an icy cold rain, and compelled to remain out in it for hours; neither have they been compelled to keep a load of mail under control in a driving windstorm or to plow hip deep through newly fallen snow, in the meantime keeping their sense alert to maintain accurate delivery. There is no job as exacting as that of carrying mail, there is no job that demands and extracts more physical and mental energy. There is no job that is more closely supervised than that of letter carriers.

WHAT PRICE A STRAINED HEART?

It does seem strange that a Department as efficient as the Post Office hasn't got some way of dealing with peak loads at the letter-carrier level.

Take for instance Thursday of this week. The letter carrier who regularly carries the Tower Hill Street route arrives with the day's mail at our house box around 12 o'clock. Just above our house on Tower Hill Street is the supply box for our section.

Thursday, when he hadn't arrived at 1:10 p. m., we figured he must have been sandbagged and on our way back to work we backtracked on the route we knew he traveled. Sure enough there he was on his knees before the post office supply box just outside the schoolhouse corner of Oregon Avenue, Doyle Street, etc. He had filled his bag again and then some but there was still another bagful in the supply box.

We drove up behind him. He told us cheerfully that he had already delivered 3 bags full of mail, now he had 2 bags full at this supply box; that there were 2 more split loads at the supply-box corner of Tower Hill and Pearl Streets, and still another bagfull at another supply box toward the end of his route.

When we inquired how he was going to deliver all this mail in 1 day he shrugged his shoulders and smiled. We asked what arrangements were made when an overload like that had to be delivered—couldn't he get some help w ith maybe half of his route. He smiled again, resignedly, telling us there isn't any money for extra help.

The Honorable John E. Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks regarding the passing of our late colleague, John E. Nelson, of Maine, I hereby express my sympathy to his distinguished son, our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES P. NELSON, of Maine, and to the members of his family.

John E. Nelson was a Member of this House when I first came to Congress to serve. During the time I was here he was considered by his colleagues to be an extremely able Member of Congress. Always he had time to help a colleague in his work and to offer helpful suggestions in regard to difficult matters. John Nelson was a great friend in the truest sense of friendship.

A deeply patriotic American, John Nelson was that type of individual whose word was his bond, who was completely dependable, who was always honest and fair above all with his colleagues and fellow men.

During the decade he served in this Congress, from 1922 to 1932, John Nelson etched his name in the distinguished history of this country. His decisions on the great issues of that period disclose his wisdom and his loyalty and his

feeling toward the welfare of Americans throughout the country.

In the early days of my service here in this House John Nelson gave me many helpful suggestions and helped me greatly in my committee assignments and in the parliamentary work of the Congress. His unselfish interest in helping others will stand forever to his credit. He was one of the very distinguished gentlemen who have helped down through the years to make this House the greatest representative parliament of the people in any country in the world.

John Nelson was my colleague and was my friend. With his thousands of friends in his home State of Maine and the thousands all over America, I join in mourning his passing. His gentle qualities, his great ability, and his fine character will be forever enshrined in the history of the House of Representatives here in Washington and in the history of his country.

As the Dust Begins To Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, an emergency situation has arisen in the southern Great Plains region where it appears that a vast new dust bowl is being created.

As the Government embarks on an emergency program to ameliorate this situation, it would perhaps be worthwhile to reflect that these conditions were created in part by an earlier emergency program.

In this connection, the following editorial which appeared in the Deseret News under date of March 29, 1955, is worth of serious consideration:

AS THE DUST BEGINS TO BLOW

The farm-State controlled House Agriculture Committee issued another of its blasts against flexible farm price supports late last week. Even as it did, ominous winds were beginning to rise in the southern Great Plains. And with the winds came fears of a tragedy made eminent, in part at least, by the very price program the farm bloc is trying to go back to.

Last year's spring winds started the creation of a vast new dustbowl stretching across western Texas, eastern New Mexico, western Oklahoma, western Kansas, eastern Colorado, southwestern Nebraska, and southeastern Wyoming. The most widespread and severe soil blowing since 1938 occurred in that area last spring.

This spring it could be worse. Fairly general precipitation has prevented too much damage so far. But more soil is exposed to wind erosion this spring than last and unless mild winds and considerable moisture continue through April, there will be serious trouble.

The Soil Conservation Service has reported that about 4 million acres were damaged by winds during December and another 2 million acres early in March. SCS reports from the affected area earlier this month indicate that more than 18 million acres are "in condition to blow."

What has caused all this? There are several factors. The Department of Agriculture mentions failure to leave crop residues on the ground to bind the soil, clearing land by burning, shallow tillage, heavy grazing, failure to check water runoff.

But the number one reason listed is use of unsuitable lands for cultivation.

Here's what that means, as related to one crop specifically: Between 1940 and 1953, wheat acreage increased by 27 percent in the United States. That might have been expected. But where was it increased? Not so much in the natural wheat-growing sections, but mainly in marginal lands and to a large extent in the area that is now fast becoming the new dustbowl. Wheat acreage in Colorado, for example, increased by 163 percent, the highest in the Nation, and almost entirely in the dustbowl area.

Why? Because high, mandatory support prices of wheat made it possible for almost anyone to produce at a profit even on ground not well suited to raising wheat. So millions of acres of grasslands went under the plow. Profits rolled in, surplus wheat piled up in Government-rented elevators and mothballed ships, and now, in a dry cycle, the dust is blowing.

Emergency measures must be and will be taken, of course. Soil is too valuable a resource to be wasted. Soil conservation agents have been hard at work with farmers preparing emergency programs. The President has asked $7 million for emergency tillage and this appropriation is expected in the near future.

But is that the real answer? It is a poor physician indeed who treats only the symptom and lets the cause go unchecked. Thanks to Congress' courage last year, this year's crops are the first planted in years without the stimulus of high rigid supports bringing more and more marginal acres under the plow. That is the beginning of a basic cure.

Yet Congress, like the alcoholic who knows that a drink will ruin him but hasn't the will power to resist, is under pressure to go back to the program that helped ruin this land. America expects better judgment and stronger willpower than that.

Housing for Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith my address before the Armstrong Association of Philadelphia in that city on January 13, 1955, on the subject Housing for Everybody:

Dr. Butterweck, Mrs. Montgomery, Mrs. Hill, members and friends of Armstrong Association of Philadelphia, coming from one of your neighboring cities, I welcome the opportunity to visit with you here. This City of Brotherly Love is an appropriate place to discuss your conference theme, Good Housing for Everybody.

Some of us have been striving for this objective for many years. For 10 years I served as a member of the Reading Housing Authority. Long before, I was one of those who helped fight the battle against those elements which see public housing and every other social advance as a threat to our way of life and our basic freedoms.

I am concerned, and I know you are, too, about decent homes for the people of our respective communities. But we are also interested, as you propose in "good housing for everybody," in Reading, in Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania and for all American citizens wherever they may live, and whoever they may be. To strive for decent homes for all of our people is a way to strengthen our way of life and our basic freedoms. It is where homes are dark, damp, and dreary, where there is poverty and injustice, that the seeds of communism take root. The fight against communism and all brands of totalitarian tyranny can be won by striking at the root of these evils. Communism breeds on the lack of education and employment opportunities, on discrimination, and in slum areas. Some of the most vocal opponents against communism unconsciously promote the Communist cause when they seek to block public housing programs and other social welfare measures.

Opponents of public housing often profess an interest in other housing programs. Most anything but what we should have. Their interest is primarily in how much they can exploit home building. They are looking at the dollar sign rather than at the social problem. I am sure you have some good examples here of windfall housing profits and discrimination that is both racial and political.

You are fortunate in the city of Philadelphia to have a mayor who is sincerely interested in housing for everybody. I have a high regard for your mayor, Joseph Clark. He is a great humanitarian, a practical idealist and a man of strong character and integrity. He is a true friend of public housing and a foe of discrimination, corruption and injustice. As a Pennsylvania Democrat I am proud of him. Having a good mayor does not mean that your problem of good housing for everybody will be readily solved. Indeed there are powerful forces here and throughout the Nation who have, from the start, bitterly opposed the public housing program which did so much to lift this Nation from the distress it suffered in the early 1930's. I can remember in my own community, the shantytowns on the dumps on the banks of the Schuykill River. I can also remember the opponents of public housing at that time who tried to block public housing. They saw the end of freedom and the beginning of regimented slavery with the development of public housing projects which were proposed. But despite such opposition, progress has been made throughout the Nation. Over 8 million new homes have been constructed in the United States since the end of World War II. It is far from adequate, but is a great step forward. All the while the foes of public housing never quit in their blind opposition. Today that opposition presents their own program which in many respects is phony or which is designed to benefit only the real estate and financial interests and speculators.

The problem of homes for everybody naturally involves such questions as finances, the selection of good sites for new homes, and the matter of how to take care of the uprooted families when slum areas are cleared Always associated with the housing problem in a big city is the question of discrimination against Negroes and minority groups. So your task to win good housing for everybody is no easy one and you are to be commended for your noble efforts. To achieve the goal for which you strive it is necessary to have good organization. With aggressive leadership, inspired by humanitarian ideals and possessing vision and good sense, you may effectively push your program to a successful conclusion. You will na-

turally find many good citizens who will support your efforts, and other organizations who are equally concerned about the housing problem.

The total supply of housing in our country has been increased, not as much as some would desire, but certainly more than the number which would have been built if the Federal Government under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman had not established a vigorous Federal housing program. We have made long strides therefore, toward the goal established by the Congress that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage.

And, the Supreme Court by its decisions in the covenant cases made possible a more equitable distribution of the increased supply of good housing which exists in this Nation.

The opening of the 84th Congress last week gives us an opportunity once again to review the existing supply of tools in the housing field to see if it may not be possible to make this sharing of good housing more general, or as your conference theme puts it, for everybody.

You who believe in good housing for everybody are well represented in the House of Representatives in the Congress. I speak particularly of the five Democratic colleagues. You never need worry. My good friend, Congressman EARL CHUDOFF, claims that he has more public housing in his district than any other in Pennsylvania. He has frequently boasted of the Raymond Rosen Apartments and a few others of which he rightfully feels very proud.

Those of you who have made a study of the tools which are available now in housing must realize how complex this field of housing is. We in Congress must keep in mind the wide variety of programs which have been written into the statute books. Recently we heard of the successful termination of one of these efforts when the Home Owners Loan Corporation was finally liquidated.

Another organization, the FHA, has been much in the news this past year. Those of you who are interested in slum clearance are aware of the existence of the Urban Renewal Administration. Last year 400,000 homes were built in this country through loans partially guaranteed by the Home Loan Guaranty Division of the Veterans' Administration. One million homeowners secured mortgages through the activities of savings and loan associations which operate under the auspices of the home loan bank.

I shall not take time to mention all of the activities of the Federal Government in this field because I am sure that you have here in the State of Pennsylvania similar group of agencies from the State Housing Board, coming down through your local housing coordinator and the activities of many citizens groups including Mrs. Montgomery's Philadelphia Housing Association.

The 1950 census of housing showed the Congress the size of the housing job lies ahead and it became clear to everyone in the housing field that it would require an increase in total housing production if we were to make a realistic impact on the problem. Those associated with the conservative judgments in the real estate industry had annually predicted the volume of housing to be constructed based exclusively on family formation. As a result the predictions of construction were wide off the actual number produced and sold each year in the housing market. The difference between the rate of construction and the prediction was so great that recently leading industry economists have been forced into public admission that the formation of additional families cannot be the sole basis for judging requirements of the market in this vital field.

If the real estate industry's approach had been accurate it would have meant that those who lived in the slums, those who were doubled up, were condemned to such continued existence. But happily the market does not respond alone to such narrow considerations as family formation and production in 1950 approximated 1,400,000 and has averaged 1,100,000 since. This coming year the industry predicts 1,200,000, the same as 1954, even though competent students urge a higher level of construction not only to house the expanding population and replace the overaged buildings in our national supply but the level of adequate housing necessary to achieve "the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family," as established by the Declaration of National Housing Policy by Public Law 171 of the 81st Congress.

I believe that to achieve this objective we must set an annual goal of at least 2 million new homes a year. Even the National Association of Home Builders set their goal recently at 2 million homes a year for the next decade. Their goal, unfortunately, was based on rebuilding old as well as new homes.

The National Housing Conference, estimating replacement of the existing supply of substandard homes over a 20-year period, set the goal of just a little over 2 million homes a year—a figure advocated by the CIO in 1952. The CIO urged a minimum annual rate of production of (a) 850,000 for family and population growth; (b) 750,000 for slum elimination; and (c) 400,000 to replace outworn homes in the existing market.

The administration's proposal of 35,000 homes annually is disgracefully inadequate, and some of his administration leaders even rebel at his inadequate program.

The diehard opponents to public housing in the Congress have a philosophy which becomes apparent every time any important social and economic issues come before the Congress. They see red when any sort of improvement is suggested in the fields of housing, education, social security, and other welfare measures.

Since 1952 the organizations who represent conservative influence in the homebuilding industry, particularly the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, headed by William A. Clarke, of Philadelphia, have advocated emphasis on the old housing, that is, rehabilitation of the old housing, rather than construction of new housing.

Mr. Clarke described his performance in an appearance before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. In testifying on "Middle Income Housing," he said: "We worked out an arrangement with the Redevelopment Authority of the city of Philadelphia in which they are condemning one block in that area." Later he said: "They will turn that over to us and what they turn over to us is a block of houses that were built about the time of the Civil War. These are semidetached, still in good fundamental condition, but now in very bad shape otherwise."

The New York Times reported: "The Quakers have no permanent financial stake in their housing project. But they have spent some $60,000 which they plan to absorb as the cost of pioneering."

Even if this project was working out financially, and there is no public evidence to that effect, after 5 years it is far from completed and don't forget this was only a block. During this long period another project was started and is well on its way to completion in Bucks County.

Here great strides have been made in increasing the total supply of housing while making backward strides in the distribution. In December 1950, 10 months after Mr. Clarke revealed his plans which had been several years under formulation, the United States Steel Corp. announced construction of a $400 million plant on the Delaware River. Then other enterprising organizations announced similar developments. Then, in the spring of 1951 Mr. William Levitt turned the full resources of his organization to work to secure passage of the Defense Housing Act. In June he issued a booklet entitled "Defense Housing" with a change in the old slogan from "There ought to be a law" to "There must be a law," the defense housing law, which he helped ballyhoo through the Congress to make it possible for him to build Levittown. On July 28 he announced the purchase of 2,000 acres of land for Bucks County.

In the face of every effort Mr. Levitt and his colleagues have succeeded in establishing a new kind of segregated community as a neighbor to this City of Brotherly Love.

Recently the Congress investigated the operations of the FHA. During the course of this investigation it became clear that the success of Mr. Levitt's operation was due to the existence of a Government insured mortgage system known as the FHA. In a similar project on Long Island, Mr. Levitt secured FHA insurance for 4,028 houses, of approximately $29 million. In the Bucks County project he announced his intention to build 16,000 units.

After the houses were built and the bank loan had been repaid, and all debts had been paid, Mr. Levitt's company retained over $5 million cash in the bank. This kind of windfall profit would not have been possible without the FHA.

In the normal course of the construction business Mr. Levitt would have had no windfall; he would have even had to make some slight investment in the construction of 4,028 houses. If Mr. Levitt is such a substantial beneficiary of this Federal housing program enacted by the Congress to secure "good housing for everybody" it seems to me that the FHA should be so administered that its benefits should flow to everybody.

When the FHA appeared before the Appropriations Committee last year, Congressman YATES sought to find out whether or not the FHA was so administered. He asked, "How many units of nonwhite housing has FHA approved for mortgages this year?"

It is no wonder that there is increasing request for the Government to refuse to use its powers as insurer of mortgages for lenders or builders who refuse to make sales or to rent to any group in our population. The solution lies not alone in increasing the production of housing. While I join with those organizations who call for an increasing supply, I shall urge my colleagues in the Congress to give the most careful attention to proposals to secure a more equitable administration of the FHA, the Veterans' Administration home loan guaranties and other segments of the Federal housing program. It may well be that the time has come in the review of the administration of the National Housing Act under which FHA operates, that the Congress declare that "no FHA insurance be granted where occupancy is denied to persons because of race, creed, or national origin."

Here in the Philadelphia area, as well as in many other communities throughout the United States, can be found those examples which prove the necessity of early action by the Congress in this vital matter which may determine whether our standing in the eyes of the world will be based upon performance as well as promise.

Your help and the help of all friends of housing for everybody is needed if we can hope for a forward looking program from this Congress.

Your work is more than a great contribution to the Negro people. It is a service to your entire city. It is a service to your entire city, to the cause of human decency and democracy, and to a better America and a more peaceful world.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....The Capitol Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Buchanan, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Davidson, Bell, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, ———, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Cheif, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Fine, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Machrowicz, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Machrowicz, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Dingell, Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Harold M. Stephens, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 4-6420
	Circuit Judges	
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee, 3550 Springland Lane.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, 1500 Massachusetts Ave.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 1868 Columbia Road.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Washington, 4912 Brookway Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge---------- Robert E. Quinn
Judge---------- George W. Latimer
Judge---------- Paul W. Brosman
Commissioner---------- Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk---------- Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*__2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*_____
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____3251 Q St.
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*__3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*____
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Granahan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3063 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____The Coronet

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—3130 Wisconsin Ave.
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*—3250 T St. SE.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4420 Dexter St.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4634–B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—The Dorchester
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—726 So. Royal St., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—The Senate Courts
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison ..., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—3202 So. Stafford St., Arlington, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Internal Security and Constitutional Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address recently delivered by my able colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], before the Chicago Law Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LAWYER LOOKS AT INTERNAL SECURITY AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(Address by Senator HENNINGS)

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you tonight—to submit for your consideration some legal and political questions in matters that are increasingly on my mind, and I know upon yours, as citizens and as lawyers.

For a long time now I have been troubled by the unmistakable fact that civil rights—which are the cornerstone of our national life—are under attack and in danger of abridgement. And I am sure the uneasiness I feel is not just the result of vague impressions. Unfortunately, it is based on facts some of which I shall mention later on in the course of my remarks.

Yet, before I turn to the matter at hand, may I say, that I come before you in order to formulate questions rather than to offer conclusions. And I also come with a request that you, as distinguished members of the bar, should help our country find the answers that will preserve our civil liberties.

I believe we all agree that the erosion of civil rights, if true, is a paramount question of our political life and spells dangers of unforeseeable gravity. History, however, teaches us that civil rights are seldom lost solely by conscious deliberate action. More often than not the loss is, in great part, the result of an absent-minded, unconscious drift. When the citizens do not see the threat and when constituted legislative, executive, and judicial authorities do not realize the consequences of their acts, civil liberties are in danger of loss by default. As I see it, the trend that is now taking place in our country is just of this nature. There is, of course, no suggestion of repealing the Bill of Rights, but steadily, in unrealized stages, the rights guaranteed by the bill are invated and in danger of becoming nugatory.

The birth of our Nation was a momentous fact in the development of mankind. An entirely new state entered the community of nations. Economically, politically, and legally it had not precedent. Economically it was free of the restraining shackles of feudal economy—a land where property was held in free and common socage and where there was unhampered internal trade and freedom of occupation for its citizens, with equal opportunity for all. Politically and legally it was a country with a written constitution that embodied the experiences of a protracted fight against inherited privilege and tyranny. This Constitution happily united practical considerations with deep theoretical insights. The student of our past is impressed by its closeness to political and social realities of American life. At the same time, the sociologist and the legal scholar realize how closely it materialized the theoretical formulations of Montesquieu on the separation of powers. These, may I say, "Un-American" ideas born in old Europe became not only an integral part of our political life but found in our country their first, true and only application. Now new and how revolutionary all this had been becomes particularly clear when, for the sake of comparison, we look at the other parts of the American and European Continents at that time.

The Constitution formulated by the Founding Fathers is philosophically a complex document. It is at once optimistic and trustful—and pessimistic, skeptical, and suspicious. It is a supreme expression of the mistrust in political power; it splits the governmental authority into its component executive, legislative, and judicial parts, and it enumerates its powers. On the other hand, it is an equally strong expression of a supreme trust in man as the source of cultural and political activity—the spiritual substance of all life.

We often recall and frequently mention that our Constitution is based on the principle of checks and balances in government. I am impressed by the further thought, however, that the principle of checks and balances permeates not only the governmental structure of our country. I am afraid we often forget that the framers of the Constitution knew that this principle lies at the root of societal life itself. They have visualized our country as a social construct where the freedom of the people as a whole and that of the individual are balanced against the state and its coercive powers. Neither the people nor the state has the upper hand. This relationship, however, is not coincidental or artificial. It is founded on the recognition that man, in his rights and freedoms, is secure only within the framework of society—the state.

The creative activity of man prospers best in conditions of security and peace of mind. Any invasion of human rights has a deliterious effect on the cultural and economic success of human endeavor and is justified, of course, only when the exercise of individual rights, in its turn, invades the concurrent rights of others.

The trust in the free activity of man and the care of safeguarding it faces us in all the basic provisions of the Constitution. I have mentioned the splitting of governmental powers as a proof of this trust. The right to vote does not even require mention. More in point, is the injunction against the passage of bill of attainder—the legislative means by which the English parliament used to punish dissidents without trial and under accusations having no basis in the criminal law of the land. Article 1, section 9, clause 3 of our Constitution enjoins the Federal legislature from passing such bills and article 1, section 10, clause 1 extends this injunction to State legislatiures. It is clear from these injunctions that we have here a fundamental provision prefiguring the Bill of Rights.

In this connection I want to mention that the opponents of the first 10 amendments in the first Congress based their opposition not on any objections to the rights to be secured but on the idea that these rights were already secured by the Constitution itself. But Jefferson and his followers carried the day and the Bill of Rights was adopted as an explicit statement of faith in individual freedom.

This faith, I dare say, never faltered. And the adoption of the 13th and 14th amendments was its forceful reaffirmation in the 19th century.

All these provisions, if observed, consitute a mighty bulwark which securely protects the individual against government interference as well as against invasions on the part of fellow citizens.

We know that legal propositions are not disjoined statements but constitute a contextual entity. Only within their context are they truly interpretable. Only by the token of this context do they find their proper place within the entire structure and exhibit their relative values. When from this point of view we look now at the Bill of Rights, I am inclined to believe, that the first amendment stands out as the cornerstone of the entire protective edifice. It is this amendment which, in protecting the freedom of his thought, of his beliefs, and of his speech, secures man in the exercise of those gifts which distinguish him from animals.

The language of the first amendment is unequivocal and all-embracing. It is a truly revolutionary declaration that democracy as established by our Constitution is alien to the idea of orthodoxy as a test of human rights. Therefore, no matter how unorthodox or unpopular the opinions held by the individual, he must be protected from persecution both on the part of governmental agencies and on the part of other individuals. And that is why I believe that second in importance stands out the due process clause of the 5th and the 14th amendments.

These remarks, I hope, truthfully describe the nature of American democracy and represent views traditionally held. We discern them at the cradle of our Constitution * * * And in this connection, permit me to qoute to you from the Virginia Statute on Religious Freedom, written by Thomas Jefferson and regarded by him as his greatest achievement next to the Declaration of Independence.

The statute enunciates these propositions: "that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy * * * because he being of course judge of that tendency will make his opinions the rule of judgment and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human interposi-

tion disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them."

Now how does our 20th century practice square with our political-democratic tradition? Do we adhere to the precept that opinions and beliefs are within the sovereign domain of man as the builder of cultural values and that the State should intervene only when opinions and beliefs pass into overt acts in contravention of constitutional procedures? Or do we say, "We have changed all that," as the fake doctor in Moliere did when it was pointed out to him that traditionally the heart is on the left and the liver on the right side, and not vice versa?

Certain facts make me doubtful as to the answer.

The Smith Act, for instance, makes it a crime to teach and advocate (please note these words)—no matter how abstractly and philosophically—any ideas of overthrowing the constituted Government by force and violence. The wording of the statute seems, on the face of it, to contradict the first amendment and I am not convinced that the decision of the Supreme Court with its negative answer settles this question. *Dennis* v. *United States*, 341 U. S. 494). The decision was not unanimous and we know that dissenting opinions have in more than one instance become the law of the future.

It would be well for us to keep in mind the prophetic words of Mr. Justice Black in his dissenting opinion in the Dennis case. He said: "Public opinion being what it now is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners. There is hope, however, that in calmer times, when present pressures, passions, and fears subside, this or some later court will restore the first amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society."

It would also be well for us to recall that Jefferson on his accession to the Presidency in the exercise of his Presidential powers pardoned all persons convicted under the Alien and Sedition Acts and thereby in effect invalidated these laws as they applied to to those convicted. Jefferson, in a letter he wrote to Mrs. John Adams in 1804, explained the basis for his action in granting these wholesale pardons. In his letter he said: "I do not know who was the particular wretch alluded to, but I discharged every person under punishment or prosecution under the sedition law, because I considered, and now consider, that law to be a nullity, as absolute and as palatable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image, and that it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage, as it would have been to have rescued from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image. It was, accordingly, done in every instance, without asking what the offenders had done, or against whom they had offended, but whether the pains they were suffering were inflicted under the pretended sedition law."

If Jefferson were alive today he would be a determined and bitter opponent of communism and the Communist Party and he would do all in his power to wipe out espionage and treason, whether practiced by domestic Communists or others. We may also be sure, however, that he would insist on acting against Communists in conformity with the Bill of Rights and its historic principles.

In addition to the Smith Act we have the Internal Security Act of 1950 aimed at registering and branding Communists and members of various ill-defined organizations solely on the ground that the mere holding of certain ideas deprives such persons of first class citizenship. I will be frank with you that this legislation aroused in me grave doubts as to its constitutional validity. I found it alarming that there should be a statute in the United States which would deprive individuals of their rights without due process of law, and limit, in such drastic manner, the right to hold opinions. For this reason, last year I voted to outlaw the Communist Party. Only in this way, some of us thought, could an abnormal situation be clarified, a situation in which we heretofore claimed that it was legal for people to hold Communist ideas and belong to the Communist Party and nevertheless forced such people to register, ostracized them, starved them economically, and yet refused to give them a trial in a court of law. I thought that if we do these things, we must do them honestly. If Communists are to be stripped of full citizenship, let us do so directly by a law making it illegal to be one. Then we can bring them to trial and they can test in the courts the constitutionality of our action. We owe this to our Constitution and to our democratic tradition.

The third example I would like to submit is the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act regarding the anti-Communist oath. In passing on its constitutionality, Justice Vinson, speaking for the majority of the Court, said: "The Government's interest here is not in preventing the dissemination of Communist doctrine or the holding of past beliefs because it is feared that unlawful action will result therefrom if free speech is practiced. Its interest is in protecting the free flow of commerce from what Congress considers to be substantial evils of conduct. Section 9 (h), the anti-Communist oath provision does not interfere with speech because Congress fears the consequence of speech; it regulates harmful conduct which Congress has determined is carried on by persons who may be identified by their political affiliations and beliefs."

I am not unaware that the commerce clause of the Constitution played an important part in the determinations of the Supreme Court. And I am far from criticizing this trend of our law. Yet we must not forget that the Court itself, speaking through some of its members, on occasions expressed doubts as to the desirability and interpretative fruitfulness of overworking the commerce clause. I refer to the forceful concurring opinions of Justices Douglas and Jackson in *Edwards* v. *California* (314 U. S. 160). This was a case dealing with a California statute restricting the entry of indigent citizens of other States into California. The majority of the Court invalidated the statute as a restriction of interstate commerce, while the minority, concurring in the result, strongly urged a decision on the basis of the immunities and privileges clause of the 14th amendment. Thus Justice Douglas said: "But I am of the opinion that the right of persons to move freely from State to State occupies a more protected position in our constitutional system than does the movement of cattle, fruit, steel, and coal across State lines."

I think the reference here to the relative constitutional depth of the two provisions is significant and should, I feel, never be lost sight of. Yet in this case there was no contradiction betweenthe alternative grounds of the decision. In the quoted opinion of Justice Vinson, however, such contradiction not only exists, but it is even explicitly admitted. Are we not justified then in insisting that the validity of the oath provision be tested in the light of the first amendment—the soul of the Bill of Rights? The right of Congress to legislate in a particular field can be justified on the basis of any applicable constitutional provision, but can Federal legislation be considered valid when its substance violates a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution?

Of course we know that all this raises difficult questions—perhaps questions which go to the very root of our entire cultural and political life. They are difficult not only objectively but also subjectively. For my part I decidedly disagree with communism—its doctrines and its practices. I should say more: I abhor them. It requires a great effort on my part to discuss anticommunist legislation in terms of the democratic philosophy to which we adhere by tradition and by conviction. But the inner ideological core of our Constitution is involved and the faith in that type of world which lies at its foundation.

For us Americans the Constitution of the United States is not a passing document. It is the embodiment of our existence. Like any embodiment it is inseparable from the things it embodies. Our adherence to its provisions is not a half-hearted acceptance. It is a belief—an unshakable belief—in its wisdom. Once it was a prophecy and our history has shown that it came true. For these reasons, I feel, it is the essence of our life's task to live up to the precepts of our Constitution. And even when we think of amending it, we must beware lest we destroy that pessimistic-optimistic spirit which I mentioned in the beginning. We should shun amendments that would impair this spirit. I am convinced for instance that the Bricker amendment would do just this.

The way of life that the Constitution helped to create made our country, in the words of our anthem, "the land of the free and the home of the brave." And you will understand that, considering the way I feel, it would be insufferable to me to think of defending our Constitution by unconstitutional or even constitutionally doubtful means.

Now, I fully realize the stresses and trials of the tense international situation where the issue of communism plays such an important part. I know the temptations and I understand how the fainthearted feel, but our faith must be stronger than any doubts. And may we pray in the words of the Lord's Prayer: "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." Let us remember that the Constitution is a living thing tested in the vicissitudes of history and let us not forget that doctrines come and go but that the Constitution is and must be always with us.

When I survey the program of our anti-Communist legislation, I am not convinced that it is always in accord with the principles and beliefs just expressed. In part, I regret to say, it is the result of doubts in the soundness of our social organization and in part it must be ascribed to dullness of mind and preference for conformity where initiative is required.

Recently the papers reported that there was a question whether a piano tuner who invoked the fifth amendment in declining to answer whether he was a Communist should be licensed. As I understand it, he was finally given a license, but consider what the raising of such question implies? Assuming that he was actually a Communist, how can the tuning of pianos by a Communist endanger our security? Is it not a clear case of persecution for holding unpopular views, a position inconsistent with the first amendment? This case, to be sure, was favorably resolved. But we know that similar cases arise constantly. Would you not say that we tread here on dangerous ground?

I pass now to the loyalty-security program as a whole, and shall begin with the statement of some general propositions. I think that the following persons cannot hold positions in government agencies:

1. A traitor.
2. A spy.

3. A person whose opinions would prevent him from following established policy relevant to his tasks.

Treason and espionage are crimes, and criminals are subject to trials and, if convicted, to punishment. A person, however, who holds an opinion which prevents him from fulfilling his duties is not a criminal but an inappropriate public servant. I suggest that the reason for his dismissal or nonemployment is the lack of necessary qualifications. It seems that our difficulties with the loyalty-security program arise because we confuse these basically different situations and, also, because we disregard the cases where the opinions of an employee are irrelevant.

In stating these views, I do not close my eyes to the question of seditious conspiracy which must be considered when we deal with members of the Communist Party. I suggest, however, that it is inconsistent with the principles of democracy to imply the knowledge of criminal conspiratorial aims or to decide these matters by means of administrative determination. As a confirmed Jeffersonian, I personally feel that, in general, the scope of administrative law should not be unduly enlarged. In this instance, however, my reluctance has still another reason. The questions of guilt arising from participation in a criminal conspiracy traditionally belong in the domain of criminal law and its procedures. It does not require elaboration that according to the system of our law a person charged with a criminal offense has the right to be tried and to be convicted or acquitted by the verdict of his peers. This principle is universal, and I entertain the gravest doubts that questions of guilt raised by the loyalty-security program should be decided outside the established procedures of adjudication. To do so seems a violation of the due process clause. The crimes implied by the loyalty-security program are heinous crimes, and I do not think that persons whose very honor and economic existence is under threat can be deprived of a fair trial in the accepted Anglo-Saxon tradition.

In this question, I fully identify myself with the following words of Harry P. Cain, former Senator from Washington and now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board:

"In other periods, we have abused the meaning of the Bill of Rights. We are so abusing some of its meaning today. This must not dishearten us because until the amendments have been repealed, and this prospect is not in sight, nor is it likely to be, men and women possessed of reason can prevail upon others to understand that the amendments constitute our American way of life, and with courage these same citizens can prevail upon authorities to live in accordance with every one of them.

"What I have just recited about the letter of the Bill of Rights means just this: Had you chosen recently between being indicted for a capital or infamous crime or being held to be a loyalty or security risk, there would have been no choice to make. From the indictment, you would have been found guilty or acquitted; sentenced or released through language and methods everyone can understand. From the allegation that you were a loyalty or security risk, you might have long wallowed in the wilderness of despair and mental torment without determining what the charges were all about, or where they came from."

The idea of allowing one accused to face his accuser is indeed not new. In St. Paul's day the Romans observed this rule.

In chapter 25 of the Book of Acts, verses 12 to 16, we find the following passage.

"Festus laid Paul's case before the king, saying: There is a certain man left a prisoner by Felix; about whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and elders of the Jews informed me, asking for sentence against him. To whom I answered that it is not the custom of the Romans to give up any man, before that the accused have the accusers face to face, and have had the opportunity to make his defense concerning the matter laid against him."

When I think of the Federal loyalty-security program, I cannot escape the conclusion that a still further confusion prevents us from reaching calm and judicious decisions. The same, I believe, applies to congressional investigations. We seem to confuse more advocacy of ideals with propagation of ideas by coercion. If anybody doubts this let him read the memoranda from the FBI and the Army and Navy intelligence services which were submitted to President Truman's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty and which dictated the original loyalty program set up on the basis of the Commission's recommendations. Copious extracts from these memoranda have been published in Miss Eleanor Bontacou's recent book on the Federal loyalty-security program. These memoranda make amazing reading. They tell us that disloyal and subversive persons—they are never once defined—are dangerous for two reasons. They are dangerous, first, because they are potential spies. And they are also dangerous—and I quote—"because of the propaganda they disseminate." The Director of the Office of Naval Intelligence tells us that—and I quote—"because it has its roots in humanitarian principles based on the rights of man, our democracy is particularly susceptible to subversive attack. It is easy to masquerade as protectors of civil liberties, or promoters of the interest of individuals whose level of economy is declared to be substandard. Making an emotional appeal for the down-trodden such groups loudly demand rights for particular groups, but usually fail to point out the corresponding duty which logically arises from any social contract."

A Jefferson would have regarded the rights of man as constituting the strongest foundation of our democracy, but here this is presented as its greatest weakness. A Lincoln would have said that you cannot fool the people very often, but here the people are pictured as the great gullible who needs a policeman to keep the Communists from subverting him.

Now, I have tried to stress that, if we want to preserve democracy the fight for the integrity of our institutions must be carried on by means approved by the Constitution itself. Any abridgement of rights which it guarantees would defeat the very purpose of the fight. I have also pointed out that, in my view, we have gone far afield in stretching the limits of the permissible scope of action. At the same time, I indicated some of the political reasons for the present trends: I mentioned the emotional tensions of the cold war with Soviet Russia and the resulting fears lest our Nation be destroyed. It remains to point out some of the reasons which are anchored in home politics.

Indeed, I am troubled by the fact that when we speak of Communists, we are rather vague in stating what a Communist is. It is a matter of everyday occurrence that people of liberal views are called Communists. There is also evidence that such confusion is not limited to "neighborly" relations but tends to affect the Federal clearance procedures. In studying these attitudes, I feel that we have here a situation which threatens the integrity of our institutions and our way of life. As every other work of human endeavor, our country is not perfect. Only a steady process of improvement can prevent society from decay or revolution. We believe that the best way to bring about beneficial changes is the democratic process established by the Constitution.

The essence of liberalism is a keen feeling for the necessity of change when the existing state of affairs exhibits social and economic injustice or traits of a lifeless and trammeling past. Liberalism, therefore, is a structural element of the democratic process. To suggest that liberals are traitors or to intimate this covertly, represents a direct danger to our society.

Of late, the fight against liberals has been carried out under the slogans of the fight against treason. This new slogan came to supplement the older pretext that the liberals in our country had advocated "un-American" ideas.

Representative MARTIN DIES who was the principal proponent of the resolution creating the Committee on Unaminous Ideas and its first chairman only last Monday issued a statement strongly urging fair hearings for persons accused as security risks. He said: "I know the accused ought to be confronted with witnesses * * * he ought to have a bill of particulars in advance, and he ought to know the criteria for judging—the rules on what constitutes guilt." He stated further: "When the committee started in 1938, I warned in my opening statement that such a probe could go to excess. I pledged if it did, that I would take the lead in correcting it and defending innocent people. So I felt a moral obligation. * * * I never wanted this to become an emotional, hysterical thing." Representative DIES indicated that he became alarmed concerning the Federal loyalty-security program in the process of representing a Federal employee, Dr. Edward Elliot, charged with disloyalty. This man, Representative DIES had cleared before the Un-American Activities Committee back in 1942. In regard to this case, Representatives DIES said: "I believe that in back of this thing was violent opposition to Dr. Elliott's views. He had liberal ideas, but we're not supposed to punish men for their ideas, it made me feel we were getting back to the star chamber. It frightened me, because it seemed so contrary to what I always believed was fundamental American fair play * * * I want to do something. I am trying to accomplish the purpose of keeping security from being used for oppression or political purpose."

I believe that the time has come to raise the question as to the place of the liberals in our society urgently and openly. The liberal must be restored in his constitutional rights and given the place which, in the spirit of the Constitution, he must hold in our democratic society. And, too, the liberal must be protected from unfounded politically inspired accusations of treason, communism and subversion.

At present the position of the liberal has become particularly difficult not only because he has been placed in a state of general mistrust, but also because every one of his ideas or suggestions for the improvement of conditions in our country is immediately challenged in some political quarters as Communist inspired. In a certain historical situation there are only a limited number of measures for improvement and it is not surprising that men of different philosophies of life may in practice follow a similar train of thought. This coincidence of detail, however, does not justify the conclusion that similar solutions necessarily presuppose identity of political philosophies.

For example, John Foster Dulles has written at length how the Communists have adopted in their propaganda many basic tenents of the Christian religion. Mr. Dulles' inference was clear that an ardent Christian cannot be called a Communist because some of his social attitudes coincide with some of the views of Communists.

Do we not agree that this unworthy challenge should not be made a test of loyalty? I believe it is alarming that we are presently forced to fight for the right of the liberals

to exist and to act in our society. This disturbing trend that we are forced to fight clearly shows that the questions discussed tonight bear directly on our entire future.

It is our tragic lot to live in the shadow of a possible new global war and we know that, if war should come, it is of little importance how we plan to shape our lives. With the new weapons and their devastating power civilization will hardly survive. But we all hope that mankind will succeed in avoiding this terrible end. We trust that reason will prevail and that it will be given to us to bequeath to our children the democratic heritage as unimpaired as we have received it from the hands of our fathers. This is a difficult task to fulfill. Only a firm belief in the social values of democracy, only intellectual integrity, thoughful vigilance, and selfless dedication to serve our fellowmen can help us to prevail.

From an old past, from a different country comes to us an admonition. The scene is Rome. The time—a moment of grave danger to the Roman Republic. The speaker—Marcus Porcius Cato, the statesman and the patriot. At the Roman magistrate he threw his challenge:

"Caveant consules ne quid detrimenti res publica capiat!" • • • "Consuls, beware, lest disaster befall the Republic."

These words are always in my mind. They do not let me rest.

Wisconsin: America's Outboard Boating Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the call of spring reminds one and all that Americans are beginning to flock into the outdoors, once more to enjoy the unparalleled leisure-time opportunities of our great country. We prize this leisure as one of the great attributes of America's high standard of living.

I should like to point out, for the RECORD, that one of the most pleasant aspects of our legitimate pursuits is America's enjoyment of boating. Not only is it a pastime for an estimated 30 million Americans who will enjoy pleasure craft this year, but it is now a billion-dollar industry.

I am pleased to say that my own State is the outboard-manufacturing center of America. It is most appropriate that the Badger State is supreme in its production of outboard motors, in view of the unexcelled water resources available in and around the Badger State. Combined with Wisconsin's top fishing opportunities, outdoor craft of Wisconsin manufacturers offer a double treat to American pleasure seekers.

I send to the desk the text of two fine articles describing America's boating recreation. They appeared in last Sunday's Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE IS OUTBOARD CENTER—HALF OF MOTORS MADE IN NATION COME FROM WISCONSIN FACTORIES—OUTLOOK FOR YEAR IS GOOD

(By Paul McMahon)

Wisconsin is the outboard manufacturing center of America. Close to one-half of the 500,000 outboard motors which this country expects to build in 1955 will be produced in Wisconsin, according to industry leaders. That means $70 million in production. Outboard motors of various sizes and types are made in plants in Milwaukee, Fond du Lac, Cedarburg, Beaver Dam, Oshkosh, and Hartford. Close to 3,000 workers are engaged in this work. In addition, motors are being turned out in other States in plants owned by Wisconsin firms.

The boom in the outboard industry in recent years is causing rapid changes in the product. Motors being built today are much quieter and have a far greater horsepower than a few years ago. Some have a gearshift and a remote gas tank. They are as colorful as automobiles.

"The industry realizes that it will sell more engines if they run more quietly and work better," said J. R. Brown, vice president for administration of the West Bend Aluminum Co., which builds motors in its plant at Hartford. Brown is president of the Outboard Motor Manufacturers Association. "The entire industry has done a fine job in improving engines."

ENGINES MORE POWERFUL

Motors a few years ago were more than three times as noisy as the new ones now being produced, Brown said. He based his opinion on scientific tests made by his company, but added that every manufacturer is trying to quiet his engines as much as possible.

A change in models by the West Bend Aluminum Co., which builds the Elgin motors for Sears, Roebuck & Co., indicates the trend in the industry toward bigger, more powerful motors. The Elgin used to come in 2, 5, 7½, and 16 horsepower. This year, Brown said, the 16 horsepower is being discontinued and a 12 and 25 horsepower added to the company's line.

The biggest outboard motor in the industry is the 40 horsepower Mercury built by the Kiekhaefer Corp., according to its vice president in charge of sales, Armand Hauser. Kiekhaefer has plants in Fond du Lac, Cedarburg, Beaver Dam, and Oshkosh. Mercury motors also come in several other sizes ranging from 5 to 18 horsepower.

OPTIMISTIC OUTLOOK

Some of the industry's bigger motors are being so built that a father can lock the engine at a particular horsepower if he doesn't want his children using the maximum power. This device also permits use of powerful motors in States which otherwise would not allow them because of legal restrictions.

"The trend in outboard motors is about the same as in automobiles," observed George L. Kuehn, president of Metal Products Corp., Milwaukee, builder of the Flambeau engine. "Actually, cars and motors may not need all this power stuff but the public wants it. And the public doesn't seem to want the cheap items."

Wisconsin manufacturers have only the most optimistic outlook for this year. One manufacturer reported that his business for the first 3 months of this year was 49 percent better than for the comparable period last year.

The rapid expansion of the industry generally was reported by W. J. Webb, vice president and division manager of the Evinrude Motors division of Outboard Marine & Manufacturing Co. He said that in 1951, slowed by the Korean war, the industry produced only 290,000 outboard motors. The number increased to 320,000 the next year, to 450,000 in 1953, and 500,000 last year. In contrast, only 175,000 were produced in 1941.

"All of Wisconsin manufacturers will benefit from this expanding market," Webb predicted. "The greatest gain in sales will be among newcomers. Last year 3 out of 4 Evinrude sales were made to first-time owners. There is every reason to believe that this rate will hold true for all manufacturers."

THIRTY MILLION PERSONS AFLOAT—BOATING, IN SPECTACULAR GROWTH, LOOKS FORWARD TO A GREAT YEAR—CRUISING GAINS IN POPULARITY

Where the lakes show blue and where the rivers ripple, hugged between their tree-lined banks, the growing flotilla of pleasure boats will sail this spring. And once again, the number of the craft will increase. The few years since World War II have brought about a remarkable change in boating, transforming it from the pastime of the few to recreation for millions.

The figures on boating are spectacular:

Thirty million Americans, the industry says, will be afloat in pleasure craft this year.

For the second year in a row, boating will be a billion-dollar industry.

Half a million outboard motors will be built in 1955, three times the 1941 production.

There are 5,300,000 small craft in the Nation, of which 760,000 contain sleeping cabins.

The number of boat trailers, an index to the number of boats moving around small inland waters, will approximate 100,000, which is 25 times the number in 1947.

STATE BOATING CENTER

This growth Milwaukee and Wisconsin share in full measure. The State borders Lake Michigan, always a boating center, and is interlaced with water for small craft, within easy reach of every State resident. It is the center of outboard-motor manufacture—nearly half of all the outboard motors produced in the Nation are built here.

The Milwaukee Journal consumer analysis shows that 18,991 families in Greater Milwaukee—18 percent of the total—own outboard motors. Manufacturers and dealers here describe this as "tremendous outboard ownership." In the Milwaukee area as a whole, 55,205 outboard motors are owned, as against 32,513 in 1950.

Boating and outboard motors are expanding in each of four broad fields.

The number of fishermen and summer cottagers is growing yearly. To these, a boat is an integral part of the fun, and the great majority has become so convinced of the advantages of an outboard motor that it is a "must."

CRUISING ON INCREASE

Pleasure cruising—the act of hopping into a boat and driving it for fun—has spread from the larger waters to the smaller. This, a new development, is attributed in large part to the crowded condition of the highways, hampering the leisurely family afternoon drive. The amount of this type of sailing on the Great Lakes is also on the increase.

Increased knowledge and improved technique have changed water skiing from an adventure by a few madcaps to a sport within the reach of nearly everyone. Water skiers claim theirs is the fastest growing of any aquatic sport.

The sport of racing is on the increase, both on the big water, where hundreds of yachts have been added to Great Lakes fleets, and among outboard enthusiasts, whose addiction went into a temporary eclipse during and after World War II.

OUTBOARDS QUIETER

In this boating growth, the outboard motor is playing a major role. With the reliability of their product beyond question for years, the outboard manufacturers have been adding horsepower and refinements. One of the present aims is silence, and great strides toward it have been made in recent years.

Numbers, types, and materials in boats have increased. The boatmakers are striving for comfort and safety. The present trend seems to be toward greater beam and added freeboard.

For the small-craft cruising enthusiast, manufacturers are producing trailers to fit any small boat and developing new mechanisms to ease the task of launching and pickup. New equipment for the boats themselves is being brought out constantly.

BOATING SPREADS OUT

One of the important developments in boating is that it is spreading out geographically as well as numerically. A few years ago, 95 percent of the Nation's small boats were concentrated in five areas. Long Island Sound, Chesapeake Bay, Miami, Lake Michigan, and Puget Sound.

Now boating sales are national. The great impoundments of the Tennessee Valley Authority have added a big and important area to the Nation's boating grounds, but boating is also taking hold in areas which, in the public mind, do not seem to contain enough water to fill a bird bath. A power cruiser squadron was recently formed, for example, in Oklahoma.

One of the big appeals of boating is the feeling of untrammeled freedom and power it gives to the person afloat, members of the industry believe. Coupled with this is the realization that the recreation is not reserved for the wealthy, but is well within reach of persons of moderate income.

WANT THE WATER

The longing of men for the watery horizon was brought out dramatically at the recent national motor-boat show in New York, where 4,000 persons waited in line in freezing weather for the opening of the first Sunday session. In the show's 10 days, it was attended by 215,000 persons, who bought $15 million worth of boats and accessories.

Showpiece of the show was a 51-foot cruiser, bought later for $88,000. Men and women stood in line for an hour and a half for a chance to inspect the craft. When they got aboard, the women headed for the salon, where they sat on divans and dreamed. The men, one after another, went to the cruiser wheel, fingered it lovingly and stood for a moment, their eyes fixed upon an imaginary horizon, savoring the mastery of a ship at sea.

Milk 12 Cents a Quart—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks in three instances to include the full text of an article by Bill Davidson in the April 29 issue of Collier's magazine.

The article by Mr. Davidson, titled "Milk 12 Cents a Quart—Why Not in Your Town?" deals with a subject of interest to every person in the country. This explanatory article is of particular interest to dairy farmers and consumers.

The dairy subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee will very shortly start to hold hearings on some of the problems discussed in Mr. Davidson's article. Without any comments or observations on my part, I urge my colleagues to study the article. The first installment follows:

How much do you pay for milk? Last summer, when supplies were plentiful, the price in Jacksonville, Fla., was 27 cents a quart; in Kansas City, Mo., 14½ cents. Similarly, people in Portland, Oreg., had to pay 21 cents while families in Minneapolis, Minn., could buy a quart for only 12½ cents. In some areas, the price at times has been nearly twice as high as in nearby communities. The situation is most bizarre, probably, along the Pennsylvania-Ohio border. On the Ohio side of the line, the summer price not too long ago was 12 cents; only a few feet away in Pennsylvania, people were paying 25 cents.

Seldom has an American industry been so ridden with chaos, seldom has the American family been so victimized. As a result, 12-to-15-cents-a-quart milk, which should be the rule in much of the country, is rare in the United States today.

The milk muddle involves politics, greed, short-sightedness—and honest but misguided concern for the public health. It has turned union against union, city against city. It helped elect a governor in Pennsylvania, where Democrat George M. Leader campaigned last year on a promise to untangle the State's snarled milk situation. It has bred violence and gangsterism—in Ohio, where the tires on trucks owned by crusading Akron dairyman James J. Lawson were slashed and stink bombs thrown into his milk tanks; in Oregon, where thugs threatened to throw acid into the eyes of State Representative Maurine Neuberger, wife of United States Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, because she helped lead a successful consumers' fight in a State referendum to get cheaper milk.

Most tragic of all, the American people are not drinking enough milk—and the chaos and wrangling are one reason why. In 1950 United States Assistant Surgeon General Dr. Charles L. Williams told the Senate Agriculture Committee, "It is a matter of great concern to public health authorities that many of our citizens in the milk-deficient sections do not consume sufficient amounts of this most nearly perfect food. The effect is particularly serious among low-income families who can afford little, and frequently no milk for their children. Reduced consumption of milk and milk products may seriously affect the nutritional status of the Nation."

The situation has not improved much since 1950. Indeed, in some areas it has worsened. By 1953 national per capita milk consumption had dropped 11 percent from its high in 1945; in New York City, it had fallen off an alarming 17 percent. The estimated figures for 1954 are no better. Though nutritionists agree that a child needs a quart of milk a day and an adult requires at least a pint, there are many cities—such as Evansville, Ind., and Birmingham, Ala., where the average is considerably less than a pint per person per day.

MANY FAMILIES CAN'T AFFORD ENOUGH MILK

In Alabama, I spoke with a number of low-income families, and one after another told me that they just couldn't afford enough fresh milk. "We should have 3 quarts a day in our home," said factory worker, J. A. Black, "but that would cost me nearly $300 a year—or one-tenth of my take-home pay." A leading nutritionist reports, "Millions of American children are being raised today without enough of the calcium, riboflavin, and other milk components that are necessary to build strong bones and healthy bodies."

Despite these shocking deficiencies at home, a Minnesota dairy princess, Eleanor Maley, journeyed to France recently to help the then premier, Pierre Mendès-France, in his campaign to entice the French people to drink more milk instead of wine. The beauteous Miss Maley presented the premier with 48 bottles of milk and a milk dispenser, presumably as symbols of America's great milk-drinking propensities and as an inspiration to the benighted people of France. Embarrassingly enough, it turned out that the French were already far ahead of Americans in per capita consumption of milk and dairy products as a whole. (France ranks 11th among the nations of the world, the United States 13th.) It is true that Americans drink more fluid milk than the French, but even in this category the United States ranks only eighth in the world—behind such countries as Sweden, Canada, and Ireland.

How could we—the wealthiest and most advanced nation in the world—fall so far behind in the consumption of one of the most essential foods A host of investigating agencies—from the United States Department of Agriculture to the National Grange—is looking into the matter, and all have focused on one basic cause among many. As the Senate Agriculture Committee reported, "High retail prices, particularly for the low-income families, coupled with health and inspection laws and ordinances preventing the free flow of milk in interstate commerce, have reduced milk consumption in various localities."

In other words, a crazy patchwork of outmoded laws and regulations—piled one on another without regard for the public welfare—is undermining the health of our children. Our pocketbooks are being taxed because of scores of artificial legal barriers—called "Chinese Walls of protection" by A. W. Fuchs, a sanitary engineering director of the United States Public Health Service.

These "Chinese Walls" of the milk industry vary in height and composition, and many were erected with insidious intent. In Rhode Island, there used to be a law permitting the commissioner of agriculture to color all milk brought in from outside the State with vivid vegetable dyes. Now the relatively cheap outside milk is excluded by a more subtle method; no milk can be shipped into the State in tank trucks or cars. It must arrive at the distributing dairy in the same small cans in which it was placed by the out-of-State farmer when he milked his cows, and each can must bear the farmers's name and address. "The regulation is necessary so we can trace the source of contaminated milk," one official told me—but he winked as he said it.

Actually, milk is shipped all over the United States today in modern refrigerated tank trucks and cars—hundreds of miles farther than the short haul from, say, upstate New York to Providence. It has been years since any other State required that milk be kept in the farmer's original cans, and it's virtually impossible for any contamination to escape detection when the milk is inspected at the processing plant by health authorities using universally accepted standards. The original-can regulation simply piles crippling expense on any dairy rash enough to want to bring in cheaper milk from the outside. As one Rhode Island dairy executive admitted to Gordon K. Zimmerman, of the national grange, "We are determined to find a home for every gallon of milk produced in Rhode Island, and at the right price, before we import any outside milk." Says Zimmerman, "The Chinese Wall really works in Rhode Island—and the people of the State get it in the neck. Milk is 25 cents a quart in Providence."

A less subtle method of victimizing the housewife is practiced by the State of Ala-

bama. Since it costs anywhere from 3 cents upward to deliver a quart of milk to the home,you'd expect to pay considerably less if you purchased a bottle in a store and carried it home yourself. But Alabama has fixed the price of store milk at exactly that of home-delivered milk—and in addition imposes a 1-cent sales tax on store milk. Thus the price of store milk actually is higher than that of the more expensive home-delivered product—a violation of all the laws of economics. One Birmingham dairy executive told me, "If the store price dropped, milk would flood into the grocery stores and markets. Then what would happen to us home-delivery fellows? And what about the milk drivers union? They deserve protection, too."

Again the Chinese Wall. Milk runs as high as 27 cents a quart in Alabama.

OPPOSITION TO A PLAN TO REDUCE PRICE

The Chinese Wall has been encountered in still a third form by Meyer Parodneck, head of a farmer-consumer milk cooperative in New York City. Not long ago Parodneck instituted a plan to knock 2 to 4 cents off the retail price by delivering quarts of milk to central locations in big housing projects. He hired part-time clerks from among the tenants and anyone could go to the clerk in his building and purchase milk at the reduced price. Parodneck also cut the price of home-delivered milk 2 to 4 cents a quart under that charged by other distributors. Soon afterward the State of New York revoked Parodneck's license for unauthorized procedure—and the case has been in the courts ever since. As the late John Hartford, chairman of the board of A. & P., once wrote, "Whenever a retailer tries to sell milk cheaper, he either finds that he is violating the law, or cannot get milk at all."

Nearly everywhere I went in the dairy industry, I found people lamenting the barriers—except when they themselves benefited from them. Every segment of the business has its own set of protective ordinances—and some of them have been on the books for almost a hundred years. It's been easy to get all sorts of milk legislation passed because of the natural anxiety of Americans that their families get the purest and best supervised milk. No one is against stringent measures to prevent disease germs from developing in the highly perishable product, but as Cornell University's Dr. A. C. Dahlberg points out, "There sometimes is more self-interest than public interest in milk laws and ordinances."

Farmers, unions, and distributors have all taken advantage of the concern of the consumer to push through self-interest regulations. Ancient ordinances made obsolete by modern technology remain on the books simply because they eliminate competition for small favored groups. Laws passed to deal with now nonexistent economic conditions are kept in force for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. A University of Illinois bulletin states that of some 2,000 standard foods—including many more perishable than milk—none other is subject to such a monstrous tangle of restrictions. "Milk," says the bulletin, "is the only food sold in large quantities in the United States against which legal barriers have been created to prevent free intermarket shipments." Dr. W. E. Petersen of the University of Minnesota says, "Outside of drugs nothing is more regulated than milk."

The regulations generally take two forms—those adopted in the name of protecting public health, and out-and-out economic prohibitions. The health barriers are erected at both the State and local levels. Not long ago, a forward-looking Chicago dairyman named Sam Dean sought to extend his milk deliveries to the city of Madison, Wis. To his amazement, he discovered that the city had passed a "health" ordinance just 2 years before, forbidding the sale of any milk not pasteurized and bottled within a radius of 5 miles of the center of Madison. Such a regulation had no scientific justification even in the days before modern refrigeration and high-speed trucks. Dean's milk, moreover, was inspected by the ultrastrict Chicago Health Department, and he was perfectly willing to submit to Madison inspection as well. He sued the city, and the case was fought all the way up to the United States Supreme Court. The Nation's highest tribunal suggested that the ordinance was not a health regulation at all, but an attempt to interfere with interstate commerce. It was, said the Court, "an economic barrier protecting a major local industry against competition from without the State."

Milk 12 Cents a Quart—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the second of three articles by Mr. Bill Davidson on Milk 12 Cents a Quart—Why Not in Your Town? The article follows:

LACK OF COOPERATION AMONG CITIES

Sam Dean got to sell his milk in Madison. But in dozens of other American cities where there has been no crusader to take the fight to the courts, the same type of ordinance is still in effect. Furthermore, most cities refuse to accept the milk-inspection approval of other cities, even though nearly all use the same code, drawn up by the United States Public Health Service. This refusal, too, tends to exclude less expensive outside milk that would drive down the local price. "How silly can you get?" asks Dr. Glenn C. Holm, dean of the school of agriculture at the South Dakota Agricultural College. "Wouldn't it be just as logical to say that all the lettuce and lobster sold in Denver or Chicago had to be produced within an area of 40 or 50 miles? Lobsters and lettuce are also perishable products."

Unnecessary health regulations also add to the cost of milk in other ways. One of Sam Dean's current problems is in the city of South Bend, Ind., which has an archaic law requiring that, for bottled milk, every cow of every producer be tested for tuberculosis once a year. The rub is that tuberculosis has almost disappeared from American cattle, and in the absence of epidemic the United States Public Health Service and most States and cities do not require the expensive tuberculin test more than once in 3 or 6 years.

The annual South Bend test is not too much of a financial burden for the local dairymen, who obtain their milk from relatively few cows. But how about Sam Dean, who draws on thousands of cows and sells his milk in more than a dozen other cities in the South and Midwest? Because he distributes milk in South Bend he must pay to have every single cow examined once a year, even though only a fraction of the milk goes into South Bend. That adds to the overall expense throughout his distribution system. "Why," he asks, "should the people of Chicago and Memphis have to pay more for their milk because of the whim of a distant town?"

Cornell's Dr. Dahlberg, one of the world's top milk sanitation experts, says, "The payoff on all these overstringent regulations is that the record proves they have little or no public-health significance. For a considerable number of years there has been no disease epidemic traceable to properly pasteurized milk. In all cities the majority of the supply is pasteurized and in most cities nothing but pasteurized milk can be sold. They have given America the most sanitary milk in the world." Yet the unjustified, expense-creating rulings persist. Farmers must keep open-top milk pails for some cities, closed-top pails for others. Pennsylvania suggests that the milk stool on which the farmer sits should be of a certain height; how, asks Dr. Dahlberg, can that possibly affect the quality of the milk?

The National Research Council began looking into the problem in 1949 and found hundreds of equally meaningless rules. In 1953 it reported, "One could not expect * * * any relationship between the quality of milk and such regulations as the cow yard * * * being a specified distance from the barn * * * 2 rooms instead of 1 in a milkhouse * * * It is decidedly doubtful whether a producer who must build to precise specifications would produce better milk than another without them."

Now, 2 years later, it appears that little heed has been paid to the council's disclosures. Recently, an upstate New York farmer wanted to modernize his plant so that he could bring down the price of his milk. But the local sanitary inspector told him: "You can't do that unless you install a 60-foot length of pipe. It must be of stainless steel and it must be in one piece, without seams." That ended the modernization—and the prospect of a reduction in the price of the farmer's milk. Not only would it have been extremely difficult for him to obtain 60 feet of stainless-steel pipe all in one piece (an absurdity, according to milk sanitation experts), but to install it he would have had to take the roof off the plant.

In the milk business, absurdity seems to pile on absurdity. In Washington, D. C., the following procedure has been laid down for cleaning cows before milking: "Take one towel for each udder and after using, place in a separate bucket. Then dry each udder with a clean, dry, individual towel. * * * Towels should be at least 12 by 14 inches or its equivalent in area. * * * After towels are washed they may be dried on a line in the washroom, boiler room, or outside of the dairy. Towels shall not be hung on a line in the stable." Says Dr. Dahlberg, "That means the farmer must have four towels per cow per day. He must have electric washing machines and hang up towels all over the premises. The United States Public Health Service, on the other hand, allows the farmer to use a single, germicidally treated towel until it is soiled. You don't have to go beyond this regulation to realize the "udder" ridiculousness of some procedures."

NEW YORK HOUSEWIVES PENALIZED

But few areas are free of such restrictions. New York prohibits the importation of out-of-State cream on nebulous health grounds. Wisconsin cream, which the regulation is designed to exclude, is safely consumed in adjoining New Jersey and Connecticut—and costs 4½ cents a pint less than New York City residents, just a few miles away, pay for their State product. The city also is one of the few still clinging to the outmoded custom of dating milk. As New York Governor Averell Harriman recently pointed out most experts now consider milk dating an anachronism, a burdensome holdover from the days before modern pasteurization and refrigeration, when milk could not be expected to keep safely for much more than 24 hours. Today, if milk is kept cool, it's perfectly good for at least 5 days and, in some cases, for as long as 2 weeks after pasteurization. But New York distributors must go to the added expense of

buying separate bottle caps or containers for each of the 7 days of the week. Also, hundreds of tons of flawless fresh milk must be returned from the stores every day because housewives won't buy milk on Thursday if it's dated Wednesday. Who pays the cost of the wastage? The housewife.

Sometimes, too, the housewife suffers in other ways from needless health barriers. Birmingham, Ala., for example, insists on a bacteria count far below the United States Public Health Service standards. This means extra expense, for the farmer has to install costly special equipment to meet the strict requirements. But what happens? The National Research Council reports that of the eight cities which it surveyed, Birmingham had the worst-tasting milk a few days after pasteurization. Housewives there complained to me that the milk has a tallowy or cardboardy flavor. One reason may be the low bacteria count. The bacteria that remain in milk after pasteurization are harmless. If there are too many they quickly turn the milk sour, but in moderate numbers they perform a useful function: as the milk oxidizes, they absorb the oxidation products. In Birmingham, apparently, not enough bacteria remain to do the job. Many experts believe that the excess oxygen reacts with other components in the Birmingham milk to produce the bad taste. More bacteria, they think, would prevent the tallowy, cardboardy flavor.

Far more serious is the role played by the artificial health regulations in preventing progress in the industry. The American Dairy Industry Association is now conducting a campaign to get people to drink more milk. The members are advocating new, modern methods of making larger quantities of milk more readily available. "However," says Frank Neu, an executive of the association, "we run head on into laws which stymie us. We feel that one of the best ways to sell a lot of milk at lower prices is through multiple-quart containers and through milk-vending and dispensing machines. But many States and cities forbid them—on unfounded sanitary grounds. These are the most damaging barriers of all."

In Akron, Ohio, progressive dairyman James J. Lawson figured he could cut costs and gain volume sales by selling milk in gallon jugs. He tried it, and soon was able to drop his price to the equivalent of 12½ cents a quart. Consumption of milk in Akron increased to almost 13 percent above the national average, according to Akron Health Department figures. Nonetheless, six States and many cities ban the gallon jug on the grounds that it can't be sterilized properly. A leading milk-sanitation expert says, "If anyone claims it's more difficult to wash a gallon bottle than a quart bottle, he has some other purpose in mind—such as trying to keep out competitors who could come in with the gallon jug and cut prices." New York dairyman Meyer Parodneck adds, "There's no more reason for regulating the size of a bottle for milk than regulating the size of buttons."

I saw the controversial modern milk-dispensing machines in restaurants in Wisconsin, and big roadside vending machines (called Maisie, the mechanical cow) in Minnesota. The dispensers had disposable plastic nozzles so that no human hands would ever touch the milk. The vending machines were placed in gasoline stations and along busy highways and delivered a half-gallon container down a chute when coins were placed in the slot. Wherever installed, these mechanical devices have contributed to lower prices and increased consumption, but they are banned in Ohio and in many important cities in other States on the grounds they are not sanitary. Said one Milwaukee dairyman, "If it's true what they say in Ohio about dispensing machines, then everyone in Wisconsin should be dead." (Actually, dairymen say, the laws are protective barriers for milk-handlers' unions, which fear that the machines will eliminate jobs.)

The second major group of artificial barriers in the milk industry are price-fixing laws. Many experts feel that these laws, too, are archaic and even basically evil in their present-day application. They were passed during the depression, when price wars raged and farmers dumped their milk into ditches rather than accept only a cent or two a quart for it. Even Al Capone was in the dairy business at the time, and the competition for customers was enlivened by bombings, machine-gunnings and bottle-breaking. The economists of the day believed that if you fixed a minimum retail price as well as a farm price, it would eliminate the retail price wars that were ruining the farmers.

In recent years, however, most experts have come to the conclusion that if the State fixes the farm price alone (which also can be done by the Federal Government whenever the farmers of an area request it), that's sufficient protection for the milk producer. Of the 28 States which originally fixed prices, 12 have given up the practice. Five States continue to control the farm price, while 11 still fix retail prices—and these 11 are the scene of most of the trouble today.

The retail-price-fixing States are Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia. In all, the State price-control laws sometimes do great harm and even encourage illegal practices—such as secret rebates and under-the-counter deals with storekeepers. In New Jersey, four distributors were recently fined $10,000 apiece for such practices. The whole history of barriers has been tragic in that State, for local farmers were almost ruined by the very price-fixing law that was passed to protect them. Not long ago some of the largest New Jersey distributors began buying less expensive milk from farms in nearby Pennsylvania and upstate New York. The cheaper milk gave the distributors a much bigger markin of profit at the State-guaranteed high retail price—and put the New Jersey farmer and consumer in a dreadful squeeze. Alarmed, Gov. Robert B. Meyner, denounced 13 distributors for engaging in "pirate trade" and accused them of "wanting to have their cake and eat it." Then, a few weeks ago, he ordered the end of all retail price controls on milk in the State.

Milk 12 Cents a Quart—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the third and final installment of an article by Mr. Bill Davidson which appeared in the April 29, 1955, issue of Collier's magazine.

I wish to point out that I have inserted the full text of the article titled "Milk 12 Cents a Quart—Why Not in Your Town?" without any comment or observations because I believe it brings out certain problems facing dairy farmers and consumers on the selling and consumption of milk. I do not say whether I am in complete agreement or disagreement with the article. I do hope, however, that the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, will soon have some authoritative information on the problems discussed by Mr. Davidson. This is the reason why I have inserted the article in full in the RECORD.

The final installment of the article follows:

TWO ECONOMISTS CHANGE VIEWS

Significantly, some of the people who once were the strongest supporters of State retail price-control laws have turned against them. Dr. Leland Spencer, a Cornell agricultural economist, now says, "I have come to the conclusion that the disadvantages outweigh the advantages." In California, one of the framers of the State's milk-control law—Dr. James M. Tinley, of the University of California School of Agriculture—now firmly favors its repeal.

What would happen if existing price-fixing laws were repealed? Defenders of the controls insist that the result would be disastrous price wars, but no such catastrophes have occurred in the 17 States which already have junked retail price fixing. All that's happened is that the price for the housewife has come down. Milk dropped 2 cents a quart in New Jersey immediately after repeal, and the same blessing befell the people of Oregon after that State tossed out its controls. The Oregon situation has turned up other interesting results. Hugh Gallagher, manager of the Damascus Milk Co., a subsidiary of the Carnation Co., says, "We opposed the repeal. But now we have to admit that we have been dependent on a cane for 22 years. With the law going out, the market has stabilized more rapidly than we anticipated. Our margins are substantially what they were before.

John Denny, market editor of the Portland Oregonian, reports an average increase of about 10 percent in milk consumption.

What would happen if all barriers—both the economic and the needless sanitary ones—were removed? Dr. Roland W. Bartlett, professor of agricultural economics at the University of Illinois, has made some studies which give a clue to the answer. In Cleveland, with an open market and the removal of most barriers, the price of milk dropped 4 cents a quart between 1952 and 1953. With housewives flocking to buy more milk at the reduced price, the farmers made $550,000 more than they otherwise would have. When the price dropped in Detroit, milk consumption jumped 5.9 percent. Similarly, Columbus, Ohio, reported a spectacular 11.1 percent rise in consumption after price cuts.

Dr. Bartlett says, "If all barriers were removed, the price would drop as much as 20 percent in many places, and per capita consumption would rise as much as 10 percent nationally. That means we would have no dairy surpluses—and no more worries about our children not getting enough milk." Cornell's Dr. Spencer, a long-time adversary of Dr. Bartlett, agrees that consumption would go up, but is more conservative. "If the price drops 10 percent," he says, "we can expect a 3 percent rise in milk drinking." Even that would solve many of America's milk and dairy problems.

What are the chances of the millenium occurring in the near future? The outlook is dim but hopeful. Many crusaders have sprung up in the last few years to fight for reduced milk prices. In Oregon, a small dairy farmer named Elmer Deetz almost singlehandedly knocked out the State milk-control law after he was refused permission to sell milk. He took his battle to the people and not only did he win an overwhelming victory in a referendum in the 1954 election, but he was elected to the State legislature as well. In Pennsylvania, dairyman Temple McAllister has moved across the border from

Ohio and is challenging Pennsylvania price control in the courts as a violation of Federal antitrust laws. The most dogged crusader of all, dairyman Sam Dean, of Chicago, has waged no less than 16 major court campaigns against petty sanitary regulations. He fought to get paper containers legalized in Chicago and he battled for half-gallon containers elsewhere. He also led the fight for a lower store price in many Midwestern cities—and he deserves considerable credit for the fact that Chicago had milk for as little as 15 cents last summer.

In recent years, too, some big store chains have joined the fray. In California, the fight is being led by Safeway Stores—both in the courts and in the legislature. Ray Bush, manager of Safeway's subsidiary, the Lucerne Milk Co., says, "Safeway is convinced that unrealistic prices are discouraging the consumption and sale of milk. We firmly believe that the producer and the consumer are both harmed by regulations that fix prices of milk beyond the producer level. It's our job to sell food to the consumer, and what's good for the consumer is good for us."

TOO MUCH MILK FOR UNCLE SAM

The crusaders soon may have some help from an unexpected source—the Federal Government. A few months ago, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson become so concerned over the fact that the Government had had to buy a staggering surplus of dairy products equivalent to 5,500,000,000 quarts of milk that he ordered a study by the Department's Agricultural Marketing Service. "Why," he wanted to know, "isn't more milk being sold?"

Like everyone in the industry, the Agriculture Department investigators realized the bewildering complexity of the milk business—a tangled labor situation, complicated pricing arrangements, backwardness in merchandising and advertising. But they decided to concentrate on what they felt might be the two principal causes—the artificial health and economic regulations. Their report is due in June, and the crusaders hope it will give them new weapons in the battle of the milk barriers.

In the meantime, how is the battle going? All in all, the attack against artifical sanitary ordinances is developing slow but noticeable momentum; the campaign against price-control laws is a standoff. It seems that Pennsylvania and California may drop their retail-price laws within the next 2 years, but in at least two other States the legislatures appear about to pass archaic price-fixing statutes.

IF THE CRUSADERS SHOULD LOSE

What will happen if the crusaders lose the battle of the milk barriers? Secretary of Agriculture Benson says, "There is danger that milk will price itself out of the market, just as butter has done." If that occurs, it could set in motion a series of events that might be disastrous to our economy. As Wisconsin dairy farmer John Fluckiger, Jr., told me, "The collapse of the fluid-milk market could mean the destruction of the cheese industry as well." Gordon K. Zimmerman of the National Grange points out that a collapse of the dairy industry would hurt the fine flood- and erosion-control programs in the South, where worn-out cotton lands are being put back into grass—which holds the soil. "The prime incentive for a farmer to grow grass," says Zimmerman, "is the money he can make from grazing cattle on it."

Most important of all, if milk prices itself out of its market, it means a threat to the health of your children and mine.

That's why more and more thoughtful Americans are asking their legislators and city officials, "If it's possible elsewhere, why can't we have 12-cent milk?" And they are finding that the answer is not easy. As Federal Judge Jerome N. Frank once wrote in a court decision involving a New York dairy, "The milk problem is exquisitely complicated. The city dweller or poet who regards the cow as the symbol of bucolic serenity is indeed naive. From the udder of that placid animal flows a bland liquid indispensable to human health, but often provoking as much human strife and nastiness as strong alcoholic beverages."

The People's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the American people, in a truly democratic fashion, could choose the military service they want to guarantee United States defense, there is no doubt what their choice would be. They believe in air power, and they know that only air power can guarantee our security. They know that the United States Air Force, with its intercontinental bombers, and its record of performance in World War II and in Korea, is the best bet for victory in world war III, if it comes, and for keeping the peace, in hopes of avoiding it.

A recent Gallup poll has proved this decisively. When asked which branch of the Armed Forces they thought would be most important in the event of another war, more than 70 percent of the people questioned reaffirmed, as they did in a similar poll in 1949, that they thought the Air Force would be the most important.

Comments the director of the Gallup poll:

Military experts may be startled to note how extremely one-sided the vote continues to be on the Air Force—how much the drama and color of the Air Force has fired the popular imagination.

The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. Persons who have attended college feel the same way about the relative position of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as those who attended only high school or grade school.

It is not that the Air Force is the most popular of the services in general esteem, however. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Air Force must play the top role in the next war, if we are to win it; and that is what the American people know, and what we must keep in mind in our consideration of the defense budget.

I ask the consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the figures assembled by Mr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, bearing on this inescapable fact. The news release containing this significant information follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—TOP ROLE FOR AIR FORCE IN NEXT WAR FORECAST

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 31.—If another world war comes, the average American today has one idea fixed firmly in his mind: the United States Air Force would play a much more important part in it than either the Army or the Navy.

More than 7 out of every 10 persons, or 71 percent, questioned in the latest institute survey think the Air Force would be most important, compared to 5 percent who say the Navy and 4 percent who think the Army would be most important.

About 1 person in 5, or 19 percent, believes all 3 branches will be equally important. This is an increase, however, over the opinion reflected by a similar question in 1949.

This is clearly shown in the results of interviews with a cross-section of adults across the country, who were asked this question by institute reporters:

"In the event of another world war, which branch of the Armed Forces do you think will be most important—the Army, the Navy or the Air Force?"

The vote today and that of a similar survey in October, 1949:

Today 1949

	Today	1949
	Percent	*Percent*
Army	4	6
Navy	5	4
Air Force	71	74
All three equally important	19	9
Don't know	3	7

Today's table adds to more than 100 percent because some persons named two branches which they said would be equally important.

Military experts may be startled to note how extremely one-sided the vote continues to be on the Air Force, how much the drama and color of the Air Force has fired the popular imagination.

The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. Persons who have attended college feel the same way about the relative position of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as those who attended only high school or grade school.

The same situation prevails by age levels, as shown in the following tables:

By education

	College	High school	Grade school
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Army	6	3	6
Navy	4	4	6
Air Force	71	71	70
All three	19	21	16
Don't know	2	2	5

By age

	21–29 years	30–49 years	50 and over
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Army	7	4	3
Navy	3	5	5
Air Force	70	69	75
All three	19	21	17
Don't know	2	3	3

Bridge Clearances Over Navigable Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Evening Star on March 25, 1955:

FORE AND AFT

(By Malcolm Lamborne, Jr.)

The recent Commerce Department report on bridge clearances over navigable streams has brought into the open a long-standing dispute between highway and railroad groups on one hand and waterway forces on the other. The report is only the beginning of what promises to be a hot debate for some time to come.

Final arbiter in all likelihood may be Congress. What it decides could sharply affect boatowners in all parts of the country, including the Potomac and Chesapeake Bay area.

With the administration's $101 billion proposed highway program as a backdrop, State highway officials, road builders, and others are vitally interested in keeping down costs, particularly for bridges over rivers and coves. For many years the Army engineers have had the final say on bridge clearances over waterways.

There has been a move by some groups, meanwhile, to have Congress shift responsibility for bridge clearances to the Commerce Department which some feel would be more friendly to highway people—perhaps at the expense of waterway traffic. While the Commerce study refrains from making any transfer proposal, the Hoover Commission task force on water resources, headed by Adm. Ben Moreell, has been looking into this and other problems. Its report is due to go to the full Commission next month, and the Commission to report to Congress in early May.

It is of interest that the engineers would not support the key recommendation of six proposals made in the Commerce report. Commerce would have Congress set up new categories of what is a navigable stream. Under the lowest category would come waterways now "deemed navigable but of questionable value for navigation." Obviously this would include many rivers and waterways used by yachtsmen and fishermen.

Commerce suggests a solution for craft using these waterways: Hinged masts, radars, and stacks. What this would cost boatmen no one ventures to estimate.

Boat owners have an ally in this respect, too. A report from the Treasury Department (obviously prepared by the Coast Guard) states that it may not be practical or safe for masts to be unstepped or collapsed, and besides, such alterations might violate both international and inland rules on carrying of navigation lights.

The Commerce study also discloses that Defense Secretary Wilson does not go along with the Army engineers on the need for additional legislation in defining the new categories of waterways.

The American Association of State Highway Officials, which has been active in this whole field, has summed up the arguments for the land forces in this way:

"We are not opposed in any way to reasonable and justifiable clearances and navigation requirements, but the relative importance of waterborne and automotive transport has not remained static over the years since the action of Congress in 1906 when the superior rights of water traffic was indicated. In 1906 there were 106,000 passenger cars and 2,000 trucks used in our country, whereas now there are some 46 million passenger cars and 10 million trucks * * * the relative importance of waterborne transportation has diminished."

Boatmen, lacking any national voice in such matters, only hope the boom won't swing too far the other way in this whole dispute.

Ironically, it would come at a time when boating has become a major form of recreation and the boating industry reaches close to a $1-billion-a-year operation.

Red Cross Programs and Services in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a report made to the Governor of Alabama on the Red Cross programs and services carried on in Alabama this last year. The citizens of Alabama as Red Cross volunteers, are giving daily exemplary humanitarian service to their neighbors in need. The Red Cross volunteers in Alabama have been particularly active in the national blood program. Last year the residents of Alabama made it possible to supply sufficient blood to meet both defense and civilian blood needs in the territory. These volunteers are performing a wonderful service and I wish to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation of the personal sacrifices they have made in behalf of all the people.

The aforementioned report follows:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Atlanta, Ga., April 7, 1955.

The Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: As Representative from Alabama, we believe that you will be interested in the attached copy of a report made to the Governor of Alabama on Red Cross programs and services provided in the State during the last fiscal year. This same report has gone to each of the State legislators. We are happy to share with you information regarding Red Cross in your State and in your district since we feel that you have a personal interest.

As director of field service for Alabama, it is my pleasure to work with each of the 78 Red Cross chapters in the State. I am very proud of the record that has been made by Red Cross volunteers and look forward to continued progress in all programs and activities during the coming year.

The chapters in central Alabama participate actively in the national blood program through the Red Cross regional blood center in Birmingham. Last year residents of Alabama made it possible to supply sufficient blood to meet defense and civilian blood needs in the territory.

We will be glad to provide additional information on any of the Red Cross services or programs about which you may have questions.

Sincerely yours,

EDNA MATTOX,
Miss Edna Mattox,
Director, Field Service.

REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA, RED CROSS ACTIVITIES IN THE STATE DURING 1954

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Atlanta, Ga., February 25, 1955.

The Honorable JAMES E. FOLSOM,
Governor of Alabama,
Montgomery, Ala.

DEAR GOVERNOR FOLSOM: Citizens of Alabama, as Red Cross volunteers, are giving exemplary humanitarian service to their neighbors in need. It is with pleasure that we offer this annual report of their activities during 1954.

In 78 chapters covering every community in the State, 29,000 volunteer workers are giving consistently of their time, training, and talents toward accomplishment of these services. In many instances they are working in conjunction with governmental and community organizations.

These volunteers, in discharge of a primary obligation of the Red Cross, are assisting members of the Armed Forces and their families with their personal problems. Last year 11,500 servicemen's families, through local chapters, were assisted in family crises created by illness, accident, death, financial, and other emergencies, and many routine welfare problems. Working with hometown chapters in handling these situations were Red Cross staff assigned to military installations and hospitals in the United States and overseas.

They are providing entertainment and recreation for convalescents in military, veterans, and civilian hospitals. Gray Lady, canteen, entertainment, staff aide, nurse's aide, motor service, production, and other volunteers gave almost 30,000 hours of time and special talent in the entertainment and instruction in crafts of convalescent patients in military hospitals. Volunteers also have given 33,400 hours of time to similar service in Veterans' Administration hospitals located at Birmingham, Montgomery, Tuscaloosa, and Tuskegee in the past year.

They are assisting war veterans and their families in welfare problems, and also giving assistance in applying for Government benefits and in developing and presenting claims. In this service they work with Red Cross claims staff assigned to Veterans' Administration offices. A total number of 900 claims cases were acted upon last year.

They are helping to make whole blood and its derivatives available to the sick and injured through Red Cross blood centers located at Birmingham and Mobile, and Atlanta, Ga. Last year, Alabama donors contributed 58,200 units of blood to these centers. Fifty-seven Alabama chapters are participants in this blood program. The Office of Defense Mobilization distributed 30,080 cc's of gamma globulin from Red Cross sources to public health departments in Alabama during 1954, in addition to shipments from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

They are helping the victims of tornadoes, floods, hurricanes, fires, and other natural disasters, not only in time of emergency but also for weeks afterward, where needed, giving long-term rehabilitation aid that will help restore stricken families to normal life. In disaster operations they work in conjunction with State, county, and city governmental agencies; Civil Defense; military and other groups having responsibility in this field. Also in cooperation with these groups, Alabama's Red Cross chapter workers are active in preparedness for disaster, educating the public in precautionary measures, and setting up cooperative plans of emergency action with other agencies. The past year was a relatively light one for major natural disasters in Alabama. In 12 relief operations the Red Cross helped 144 families at a cost of $96,800, mostly for homes reconstruction and refurnishing and assistance with medical and hospital expenses.

Alabama chapters' volunteers are reducing the hazards of water sports by providing training in swimming and lifesaving, and in safe handling of small craft. Last year, 700 water safety instructors issued 8,600 certificates in swimming and lifesaving.

They are teaching people how to be self-reliant in home nursing and how to give first-aid in emergencies. Last year, 1,600 first-aid instructors issued certificates to more than 7,500 persons; while 3,200 certificates in home care of the sick and mother and baby care were issued by approximately 200 home nursing instructors.

Volunteers have taught young people of high and elementary school age, through the Junior Red Cross, how to be good citizens through service in projects for the community and in behalf of needy children in other lands. Last year, Junior Red Cross enrollment in Alabama's schools totaled 371,880 students.

This record of service is one of which you and all the people of Alabama may well be proud, for it is a magnificent tribute to the warm heart of a great people.

Respectfully submitted.

EDNA MATTOX,
Miss Edna Mattox,
Director, Field Service.

Ike Strong in Minshall Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the results of a poll taken by my colleague, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, who represents the 23d District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you join with me when I say that some of us who have been here for several terms look with pride upon the endeavors and accomplishments of some of the freshmen or new Members of Congress. I have that pride when I see the services being performed by Congressman MINSHALL, of Ohio. It was my privilege to serve with Congressman MINSHALL back in the Ohio Legislature. He is bringing to Congress the same excellent service and unceasing efforts on behalf of the people he represents. His endeavors to keep in contact with his constituents by means of many visits and polls certainly is comemndable. In my opinion, we need have no fear of the future when the American people send to Congress young men with vision, integrity, honesty, and a willingness to work as exemplified by some of the new Members of this great legislative body, including the capable Member from the 23d District of Ohio.

IKE STRONG IN MINSHALL POLL

Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL today released the final tabulation of returns to his opinion poll which was mailed to a cross section of approximately 25,000 23d Congressional District residents in March.

The final tabulation of nearly 4,000 returns produced unmistakable evidence that President Eisenhower and his program are extremely popular with 23d District voters. Eighty-three and seven-tenths percent of those people answering the poll answered "Yes" to the question, "Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?"

This 83.7-percent support is an increase of almost 15 percent over the Eisenhower vote in 1952 when the President received 69.4 percent of the total vote cast for that office in the 23d Congressional District.

The largest number of "Yes" answers was in response to the question "Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy in private enterprise?" Ninety-three and one-tenth percent of the answers favored this portion of President Eisenhower's program. Another portion of the Eisenhower program heavily favored by 23d Congressional District voters was the 89.4 percent support of the President's Armed Forces Reserve program.

Twenty-third District residents registered their greatest disapproval against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Almost as great a disapproval was registered against the further lowering of taxes when 84 percent of those polled answered "No" to the question "Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later?" In this regard, a near majority, 49.3 percent, would even approve higher Federal taxes if needed to balance the budget.

Thirty-one and five-tenths percent of the people polled had no opinion on the Bricker amendment and 27.2 percent had no opinion on the reciprocal trade-agreements program, the two largest percentages in the "no opinion" column.

Congressman MINSHALL expressed his appreciation for the prompt and amazing response to his opinion poll and stated: "The results evidenced such a sincere and genuine interest in Government operations that future polls will be a regular part of my representing the people of the 23d Congressional District."

The final tabulation follows:

Final tabulation, Congressman William E. Minshall's opinion poll

Question	Answer in percentages		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor continued military assistance to Asia?	69.7	21.5	8.8
Do you favor continued economic assistance to Asia?	70.1	21.6	8.3
Do you favor continued military assistance to Europe?	72.4	21.3	6.3
Do you favor continued economic assistance to Europe?	56.2	37.5	6.3
Should nuclear weapons be used against Communist aggression?	73.7	17.7	8.6
Do you feel the United Nations deserves our continued support?	80.6	13.3	6.1
Do you favor admitting Red China to the United Nations?	11.9	82.4	5.7
Are you in agreement with the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy?	74.3	11.9	13.8
Would you favor reductions in defense spending?	28.0	67.7	4.3
Do you favor wage and price "standby" controls for use in case of emergency?	79.3	13.7	7.0
Do you believe that the civil defense program is adequate?	34.2	52.3	13.5
Do you favor congressional investigations of Un-American activities?	75.2	19.7	5.1
Do you favor granting immunity from criminal prosecution and forcing people to testify who use the defense of the fifth amendment?	39.1	47.9	13.0
Do you favor the use in Federal courts of evidence gained by or developed from wire tapping in cases involving national security?	81.7	14.0	4.3
Do you favor an Armed Forces Reserve program to build and maintain powerful civilian reserves?	89.4	6.6	4.0
Do you favor universal military training?	76.8	19.3	3.9
Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later?	12.3	84.0	3.7
Would you approve higher Federal taxes if needed to balance the budget?	49.3	46.3	4.4
Would you favor increasing present old age and survivorship benefits under the Social Security Act?	56.5	36.3	7.2
Should the Taft-Hartley Act be amended?	34.9	49.7	15.4
Do you approve of Federal aid to education to assist States in providing more public school classrooms?	64.4	30.3	5.3
Do you approve of statehood for Hawaii?	76.4	10.2	13.4
Do you approve of statehood for Alaska?	73.6	15.6	10.8
Do you approve of the reciprocal trade agreements program?	65.5	7.3	27.2
Do you favor the administration's farm program of flexible price supports?	66.8	19.7	13.5
Do you favor the Bricker amendment?	35.6	32.9	31.5
Do you favor raising postal rates to reduce the deficit in the Post Office Department?	71.4	23.2	5.4
Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote?	40.9	53.6	5.5
Should the present 75 cents an hour minimum wage law be increased to 90 cents an hour?	56.6	32.6	10.8
Do you favor a salary increase for Federal employees?	51.8	29.1	19.1
Do you believe that Congress should authorize 35,000 additional public housing units in each of the next 2 years?	32.8	43.8	18.0
Do you believe that the Small Business Administration which assists and encourages small-business enterprises should be continued?	81.7	10.8	7.5
Are you in favor of the administration's expanded Federal interstate highway program?	84.2	8.6	7.2
Do you favor a Federal health reinsurance program to encourage voluntary participation in health-insurance programs?	38.5	44.0	17.5
Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy in private enterprise?	93.1	4.1	2.8
Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?	83.7	5.1	11.2

National Monument at Summit, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from Utah State Legislature urging national monument at Promontory Summit, Utah:

Senate Resolution 5

Resolution of the Senate of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah Urging Congress to Have the Area at Promontory Summit, Utah, Where the Two Railroads Joined Made a National Monument

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas the Union Pacific Railway Co. and the Central Pacific Railway Co., now known as the Southern Pacific Railway Co., constructed nearly 1,800 miles of railroad in 6 years and joined a continent by meeting at Promontory Summit, Box Elder County, Utah, on May 10, 1869; and

Whereas the joining of our west and east coasts by railway changed the history of our country and affected and improved the lives of its inhabitants; and

Whereas the building of these two mighty railroads in such short time and over such rough and wild country still stands as one of the finest examples of American ingenuity; and

Whereas the importance of the event attracts large numbers of visitors and tourists to this area each year, although there are few accommodations at present for them; and

Whereas many thinking people have investigated for sometime plans to perpetuate this great and important historical moment in our Nation's history and have concluded that the area must be given to the people of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed to have a national park made of the area at Promontory Summit, Utah, to commemorate the event mentioned; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the congressional delegation for Utah and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America.

Background on Parcel Post Size and Weight Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the parcel post service was created by act of Congress in 1912, and went into operation on January 1, 1913. It was recognized in the Congress at that time that the establishment of a parcel-post system would bring about some dislocations in the transportation business. Proof is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 13, 1912, where this statement is found:

> The proposed measure will benefit all classes of the people except those carriers now engaged in the business of transporting small wares. While the patronage of these will be lessened, it will have the effect to limit their business to the more weighty freight, which is distinctly the business of such carriers.

That statement also belies some allegations that the parcel-post establishment was for the principal benefit of rural residents in that it says the enactment would benefit all classes of people.

The impermanence of the original 11-pound, 72-inch limit on parcel post is pointed up by the Senate committee report of 1912, which said:

> When the parcel-post service has once been inaugurated, details, such as insurance, collect on delivery, reduction in rates, increased weight limits, and so forth, can be rapidly added as experience indicates the character of the new service that should be provided.

The wants of the American public were quickly made known, and the first increase in parcels allowable in the mails was made in August 1913—just 8 months after the service began. Other increases were made periodically until 1931, when the 70-pound, 100-inch limit was reached. This was apparently the optimum, as it remained in effect for more than 20 years, half the life of the parcel-post system, until Public Law 199 was enacted in 1951.

During this 20-year period, the Railway Express Agency was making acquisitions to become a monopoly in its field, the final acquisition being made in 1938. During this 20-year period, the express agency enjoyed its greatest period of prosperity. During the latter part of this 20-year period, there began an upsurge in the businesses of motor carriers and freight forwarders.

In an economic period, when nearly all business was prospering, the early years after World War II, the business of the express agency declined. Rising costs of doing business forced railway-express rates up 123 percent, while parcel-post rates were increasing 125 percent. During this period, there was a 25-percent decline in railway-express shipments and a 50-percent decline in railroad less-than-carload shipments. At the same time, however, there wa staking place a 180-percent increase in freight-forwarder activity, a 260-percent rise in over-the-road carriage—motor carriers, and a 7,251-percent increase in air freight. During this same period, the growth of the parcel-post service only paralleled the growth of business in the other three classifications of mail.

The express agency, supported by its parent-company railroads, found a convenient whipping boy in the parcel-post system. Apparently they felt that it would be easier to wreck this valuable service in an effort to recoup its losses than it would be to cope with their true competitors—the freight forwarders, motor carriers, and air transport.

They sold their case well to the Congress. The employee unions of the railroads and the express agency were mobilized, and the rank-and-file employees were recruited to write emotional letters to the Congress, and fallacious reasoning was employed so effectively that the Congress was persuaded to enact Public Law 199 in 1951, to become effective January 1, 1952.

That law says:

> I. Packages moving between first-class post offices in the first and second postal zones can measure no more than 72 inches, length and girth combined, and can weigh up to 40 pounds.
>
> II. Packages moving between first-class post offices in the third through eighth postal zones can measure 72 inches, length and girth combined, but can weigh no more than 20 pounds.
>
> III. Parcels moving to or from a second-, third-, or fourth-class post office could still adhere to the 70-pound, 100-inch limit formerly available to all postal patrons.

The effect of this law was to provide a Government small-parcel delivery service to the least populous sections of the country; a parcel delivery service of the most expensive kind to the areas of the country which by reason of their lack of development contributed least to the support of the cost of the service. But at the same time, the citizens of the more densely populated areas, from whom comes the major financial support to the Government, are being denied all but a small part of the parcel-post service.

The law was enacted over the protest of the shipping public who stood ready to pay any necessary cost of the parcel-post service commensurate with efficient operation; a shipping public which knew there could be no substitute for the parcel-post system, which reaches into every town, village, and hamlet of the United States.

The proponents of Public Law 199 had as their watchword "Get the freight out of the parcel-post service." While Webster's International Unabridged Dictionary provides no definitive dimensions for freight, traffic experts recognize freight as being only those shipments in excess of 100 pounds.

The effects of the law have been these:

Contrary to the claim that enactment of the law would increase Railway Express employment, the number of employees of that agency has continued to decline until now there are fewer employees than in 1940, and 1,155 fewer employees than when the law went into effect.

According to information filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Express Agency net profit has fallen from $556,000 in 1951, the last year before Public Law 199 became operative, to only $11,624 for the first 10 months of 1954.

Packaging costs of commercial users of parcel post have increased greatly due to the necessity of breaking packages formerly acceptable in parcel post into two or more packages in order to meet the restrictions of Public Law 199. This also has the effect of increasing operating expenses in the Post Office Department by reason of increasing the number of packages handled in moving a volume of weight formerly acceptable in the mail in a single package.

The private patron of the parcel post system has met with utter confusion under the act. In many instances the son or daughter in college can no longer send their laundry home; food boxes from home are smaller. New patterns are being sent in Christmas gifts going through the mails in order to avoid the freight classification spelled out in Public Law 199. A lady's winter coat, when properly packaged for mailing, is now barred from the mails because it often falls into the category of freight.

Rural patrons of the Post Office Department, who were exempted from the restrictions of Public Law 199, were not able to escape the 36-percent increase in parcel-post rates, which is said by postal officials to be an increase nearly 60 percent greater than would have been necessary without Public Law 199.

The fiscal condition of the Post Office Department, in behalf of which the proponents of Public Law 199 assumed to speak at length, is said by postal officials to be around $70 million worse off than would be the case without Public Law 199.

But the efforts of the opponents to this law to get it repealed have not yet been successful.

Principal reasons for this lack of success to date are:

The proponents of the law are most adept at twisting statistics to picture conditions as favorable to their cause when such is not the case. They take the Post Office Department reports and interpret them to mean something entirely different from what was intended by that office. They quote statements out of context, and use different figures of their own to portray whatever picture best suits their need at the moment.

An outstanding example of the latter is this:

The express agency, when seeking ICC approval for increased minimum charges, said they had captured only 20 percent of the business lost to the Post Office Department by reason of Public Law 199. But, a few weeks later, when they went before the St. George subcommittee in the House of Representatives in January 1954 to urge retention of that law, they said they had gained 57 percent of the business lost to the post office by reason of Public Law 199. In the same connection, the agency often claims that competition from the Post Office Department had caused the layoff of 40,000 railway express employees. However, when they appeared before the ICC to get a rate increase, they presented information to show that 1,941 employees had been returned to their jobs. They told the congressional committee that about 4,000 had been returned to their jobs. Now, if they had recovered 20 percent of the business they claimed the parcel-post system had taken from them before Public Law 199, it would seem that 8,000 people would have been returned to their jobs. If they had recaptured 57 percent of the traffic driven out of the parcel-post system by Public Law 199, would not more than 22,000 people have been returned to their jobs? Yet, according to most recent employment figures available, there are 1,155 fewer employees in the agency now than when Public Law 199 went into effect. That leaves us completely in the dark as to just how has the parcel-post system affected railway express employment and profits? Indeed, is there any relationship at all? Was the parcel-post system ever competitive with the Railway Express Agency? The business on which the motor carriers, air carriers, and freight forwarders are prospering certainly did not come from the parcel-post system. Proof of this lies in the difficulties experienced when a shipper asks for the pickup of a shipment weighing less than 100 pounds. The prosperity of these carriers cannot all be attributed to movement of merchandise that just never moved before. It had to come from some other carrier, and there is ample evidence to indicate that much of it came from the railroads and from the Railway Express Agency.

But the railroads and the express agency have the political strength to continue to convince the Congress that its competitor is the parcel-post system; they have sold the Congress that its losses were due to the dozen shirts, the fishing rod, the card table, the lamp shade, and any number of similar items formerly carried by the parcel-post system, but which, because of a strange act of Congress, are now classified as "freight," and, as such, are barred from the mails.

It is to be hoped that Congress will soon realize that interests of 160 million Americans—all potential users of the parcel-post system—are to be considered ahead of the interests of a single monopoly that cannot rightly tell who its real competitors are. When the Congress reaches such a realization, or when the true facts of the parcel-post controversy are evaluated, there can be only one result: repeal of Public Law 199.

Percy A. Brown Observes 50th Year in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature story from the Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Sunday, April 17, 1955, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary observance of one of the Nation's outstanding restauranteurs and merchandisers, Percy A. Brown. As documented in the article, Mr. Brown's career is a saga in the annals of American private enterprise, and graphically points up the inevitable result of hard work and initiative. His is a career of which I am exceedingly proud.

The article follows:

PERCY A. BROWN TO MARK 50TH YEAR IN BUSINESS—STARTED CAREER AS NEWSPAPERBOY ON STREETS OF WILKES-BARRE—FIRM HAS SPLENDID NATIONAL REPUTATION

Percy A. Brown, Wyoming Valley's merchant prince, is preparing to observce his 50th year in business.

The man who started his career as a newspaper boy on the streets of Wilkes-Barre at the age of 10 will mark his first half century as a business leader with a series of gala events within the coming weeks.

As he prepares to start another milestone in business his eyes are on the future.

"We have gone a long way in the past 50 years through up-to-date merchandising. The people of Wyoming Valley can be assured that our policy will not change in the years ahead. We will try with each succeeding day to keep abreast of our field," Mr. Brown declared.

From a humble beginning Percy A. Brown has progressed to a place of eminence in the business history of the State and Nation. His combination store and cafeteria at 18–32 East Northampton Street has a splendid national reputation. During the years that have passed since he first entered business, Mr. Brown has been a pace setter. His merchandising methods have been copied by businessmen the Nation over.

ACTIVE FOR YEARS

A leader in all branches of community life, Mr. Brown has the respect and admiration of the cosmopolitan population which makes up Wyoming Valley. During the past half century he has been at the forefront of all movements designed to assist in the promotion and development of this region.

Mr. Brown was born of humble parents in 1883, near St. John's in Butler Valley in what is now commonly referred to as the Pennsylvania Dutch country. His father, the late Franklin Jackson Brown, moved to Wilkes-Barre to accept employment as a substitute mail carrier when the present merchant prince was a mere tot. His late mother was Mary C. (Wenner) Brown. The merchant's father finished his life serving as a coachman for the late Morgan B. Williams, a coal operator in the days when Wilkes-Barre was not so old.

PARENTS OF DAUGHTER

Percy Brown married Leah Brink, of Laceyville, and they have one daughter, Mrs. Clyde Davis, of Kingston. Mrs. Davis is secretary of Percy A. Brown & Co.

He attended the public schools and at the age of 10 began his active business career as a newspaper boy. Later, after leaving school, he was employed as a delivery boy in the department store of Fowler, Dick & Walker.

In 1896 Mr. Brown first became connected with the meat business finding employment with L. M. Utz, a prosperous and successful meat dealer. He remained with this establishment for 5 years, acquiring a thorough knowledge of the meat business. Later Mr. Brown was connected with other establishments of the same type, including the meat markets of Herman Knappman, Jacob Henricks, and Frederick LaFrance.

When Mr. LaFrance died in 1905, Mr. Brown, together with his father, bought the business and at that time continued the meat market at South Washington and East Northampton Streets.

Mr. Brown's policy of handling only top quality meats and bolognas proved successful from the start. By 1909, Mr. Brown's business had increased to the point that it was necessary to find larger quarters and he moved to the location the store now occupies. Every few years after he added new departments.

The first addition provided for a New York-type delicatessen department. From the outset Percy Brown carried imported and fancy foods along with scores of standard items, thus providing his customers with the greatest selectivity possible.

NATIONALLY KNOWN

During the intervening years, Mr. Brown's reputation as a merchant grew in leaps and bounds. His concern is now nationally recognized as a famous food market and cafeteria. To complement his meat and delicatessen departments, Mr. Brown first added a fresh fruits and vegetable department and soon after that incorporated fresh fish in the same department. Next came the sandwich counter which in 1920 was developed into a large, modern cafeteria. At the same time the bakery was added; followed soon by his own ice cream and dairy department.

After this period, Mr. Brown's energy was poured into the task of making more room for his evergrowing business. His interest in better cooked foods and the quality standards he adopted in 1905, kept his organization ever mindful of better methods, improved ingredients and perfect housekeeping. Quality was always the prime interest. Procedures for uniformity and quality control methods were constantly being installed so that every day the hundreds of items served or sold at Brown's were always the same.

In 1929, the cafeteria was again enlarged and modernized. Four years after that, a complete candy department was acquired, making the store as complete as could be found anywhere.

Just before World War II started, Mr. Brown became interested in the development of cooked frozen foods. Many people had successfully frozen and marketed frozen vegetables, fruits and juices, but up until this time little had been done in the freezing of cooked food items. With his eyes on the future, Mr. Brown embarked on a project of research in this line.

MANY STUDIED RESULTS

His research was so extensive many famous restaurant and food store owners throughout the country visited Brown's to study the results. The United States Army, working with the National Restaurant Association in 1946 sent a group of technicians

and a mobile laboratory from Chicago to make tests on some of the items Percy Brown had frozen.

Other experimental projects were launched by Brown's. A radar range was installed for experimental purposes. Dietitians employed by Mr. Brown performed services for the entire industry, finding out what could be done with this type of cooking. The manufacturer of the range still uses many of the techniques developed by Percy Brown.

A new and controlled method of aging beef was developed in the back room of Brown's. Somewhere in the country, some men had made a cabinet to age beef, thus improving the flavor and increasing the tenderness. The final technical angles and the method was supplied by Percy Brown.

During the past 50 years, Percy Brown has been first in many achievements. The first air-conditioning system was installed in the cafeteria long before the modern systems were developed. Although a bit crude from the mechanical point of view, this system then provided by ice and fans, afforded comfort for the guest in the cafeteria.

In recent years a stainless steel anthracite burning stove was installed in the restaurant kitchen. This was widely publicized because it was the first stainless steel coal stove ever made.

Over this last half century, improved equipment, such as ice-making machinery, conveyor systems, reel type ovens, automatic wrapping machines and a vacuum blender which extracts all air during the mixing process of bolognas and table-ready meats were added.

Today, after 50 years, the completely modernized Percy Brown's offers to this community, the widest variety of quality foods at consistently competitive prices, in an atmosphere of courtesy and friendliness.

International Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—GRANTS FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS TO STUDY AT INSTITUTIONS IN OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The report of the House Appropriation Committee on the international educational exchange activities of the State Department includes a statement to the effect that the committee "doubts that it was ever the intent of the Congress to pay the cost of sending foreign students from their country to study at a university of another foreign country." This statement read in connection with the hearings on this activity seems to reflect some concern over the fact that $220,155 in foreign currency equivalents, out of a total of $22 million requested for this activity, would be spent on grants to enable foreigners to attend American educational institutions in other foreign countries.

I should like to point out that the hearings indicate that the Department does not propose to spend this modest sum for studies in universities of other foreign countries but rather for studies in American colleges, American schools, and American institutes situated in foreign countries, and mostly in the countries of which the proposed students are citizens. It is true that to a limited extent some of these students would study in other foreign countries.

The information submitted by the Department and included in the report of the hearings (p. 334), however, indicates that something less than 16 percent of the local overseas grants or a total of $35,154 in foreign currency equivalents would be devoted to such studies in so-called "third countries." That information indicates that this small sum would enable two students from Iraq to study at the American University of Beirut and that less than 220 out of the 1,354 of these local overseas grantees would study for short periods of time at the well-known Salzburg Seminar in American Studies in Salzburg, Austria, and at American institutes modeled after it in Norway and Holland.

As I understand it, the authority for such grants is to be found in the Fulbright act. That act provides, among other things, for the expenditure of foreign currencies for "financing studies, research, instruction and other educational activities * * * of the citizens of such foreign country in the American schools and institutions of higher learning located outside the continental United States" and its territories "including transportation, tuition, maintenance, and other expenses incident to scholastic activities." I understand that this provision was intended to extend the benefits of educational exchange to a few foreign grantees, too many of whom could not come to this country and for whom such contact with American education and American educators would be the next best thing.

Pursuant to that provision, grants have been made for attendance at such American centers of American influence as Roberts College at Istanbul, the American University of Beirut and the American Farm School at Salonika and other such institutions. As the program has progressed, other additional institutions have been qualified to participate in this phase of the program by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the Board appointed by the President of the United States and consisting primarily of nongovernmental educators "for the purpose of selecting students and educational institutions qualified to participate in this program, and to supervise the exchange program authorized herein."

The hearings in the report would indicate that the committee was concerned primarily with the attendance of these foreign nationals at such American institutes abroad as the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies at Salzburg, Austria, and similar American institutes which have been established with the Salzburg Seminar as a model. I understand also that the focus of study in such institutes or seminars is American institutions and American studies, and that in most cases the students who receive these small grants are, in fact, teachers and mature people in positions where they can pass on what they have learned about American institutions in an influential way to their students, their associates, and their fellow citizens at home.

The hearings themselves contain a full description of the Salzburg Seminar which points out the fact that the Seminar is a private American institution which has received gifts from many private respectable American sources. The purpose of the Seminar is to enable Europeans to understand more fully the United States, its institutions, culture and way of life, and insofar as possible to correct the misconceptions concerning the United States which exist in Europe today. I call attention especially to the statement of the United States High Commissioner to Austria in 1951, which is quoted in the hearings: "Never before has it been so necessary for freemen to meet together in groups dedicated to better understanding and support of our free institutions."

I understand that the Salzburg Seminar and others like it also utilize fully American professors sent abroad under the FULBRIGHT program thereby expanding greatly the audiences for these spokesmen on American life and institutions. In view of all these facts, I would hope that nothing in the committee report would convey the impression that these seminars or institutes are universities of another foreign country. Rather, they are American centers abroad which, like the earlier and better known institutions like Roberts College, are islands of American influence and understanding overseas. I hope that this kind of activity can be continued on its current modest scale.

Will We Have To Ration Doctors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of my radio broadcast on Saturday, April 16, 1955, over WMEX, Boston, Mass.:

The health standards of the United States are rising.

More people recognize the importance of good health and want to protect it.

With our increasing population, however, there are not enongh doctors, dentists, and nurses to go around.

The question "Will we have to ration doctors?" is intended to point up the shortage and to get us thinking about remedies for this malnutrition in the medical profession itself.

The Health Resources Advisory Committee, which includes distinguished doctors, has just made a report of its findings to the Office of Defense Mobilization of the United States Government.

Their diagnosis should be given careful consideration in the treatment of aid-to-medical-schools bills which are now before the Congress. Generally speaking, these bills intend to provide $250 to $300 million in direct-grant aid to medical schools on a matching basis for the construction of new facilities.

Why is this necessary?

To help meet the $330 million construction of new facilities by medical schools that was needed as far back as 1947–48.

Based on the estimate of 75 out of 79 medical schools that they urgently need additional or improved space.

The increase in the number of physicians is falling behind the more rapid increase in our population.

The gross ratio of physicians to population is now 1.32 per 1,000, and the net ratio (active physicans only) is now 1.18, both slightly lower than just before World War II.

By 1960 the United States will have a total of 177 million people who will, at some time or another, need medical care.

At the rate we are going in medical education there will be fewer physicians percentagewise in 1960 than we had in 1950.

As the Committee summarizes, "We have a tight supply situation in the three major health professions—medicine, dentistry, and nursing. The supply, both of physicians and dentists, has not increased as fast as the

population, in the period since the beginning of World War II. The supply of nurses has increased more rapidly, but there are still many unmet demands for graduate nurses. There is little prospect for improvement in the total situation in this decade."

The medical schools are finding it hard to maintain adequate staffs with money problems and the shortage of qualified health manpower exerting heavy pressures.

Most medical schools reply upon part-time personnel, especially for instruction in clinical subjects. In the 1951 survey, medical faculties included 3,933 members with full-time, and 11,630 members with part-time appointments. Many of the 11,630 part-time faculty members were able to devote little time to teaching, the average being less than 300 hours per year.

Only 21 of the 72 four-year medical schools reported staffing which was up to the standard recommended by the Joint Committee on Medical Education.

The most specific report on this subject is found in the 1953 Education Number of the American Medical Association which states that for the school year 1953, the number of unfilled fulltime positions in the instructional staffs of medical schools was 283.

A significant change in the pattern of medical education and practice in recent years, is the growth of hospital internship, and residency training programs. Hospitals and practicing physicians have come increasingly to rely on these "house staffs." The result is that the demand by hospitals has, for some time, been greater than the supply of potential trainees, and hospitals vie with one another for their services.

In spite of the rapid increase in the number of physicians in training, the opportunities for training have continued to increase faster than the number of applicants. In 1952–53, 28 percent of internships and 24 percent of the residencies in hospitals were unfilled.

An important aspect of the hospital staffing picture has been the increase in the number of aliens on house staffs. Alien physicians comprise over a quarter of the house staffs of general nonteaching and of tuberculosis hospitals, and almost a quarter of the staffs of mental hospitals. Without their services, the shortage would be acute.

Concerning physicians in private practice, the very long workweek reported, 60 hours on the average, shows that there is little reserve of professional time and skill in today's pattern of provision for medical care.

Although there has been a rapid growth of public health services in this country, at least 30 million people live in areas without organized health departments. As of 1951, budgeted vacancies in the existing State and local public health departments amounted to 20 percent for physicians, 21 percent for dentists, 14 percent for sanitary engineers, 6 percent for sanitarians, 10 percent for veterinarians, and 9 percent for public health nurses. Even without the threat of atomic attack, or biological warfare, a shortage of this size is serious. With these threats existing, the shortage might threaten preventable disaster.

Bear in mind that this whole report was on the subject of "Mobilization and Health Manpower" and was submitted to the Office of Defense Mobilization where you hear this conclusion, and I quote:

"The physician-population ratio has become essentially stabilized. There are unmet demands today in medical education, public health, mental and tuberculosis hospitals, industry and rehabilitation, to name only a few areas. Many rural areas and small towns are in need of practicing physicians. Hospitals in increasing numbers are using alien physicians for house staffs.

"If the threat of attack on the cities of this country were to materialize in any of the presently predicted forms, the combined effect of civilian casualties and casualties in the health professions would place a considerably heavier burden on the population than did the last war, when the civilian population suffered neither military attack nor such an occurrence as the influenza pandemic of the First World War. A civilian disaster of the magnitude possible today could put an incredible load on the civilian health personnel."

Concerning the overall question: "Is there adequate medical training in the United States?" a few of the following facts will help us to reach an answer.

There are 74 approved medical schools, and 6 approved schools of basic medical sciences in the United States, including 1 approved medical school in Puerto Rico.

Twenty-seven thousand six hundred and five students were enrolled in the country's medical schools and 438 students in schools of basic sciences in 1953–54, making a total of 28,043 persons now preparing to fill the Nation's need for doctors.

Six thousand eight hundred and sixteen students graduated from medical schools in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1954. However, it is estimated that about 4,000 doctors are lost each year through death and retirement, so that the actual net increase of doctors was only 2,816.

Fourteen thousand six hundred and seventy-eight individuals applied for admission to American medical schools for the college year 1953–54.

Forty-three percent of these applicants came from 6 States (New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, and California).

Applicants from the following 7 States (Delaware, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Vermont, and Wyoming) represented only 1.4 percent of all persons submitting applications for admission to our medical schools. Only one of this number, Vermont, has an approved medical school.

By contrast, 2 years previously more than 20,000 applied for admission. The drop for 1953–54 reflects three factors.

1. The increasing cost of medical school tuition is pricing thousands of potential medical school students out of the market. New York University recently raised its medical school tuition to $1,000 per year.

2. The end of eligibility under the GI bill of rights.

3. A general feeling among college graduates that it is just too tough to get into medical schools.

Only 53 percent of the applicants were admitted as freshmen to the medical colleges in the United States in 1953–54.

Large numbers of qualified applicants are unable to gain admittance because of geographical restrictions. Thirty-eight percent of the State and municipally owned medical colleges (15 out of 39) restrict enrollment of first-year students to residents of the State in which the school is located. Twenty-three schools limit the number of out-of-State residents to less than 10 percent of the positions in the entering class. Only 22 schools admit out-of-State residents in numbers equal to more than 50 percent of the openings. As a result of these restrictions, some medical schools are forced to take nearly every one who applies, while others can accept only 1 out of every 10 or 15 applicants.

The basic barrier to increasing the number of physicians is actually the limited capacity of our medical schools. This means that the proportion of students who enter medical school has remained almost constant for the past 20 years whereas the proportion who receive a college education has more than quadrupled, and the proportion entering engineering has increased sixfold.

By 1960, the shortage of nurses for this country as a whole may exceed 50,000.

There are almost 300,000 auxiliary nursing workers in hospitals, and perhaps another 100,000 elsewhere. The need in 1960 for these workers, is estimated at more than 450,000.

The technician shortage is a serious bottleneck in the provision of medical service. Hospitals in the United States recently reported about 18,000 vacant positions for workers in 7 major fields allied to medicine—laboratory technicians, therapists of all kinds, X-ray technicians, hospital administrators, clinical psychologists, etc. In another 5 years, 35,000 will be needed.

In a nationwide survey conducted by the New York Times in 1952, it was found that "30 percent of the Nation's medical schools report that they are unable to get sufficient funds to meet their operating budgets." Of the $3,000 to $4,500 a year it costs the medical school to educate a medical student, the average student pays $600 to $900 a year in tuition, or only one-fifth of the cost.

In contrast to the $93 million to be spent for medical education in the academic year 1954–55, the American public spent in 1953 $5,300,000,000 for tobacco products and smoking supplies, $377 million for parimutuel net receipts, $105 million for make-up bases, face power, and lipsticks.

From this comparison, it would seem that the Congress would be justified in making a modest appropriation to keep our medical schools alive.

Iowa Leads Nation in Meat Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IOWA AGAIN LEADS NATION IN MEAT PRODUCTION

If all Iowa-produced meat had been kept in the State in 1954, each well-fed Iowan would have eaten almost 3 pounds of meat a day—or during the year over 1,014 pounds of pork products, juicy beefsteaks, roast beef, veal, lamb chops and roasts, calves liver, and, of course, Mulligan stew.

United States Department of Agriculture overall commercial meat-production figures for 1954 show that Iowa again led all 48 States in total volume of all livestock slaughtered. Of the 23,823,000,000 pounds of meat commercially produced in the United States, Iowa livestock accounted for over 11 percent—or 2,658,125,000 pounds—reaching American tables.

Besides taking first honors in hog production, Iowa ranked second in slaughter of sheep and lambs, third in cattle production, and ninth in calf slaughter.

Iowa ranked second in the number of cattle and calves on farms, with 6,279,000 head, or 6.5 percent of the Nation's total.

FROM IOWA HOGS IN 1954: OVER 400 MILLION PORK CHOPS

In terms of pork chops at an average of 38 chops per hog, in 1954 Iowa's porkers could have come to the dinner table as 408,804,000 pork chops.

If Iowans wanted to keep all the pork chops at home, there would have been enough chops from Hawkeye hogs to give each Iowan a supply of 156 chops. Dividing the supply up, enough Iowa hogs were raised in 1954 to provide 2½ pork chops apiece for the entire United States population—man, woman and child—including the

Armed Forces. And this doesn't include the rosy baked hams or pork loin roasts or bacon or sausage from Iowa's 1954 pig crop.

Last year Iowa again led the Nation in hog production, with 10,758,000 head, or 2,750,088,000 pounds liveweight, slaughtered in 1954. (This United States Department of Agriculture figure includes slaughter in federally inspected plants and other wholesale and retail plants, but excludes farm slaughter.)

Iowa's hog production last year was almost equal to the combined production of the two next highest States, Illinois and Minnesota. Of the 64,901,000 hogs slaughtered in the United States during the year, Iowa accounted for 16.4 percent—or 10,758,000 head.

Although fewer hogs were slaughtered in 1954 compared with 1953, an increase in average liveweight per head resulted in a 1-percent increase in pork production. Total liveweight of hogs produced in the United States in 1954 was 15,569,609,000 pounds, and 17.6 percent of the national total was made up of 2,750,088,000 pounds of corn-fattened Iowa porkers.

IOWA COWS SUPPLY 7.8 PERCENT OF NATION'S MILK SUPPLY

Iowa ranks third in the Nation in production of whole milk used in manufactured dairy products.

Iowa's dairy cows contributed 7.8 percent—4,420,420,000 pounds—of the Nation's total production of whole milk (57,016,696,000 pounds) in 1953.

Substantiating Iowa's position as a top-ranking dairy State, figures released by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture show Iowa third in creamery butter production. Of the Nation's total butter supply of 1,411,814,000 pounds. Iowa accounted for 13.3 percent, or 187,296,000 pounds. On a 10-year average, Iowa ranks second in butter production.

Iowa takes fourth place in the United States in number of milk cows on farms. Last year's total number of milk cows in Iowa, 1,111,000, constitutes nearly 5 percent of the total number of milk cows throughout the Nation, which was 24,408,000 in 1954.

UNICO's Newest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Times-Leader-Evening News, of April 16, 1955:

UNICO'S NEWEST SERVICE

In presenting two ether suction machines to Wyoming Valley Hospital today, UNICO, a local service club organized by a group of Americans of Italian extraction, adds impressively to its record of philanthropy. The equipment, costing in excess of $1,000, was financed by proceeds of the East-West football game sponsored by UNICO.

In 1954, UNICO presented a fluoroscope to Wilkes-Barre General Hospital. Next year, one of the other hospitals will receive an appliance of its own choosing with the needs of underprivileged children in mind. UNICO, which derives its name from the first letters of the words—Unity, Neighborliness, Integrity, Charity and Opportunity, thus carries out its program.

UNICO has made cash contributions to the Salvation Army, Catholic Charities, Family Service Association and the Cerebral Palsy Fund. It also has financed a cancer bed and radio for a patient at home.

For a group of 35 representative citizens, UNICO is setting a stiff pace for clubs throughout the area.

Day of Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled, Day of Triumph from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 13, 1955. The editorial emphasizes the great contribution of Dr. Jonas E. Salk, director of the University of Pittsburgh Virus Research Laboratory, in developing a successful polio vaccine. A tremendous debt of gratitude is owed to Dr. Salk, his colleagues and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for this dramatic triumph over another dread disease.

It was praticularly appropriate that the announcement of this great milestone in medical history was made on the tenth anniversary of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The establishment of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis by Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought dramatically to the public mind the need for funds to carry on the virus research.

The editorial follows:

DAY OF TRIUMPH

April 12, 1955, will go down as one of the most memorable dates in the annals of medical science. Although yesterday's announcement of the success of an antipolio vaccine was not unexpected, it put a stamp of official approval on a weapon which had promised to prevent the touching tragedy of widespread death and paralysis, especially among children. Now the promise is fulfilled. Independent field trials conducted under the direction of Dr. Thomas Francis of the University of Michigan have shown that the vaccine developed at the University of Pittsburgh is safe and 80 to 90 percent effective.

Yesterday was a day of triumph for Dr. Jonas E. Salk, director of Pitt's Virus Research Laboratory, where the vaccine was developed. It was a day of triumph for all of the other brilliant scientists who contributed knowledge conducive to victory: Dr. Karl Landsteiner of Austria, who identified the polio virus and showed that the disease could be transmitted to monkeys; Drs. John F. Enders, Thomas H. Weller, and Frederick C. Robbins of Harvard, who showed that the polio virus could be grown in cultures of non-nervous tissue; Dr. William McD. Hammon of the University of Pittsburgh, who showed through the use of gamma globulin that temporary prevention of polio paralysis could be achieved by raising the antibody level in the bloodstream; and many other scientific pioneers.

But April 12, 1955, was also a day of triumph for many whose names have never been seen in print: the patient researchers in scattered laboratories here and elsewhere, the forgotten benefactors who gave money for research with no guaranty of a payoff, the countless supporters of and workers for the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. These will be rewarded by the now bright prospect that within the next few years a deadly scourge will be ended. We are happy that the University of Pittsburgh and Pitt scientists have played such a significant part in the conquest.

County Man Learns a Union Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to introduce a letter from Mr. Lee Vandiner, of Buena Park, Calif., to the ediitor of the Santa Ana Register which appeared on March 23, 1955, and an editorial in the same edition of the Register discussing the letter.

The letter from Mr. Lee Vandiner is one of the best arguments in favor of the right-to-work laws.

The idea of forcing a person to join an organization against his will in order to make a living is against the principles of freedom upon which this country was built, and the damage is compounded when a man, realizing that he is prevented from making a living because of the power of the unions, is willing to pay the tribute demanded for membership and then still is denied the opportunity of working because the union arbitrarily refuses his membership.

The letter and editorial follows:

EDITOR, SANTA ANA REGISTER:

I am a painter, have been for 25 years, have some good letters of references, have for the last 3 months been working for anyone by day or otherwise.

Because I am not a union member, 2 weeks ago I went to the union hall on East First in Santa Ana.

I told the business agent if I could go to work out of there and pay the regular $3 per day they charge on permit men, this $3 goes toward becoming a member, the total fee is $150 for a painter's book. He said (Bill Seiguest) he could not send me on a job as long as some of his members were not working. So last Friday I talked to a contractor; he told me to go to the Santa Ana local and get a permit; he could put me to work Monday which is today.

I went to Bill Seiquest today at 8:30 a. m., stayed around there till 10 a. m.

I saw the union send men out on different jobs—one painter was sent out to wash down a kitchen and paint it. He came back, said "h—, I don't want to use a spunge and a bucket of water."

Another painter was sent out on a job He came back, said "Oh, the guy just had 2 days' work; I don't want that." Several men were asked if they wanted to go to work for the same man I got a job from Friday. They said, "No." I know some of those members don't want to work. They lay around that union hall and that of course keeps their names on the want book.

The point is Where is my right to work? I am kept out of work by such goings on. I would have taken any of those jobs and payed $3 per day to work, until I had paid

$150 to become a member. Now, on the other hand, if I had $50 to give them on a $150 book to become a member they will send me out. I want to know if we still have our rights in this land of the free, the pursuits of happiness, and so forth.

I have a family, am willing to pay to work if it is not written in our Constitution. I will drive most any place to work. I didn't know maybe you wanted to tell the free people this or maybe you don't care. At any rate I thank you for your time.

LEE VANDINER.

BUENA PARK.

COUNTY MAN LEARNS A UNION LESSON

Those who think that "there are some good unions" and that "we need laws controlling the right to work" ought to talk to Lee Vandiner, 9232 Western Avenue, Buena Park, whose letter appears in the Clearing House column today.

Mr. Vandiner puts it on the line in cold, bitter, and understandable English that leaves no doubt or confusion about what he thinks.

As he says:

"The point is, where is my right to work?"

It seems pretty pitiful that a man must be willing, as Mr. Vandiner says he is, to pay $3 a day to work. That, in itself ought to inflame anyone who believes in the American system and the American way of life. But it must be the nadir of something when a man is willing to pay $3 a day for "the right to work" and still cannot get work through the union that is supposed to be in the business of providing such workers.

We know nothing of Mr. Vandiner's accomplishments as a painter but we would like to hazard a guess that his interest and his determination to get work would spur him to do a better job than most union painters who seek to maintain an artificial and unearned monopoly in the painting business. We would be willing to bet that a man as interested in getting a job as Mr. Vandiner is would be just as interested in doing a good job so that he might put himself in the position of getting more work.

We hope that the publication of his letter and whatever we say here will be the means of encouraging those who have work for him to get in touch with Mr. Vandiner.

In this connection it is interesting to remember that Gov. Goodwin J. Knight has told us, prior to his election, that he would do his best to veto and defeat any sort of legislation designed to help people in the same position as Mr. Vandiner.

Some of us with reasonable memories will recall that on the occasion of a visit to the Santa Ana Lions Club Governor Knight was asked some pointed questions about his views on labor legislation. Knight contended that labor unions had done so much for "the working man" that those people who do not belong to the labor unions should not "get the advantages created by labor unions." But when he was pressed by his questioners to give any information on how any labor union ever raised the wage levels of all the workers he was mighty anxious to get away and duck the question.

The point, of course, was that he nor no one else can give any evidence that labor unions have benefited the working man if the definition of the working man is a person who produces. We are all "working men" whether we use a paint brush, a typewriter, a scalpel, or do any other kind of honest and dignified work.

We would like to have Governor Knight explain his theory to Mr. Lee Vandiner of Buena Park. We suspect that Mr. Vandiner might have some different ideas on just how valuable the unions and union bosses are to "the working man."

Smeared With Sugar, Quota Change Proposals Still Are Sour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

M. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues two editorials dealing with proposals to alter the Sugar Act of 1948. Having recently completed an exhaustive study of the Cuban sugar industry in relation to the Cuban economy and to the best interests of the United States, I find myself in wholehearted agreement with both of these articles.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 6, 1955]

PROTECTING THE PROTECTED

Senator ELLENDER's bill to give increased protection to domestic sugar producers emphasizes anew the contradictions in our agricultural policy. The sugar industry is one of the most heavily protected and subsidized in the country. But as is nearly always the case, the protected want constantly more protection, at the expense, of course, of the taxpayer and our relations with friendly countries.

Domestic sugar producers have a plausible argument that because of better methods of production they are being forced to divert their lands to other uses; instead of doing this they would rather limit imports of sugar more and more. Their representatives in Congress jump to their defense without much thought of the consequences. Yet domestic producers have the benefit of import quotas, tariffs, and subsidies. The subsidies amount in some instances to as much as $53 an acre. The result is that Americans pay about 50 percent more for their sugar than they would pay if they could buy it at the world market price.

The present sugar act establishing quotas for producers in this country and for foreign suppliers of the American market is supposed to continue in effect through 1956. But Senator ELLENDER's bill would amend the act immediately so as to allow domestic producers an additional 240,000-ton annual production at the expense of Cuban imports. This would cause real hardship in Cuba, which already has made its plans for this year on the basis of Secretary Benson's estimates of United States sugar needs in 1955. If any adjustment in sugar quotas is warranted because of the increase in population, certainly it should not be until the present act expires next year.

[From Barron's of December 20, 1954]

ONE LUMP OF TWO?—THE UNITED STATES NEEDS MORE IMPORTED SUGAR, NOT LESS

To those who encounter it only at coffee or tea time, sugar must seem a pleasant and inoffensive commodity, calculated to stir up nothing more controversial than the question of one lump or two. It is the vital ingredient in such good things as soda pop and candy, and it contributes to the richness and flavor of beer. In recent years, in one form or another, the United States has been consuming some 8 million tons annually, a figure which suggests that this country has an enormous sweet tooth indeed.

Yet, in the words of the poet, sometimes "things sweet to taste prove in digestion sour," and in a manner of speaking that is true of sugar. For this innocent-seeming table product is the very stuff of controversy, both at home and abroad. The reason is, simply, that the United States Government, at the behest of those who raise beets and cane, has set up a rigorous and fantastic system of subsidies, tariffs, and quotas on the production of sugar. This week, in fact, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson will announce the first official estimate of United States sugar consumption in 1955, as well as the quotas set for the various producers; in all likelihood, thereby, he will touch off a dispute which will rage in the halls of Congress next year and echo in a number of friendly chancelleries. The story of sugar, in short, is the old tale of the mischief that invariably comes from trying to find a substitute for supply and demand.

Nobody in Washington understands this better than Ezra Benson, who fought and won the good fight over flexible farm price supports, and who probably finds his chores with respect to sugar somewhat unpalatable. But whatever his own predilections, Cousin Ezra is bound to administer the law, and in this matter the governing statute is the notorious Sugar Act of 1948. Under this legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture each fall must determine how much sugar the United States will consume in the coming year. In making his estimate, however, he is adjured to carefully take into account its probable effect on the price of the commodity. Without quite saying so, then, the Sugar Act hints as broadly as possible that Agriculture's estimate should be low, in order to keep the price firm. In any case, that's how things have worked out in practice. In nearly every year, sugar consumption has been underestimated at first, and frequently revised upward later. More than once, under this incredible system, the United States has suffered from a temporary shortage of what is, after all, in anything but wartime or some other emergency, a surplus commodity.

This very abundance helps explain the second principal feature of the Sugar Act, its provisions for doling out the lush domestic market among the various American producers on the mainland and overseas. Each group is allotted a fixed tonnage which, by and large, only Congress can change. Thus, for example, of the aforementioned 8 million tons, domestic growers of beet sugar, which is raised in some 22 States, enjoy a quota of 1.8 million; mainland cane growers (in Louisiana and Florida exclusively), 500,000; Hawaii and Puerto Rico, slightly more than 1 million tons each; the Philippines, around 950,000 tons; and the Virgin Islands, 12,000 tons. This adds up to roughly 4.4 million tons. The rest of the quota is given to foreign growers, notably Cuba, which gets nearly all of it and a few other countries such as Mexico and the Dominican Republic. All imported sugar, it might be noted, is subject to a stiff duty, which, in effect, is turned over to the higher-cost domestic growers in subsidy payments.

This ingenious cellophane-wrapped marketing scheme, until quite recently, achieved all its adherents hoped for. The price of sugar in the United States for years has been "stabilized"—at levels nearly twice that prevailing anywhere else on the globe. Throughout 1953–54, for instance, the quotation for raw sugar on the New York Commodity Exchange hovered around 6 cents per pound, compared with something over 3 cents on the world market. But lately trouble has arisen in this protected paradise. Sugar is again in vast oversupply all over the world, and prices are generally low. Moreover, acreage restrictions on cotton and

wheat in this country have made farmers more eager to grow sugar beets which, thanks to the subsidies and controls, are a sure cash crop. Hence the various producing groups have all begun to clamor for a bigger slice of the United States pie.

Particularly strident—and politically powerful—are the demands of the domestic beet and cane growers. Although the Sugar Act does not expire until 1956, Democratic Senators from both Louisiana and Florida this year introduced bills to raise the mainland cane quota from 500,000 tons to 600,000. With fine bipartisanship, Senator HENRY DWORSHAK and Representative HAMER BUDGE, both Idaho Republicans, offered measures to lift the quota on beets from 1.8 million tons to 2 million. None of these proposals got very far at the last session of Congress. However, they are certain to be introduced again when the lawmakers return, and they are conceded to have a pretty good chance of passing. If they do, it is perfectly clear who will suffer. Since the total quota is only raised a little each year, a bigger share for one producer must come at the expense of another. In this case the chosen victims are Cuba and its sugar companies (largely United States owned, by the way) which happen to be low-cost producers, but which unfortunately, can muster no divisions on Capitol Hill.

In the end, of course, this country will also suffer from new curbs on foreign sugar. For a cutback in United States purchases of the Cuban product, which is basic to the island's economy, must sooner or later lead to lower sales of American-made goods in this part of the world. The same principle in varying degree applies to the other overseas producers. In return, the United States will get nothing but a steadily increasing acreage planted to beets and cane, which would have trouble surviving without special subsidies and tariff protection. This is Adam Smith's division of labor turned topsy-turvy and its effects can only be harmful to all. The moral seems clear. Sugar, like any other commodity, should be free to seek its proper level in the market place.

Polio Is Conquered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, probably no material blessing has happened to the world of such importance in generations as that which came from the University of Pittsburgh's Medical School, under the direction of Dr. Jonas E. Salk. This is the vaccine that will relieve the anxiety and apprehension of fathers and mothers throughout the world. It will prevent the dread disease of poliomyelitis attacking and crippling especially our children.

We must not forget, either, that the March of Dimes has contributed much toward this with its financing of this project. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Greensburg (Pa.) Morning Review. It is a splendid editorial and says eloquently what must be in the hearts of all of us:

POLIO IS CONQUERED

Man has conquered another disease—the Salk vaccine having delivered the knockout punch to polio which attacked so many children.

In the future polio, like diphtheria and scarlet fever, will rarely strike anyone who has been immunized by the Salk vaccine.

Dr. Jonas E. Salk, of the University of Pittsburgh, rightly receives the plaudits of the world but Dr. Salk—modest as are all great men—gives equal credit to the many assistants who aided in development of the vaccine.

He has from the first attempted to have the vaccine publicized without the use of his name. However, the public seems to have decided that it must be called Salk vaccine.

The public at large can share Dr. Salk's pride in the vaccine which will kill the polio threat. It was the dimes and dollars subscribed to the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis—founded by Franklin D. Roosevelt, himself a sufferer from polio—which made the extensive tests of the vaccine possible.

The result of the tests was forecast when the date for the evaluation report was set on the 10th anniversary of the death of the late President Roosevelt. Its confirmation set at rest all doubts.

There is bound to be an overwhelming rush by parents to have their children immunized. It will take time, however, before all sections of the country can be covered. In the meantime patience will be required from those who are most anxious to have their youngsters given the shots.

April 12 should become a day of general thanksgiving.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given by me commemorating the 212th anniversary of the birth of Jefferson, under the auspices of the Sons of the American Revolution held at Jefferson Memorial, April 13, 1955:

My fellow Americans, today, in an atmosphere befitting the occasion, we assemble to do honor to a great American. Standing here at the memorial he so richly deserves, we gaze upon the outskirts of Washington, a city which represents the Capital of a nation he helped to mould. Lawyer, rebel legislator, Governor, Ambassador, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President, Thomas Jefferson perhaps more than any other man charted the course and served at the helm of a ship of state which has become through the years the envy of the entire world.

Though his capacities were many in service of his country, his greatest attainment was as an architect. He visioned and built Monticello. He visioned and built the University of Virginia. But, best of all, he visioned and built a Federal Constitution that guaranteed freedom to live the life of one's own choosing; to worship as our conscience dictates; to speak our own minds without fear; to participate in the affairs of our Government; to preserve our own dignity as God intended that it be preserved.

He made another major contribution to America and the entire universe. He was the architect of a political philosophy which is as rich and as right today as when he put it into words nearly 200 years ago. The philosophy of Thomas Jefferson has been a beacon light to guard America's future against dangerous adventures and false Old World philosophies which would compromise or destroy our birthright.

Indeed, dangerous times came about when prophets of socialism in other guises sought to belittle and brush aside the advice of the Sage of Monticello. And in these times our Nation ventured into strange waters which brought a degree of regimentation of the people; of peacetime controls over the economy; of inflation and unbalanced budgets. Jefferson had warned that when we tell the farmer what to sow and what to reap we would soon want bread. He was so right when he said:

"My God. How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy."

And yet despite our previous misadventures and experiments away from the American form of government, there are still a number of national legislators backed up by a strong and vociferous minority who believe there is something wrong with the way we do things; that we can borrow parts of socialism and integrate them into our philosophy of government. My good friends, freedom and socialism are as compatible as a cat and dog. If we want to destroy freedom we have only to adopt socialism. Extreme danger exists even if we flirt with it as some of our nearsighted people suggest.

Thomas Jefferson had another architectual accomplishment. It was through his efforts that the great Democratic Party came into being. Throughout the years until the early 1930's, his political philosophy dictated the action of that party. But then the party began to depart from Jeffersonian teachings and direction.

But after a period of this transgression the American people became alarmed and through the voice that Jefferson gave them returned the Nation to the course decreed by our forefathers. In so doing, they reaffirmed their belief in and adherence to the principles on which America was founded and grew to greatness.

Today the political party Thomas Jefferson brought into being is content to team him with another patron saint—Andrew Jackson. That is somewhat of a shotgun wedding because Jefferson was a statesman with ideals that transcended political considerations and Jackson was a political and a very inept politician at that. He does not belong in the same company with Jefferson.

Jefferson is not a patron saint of the Democratic Party only. He is also a patron saint of the Republican Party. He was also the founder of the Jeffersonian Republican Party. And throughout the years the Republican Party has more consistently embraced and advanced Jeffersonian philosophy than has the Democratic Party. The critics of that philosophy and those who expound it say that we are behind the times; that we live in a forgotten age; that tradition mars our vision; that the world is passing us by.

If keeping step with a world of communism and socialism is necessary to progress; if following in the footsteps of Bevan and Stalin are essential to America's future then then indeed we are a decadent nation and a decadent people. But I, for one, prefer to be decadent; I prefer that the world march by without us. I prefer to live in a forgotten age—an age that gave me cherished and inalienable rights; I prefer to have my vision clouded by tradition.

Of course we are not out of step with the world. By following the principles of Jefferson and others like him we are so far ahead of the world in government philosophy, in spiritual and material greatness that the world will never catch up with us. Those

who advocate a departure from our course are either terribly misguided or they are purposely seeking to destroy our way of life. We shall not fall into their trap. We shall not guide our ship of state into dangerous shoals.

We most certainly would not forsake the American way for that of Russia or her satellites. We would certainly not lower our standards to those of England whose previous socialistic experiments have made it a nation of "have nots." Of France, Jefferson wrote and I quote:

"Indeed it is difficult to conceive how so good a people, so fertile a soil, so genial a climate, should be rendered so ineffectual for producing human happiness by one single curse—that of a bad form of government. * * * Of 20 millions of people supposed to be in France, I am of the opinion there are 19 millions more wretched, more accursed in every circumstance of human existence than the most conspicuously wretched individual of the whole United States." Jefferson wrote this appraisal in 1785. It still stands good. France is now floundering because of unstable government. Her standard of living cannot be remotely compared with ours. Do we want to keep in step with France? The answer is a thundering "no."

Name any nation, compare it with these United States, and you will quickly count your blessings. America became that way because of farsighted men like Thomas Jefferson. And America is going to stay that way by rededicating itself to the principles of Thomas Jefferson. These principles are given himself in what might be called a credo to a Democrat. In a letter written to Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, in January 1799, Jefferson said, and I quote:

"I am for preserving to the States the powers not yielded by them to the Union * * * and I am not for transferring all the powers of the States to the Federal Government.

"I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all of the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing, by every device, the public debt on the principle of it's being a public blessing.

"I am for free commerce with all nations; political connection with none. And I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe; entering the fields of slaughter to preserve their balance, or joining in the confederacy of kings to war against the principles of liberty.

"I am for freedom of religion and against all maneuvers to bring about a legal ascendency of one sect over another; for freedom of the press and against all violations of the Constitution to silence by force and not by reason the complaints or criticisms, just or unjust, of our citizens against the conduct of their agents. * * * The first object of my heart is my own country. In that is embarked my family, my fortune, and my own existence. I have not one farthing of interest, nor one fibre of attachment out of it, nor one single motive of preference of any one nation to another, but in proportion as they are more or less friendly to us."

Those are the words of Thomas Jefferson and instead of the "credo of a Democrat," they should be the "credo of an American." Many have sought to tag Jefferson with the label of an isolationist. But harken to his words which I just quoted and which I now repeat. Said he: "I have not one farthing of interest, nor one fiber of attachment out of it, nor one single motive of preference of any one nation to another but in proportion as the are more or less friendly to us." "More or less friendly to us." This phrase, in my opinion, gives Jeffersonian sanction to the mutual defense alliances between the free nations against the spread and aggression of communism. Indeed, communism would destroy all Jefferson worked and labored for and were he living today he would be one of its most vigorous opponents.

The Sage of Monticello was a doer. His accomplishments in behalf of his country were their own reward. His labors brought him satisfaction and a measure of contentment. He was essentially a family man and it was his regret that he could not spend more time with those dear to him. The great love of his life came to an untimely end with the death of his Martha, who gave him six children. On the white marble tombstone Jefferson inscribed a verse of such tenderness that, to shelter his emotions from the public gaze, he had it chiseled in Greek. Translated it reads:

"If in the melancholy shades below,
The flames of friends and lovers cease to glow,
Yet mine shall sacred last; mine undecayed
Burn on through death and animate my shade."

And though he had lost his most precious possession the great man found momentary relief in the unselfish service of the Nation he helped create. And in this process of service and eventual retirement his affections were transferred to his daughter, Martha Randolph.

When, after perhaps the most useful life of any American citizen, Thomas Jefferson himself saw the approach of his own death, it was to Mary Randolph he penned a private and deeply moving farewell. It was a little poem and he handed it to her in a little casket. It read, and I quote:

"Life's visions are vanished, its dreams are no more,
Dear friends of my bosom, why bathed in tears?
I go to my fathers; I welcome the shore
Which crowns all my hopes or which buries my cares.
Then farewell, my dear, my lov'd daughter, adieu!
The last pang of life is in parting from you!
Two seraphs await me long shrouded in death;
I will bear them your love on my last parting breath."

Death came to him, as it must to all of us, on July 4, 1826, just 50 years to the day after the Declaration of Independence.

Thomas Jefferson had lived triumphantly a full and rich life, the fruit of which will feed and inspire countless generations of Americans to come. Said James Madison: "* * * he lives and will live in the memory and gratitude of the wise and good, as a luminary of science, as a votary of liberty, as a model of patriotism, and as a benefactor of human kind."

To pay homage to this great man today is an honor and a privilege. Like Washington, he is "first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Polish-American Journal on Saturday, April 2, 1955. This article, by George Mark, former national commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, advocates the expansion of trade among free nations and the liberalization of American trade policies. Mr. Mark further advocates, following his world tour, the maintenance of our reciprocal-trade program and a lowering of our tariff barriers in order to prevent free nations from falling into Communist hands.

The article follows:

Mr. Mark said:

"Distrust of America's capacity to lead the world in a global fight against communism is rolling over the skies of Europe and Asia like an atomic cloud. In every country I visited I found government and party leaders suffering from the fallout of empty promises, broken pledges, and diplomatic doubletalk emanating from Washington," Mark stated.

"The effects of this loss of world confidence in the United States are worse than those of radiation disease. They sap the strength of government leaders in dozens of countries where they are fighting a battle against communism in their own front yards, instead of comparative safety of Washington, or the United States State Department," Mark declared.

NO FAITH IN GOP

"The world has no faith in the Republican promises to liberate enslaved nations or to use massive retaliation against Communist aggression. People in Europe and Asia are wondering whether the balance of the Republican Party pledges to restore peace in the world will be forgotten as just 'campaign promises.'

"I believe the entire world is waiting now to see whether the Eisenhower administration has the strength to carry out its last remaining pledge—to safeguard the economies of free nations by unconditionally supporting and promoting world trade," the former PLAV commander stated.

"President Eisenhower's decision to raise tariffs on Swiss watches was considered throughout Europe as the test case of his foreign-trade policy in which he completely failed to live up to his own trade principles."

Mark further emphasized that, "if we break this final pledge we will forfeit the respect of the world. Europe's leaders, who have been made cynical of American trade promises by the example of our treatment of Switzerland, will turn to more and more trade with Russia as they see the American market withdrawn from them. This will mark the beginning of the greatest Communist triumph. Russia will not hesitate to insidiously penetrate the economies of every nation in the world and to weaken the morale and political fiber of each of these countries by becoming the ruling economy power in trade, because we have abdicated our position."

How Your Dimes Can Buy Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it must be a great satisfaction to those who have been contributing their dimes over the past years for the elimination of the dread disease, Poliomyelitis, now to know that their hopes have been attained.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press. We from western Pennsylvania are very proud that the Pittsburgh Medical Center, through Dr. Salk, has become world-distinguished as the result of the effectuation of this vaccine:

HOW YOUR DIMES CAN BUY HEALTH

While the flush of success in the long grueling fight against infantile paralysis still is in the headlines, let us consider how it all happened.

First of all, of course, there was the disease itself, and the deadly fear of it. Nothing can stimulate public action as an epidemic can do, or dread of it.

Yet polio has been a crippler for centuries. And the elder among us can recall the frightening epidemic of 1916.

It was 50 years ago that scientists discovered polio was caused by a virus.

Still, it was only in last few years that the problem was attacked on anything like an adequate scale—and, as a result, virtually all of our progress has occurred in these few years.

It was the dramatic personality of Franklin D. Roosevelt which got the show on the road. A victim of the disease, Mr. Roosevelt in 1927 set up the Warm Springs Foundation, first institution exclusively concerned with polio. Even that was a relatively small effort.

It was the idea of a "March of Dimes," to celebrate the late President's birthday, which really launched the program now capped by the success of Dr. Jonas E. Salk and his University of Pittsburgh researchers.

Since 1938, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has spent more than $200 million aiding victims, training doctors, nurses, and technicians, financing research, all of this paid for in dimes donated by the general public.

It is the story of what research can do and what is not done without research. It is evidence of what can happen when the public is inspired to furnish the financial means, whether in dimes, or even pennies.

Take such a commonly known ailment as deafness. There are 750,000 persons in the United States who are totally deaf. Another 3,500,000 are partly deaf. Yet only $200,000 has been spent for research on disorders of the ear, according to a recent inquiry.

Consider, then, the possibilities if this problem were tackled with the same intensity, scholarship, and financing which have been applied to polio.

There are other grave problems: cancer, heart diseases, mental illness, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, blindness, arthritis, diabetes, to name the worst ones.

The answer in every case is more and better research. And, as with polio, the research could be financed by dime, or even penny, donations once the problems were publicly appreciated and the impetus and dramatic appeal supplied.

Studying Our National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the job we have of studying national problems and enacting appropriate legislation is indeed a complex one. No longer are we in the slow-moving age of the horse and carriage, an age in which the great issues of the day are relatively simple, the day in which legislative problems can be resolved as matters of national policy with comparative ease.

That day is past, Mr. Speaker, and we now live in a most complex era, the atomic era, an era geared to rapid transportation and high-speed communications of all sorts. Our population is nearing 165 million. Our great system of transportation has reduced the size of the Nation in which we have overnight communication by mail from coast to coast. We live in an age of pressure, tension, and speed.

And these many problems, I am certain my colleagues will agree, have greatly complicated our mission of legislating for our fellow Americans. And by no means the least of our problems is the task of enacting laws which will assure fair and equitable treatment for our public servants—the great army of men and women who do the Government's work at every level of endeavor.

Every member of this body does his conscientious best to see that fairness and equity are dispensed legislatively and administratively. There are wide differences of opinion, differences which are by no means alined to political disagreements, but differences on philosophy and interpretation of what should be done.

In our endeavors in the House we must by the necessity of things depend upon those who speak for substantial number of public servants. In depending on these representatives we thereby are able to see, through the eyes of the workers themselves, the problems of salary and working conditions. And in this task we meet many fine men and women, people who are dedicating their efforts, their time and talents to improving the lot of their fellow citizens whom they represent. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to refer to one of these representatives, a man who is an outstanding leader in his chosen field—a leader as the representative of a great association of workers and a leader as a public-spirited citizen. I refer to one who most of the Members of this body know, some who may have acquaintanceship which antedates my own—I refer to William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

I would like here and now to spell out some of the facts about the activities of Bill Doherty, some of which even some of his closest friends and associates may be unaware. Bill Doherty needs no praise from me, but I would like, as a matter of public record, to spell out some of the facts about this rather extraordinary American, for I am sure they will be praise enough. I would like to point out some of the salient activities of Mr. Doherty, as a labor lead and as a citizen—the man Fortune magazine this month calls the most important leader of Government unions.

Mr. Doherty began in the postal service in 1923 and was active in branch No. 43 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and 3 years later he became financial secretary. From 1928–31 he served as branch president and was elected the following year as president of the Ohio State Association. During that same year, 1932, he was elected to the national board of officers of his organization, and in 1935 became a member of the executive board. In 1941 Mr. Doherty was elected national president, and at each succeeding convention he has been reelected to head the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Most of the members of this House who have served during the last 10 or 12 years will be familiar with the fine work Mr. Doherty has done in behalf of the membership in Washington. He has been an eloquent and persistent spokesman for his people and for all Government employes. He was a founder and organizer of the Government Employees' Council in 1945, an association of more than a half million Government workers.

Not only has Doherty been a strong and able leader in behalf of the postal workers and Government workers, he has served with distinction as a member of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, a post he has held since 1943. As an AFL council member, he has given strong support to efforts of the last few years to effecting a unity in the ranks of labor and is a member of the unity committee of the AFL and CIO which brought to a conclusion plans to merge the two great confederations of American workers. The unity committee is continuing in developing proper and smooth-working procedures for bringing to a successful consolidation the forces of the AFL and CIO. He has also served on AFL jurisdictional committees, helping to iron out some of the vexing problems caused by differences in interpretations of lines of authority known as jurisdictional disputes.

A bright chapter in the career of Bill Doherty is the many contributions he has made in the field of international labor relations. Mr. Doherty is an anti-Communist from way back. He fought the old World Federation of Trade Unions, a group dominated by the Soviets, and he was a founder of the anti-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He has been a delegate to the world conventions of this group and has served on important committees.

Mr. Doherty is an executive member of the Postal Telephone and Telegraph International, Berne, Switzerland, and has addressed world meetings of the group from time to time. He has carried his campaign against communism into the camp of the enemy through Radio Berlin where he spelled out the differences between free labor and slave labor. And speaking of slave labor, Mr. Doherty turned over to a Member of this House who was a delegate at the conference founding the United Nations 10 years ago this month data on Soviet slave labor. This data was shown to a delegate from the U. S. S. R.—and this was at a time when it was not popular to discuss such topics with the Russians.

Not only has Mr. Doherty served in the international field abroad, he has been host to numerous visiting delegations of exchange labor leaders, students, and others coming to America under the auspices of the Marshall plan and other

groups. The Letter Carriers has been singled out as a fine example of a Government union.

The public service of Bill Doherty includes service as a citizen and as a soldier. He served in Siberia in World War I with the American Expeditionary Forces as a telegraph operator in the Signal Corps on the Chinese Eastern-Transsiberian Railroad. After service there he was chief radio operator on Corregidor. And 4 of his 5 sons have seen foreign military service and a fifth son is nearing military age.

Mr. Doherty originated the first National Flag Day program in the Nation's Capital a few years ago. His union, under his leadership, directed the muscular dystrophy national drive 2 years ago and the record of Doherty's union in war-bond drives and other humanitarian crusades such as the Red Cross, March of Dimes, and other efforts is too well known to require further comment. He has taken a strong interest as a citizen in civil defense, in labor-management problems and in civil service and he has served on citizens' advisory groups in each of these areas.

There is more that I could say on the work and activities of this leader, but I think the facts that I have listed spell out better than words of praise a tribute to the leadership, energy, resourcefulness, and great ability of this man. I am proud to call him my friend—and that is a sentiment I am certain is shared by a great many in this body. In the current problems of Government and postal pay, Mr. Doherty has shown characteristic energy and understanding—in forwarding the cause of those whom he represents and the cause of all public workers. His work and the results achieved are his best tribute and the few words I have added here merely point up the highlights of the career of this man.

Trial of United States Service Personnel Stationed Abroad for Offenses Committed on Foreign Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Utah State House entitled "Memorializing the Federal Government and the military authorities to assure fair trials for United States servicemen who commit offenses on foreign soil":

House Joint Resolution 12

Joint resolution memorializing responsible Federal Government officials, the United States Senate, and United States military and naval authorities with respect to the trial of United States service personnel stationed abroad for offenses committed on foreign soil

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (each house concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Utah, in regular session assembled, expresses its belief that all United States service personnel stationed abroad should be tried, wherever possible, by United States military tribunals for any offense committed on foreign soil and calls upon all responsible Government officials to make an effort in every case to secure jurisdiction and provide for disciplinary action, by United States military authorities, and failing this, to make every effort to insure that the persons involved are guaranteed a fair and legal trial. We urge that in future treaty negotiations or renegotiations, the responsible Government officials and the United States Senate seek to secure exclusive military jurisdiction over United States military personnel.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this joint resolution certified by the secretary of state of the State of Utah, under the great seal of the State of Utah, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of Defense of the United States, the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, the Chief of Naval Operations of the United States, and to the Honorable ARTHUR J. WATKINS and the Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT, United States Senators from the State of Utah, and to the Honorable WILLIAM A. DAWSON and the Honorable HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Representatives of the United States from the State of Utah.

Mrs. Katherine Wilson Hyatt, Mother of the Year for Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Mother of the Year for Arkansas," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.

Dr. Reuter has written a well deserved tribute to Mrs. Katharine Wilson Hyatt of Monticello, Ark., who has been selected Mother of the Year for Arkansas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTHER OF THE YEAR FOR ARKANSAS

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Arkansas A. & M. College)

Mrs. Katharine Wilson Hyatt has been selected as 1955 Mother of the Year for Arkansas. She will be 1 of the 52 selected. The list will include the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D. C. She is the second person to be selected who came from Monticello, Ark.

Mrs. Hyatt is the widow of Dr. Robert Fee Hyatt, well-known optometrist and pharmacist. She is the mother of 10 children, 8 of whom are alive and active. They are Mrs. Ethylen Clare Hyatt Smith, wife of Morris Smith, Little Rock architect; Mrs. Margaret McCain Hyatt Albright, wife of Dr. Spencer D. Albright, Richmond, Va., educator; David Taylor Hyatt, a Monticello pharmacist; Mrs. Eliza Wilson Hyatt Lee, wife of R. E. Lee, Montrose, Ark., merchant and planter; Dr. Robert Fee Hyatt, Jr., and Dr. Cyril Lewis Hyatt, Monticello, Ark., physicians; Dr. Alexander Jamison Hyatt, Richmond, Calif., Baptist preacher; and Dr. Ross Wilson Hyatt, Monticello dentist.

Mrs. Hyatt was born in Monticello, Ark., November 16, 1878. The Wilson family came to America from Belfast, County Antrim, Ireland, on the ship *Irish Volunteer*. Her parents came to Monticello, Ark., on Christmas Day, 1857. Her father, Alexander Jamison Wilson, served with Owens Battery, 1st Arkansas Field Artillery, and with Stephen D. Lee and Forrest's Cavalry during the War Between the States. Mrs. Hyatt's mother was Eliza McCain. A direct ancestor was Hugh McCain, Sr., who came to America in 1752. He was with George Washington at Valley Forge and served as an officer under him at Braddock's defeat. Mrs. Hyatt is qualified for hereditary membership in the Society of Order of Cincinnati. Her sons served in World War II.

Mrs. Hyatt has been a successful mother, an active Southern Baptist, an outstanding homemaker, a devout believer in the precepts of the Golden Rule, and active in civic affairs. Of all the fine organizations she has been active in other than the First Baptist Church of Monticello, the WCTU stands out.

Arkansas has a real candidate for 1955 for national mother. All the people in Arkansas should encourage her to go to New York City as the winner. There have been sad moments, in the passing, as Mrs. C. C. Smith; there have been glad moments, in awarding Daisy Young Boggs in Holden, Mo., as an outstanding lodge member from a distinguished American family, but we truly can proudly hail Mrs. Hyatt, a special mother for a critical time.

Mrs. Alice Nelson Hyatt, wife of Dr. A. J. Hyatt, wrote these words on Mothers' Day, 1944:

"TO MOTHER HYATT

"We never cease to marvel
At your attitude serene
In all the ups and downs of life
Which might o'ercome a queen.

"A Queen you are, in very truth
With realm and subjects, too.
Your realm, your home;
Your throne, our hearts,
Which loyal are, and true.

"Your home is a dear haven
From toilsome hours and blue,
Where courage, faith, and love prevail
That does our strength renew.

"Then thanks be to our Father
Who sendeth from above
The good gift of a Mother dear,
Like you, for us to love."

A distinguished list of mothers have represented Arkansas. They are: Mrs. John W. Rhea of Waldo, 1945; Mrs. Roberta W. Fulbright of Fayetteville, 1946; Mrs. David D. Terry of Little Rock, 1947; Mrs. Agnes Wynne Twitty of Fordyce, 1948; Mrs. James R. Echols of Monticello, 1949; Mrs. T. J. Raney of Little Rock, 1950; Mrs. Owen O. Oxley of Warren, 1951; Mrs. Alice Harris Walker of Forrest City, 1952; Mrs. Guy Cazort of Little Rock, 1953; and Mrs. W. A. Woodward of Magnolia, 1954.

And finally, Mrs. Juanita Biscoe wrote a Tribute to Mrs. R. F. Hyatt, Sr., as follows:

"On this beautiful Easter morning,
Surrounded by family and friends,
There sits a most modest mother,
Happy in the church she attends.
We all know this kind mother
Whom we just adore
Whose unselfish life
Earned admirers by the score.
Just to know her is to love her
She's a friend to those in need.
'Cause she has a way of knowing
Just how she can proceed.
A mother of eight lovely children
She gave them the best she had,
She shared all their joys and sorrows
While making them so very glad.
A vision of the eveningtime
With the family gathered there,
While father read the Scriptures
And this mother led in prayer

Life's page holds no memories
Half as sweet that can compare
With that sacred family altar
Where this mother led in prayer.
With her endless words of encouragement
She urged for each a college degree,
Developing three doctors, chemist, and a divinity
Thus adding to their family tree.
Each morning should be a challenge
As we view this Easter morning sun
While going along life's journey
With knowledge, God's eternity has begun.
Let's make our life an example
To this 'mother of the year.'
While treading upon the sands of time
And striving for the clestial sphere
To you, Mrs. Hyatt, 'the mother of the year,'
A tribute we wish to convey
For the bestowal of this great honor
On this very 'Special Day.'"

Food and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Food and Peace," which was published in the Missouri Times of Pleasant Hill, Mo., on March 17, 1955, which includes correspondence between the Reverend Albert Danter, pastor of St. Boniface Church, of St. Louis, Mo., and myself.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD AND PEACE

The world and Mr. Dulles, it seems to us, are playing the old-fashioned chess-game kind of diplomacy. No one, however, is going to be able to say "check and mate" in the big game now, the overwhelming danger being that the board will get kicked over.

Such pawns as Quemoy and Matsu and even Formosa are not, we feel, of stupendous interest to ordinary people, who fail to understand as well as they should the concepts of battleship strategy in a time when Val Peterson is suggesting the construction of concrete culverts for them to cower in if war should come.

Mr. Dulles' reports are interesting, but a more enlightening discussion of some basic things about world peace comes, we think, in an exchange of letters between the Reverend Albert Danter, a Catholic priest of St. Louis, and Senator STUART SYMINGTON, to whom we are indebted for copies of this correspondence.

Wrote Father Danter to the Senator:

"It is said that the United States Government has $7 billion worth of surplus farm products stored on farms, in elevators, in caves, and even in ships anchored in the Hudson River (America, February 5, 1955). Despite these huge surpluses and the problem of their disposal the delegates to the last convention of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference thanked God for the great abundance of food which He has given our country and continues to give. They noted with approval the trend toward increased production both per acre and per person. They decried the growing alarm over these surpluses and the call for lowered production. They declared these surpluses a blessing, not a curse.

"Why did they speak this way? Because these surplus food products may be embarrassing to us, but they would be a gift from heaven to millions in many other countries not as fortunate as ours. It is a crime that cries to heaven for vengeance to allow these surpluses to rot or to call for lowered production when millions of human beings all over the world are hungry and starving. The obligations of charity do not stop at our national boundaries. According to the teachings of Christ, every human being is our neighbor. And if our neighbor is starving, we are bound to help him, whether he lives in New York, Los Angeles, India, or South Africa. I cannot see why God does not punish us severely for keeping this food from the mouths of the starving. He may do so yet.

"What means can we use to see that this food reaches the hungry all over the world? I would like to suggest one means, at least: the lowering or, perhaps, even the abolishing of our tariff walls. The peoples of other countries cannot buy the things they need from us unless we in turn buy their products. The selfish think only of American industry policy is not only short sighted, it may be disastrous. While we turn our backs on our neighbors, Soviet Russia grows fat from world trade. In this matter President Eisenhower is to be commended for his efforts to lower tariffs.

"I would like to suggest also, a continuation of, and even expansion of, point 4, and other programs to help poor countries to improve their economies. This will eventually do more to check communism than the billions we are pouring into ammunition.

"We take great pride in our prosperity and look down our noses at other less well-fed nations. Instead, we should not forget that God blessed us richly. We should not forget, also, that we were lucky enough to get one of the most fertile, most richly endowed regions in the world. It's time for us to get rid of our smugness and begin to thank God most humbly and most earnestly."

Senator SYMINGTON, in reply, said:

"Thank you for your very thoughtful elter of March 2 which I read with a great deal of interest.

"Communist drive to conquer the world can be met with atomic and hydrogen bombs; or with food, and ideals looking toward a better life.

"We must be so strong that the godless leaders of the Communist conspiracy will not dare attack us; in my opinion, if ever we are to achieve a lasting peace, it can only be through raising the living standards of the peoples of the world, that is, through the use of food.

"Ideals are of great importance, but ideals soon lose their meaning when not matched with deeds."

Address by Thomas Dixon, National Commander, United American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have an address by Mr. Thomas Dixon, national commander of the United American Veterans, of April 15, 1955, which I should like to insert in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY THOMAS DIXON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, UNITED AMERICAN VETERANS, DELIVERED OVER THE FACILITIES OF WPIK, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 15, 1955

Patriotic Americans, on March 28, 1955, Patrick Henry, of the speech, "Give me liberty or give me death," was dramatically brought back to life in a play at Lisner Auditorum, entitled "Cry of Freedom."

One hundred and eighty years ago, those words thrilled the Virginia statesmen, and led this country in action to partial victory. Over the years, however, it has amounted to little more than our freedom on paper from the British Government. It is still dictatorial in our foreign policy—exerting and apparently having a controlling influence over our Secretaries of State.

What this country needs today is the inspired leadership of some 20th century Patrick Henry so we may gain full and unfettered freedom from the Honorable Sirs and company in England.

Just take a look at all the words from England concerning the islands of Matsu and Quemoy. The English Sirs have stated that should this country get into a war over these islands, England would not support the United States in such a war. Very well, Honorable Sirs; but I warn you, that if and when the Communist Chinese start to drive the British out of Hong Kong and other British possessions in China, American citizens nationwide will oppose any act of Congress allowing American soldiers to be sacrificed for the financial gain of the British Empire. We have had entirely too much political pressure from those leaders. Enough is enough.

And while we seek our freedom again from the British leaders, we must also obtain our complete freedom from the United Nations. Complete separation is clearly indicated. There is one solution for the American people, and that is for Congress to enact H. R. 3269, which was introduced by Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota. This important resolution calls for the withdrawal of our membership from the United Nations. A growing number of our own leaders have had their eyes opened, and now openly admit that the United Nations is ineffectual as an instrument to bring about world peace, and has proved itself worthless to command peace among its member nations.

Let's face facts. If the United Nations could fulfill the mission which it was organized to accomplish, there would be no need for so many endless conferences. Thirty percent of American adults who were interviewed said they were against the United Nations. This percentage is increasing.

I should like to refresh your memory on brighter things to come. I have spoken about an organization, recently incorporated, with the unselfish purpose of sponsoring and building a shrine here in Washington to symbolize the honor long due the American Indians.

One of my listeners wrote, asking what value would such a shrine represent. Let me remind this listener of the great sacrifices the American Indians have endured. Let me remind you that there is no race of people on earth that has been the victim of such cruel injustice as the American Indians. Don't forget, this mistreatment continues even today, and has deprived many American Indians of the means of decent living. In Arizona the Indians are being deprived of the legal and rightful share of water to irrigate their farms. This property right was taken from them—in a cruel and inhumane way.

Another case you may not know, concerns a small tribe known as the Natchez-Cado Indians in Louisiana. Originally they possessed the area, now the State of Louisiana. They have been dispossessed of their ownership, and have never received one penny

from the United States Government. And they can't get any money now, because they have never made a peace treaty with the United States. You remember in studying history, when the United States cavalry drove the Indians into what is now Oklahoma, the Indians in Louisiana did not want to go to Oklahoma, so they hid out in the swamps and hills. And their descendents are still in the swamps and hills of Louisiana, many of them can't read or write, and they are in desperate financial condition. Such cases could be multiplied many times. We as individuals and as a Nation certainly do owe a great deal to those who sacrificed so much.

America has been rightfully generous in its splendid tributes of honor to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and a great many other distinguished persons. We are proud of these monuments and cherish the stimulation of thought which they represent.

The shrine dedicates to the great spiirt honoring the American Indians, will be a memorial in recognition of the great character and the great sacrifices endured under bitter conditions.

Many Indians will visit this shrine for spiritual inspiration, and for the satisfaction of realizing that at long last their contributions to the American way of life is evidenced in such a shrine.

This shrine will also be a mecca of great interest for millions of world tourists visiting Washington, the arts and handicrafts of many tribes will be displayed, and where genuine Indian articles may be purchased. Such objects of beauty and utility have a very great appeal. The net proceeds realized from all sales will be set aside for the assistance of needy American Indians, and for the higher education of talented American Indian youths who desire such an education.

The shrine represents a creative idea, it is to be alive to the needs of the time—all time. It will be the encouraging factor in its inspiration and guidance for Indian youths—ever leading onward.

The American Shrine, Inc., will always work for the best in the heritage of the past, and work for a better future for the many tribes of American Indians, bringing hope and at least some indemnity for the extreme losses in the past.

I shall be pleased to hear from you. Write your ideas to post office box 2518, Washington, D. C.

I thank you.

Father of Cotton Fiber Technology in United States Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Father of Cotton Fiber Technology in U. S. D. A.," written by Fred Bailey, and published in the Cotton Gin and Oil Mill Press of February 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY OWES HIM MUCH—FATHER OF COTTON FIBER TECHNOLOGY IN USDA

(By Fred Bailey, Washington representative, the Cotton Gin and Oil Mill Press)

Have you ever cussed the Government and damned the bureaucrats? If not, this article probably will not interest you and we suggest you simply turn the page.

But, if you are among the great majority of us who have exercised that greatly prized privilege of telling off Washington, we suggest that you read on, for here is a story of a man you may want to applaud.

In the cotton industry we probably owe Dr. Robert W. Webb many times the amount we have paid him as a Government worker in the past one-third of a century. His work has added millions of dollars to the income of cotton growers, ginners, and spinners.

Often called the father of cotton fiber technology in the USDA, it was by birth and chance that Dr. Webb became interested in cotton-fiber research 28 years ago, come next March. Under various titles and departments since 1927 he has headed cotton-fiber research in USDA.

Born and raised in South Carolina, Dr. Webb learned about cotton production early in life from a practical standpoint. After graduating from Clemson College and Washington University, he joined the Department in June 1921.

Six years later, while he was engaged in plant pathology work on wheat, Arthur W. Palmer, now in charge of the cotton marketing division, asked him if he would be interested in working on cotton fibers, a field then largely ignored by the Department.

Dr. Webb replied that he felt the future of southern agriculture depended in a considerable measure on improving and finding new uses for cotton and that he would like to work on that. So little was known about cotton fiber that Dr. Webb and his staff spent the next 2 years searching out all that was known. Most of that time was spent in the Library of Congress.

He established the first modern cotton fiber research and testing laboratory in the United States and the third in the world. Two earlier ones were established in England. Today there are more than 125 government and private laboratories devoted to the study of cotton fiber properties.

Dr. Webb has been far more than just a pioneer in this field; he has been, and is, a leader and one of the principal contributors to the science of measuring the properties of cotton fiber. He has received many awards, the latest of which was a certificate of merit at the cotton industry Spinner-Breeder Conference held last October in Greenville, Miss., in "recognition of outstanding contributions to the development of scientific knowledge connected with the definitions and relationships of fiber properties and spinning qualities."

He is the inventor of the Suter-Webb duplex machine now in common use for separating cotton fibers according to length. He developed and directed the first modern and comprehensive cotton-quality research program in the United States, including cotton fiber, ginning, and spinning studies.

Dr. Webb established the fiber technical basis which sparked congressional authorization for the creation of the first cotton ginning laboratory in the United States in 1930, and for the successful development of the world's most comprehensive ginning research program.

His findings in reference to cotton-fiber fineness gave breeders in this country, as well as in others, a new target for use in their cotton-breeding and improvement work. Those results have been a prime factor influencing the direction of future cotton-breeding, improvement, and production programs in the United States and elsewhere.

Information developed by Dr. Webb led to creation by Congress of a cotton-testing service in the USDA in 1942. This made available cotton fiber and spinning tests on a fee-per-sample basis. Associates say this service has made possible rapid and positive improvement in the quality of the American crop, and that still more progress may be expected in the future.

In the past 28 years, Dr. Webb and his staff have trained and supervised hundreds of staff members in cotton-fiber technology. In most of the more than 125 laboratories mentioned above there are men trained by Dr. Webb.

The work of Dr. Webb over the past more than a quarter of a century has not been blazoned in headlines, but it has contributed solid advancement to one of our most important national industries, the growing, processing, and spinning of cotton fiber.

The unsung story of Dr. Webb is not an exceptional one. It is duplicated, more or less, by many thousands of honest, hard-working, and intelligent public servants who go quietly about doing their jobs.

"Thanks, Mr. Sam"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a summation of the thoughts I have had as a freshman Member of the House about the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of the United States.

Speaker RAYBURN was honored by the members of his party last weekend, and these honors, plus the fact that I have had great respect for our beloved Speaker over the past several years, have moved me to write down some observations which I occasionally pass along to constitutents in conversation and by letter.

As a young man in southwest Virginia, which borders east Tennessee where our Speaker was born, I often heard of "Mr. SAM" from the Honorable John W. Flannagan, who served the Virginia Ninth District for many years in the House, and later from the Honorable Tom B. Fugate, who followed Mr. Flannagan as the Ninth District representative. They spoke of "Mr. SAM" with praise in every respect.

Later, when I started my campaign for Congress, numerous citizens came to me and said, in essence, "You see 'Mr. SAM' when you get to Congress and he will help you out." Those friends of mine, who had followed our Speaker's illustrious career through the years, were absolutely correct in their advice.

Even before I was elected, "Mr. SAM" came to my district and made a speech, met many of the citizens who have been his supporters over the past years, and discussed with them the phases of government which were of interest.

I have found in the short time that I have been a Member of this great representative assembly that our Speaker serves in his high position with dignity, calmness, and ability in every respect. He is a statesman with the qualifications of wisdom, patriotism, and devotion to duty. He uses wisely and effectively the powers of the high and honorable office he occupies.

I have already learned to love and respect him as one of the greatest Americans I have ever known.

This brief but sincere tribute cannot be ended without mention of his help and fatherly advice which he readily gives to the newcomer to Congress. On several occasions I, as I am certain many other freshmen have in the past, turned to him for counsel and guidance. He has never been too busy to discuss problems with me nor to give me the benefit of his many years of experience in the House.

So, "Mr. SAM," I say, "thank you" for your aid in the past. I express the wishes of hundreds of my constituents when I wish for you many more years of service in the House. You have our love, our respect, and our heartfelt thanks for your great contributions to the welfare of this Nation through the past years.

Wall Street on the Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 last, the New York Times published an excellent editorial on the stock market investigation. I delayed placing this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pending the test of time on the accuracy of the opinion presented by the editorial.

To my many friends and former colleagues in the New York metropolitan area, I expressed the opinion that the investigation was a very salutary thing. At the time they felt that it was an expression of gloom and doom and would have unfortunate results. It seems to me that an intelligent and comprehensive study of a major facet of our economy, particularly where the results are good, is the best advertisement the industry could have. The results seem to bear this out.

The editorial follows:

WALL STREET ON THE STAND

With the conclusion of the first phase of the Fulbright committee's study of the stock market both the Senators on the committee and the public at large now have the opportunity to evaluate the results of these past few weeks of testimony. Senator FULBRIGHT has given his own personal conclusion that there are no major abuses in the market and no urgent legislation is required. The stock market itself, after declining for a time after the hearings opened, has resumed its upward march these past few days.

Several constructive results of the hearings are readily apparent. The public interest they have generated has probably given many persons a new awareness and understanding of the stock market—a useful result since this market is one of the key mechanisms permitting our free economy to function. The differences of opinion among those who have testified should help many to understand that the stock market is a complex phenomenon before which even the wisest of men, let alone the amateur investor, dare not be too dogmatic. The dangers of excessive speculation, and the need for caution even in these days of Securities and Exchange regulation, have also been well publicized. Against these positive effects must be put such unhappy by-products as Senator CAPEHART'S personal attack on Prof. J. K. Galbraith, whose views on the market, whether right or wrong, are far from being Communist.

Testifying on the last day of hearings, Bernard Baruch compared the stock market to a thermometer, pointing out that market fluctuations reflect the many uncertainties of our economic and political life. The real problem, he properly pointed out, arises from the need for sound economic and security policies, since if these exist the market will reflect the soundness of the environment in which we live.

Particularly pertinent, and in an area far more general than only the stock market, was Mr. Baruch's advice that we determine what national security requires in the way of expenditures "and then do it," putting other subsidiary considerations, such as tax reductions, in their proper secondary place. The high level of Mr. Baruch's testimony was a fitting close for a Senate study whose general conduct, with some few exceptions, has been such as to reflect credit upon Senator FULBRIGHT and his colleagues.

Proposes Nothing New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I feel that the following editorial from the Burlington, Iowa, Hawk-Eye Gazette, of April 15, 1955, makes a point which many people are inclined to overlook in appraising our foreign policy:

PROPOSES NOTHING NEW

Adlai Stevenson, the titular head of the Democratic Party, has broken his long silence on the Asiatic problems faced by the United States. He would have the United States refrain from defending the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, but would stand behind General Chiang Kai-shek in the defense of Formosa.

Stevenson would have his admirers believe he has reached these conclusions after long research and that he is advocating a policy more wholesome than any advanced so far by the Eisenhower administration. His prediction is that to follow his course another world war might be avoided.

Obviously, Stevenson would like to appear in the role of a world saviour * * * a seer whose wisdom prevented another holocaust. This is natural since he probably still holds ambitions to be President, an honor denied him in 1952 by the United States voters.

Oddly enough, however, Stevenson's recommendations are virtually in support of rather than a substitute for the Eisenhower program. There is every reason for confidence that the President has sought diligently every avenue to avoid war in the Far East or anywhere else. Eisenhower has long pursued a course with which Stevenson, if sincere in his latest public statements, is not out of agreement.

Footnotes on the 1956 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a historic speech delivered at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1955, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said that the western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front. While in Moscow he gained the impression that communism was moving ahead in many fields which the present western strategy overlooks. The arms race, he said, was not the only area in which they are competing with us. They have taken sports and culture and the impressionable years of youth and transformed them into arenas of the cold war. By inviting to Russia picked delegations from the satellite countries and the neutrals they strive to convey the impression that Soviet life is superior to that in the West.

Sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed. The United States is likely to have a tough time at the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, when Soviet Russia enters a team which even now is being prepared for the big test, he warned.

America has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has also been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people. How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?

Of course, these Russian athletes are not really amateurs. They are professionals. They are trained under government guidance, with government help. They receive bonuses and money prizes.

"We should find some way," he said, "of making sure that our Olympic contenders get everything they need in the way of training opportunities."

Mr. Hearst went on to say that—

The lively arts are another field wherein the commissars are operating with the professed intention of proving to the young people of the world that Russian achievements far surpass the West. Ballet, the theater, literature all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

From Moscow radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism. It stands to

reason that such extensive wooing of impressionable minds is likely to pay dividends—unless we compete vigorously with the Communist effort and even surpass it. We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor.

But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete. Nor is it enough for our leaders to advocate and appropriate large sums for foreign military and economic aid and think they have met the challenge.

Money is not enough. I came away from Russia convinced that only deep thought and long-range planning would suffice to prevail over communism in the conflict of coexistence. Money spent on foreign aid will not get the most effective results unless it is thoughtfully expended in those fields where it will do the most good.

We should seek to convey to the world—to our allies, to the uncommitted countries especially, and to the Russians if possible—the idea that America is not only proud of its motor cars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements. I believe that any cultural exchange between Russia and the United States is certain to develop in our favor. Within limits, I think such exchanges should be encouraged.

Mr. Hearst advocated the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists. This board should be scrupulously nonpartisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available, both in public and private life. It should survey the whole global scene and develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. "Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems," Mr. Hearst said and added: "Who can doubt that America would emerge on top in any such competition?"

I have introduced several bills which are specifically designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals made by Mr. Hearst. One bill, to establish a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital, has been reported favorably to the House District of Columbia Committee and action is expected to be taken on it shortly. A second measure, H. R. 5040, would "establish a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism, establish a Federal Advisory Commission to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation, and provide awards of merit." This bill makes a specific finding that communism cannot be overcome by armed strength alone, and that competitive coexistence must extend to every field and every front. It also takes note of Communist material achievements, and the extent to which cultural and artistic programs are used to spread Communist doctrine, and approves the President's recommendations to the Congress on the fine arts in his message on the state of the Union.

A third bill, H. R. 4109, would establish an advisory group, made up of the Nation's leading sports organizations, to assist the Federal commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in establishing a national stadium for Olympic games as a memorial to the heroes of World War I, World War II, and the Korean hostilities.

I hope that a number of my colleagues from both sides of the House will join with me in sponsoring these measures, and I am very pleased that all of the Hearst newspapers have carried supporting articles on my measures similar to the following, which appeared in Chicago American on March 19, 1955:

HOUSE GETS DETAILS—HEARST AIMS TO CONGRESS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—The warning by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., that preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence with Communist Russia was recorded before Congress today by Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey.

In detailing on the floor of the House the "trenchant observations" made by the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers in his recent speech before the National Press Club, THOMPSON explained he and congressional colleagues have introduced several bills "which are specifically designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals made by Hearst."

THOMPSON pointed out that one bill, to establish a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital, has been reported favorably to the House District of Columbia Committee after testimony from the country's leading cultural and business groups.

A second bill, THOMPSON continued, would establish an advisory group, made up of the Natilon's leading sports organizations, to assist a proposed Federal commission in establishing a national stadium for Olympic games as a memorial to the heroes of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict THOMPSON added:

"The third measure would provide in the field of culture the kind of flexible and imaginative strategy called for by Mr. Hearst as well as the kind of program which will show that America is not only proud of its motorcars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements and its creative artists."

In illustrating before the House how he was attempting to tailor the proposed legislation to fit the suggestions contained in the Hearst speech, THOMPSON paraphrased or quoted directly from the publisher's address, as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, the strength and ultimate survival of the free world's system, based on human freedom, the dignity of the individual, and private initiative, is being challenged by the Communists throughout the world.

"America has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It also has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people. How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?

"The lively arts are another field wherein the U. S. S. R. is operating with the professed intention of proving to the young people of the world that Russian achievements far surpass the West.

"Ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination.

"We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor. But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete."

I am including, also, an article by Ray Hasson which appeared in the Trentonian, of Trenton, N. J., on April 14, 1955, telling of the work which one of my constituents is doing at the local level and with his own means to spike the Russian plans to capture the 1956 Olympics. Michael (Mike) Dertouzos is hoping to launch a local campaign to raise funds for the Olympics committee. He is looking for the cooperation of all groups in this job that now goes beyond the limits of mere athletic competition and is one of the major battles being fought in the cold war.

As Ray Hasson fittingly points out—

The ancient Greeks developed the basis of our free, democratic civilization. They also founded many of the athletic contests in the Olympics, which have been called the Greek Games.

It seems fitting that Mike, who springs from those freedom-loving people, should be a warrior in the battle to preserve that concept of civilization, and strike a blow in the cold war by helping America win the Olympics.

The Trentonian article follows:

TRENTONIAN TOPICS

(By Ray Hasson)

Around Trenton: The boys in the Kremlin don't know it, but their grandiose scheme to strike a major propaganda victory next year may be spiked by guys all over the country like Trenton's Mike Dertouzos.

It's Mike's idea that the cause of freedom—and winning world opinion to our side in the cold war—will be dealt more good if the free nations win next year's Olympics in Australia than all the mouthings of the striped pants set.

The Russians are straining to prove their alleged superiority in all things, sports particularly. And they have been subsidizing their Olympic athletes and training them to win next year's competition.

ANOTHER HOOK

If they come out tops, it will give them another hook on which to hang their claim that their way of life is superior to ours. It could be effective on the world's uncommitted peoples.

America is the only country that doesn't subsidize its athletes. It's nip and tuck whether the National Olympics Committee will get up enough scratch to pay for costs of training, coaching, feeding, transporting our athletes to Australia.

If we don't get our best athletes in the games, we stand a good chance of ending up second best.

Mike is hoping to launch a local campaign to raise funds for the Olympics Committee. He's looking for the cooperation of all groups in this job that now goes beyond the limits of mere athletic competition. It's a battle in the cold war.

"We have to prove to the world that we have the best way of life because the world looks to us for leadership, not only in diplomacy, but sports, as well," Mike says.

AAU BACKER

Mike, who owns the Famous Restaurant, is no stranger to sports. He's been active for years in promoting amateur sports events through the American Athletic Union. Last year he was president of the State AAU and is a member of its national executive and foreign relations committees.

He started the hard way—picking up dimes. Born on the Greek island of Andros, 60 miles from Athens, he shipped out as a passenger liner seaman.

In 1919 he landed in New York with two bucks in his pocket. After a job on Vincent Astor's yacht folded, he came to Trenton and became a waiter. He took boxing lessons at night. Then he started a luncheonette. It interfered with his boxing, so he sold it.

In 1937, he started his present restaurant. He had a gym upstairs where he taught boxing to kids and sponsored other athletic events.

A lot of top Trenton amateur athletics were aided by Mike. Many worthy causes picked up the entire box office receipts from athletic events he staged.

The ancient Greeks developed the basis of our free, democratic civilization. They also founded many of the athletic contests in the Olympics, which have been called the Greek Games.

It seems fitting that Mike, who springs from those freedom-loving people, should be a warrior in the battle to preserve that concept of civilization, and strike a blow in the cold war by helping America win the Olympics.

Mr. Stevenson's Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published on April 14 by the Carlisle Sentinel, one of the oldest and most highly respected newspapers in central Pennsylvania:

MR. STEVENSON'S SUGGESTIONS

Adlai Stevenson had barely finished his speech when Secretary of State John Dulles, speaking for the administration, claimed that Mr. Stevenson had stolen the administration's thunder, that all of the program suggested by Mr. Stevenson was part and parcel of "exploitation" of foreign policy of the Government—in the planning stage.

Sometimes, it is most difficult to understand the actions of Mr. Dulles and the GOP administration. It is ridiculous for the Secretary to claim that Mr. Stevenson merely repeated the foreign policy program of the Eisenhower administration.

The Republican Party has rarely been split so badly as it is today, with, as Mr. Stevenson said, the President and his liberals on one side and Senator KNOWLAND and his conservatives on the other. There is not even the strength or power of unity at home, let alone on foreign policy. There is no real foreign policy because the administration is unwilling to separate foreign policy from domestic politics. Until there is unity within the GOP ranks—and that is wishful thinking—there will be argument over how problems in the Far East and the rest of the world should be handled. Too, as long as this Nation attempts to be master of other nations she will continue to lose the faith and trust of her allies. It is completely wrong to shout "mass retaliation," "unleashing Chiang for mainland attacks," and "Formosa will be protected" without a firm, clearly stated policy to our allies. The administration has done a lot of talking and made hundreds of commitments, but has backed down on every one when the cards have been called. The talk is merely talk and the commitments worthless paper—at least at the present time.

The experts, thus, can find no reason for Mr. Dulles' condemnation of Mr. Stevenson and neither the experts nor anyone else can find any evidence that the administration is exploting a Stevenson program, which Mr. Dulles said originated with the State Department and the administration. Ghost stories did appear in Wednesday's papers (stories not attributed to any source) claiming that there is general agreement between the administration and Stevenson programs but those stories were false propaganda pushed out quickly for publication to support Mr. Dulles' claims.

The real answer to this statement by the State Secretary accusing Adlai Stevenson of plagiarism is the same story as that of the Democrats during the campaign to reelect former President Woodrow Wilson. With the GOP split, and no candidate in sight who could win the Presidency, the administration is permitting the prestige of the United States to fall by the wayside (the Democrats did not do that) to gain political ends at home. The administration is purposely leaving the foreign policy position in the Far East in confusion and silence (the Democrats did not do that), so that the GOP campaign slogan (it hopes) for Mr. Eisenhower can be: "He kept us out of war."

It is almost unbelievable that this great Nation, formerly friendly and helpful to all the free world and respected by the free world, stands almost completely alone today in a sullen and disillusioned global community because of selfish politics. But it is true.

As Mr. Stevenson pointed out, it is time we return to our former position in the world if we can, it is time to try to gain international unity of all the free countries and request United Nations to take up the issue. Mr. Dulles, of course, claims it has been part of the administration's program to take the problem before U. N., but if that has been the case, the news of the action has been very successfully suppressed.

Hobbled Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following article from a Midwest paper:

HOBBLED BENSON

Agriculture Secretary Benson is perhaps the most bludgeoned and hand-tied member of the Cabinet. Yet he keeps struggling doggedly, the political job of the Ike administration.

The hobbles around his official ankles are not of his making. Some of the incessant criticism hurled at him is obtusely unfair. He may not be a superman, but he exhibits superior patience and keeps driving toward what he believes is a saner farm program. More and more of the Nation's dirt farmers lean to the conviction he is right. But the political catcalls and brickbats still hurtle about his head.

Mr. Benson came to office under a heritage of crushing crop surpluses, largely induced by the high, rigid parities. He brought to his job the philosophy that farm products were produced to be sold and used, not stored in bulging Federal bins and piled in moldering pyramids of waste. He fought rigid parities in the teeth of wide farmer and political opposition. Months after he launched his campaign, wiseacres predicted he was not long for Washington's world.

But he remained. He has gained in stature. He has not convinced agriculture, but he is winning many of its shrewder leaders.

After stiff battling, he got a compromise flexible price support law enacted by the last Congress. This schedule was nothing like what he sought, but it did provide for variable crop supports, ranging from 82½ percent to 90 percent. They supplanted the mandatory 90 percent parity on corn, cotton, rice, wheat, and peanuts. But these elastic controls do not go into effect until the 1955 fall crops are harvested.

Meanwhile, the surpluses are mounting in cost and unused farm products. Because of the administration's inherited farm program, borrowing authority for supports has twice been raised from the 1952 figure of $6,750,000,000. Now Secretary Benson fears a third boost will be needed—$2 billion—which would hike the support borrowing to $10 billion.

Now certain groups in Congress are apparently blaming Mr. Benson for acreage controls, crop surpluses and inadequate foreign sales—all problems resulting from policies yoked upon him when he assumed office. Some of these critics were among the most stentorian champions of rigid supports. They are finding that high parities take acreage out of production, increase Federal controls, and encourage an increase of foreign production, with which we can't compete because of our high parity prices. That precisely is what Secretary Benson has warned about for 2 years.

It is true Mr. Benson has not solved the farm problem. But what has occurred to fatten surpluses and decrease production is not of his design. Quite the contrary. Some means of increasing foreign use of American farm products is essential, and close study should be given the new proposal in Congress for an international food and raw material pool. The more elastic parity scales, effective next fall, should help. A sorely handicapped Secretary Benson is moving in the right direction.

Public Opinion Poll in First Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to poll public opinion in the First Congressional District. I arbitrarily sent a copy of this questionnaire to every fifth name in my card index. In addition the questionnaire was printed in over 20 weekly newspapers. Over 6,000 answers of one kind or another on the identical questions were computed.

Question No. 1 was the same as the first question of last year's poll. It is extraordinary to note that the percentages were identical. If all those who answered "No opinion" on question No. 3 had answered "Yes," which is more probable than not, we find an unusual change in basic American thinking. The overwhelming support of President Eisenhower's UMT and lower reciprocal tariff programs was particularly illuminating.

	Yes	No	No opinion	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	
1. Should nuclear weapons be used to stop clear-cut Communist aggression?	(73)	(18)	(9)	1
2. Do you think it possible for the free world to live in peace with Communist nations?	(39)	(52)	(9)	2
3. Should Communist nations be destroyed by "preventive" war?	(27)	(55)	(18)	3
4. Do you favor President Eisenhower's permanent manpower defense program (UMT)?	(83)	(12)	(5)	4
5. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's "Trade not Aid," lower reciprocal tariff program?	(83)	(10)	(7)	5
6. Do you favor the entry of the Federal Government into the field of education in the form of school construction grants?	(54)	(42)	(4)	6
7. Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents per hour?	(71)	(21)	(8)	7
8. Do you feel postal rates should be increased to reduce the postal deficit (now running $1 million a day)?	(75)	(21)	(4)	8
9. Should statehood for Alaska and Hawaii be considered separately?	(60)	(26)	(14)	9
10. President Eisenhower said, "The transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree?	(68)	(19)	(13)	10
11. Should the United Nations be abolished?	(25)	(68)	(7)	11

John Garner: A Tribute to a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, when it was reported recently that former Vice President John Nance Garner might attend the dinner on Saturday night honoring Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the news was widely received with enthusiasm. And when the news came that because of a foot ailment Mr. Garner, upon the advice of his physician, would not be able to make the trip, there seemed to be universal regret and disappointment.

This evidence of interest in "Cactus Jack" Garner, after an absence of 14 years from Washington, is itself a tribute to a great American who as a dedicated apostle of good government over a period of nearly half a century contributed so much to the perpetuity of our institutions.

Perhaps it is appropriate that we pause in this busy life to pay tribute to that great individualist who perhaps more than any other living American typifies the rugged character and unyielding devotion to principle which actuated so many of the great men in our history. Let us hope his type will never vanish from the American scene. Today we can profit from the lessons which the public life and record of John Garner have taught.

As I think of Mr. Garner today I am reminded of the story of an incident that is said to have occurred one time at Boston. The story goes that an old man there had served for a lifetime directing ships through narrow channels in the harbor area. He had become a sort of institution, a symbol of safety and dependability. But, the story goes, there was a change in the city government and the new regime was cleaning house. It was decided that the old sea dog had served his time and that it was time to replace him. He was given a hearing, at which his capacity to do his job well was questioned.

At the hearing a critic asked the old man: "Do you claim to know where in the bottom of the harbor area all of the snares, rocks, and other obstructions are located?"

The old gentleman thought for a moment and finally replied, measuring his words carefully: "No, I can't say that I know where all the harbor obstructions are. But I know where they ain't."

And so as the ship of state was moored along turbulent seas, in and out of safe and unsafe harbors, during the first 4 decades of this century, John Garner's wisdom and guidance were of a man who may not have known where all the pitfalls were but who knew where they were not—and along such courses he chose to lead and direct.

Let us look for a moment at the life and career of this man whose judgment and counsel were so useful to America and to its progress. His grandmother brought 6 fatherless children in a covered wagon 600 miles over uncharted roads from the State of Tennessee, to seek a home in the prairie land of northeast Texas. There, in a log cabin built by his pioneer grandmother, near Blossom Prairie in Red River County, John Nance Garner was born—the first child from the marriage of Sarah Guest and John Nance Garner, the third.

General Grant had just been elected President. The Vice President was Schuyler Colfax, of Indiana, with whom the infant born in the Texas log cabin on November 22, 1869, was to share the distinction of being the only man to serve as both Speaker of the House of Representatives and Vice President of the United States.

As was common in those days, John Garner was exposed to the rigors and hard work of a country youth. When old enough he began the study of law. He was admitted to the bar, then moved to southwest Texas. He became county judge of Uvalde County, then a member of the State legislature, and in 1902 was elected to Congress. Elected and reelected 15 consecutive times, he served continuously for 30 years. He became minority leader of the Democratic Party and in 1931 climaxed his congressional career by being elected Speaker. His final 8 years in public office were spent presiding over the Senate as Vice President of the United States.

John Garner's whole political life was devoted to quiet and unselfish service. During World War I President Wilson called on him twice weekly as confidential adviser. His keen insight into political problems and judgment of men, coupled with his modest yet frank and unassuming demeanor, often caused him to be sought for confidential duties of utmost importance—duties which he performed with characteristic statesmanship, fidelity and success, but without general public knowledge.

During the early days of the depression, shortly after a White House conference with President Hoover, Mr. Garner was asked by reporters what his party intended to do about some of the proposals of the President. He made this significant statement: "Politics will be a secondary consideration. Country should always come ahead of party, and now the country should be the sole thought of everyone."

I shall not take the time here to recount some of Mr. Garner's dramatic actions as he led, with tact and wisdom, the stormy sessions of the House of Representatives that occurred during those critical, depression-burdened days of the early 1930's. Those were days when all sorts of panaceas were offered to restore prosperity; when scores of inflationary and printing-press schemes were advocated. It was a difficult time in which to exercise calm judgment, restraint and decorum, and not be washed to sea with the tide. On occasions members of both parties broke ranks to join with those offering crackpot schemes for miraculous recovery. It was, indeed, a time that called for statesmanship in leadership. And John Garner was equal to that occasion. Although effective solutions to many problems were not found, many unsound and fantastic proposals were exposed and avoided.

There have been many times when we would have done well to have followed the philosophy of this wise man from Uvalde, when his words of wisdom and restraint should have been heeded—his advice to make haste slowly, to avoid regrettable errors. He is and was a practical man and has always believed that government, like individuals, should strive to live within its income; that all governmental action should be within the framework of the Constitution and with proper regard for law. As H. I. Phillips remarked, Mr. Garner and his compatriots believed in—

Sticking to what he's learned in school
And what he's been raised to believe * * *
Things like simple arithmetic * * *
Old-fashioned bookkeeping and squarin'
Accounts on Saturday nights * * *
Dependin' on a budget, never spendin'
More than he had; being orful keerful
'Bout not making promises he couldn't keep,
An' things like that.

Research in Civil Aviation Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of an ad-

dress I delivered recently before the Civil Aviation Medicine Association.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will feel that I speak very sincerely when I say that it is a real pleasure and privilege to be with you on this occasion.

I am happy to be here because of my own personal interest in aviation and in research in general, but particularly in the field of medical science.

Among the legislative achievements in which I take most pride as a Member of the House of Representatives are the bills which I introduced and piloted through the House to establish the National Mental Health Institute, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the research program in neurological and metabolical diseases, and the National Science Foundation.

I want to express to you my personal appreciation for the very fact that you have such an organization as this. That fact in itself is a long step forward in progress toward still more far-reaching results.

It is my own opinion that there should be established some sort of institute devoted primarily to research in civil aviation medicine. As a matter of fact, I think it is becoming more and more imperative that this be done.

The time is not far distant when we shall cross the threshhold into the era of jet-propulsion in civil aviation. In my opinion the time is not more than 5 years away. And I do not need to tell you who know even better than I, the problems of aviation affecting human beings will be greatly increased.

Aviation medicine is not concerned with fighting viruses or hunting microbes. Its foe is not the general diseases of mankind, but forces man meets for the first time only as he goes out of his natural environment. Aviation medicine is concerned with the medical effects of human flight.

Nature designed man's body for a life on earth, never more than tree-top distance from the earth's surface. In the upper reaches of the atmosphere or in the airless space beyond, man is as much out of his element as a fish trying to swim across a desert. But unlike the fish, man has the capability of altering his environment—if not himself. To alter that environment, or to make it possible for man to survive and to function in it, is the task of aviation medicine.

The goal of aviation medicine is to help man adjust himself to the new world of height and of supersonic speed that the airplane has opened to him, the area that has been intelligently called "the vertical frontier." Aviation medicine helps man to meet the challenge of two of his own accomplishments, to fly high and to fly fast. Today's technology produces planes capable of carrying men at speeds and to altitudes that the human body cannot tolerate. Aviation medicine quite literally seeks to take man out of his element, and to help him to reach the stars.

In the United States Air Force one man—Maj. Arthur Murray—has already flown up to 90,000 feet—17 miles above the surface of the earth.

Another Air Force pilot—Maj. Charles Yeager—has flown at a speed of 1,650 miles per hour—almost 2½ times the speed of sound.

Still another Air Force officer—Lt. Col. John Stapp—has ridden a sled projected along the ground at 632 miles an hour, to test the effects of deceleration and wind-blast on the human body.

Air Force rockets have gone up to 250 miles of altitude at speeds up to 3,600 miles per hour, and two rhesus monkeys—named Pat and Mike—have been rocketed to 190,080 feet, and survived.

Finding out the limits of human endurance and developing ways of keeping men—not animals, but men—alive and protected in the unnatural environment man has begun to explore, is the problem of aviation medicine. The problem is the problem of survival in a new world man has never penetrated before our own generation.

There are three main fields of activity in the investigation of human factors in aviation.

1. Human resources is a field concerned with problems of man's reaction to his environment, matters of psychology, aptitudes, training, etc.

2. Human engineering is charged with determining design characteristics of equipment, and man-machine relationships, so that an operator can use that equipment with the greatest accuracy and efficiency.

3. The aero-medical sciences—which are the chief concern of this discussion.

The aero-medical sciences are concerned with the bio-medical, physiological, and psychological reactions of the individual to the wide range of situations and factors involved in aviation. Within the Air Force, for example, the chief research and development agencies are the School of Aviation Medicine at the Air University and the Aero-Medical Laboratory at the Wright Air Development Center of the Air Material Command. The first, which has the unique distinction of being the oldest organization in the Air Force that has operated continuously, without any essential change of function, does background and applied research in the basic life sciences and clinical sciences, as they affect the Air Force. Using the information developed at the School of Aviation Medicine, the Aero-Medical Laboratory develops information needed by aeronautical engineers to design aircraft without surpassing the physiological and psychological limitations of the air crew. It also develops the aero-medical protective equipment to offset man's physical limitations—equipment such as "G" suits, restraining devices, protective clothing, and escape equipment.

Frequent conferences and information exchanges are arranged with other organizations, such as the United States Navy Aeronautical Medical Equipment Laboratory, the Navy Electronics Laboratory, the Army Medical Research Laboratory, and the Johns Hopkins Operations Research Office (the latter an Army activity). Meetings of the Armed Forces-National Research Council Committees on Vision and on Hearing and Bio-Acoustics, provide additional opportunities for valuable interservice contacts.

The primary problem of aviation medical research is to find out in detail what happens to the human body during an ascent, and why. The problem is intensified as man learns to build machines that go higher and faster, but the problem is still one of altitude.

As most people know, a man can ascend to about 8,000 feet with no ill effects, if the ascent is gradual, as in driving up a mountain, but above 8,000 feet, things begin to happen to man. As man flies even higher, the field of vision narrows. Breathing becomes extremely difficult because of the lack of oxygen. Delusions can develop. Consciousness can be lost. Gases trapped in the intestines begin to expand. At 50,000 feet altitude, the heart—unprotected by devices or equipment of any sort—would probably cease to function.

To counteract these changes in man's normal body functioning, the whole body must be kept under pressure, in either a suit or a cabin. The pressurized cabin was developed during World War II. The pressurized suit for the individual flyer is a more recent development. But neither alone solves all the problems of survival at high altitude. Man must eat, man must relieve himself of body wastes, and man must combat fatigue and boredom.

Next in importance to the problem of altitude is the problem of gravity. Every time the human body is subjected to acceleration or deceleration, it feels the pull or push of gravity, or "G" forces. A jackrabbit start of a hotrod sports car can throw a passenger against the seat back. In an airplane, the whole crew is affected by any quick burst of speed or abrupt change in direction of flight. And these movements of the plane can cause internal movements in the body: blood flows from head to feet, and organs of the abdomen are pushed down to the pelvis. If the turn is sharp enough or fast enough to develop forces double the ordinary force of gravity, or more, the drainage of blood from the head and heart may cause a "blackout," that is, a loss of consciousness.

The human body's ability to withstand "G" forces varies enormously, depending largely on what part of the body's surface takes the brunt of the shock.

Research in aviation medicine, which has produced such diverse products as Aeroplast, a new spray-on surgical dressing for treating burns; the nylon pressure suit; the anti-G suit; and new inflight meals takes equally varied approaches to its problems. It may be performed by means of rockets, loaded with delicate instruments, and shot many miles above the surface of the earth; it may take place in an anechoic room, where quiet reigns supreme, which is used to study the effects of intense sound on animals and human beings. One of the most dramatic, and most publicized, research facilities is the sled at Holloman Air Force Base on which Lt. Col. John P. Stapp has traveled 632 miles an hour.

Colonel Stapp, who holds a civilian degree of doctor of medicine, and is also a graduate of the Air Force's School of Aviation Medicine and a flight surgeon, has been described both as a human guinea pig and as the fastest man on earth. He is merely an able scientist who has made his most important experiments on himself. His most publicized research has been in connection with deceleration. In his research he makes use of a sled which hurtles him along a railroad-like track at 460 miles an hour, then slams him into a braking area with a bone-jarring jolt. Every time he rides his machine he suffers the same shock that's experienced in the abrupt stop of a crashing airplane.

In the course of his research program, Stapp has several times sustained shocks greater than those incurred in fatal plane crashes. His maximum jolt was equivalent to driving an auto at 120 miles an hour into a brick wall. On three other occasions, the shock was equal to braking from 60 miles an hour to a complete stop in only 3 feet. Last December, with the windshield removed from his sled he made a supersonic run on the ground, to find out what happens to a pilot who bails out at supersonic speed at low altitudes. Without protection from the violent wind-blast such a speed will generate, and wearing no special protection except a plastic headgear and a special nylon harness, he withstood a force of 35 G's and a wind pressure of 2 tons, and suffered no lasting ill effects.

Information already developed in Stapp's deceleration experiments to find out just how much slow-down shock the human body can take will be used to redesign aircraft seats and safety belting, so that pilots and passengers will have greater protection against abrupt jolts in emergencies. The same information also can be applied to making automobiles safer. Information developed in the wind-blast experiment will be used in developing bail-out equipment.

Scientists working on the problems of aviation medicine do not hope ever basically to change man's earthbound nature. But they know that in the machine age, man has man-

aged to adapt himself to conditions that seemed "inhuman" and "impossible" as recently as 50 years ago. To ease his adaptation to space and speed, scientists are continuously studying examples of such adaptations in nature.

Other scientists meanwhile are studying the problem of inventing machines or gadgets to take over functions previously performed only by man. The real question that the jet age poses is whether man-as-flier is being made obsolete by the lag between what his brain can invent and his body can perform. In fact, planes are rapidly approaching a point where they are penalized rather than aided by the presence of a human pilot.

One important result of research in aviation medicine is the discovery that the human body can endure a great deal more physical and mental stress than was once thought possible. The answers to the problems of flight in tomorrow's jets and rocket aircraft may be found in the human research now being done in the field of aviation medicine rather than in loading the planes with heavy and expensive equipment.

So the planning brain must continue, as now, to seek new ways and ever more ingenious devices to adjust the strains to the tolerances of the body.

And so I conclude as I began by reemphasizing the need of research in the field of civil-aviation medicine.

After I have had an opportunity to give some additional study to the form of the legislation, it is my intention to introduce a bill calling for the establishment of an Institute of Civil Aviation Medicine.

And once again I express my appreciation for the contribution your association has made in the field of air safety, and for the objectives you seek.

Address by Gen. Benjamin W. Chidlaw Before the Air Defense Conference of the Air Force Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members of the House will be interested in a splendid address delivered by Gen. Benjamin W. Chidlaw, commander in chief of the Continental Air Defense Command at Colorado Springs, Colo., before the Air Defense Conference of the Air Force Association at a recent meeting in Colorado Springs.

General Chidlaw is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on air defense and air power. He is retiring soon after a long and brilliant career in the Air Force. I am pleased to include as part of my remarks this challenging address:

Mr. Alison, distinguished Members of Congress, members of the Air Force Association, and honored guests, we are genuinely delighted that you gentlemen have been able to avail yourselves of the most gracious action on the part of the Air Force Association in arranging this timely meeting, to let us talk together on air-defense matters here in the hometown of the Continental Air Defense Command headquarters, and additionally to have you here in this beautiful setting in which soon will be built the Air Force Academy, the seat of learning and the cradle of tradition for the future of air power in this country.

Airpower has, of course, been a living, breathing thing in the imagination of many people, old and young, for years, but it is today striding ever more and more into world consciousness as a tremendous factor in all military schooling and planning, in the economic future of the world, and more and more into the daily lives of each of us.

I think it can be said that air power is no longer considered so much just an equal participant in the family of military services, but has become an overall field of the military potential affecting all services. A military potential possessing such a devastating capability that the threat of its use alone might prevent a world commitment to open warfare.

The world's past wars have shown generally that nations' so-called military roads to glory have often taken them along some pretty gloomy trails, milestoned by the skulls and skeletons of man's failures to bail himself out of his dilemma by all other means.

Through air power, growing evidence indicates that its very existence affects the atmosphere and attitudes at the world's conference tables. Through air power any imbalance in favor of a possible aggressor, even though local or temporary, frequently shows in the arrogance, the ruthlessness, the baldness of his demands.

Air power, taken in the larger sense of the complete gamut of missiles and aircraft using the avenue of the air, can now be sent on a terrifying mission of destruction by our enemies, and it could come just as unannounced as it would be uninvited with such a mission.

For no longer do we have the leisure of the chess player to study, then unhurriedly counteraction with reaction.

In air-power circles, action calls for action.

The attackers, and the atomic-bomb loads or warheads set in motion by them, must be hallenged by our own weapons system as close to their bases of origin and sustenance as is possible, and our challenge must be decisive.

To reckon unleashed air power in the hands of the enemy as any less than a disastrous capacity, or to leave it unopposed, instantaneously and without quarter, is to die miserably, to die individually, even possibly to die nationally.

Not long ago, a story came to me of an old clock which had been placed in a national museum as a relic of one of the early wars on this continent. It was of that rich, deep brown color, common to aging walnut wood. It showed signs of having been hacked by either a tommyhawk or knife, and imbedded in the wood was a flint arrowhead.

It really belonged in this collection of times past.

It still had grace. It had beauty. It was decorative. It was definitely tied to the infancy of our country, and bespoke some of the turmoil in which our Nation grew to its present maturity.

For this reason, it had a place of honor in the museum.

The important lesson this old clock had for me, however, and for my people, who must live alert to each day's problems and be preparing always to meet that greater emergency which might come on any tomorrow, was that it rested absolutely on the past.

It had one great defect. It could no longer perform the functions for which it was originally built, because the hands of this clock were stilled forever, the mechanism inside clogged with rust and dust. And although it was still referred to in the museum guidebook as a timepiece, it was no longer that; it couldn't tell time.

All our military services are constantly making adjustments, orienting themselves toward today's blunt military facts of life and away from museum thinking. Nationally, we are, I believe, gradually weaning ourselves from the thinking that the next war will be fought, if ever we must fight one, as the last one was fought.

In my many trips about the country I sense that the man in the street—Mr. Average American Citizen—is becoming more and more aware of the fact that America will have to abandon her time-honored role of the protected and secure arsenal of men and weapons and take on the much more alarming role of being the first and principal target.

No military force can ever afford to become a museum piece, and if there is one thing in the world which will disclose it as one, it is its failure to keep in step with the threat and be truly up to date, better well ahead of it.

Certainly, in this air-defense business the Continental Air Defense Command cannot afford a failure to be completely realistic.

For us, no crystal ball, no ivory towers.

We know that for the Continental Air Defense Command, there is no place of, nor time for, sanctuary.

Defense of the United States from air attack is today a No. 1 preoccupation of the American people, and that defense is the mission of the Continental Air Defense system.

Our command is perhaps the first major organization of the few in our whole military structure which must meet its acid test on D-day—in fact, on H-hour of that D-day, and D-day could come tomorrow.

Therefore, the shadow of reality is always as close to us as our own shadow.

An the Continental Air Defense Command must work, tirelessly and ceaselessly. It must undergo constant test, and revision based on the showing of these tests. It must be re-equipped to be ever new, and ever newer. It can never be truly effective if any portion of our system is approaching museum status nor is it ever safe to view or inspect it from the attitude of veneration for past achievement. Rather, it must be continually assessed for vigilance, or virility.

In this vein, I am frequently asked the question, "Since our scientists, our research and development people, anticipate many major improvements at somewhat later time periods, why should it be necessary to spend large sums of money modifying and improving the present system since ultimately much larger gains in effectiveness can be anticipated at that later date?" Well, gentlemen, viewing the world situation as it is today, I think the answer to that question is pretty obvious. Remembering always in this business that our D-day may be tomorrow, we cannot, we dare not, risk less than achieving the maximum "kill effectiveness" possible, employing the tools we have presently at hand.

Knowing all these things as realistic and to keep in a realistic vein, I wish to say that true air defense is not, in my opinion, confined solely to the erection of a so-called fortress-type weapons system around a particular criticial area. Such an approach would resemble that of a boxer who confines himself merely to "slipping" or warding off his opponent's punches. The boxer, to win, must be prepared to throw a few healthy knockout punches himself, so I include the counter-punch, the left cross, and the good old round-house haymaker right all in my definition of defense.

Air defense is then, in the truest sense, the whole tricky, razzle-dazzle and flexibility of the air weapon used in its full multiplied force and as far out from our homeland as time and circumstances permit.

True air defense takes in the complete array of the offensive and defensive capacities of all services to make up this effective air defense, everything to keep the enemy guessing, everything to keep him off balance,

to make him puzzle and pause, attempting to figure our air power out and make him doubtful of his own ability to cope with it.

Thus, I believe our Continental Air Defense System starts with a formidable couplet of the Strategic Air Command with its long-range, atomic packhorses; the Navy's carrier task forces wherever it is possible for them to contribute; and also those Air Forces, tactical in nature, which are based far out from this country and on the fringes of the Iron Curtain, represented in our own commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and those of our partners in this alliance.

We have this partnership with the free world in recognition of the immediacy of the times, that should the free world be struck, our responses would be total, from close in and far away, and be now.

Concerned as we all are that we keep this far-out extension of our defenses and improve them daily, and concerned as we all are to preserve and ever strengthen the mighty fists of our strategic striking air arms, we of the Continental Air Defense Command are also concerned that our assigned mission, that of defending the skies over and the aerial approaches to our homeland, be likewise fully understood and fully appreciated. Appreciated as the Nation's blunting force which may have to endure its greatest battles while the enemy is at full strength and while the enemy effort is freshest.

Facing squarely up to the problem, I feel, as do all military commanders, that little has altered that old military truism that "the best defense is a strong offense." I am certain that a purely defensive system alone would never be the one single force which would deter forever a Russian decision to strike us.

We must, at all costs, maintain our own long-range striking forces, our Strategic Air Command, and those other forces which are capable of striking at the vitals, the heartland, of any aggressor. And they must be kept at the highest levels of efficiency and size to do their job, once their mission is ordered.

But, I'm just as certain, that a major deterring factor lies in being able to guarantee that our striking forces will not be caught in their lairs. If that aggressor, specifically, if Communist Russia, knows that while she is fighting her way toward her targets, that the golden opportunity of easy destruction on the ground has passed, and the visitation of death and destruction to their homeland is but a few, very few, short hours away, then a decision by them to launch their first aggressive blow must be born only of sheer desperation.

The objective of our present and any future air defense system is thus, to ward off or reduce to acceptable limits the impact of enemy air attack, should our national aim of prevention of war itself fail. I feel, as do my people, that the market value of air defense will undoubtedly be at its highest, at its very peak on D-day and possibly a few days or weeks thereafter. We hope, we pray, that our offensive and defensive efforts will jointly cause it to taper off markedly from that point on.

We know that nuclear armament has revolutionized not only air defense thinking, but military strategy in its entirety.

We know that A-bombs and H-bombs plus the means of carting them accurately to and over a target complex for release, compel consideration of national survival itself as the number one mission of our country's military action.

Enemy capabilities, weighed against the cost and effectiveness of an immobilizing defensive force to put in the way of those capabilities, outline the general dimensions of our air defense problem.

Dozens of factors, i. e., possible enemy approach routes, his likely target selections, his delivery equipment, prevailing winds and weather, and the like, dictate our defensive deployments.

And always the question of national economics is before us. For example, must we or should we try to add a couple of fighter interceptors, or a new guided-missile position to our defenses as the Russian adds new types or numbers to his long-range air army inventory?

And in these considerations, there is always the thought that there may be, somewhere along the line, a point of diminishing return in this air-defense business as we currently know it or visualize it and that it is and will be extremely difficult to determine just exactly where this point lies.

One thing we can be sure of, however, is that to willfully stop short of this admittedly somewhat indeterminate point could be disastrous.

Stopping short is like the old story of throwing a 20-foot rope to a man who has fallen in a well 30 feet deep. It wouldn't bail him out; it wouldn't save him, and only a gesture has been made in the right direction. And whatever was spent for the rope represents a loss since it did not accomplish the mission.

Obviously, if we assumed complete desperation and tried to completely blanket the Nation with radar in overlays and layers, at the same time providing the well over 3 million square miles of our country with maximum intensity fighter-interceptor and guided-missile coverage, we would run into economic and manpower impossibility.

It is up to us, therefore, to go about the job of doing the most we can, and the best we can, with those present and programed forces of men and weapons which can be made available to us.

Our national sense of morality, our tradition of never having struck the first aggressive blow, would, I imagine, cause the enemy to assume, and we must assume, that they will have on their side the initial advantage because of their ability to select the time (and place) of attack and start unmolested the takeoff for delivery of what they hope will be the first great blow.

They patently will have many avenues of approach which gives them great flexibility in choosing and charting their hydrogen highways, as it correspondingly confronts us with multiple problems in blocking any aerial power play they initiate.

They undoubtedly assume, and we must assume, that they will have to go for a "package deal" in target arrangements—a veritable bag of varieties. In a civilization and with a defense system as complex as ours, they must know that there is no one solar plexus, no single touch point, which when struck could leave us totally paralyzed, broken, completely subdued, and subjugated.

Therefore, his offensive efforts would logically have to be as big as the target bag, and be designed to put us in an atomic vise.

In such a packet, we must figure that he would undoubtedly attempt to neutralize or wipe out our counteroffensive capability such as our retaliatory forces and their bases, the origin of our atomic stocks, certain of our major population and communication centers, and our industrial capacity for military production.

In the language of the poker player or crap shooter, if he were ever to set off on this package-deal expedition, he would truly be, as the expression has it, going for broke.

He would be shooting the works and trying to break the bank.

It would be comforting to say that very few who "go for broke" actually ever break the bank, or that few real gamblers would go up against such odds. We should not be foolish though, and not consider that there is more than an outside chance that such a course could or might be taken.

There is grave reason for us to respect the outside chance with Russia.

Who, at this time, can read meaning into the events of recent days at the Kremlin? Certainly the gambling behind the walls of the Soviet citadel is for high stakes.

I believe we can safely and wisely assume, then, that men like Lenin, Stalin, and Malenkov, and now a new name, Bulganin, have not laid aside the tendency toward taking the outside chance when it has proven successful on occasion or when there may seem to be no other course.

For this reason, we must seek constantly for outward extensions of our warning and tracking capability to take maximum advantage of area defense weapons in the Continental Air Defense Command. Our action must start with his action, so our forces must be so disposed in depth as to make him run a gantlet of continual harassing and destructive attack as soon as we make contact with him. To be sure that our response is instantaneous and rapid toward any hostile threat, our control must be decentralized.

Our full national potential in air defense must be available and have its well-defined place in the Continental Air Defense Command System, the organization which will probably fight its major battle on the day and hour the fight starts.

All usable fighters of other Air Force commands, those based in this country, must be slotted into usable places in the system. All Navy and Marine Corps fighter aircraft based coastally or inland, even those on carriers in or near port, figure in the system. The shore-based radar equipment of the Navy and various proving ground and guided missile test centers can make their contribution. The antiaircraft guns of naval vessels in port must have their place alongside the guns and missile batteries which the Army contributes to the regular defenses. The National Guard and certain parts of the Reserve Forces strength must come into the bag with us.

The contribution of these forces, taking their control and operational direction from the Continental Air Defense Command, can be an enormous help. We are now going forward rapidly with the planning which will make thorough use of all these augmentation elements and to make sure that the control machinery is fully ready.

Our first and most pressing need is that we obtain the greatest possible advance warning of any attack. To achieve this, we are shoving our radar detection nets further and further to the north, further and further out to sea, extending our detection, identification and tracking capabilities as rapidly as circumstances permit. Our second, and nearly as pressing need, is for streamlining the processes by which we put into motion all the vast resources of those strengths I have mentioned, and putting them into motion toward the places in the system where they will contribute the most, the quickest, and to maximum effect.

As I said before, all military services today are engaged in a fight to stay out of the museum and to be in step with what must be done to make certain our national survival.

Developments in science and engineering are so fast and furious, the struggle to stay out of the museum, that to avoid being categorized as the clock which could no longer tell time is demanding on all of us.

We must be sure at the first flicker that the enemy is taking to the high aerial road, that we set up a series of toll gates, barriers, in his way as soon as he gets on that road. These toll gates, these barriers, should be all the missiles and jet propelled carriers of destruction we can put out along that

road to regulate or halt that travel as he comes on his atomic outing.

He must pay heavily at those toll gates. He must be fought to a standstill there, shot down out there, and, God willing, his whole effort die out there. Because every uninterrupted second that we let him come on and every mile we let him penetrate our borders to get in reach of his strike position makes the cost ratio in blood, in life and treasure of this country mount.

If we have the means to erect these toll gates when it has to be done, the nation lives.

If we do not, the nation dies.

To those of us who wrestle with this enormous problem, who live with it every minute of every hour of the day and night, it is just as simple, just as cold turkey, as stark as that.

There are few gray areas left to consider in this business. It is possible now in this atomic age to see mostly only in black and white.

I know that this problem is on the minds of you gentlemen of Congress and other of our highest Government leaders and all our military commanders.

My feeling on air defense is that it amounts to the sum total of all the things which can be brought to bear on any enemy who would see in an all-out air attack the most lucrative, the quickest, and the most decisive way to get at our vitals and to knock us to our knees. The Continental Air Defense Command is a complete rationalization of that air defense potential in terms of making every mile, every yard, every foot of an attacker's thrust count for us and against him.

In a measure we are blessed with God-given geographic depth for our defenses, removed some distance from any aggressor's birds of prey.

We would indeed be profligate with our responsibilities, and going against all military lessons and training, if we did not figure on making every mile of that intervening distance pay-dirt for us and a place for our enemy to bite the dust.

We can all remember the time when those of us in the military were somewhat removed from the so-called plain American citizen. We didn't know too much about each other, we didn't give each other too much thought. They went about their business, we went about ours. They sent for us when they needed us and we sent for them to give us the increased strength we needed in time of a national emergency.

This is not true today.

Today we are in each other's business right up to our necks, because no matter what any man or woman thinks his or her business is today, it is really the business of insuring individual and national survival.

Because of this feeling, we have been able to get with us in the Continental Air Defense Command some 400,000 civilian volunteers in the role of ground observers. They have becocome interested in what they can do to help and are willing to give us that help because they wanted to know a role into which they can fit smoothly should D-day ever come. Because of this growing awareness and desire in American people to know a place to do volunteer duty, I feel we are stronger than we have been for a long while. Because in addition to what these ground observers do in plane spotting they have provided the first ripple in the great wave to come as Americans become more and more conscious of what each man and woman must do if we are to be safe and remain safe.

By coming into our family of air defense weapons freely and as volunteers, they have put their apathy and complacency into the museum alongside that old clock. Complacency today is just as useless as that old clock which could not tell time.

Let us all make certain, civilian and military man alike, that we discard now and forever any semblance of complacency.

Let us not believe that because we have never lost a war that we could not lose one.

Let's make certain we don't lose it.

Let us never rest on today's weapons system or be content that what we are doing today is enough. We all must dig deep to pull out that little something extra in us.

Because in these perilous times, should our military clock stop, chances are that it might never start again.

And, if our military clock stopped, it probably would never even find its way into a museum. There might be no museum left to put it in.

Thank you.

An About Face From War to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following abstract of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, April 1, 1955.

AN ABOUT FACE FROM WAR TO PEACE

At a time when strength and unity of purpose is urgently needed, America's leadership in our critically troubled world is fumbling and faltering.

In recent weeks the objective of our international relations has been lost in the twisting and turning of Presidential, State Department, and senatorial pronouncements and actions.

Let's look at the record:

Our ally on Formosa, Chiang Kai-shek, insists we are committed to the defense of the offshore islands. The Secretary of State, carrying out the policy of the President, says maybe we are and maybe we are not; possibly we will and possibly we will not. All add to the general confusion in a time of crisis.

The President and the Secretary of State informed us a week ago that we may very well use precision atomic weapons if the Chinese Communists attack the offshore islands. But on Wednesday, March 23, the President in his press conference states categorically that atomic weapons will be used only in case of a major war and not in police actions.

The chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, Senator BRIDGES, persists, however, in stating that our national policy is to defend the offshore islands by dropping atom bombs on the mainland.

American policy runs hot and cold, uncertain and confused. Surely if these policies are indefinite and uncertain to the American people, they must be even more so to our allies and enemies.

On Monday, March 14, the official custodian of the Yalta papers in the State Department said their publication would adversely affect the Nation's security and our relations with our allies. On Wednesday, the Secretary of State, after conferring with Senate Republican leaders, expressed his astonishment at the revelation that the Yalta documents were in the hands of one of America's leading newspapers. On Wednesday night the documents were ordered released to the Nation's press. The White House expressed no knowledge of the release of the papers, and in fact the Presidential press secretary stated the President was not aware of their release.

This series of events reveals an unbelievable lack of coordination between the President and the State Department, and a degree of irresponsibility that exposes our Nation before the eyes of the world as erratic, unpredictable and politically immature. Regretfully, this same degree of uncertainty and confusion prevailed concerning the proposal of Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in suggesting a meeting of the heads of state of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France.

For at least 2 days the State Department clearly stated that Senator GEORGE's proposal was in line with the foreign policy of this Nation. The President, at least through Monday and Tuesday of the last week, felt such a conference was premature. On Wednesday, March 23, the White House and the Department of State double checked their signals, and came to the conclusion that in due time such a conference would be desirable. Since then, at a recent press conference, the President seemed to qualify his earlier approval.

These policy gyrations and conflicting statements can only add to the feeling of uncertainty and indecision as to American policy.

Perhaps we need a thoughtful reappraisal of what we are now doing—and what we should be doing.

Instead of alienating our friends through diplomatic blunders geared to domestic political expediency, now more than ever we should be seeking to strengthen our ties of unity and solidarity with our allies, to maintain a common front for preservation of the free world.

Instead of Presidential appointees deliberately stirring up the fires of domestic political controversy, now more than ever they should be devoting their attention to achieving some semblance of unity within their own party and within the Nation on vital foreign policy issues that affect the destiny of our Nation.

Instead of playing right into the hands of Red China's propaganda and helping turn Asians against us by our publicly brandishing a big club in threats to use atomic warfare, now more than ever we should be bending every effort to convince Asia our purpose is peace, not war—development, not exploitation.

Instead of letting the Communists choose their own grounds for a new international "showdown" where we may be forced to stand alone, now more than ever we should be taking the initiative in diversionary moves of our own to put the Kremlin on the defensive and upset its carefully calculated timetable of Pacific strategy.

The Yalta papers, internationally:

What kind of reckless diplomacy is it to needlessly insult your friends when you have nothing to gain and everything to lose? What possible constructive purpose could release of these documents against the wishes of England have in the present tense state of international affairs? As a result of this colossal diplomatic blunder, the free world's efforts for peace have been given a distinct setback rather than been advanced. Hereafter, frankness and candor will be ruled out of international negotiations. Diplomats of friendly countries will be as cautious as diplomats from unfriendly countries in dealing with the United States—and the cause of peace will suffer.

The Yalta papers, domestically:

Appeasement has never gained us any ground internationally, and it will not gain President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles any ground trying to appease opposition forces within their own party. Trying to turn the clock back 10 years might divert America's needed attention from problems and failures of today, but it cannot divert the consequences of those problems and failures.

High sounding comments of the President against political exploitation of these documents cannot erase the responsibility of his own Cabinet appointee for releasing them for no purpose other than political exploitation. The President and his Secretary of State must accept responsibility for an apparent willingness to toss bipartisan foreign policy out the window, and risk playing deliberate politics with our country's future security.

About A-bomb threats:

Threats of A-bomb attacks might create caution in a country responsive to the fears and the will of its people, but have just the opposite effect on a country or a government holding human life cheap, unresponsive to any fears of its own people, and deliberately conniving to tag the label "warmonger" on the United States.

Nothing could serve the Kremlin better than to jockey the United States into a position of first using A-weapons against Asians, so that it can beat the drums of world opinion against us.

One American atomic weapon used on Red China would do more to turn Asia solidly against us, than all the propaganda the Communists have been able to contrive, and to them be well worth the price in human life it might entail.

Quemoy and Matsu:

The responsible leaders of our Nation are today in the process of making what may well be the most crucial and important decision of foreign policy since the beginning of World War II.

The issue is what should be American policy concerning the offshore islands from the Chinese mainland, namely and most important, the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. What do we do in light of our commitments to the defense of Formosa if the Chinese Communists attack these islands?

Yes; we are in a period of self-examination, of self-questioning, and this is as it should be. There is still time for thoughtful consideration and for careful planning. The time is short; the urgency of the situation cannot be overestimated, and the necessity for clear thought and definite policy is evident to everyone.

This decision rests with the President of the United States who is, under the Constitution, the Commander in Chief, and the chief spokesman of our Nation in foreign affairs.

Prior to the passage of the so-called Formosa resolution, the President stated to the Congress that he alone would make the decision as to American policy with respect to the so-called related positions and off-shore islands. Our President, during the past weeks and today, has been and is seeking guidance and sound advice. This is no time for partisan prejudices or political expediency. The issue of peace and war is in the balance. The relationships between ourselves and our allies is involved in our decision over the off-shore islands. Our whole position in the Far East has been brought into sharp focus. Our strategy in meeting the challenge of Communist aggression is subject to intensive evaluation. We cannot afford to make a mistake.

Powerful weapons of mass destruction are in the hands of both ourselves and the Soviet Union. Huge armies have been trained to combat effectiveness. The whole world awaits the decision. It is not right nor true to say that what may happen in the Far East is in the hands of the Communists. We have a part in this decision—we and our allies. And we must always remember that if we take upon ourselves the sole responsibility for making a crucial decision, we are not only involving our own Nation but, due to the dynamics of modern warfare and the terrible tensions that exist in the world, we are involving all people everywhere.

The outbreak of hostilities today in any part of the world could be the spark that ignites a world-wide conflagration. We cannot safely assume that hostilities involving the off-shore islands will be limited to that area. We cannot safely assume that the Soviet Union will not honor her treaty of mutual assistance with Communist China. Nor can we assume that because of our great assistance to the other nations and our alliances in Europe and the Far East that our allies will stand with us on this issue.

It is true that the President yesterday expressed his belief that the Rusisans would not enter should war break out in the Formosa Straits. But look at the position we would be in should such a war occur. We would be thoroughly and endlessly engaged with our forces in Asia, while the real center of world communism—the Soviet Union—would be unleased to grab the prize, Europe—the core of world strength.

Therefore, with prayerful thought and the highest degree of statesmanship that we as a nation and our leaders can bring to bear, we must patiently, carefully, and objectively arrive at a decision, and do it within a matter of days.

These things we know: The Communist Chinese have declared to the world that they will take the off-shore islands. These offshore islands have historically been under the dominion and jurisdiction of the government of the mainland. Presently, these islands are under the control of the Republic of China and heavily garrisoned. There has been sporadic fighting in and around these islands for the past 6 months. These are acknowledged facts.

There are those who feel that if the islands are to be lost to Red China this would be a stunning blow to the morale of the free Chinese forces on Formosa. Commanders are split as to how much American support it would take to hold these islands against Communist attack—or if it is possible to hold them. The Navy and the Air Force have stated openly that these islands can be held with just naval and air support, plus the Chinese Nationalist troops. The Chief of Staff of the United States Army has testified before committees of the Congress that to hold these islands would require American ground forces. No member of the Chiefs of Staff has testified that the islands are essential to the defense of Formosa. They are essential only if there is to be an invasion of the mainland of China.

But, I, for one, have been led to believe by our President and the Secretary of State that our Government will not engage in any military action designed for the retaking of the mainland.

The question may very well be asked then—why is it that the defense of Quemoy and Matsu is so much more important than the defense of the islands to the north of Formosa, which were evacuated, particularly if there is to be no invasion of the mainland. It has been stated by our military commanders that these islands are not essential to the defense of Formosa—and it is to the defense of Formosa that we have pledged American strength and resources.

Our declaration of defense for Formosa has not disrupted our relationships with our allies. The British agree with us on this, and there has been no protest from other friendly powers. The legal and historical position of Formosa as to a government on the Chinese mainland is entirely different from that relation to the offshore islands. The final disposition of Formosa has never been arrived at. It is one of the byproducts of World War II yet unsettled. The offshore islands, on the other hand, represent a land area involved in the Chinese civil war. There can be no doubt about that.

From the point of view of international law, Formosa occupies a different position. Therefore, our declaration of defense of Formosa against Chinese Communist aggression is in the interests of international law and order; is in the interests of the United Nations; and is a proper and honorable policy. Quemoy and Matsu are not in the same legal or moral position.

I respectfully suggest that with respect to the offshore islands, before any decision is made we carefully and frankly discuss this matter with our friends and allies. For example, what does the Japanese Government think about American participation in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu? What about our main ally, the British? The Canadian Government has made its position clear and has frankly stated we will have to go it alone. This should cause us to pause and think. Canada is like a brother to the United States. A more firm and noble ally we have never had. And yet, the responsible leadership of Canada has notified our Government, and notified its own people, that Canada will stand aside and not be a partner with us in any military operations concerning the offshore islands.

Have we consulted with the south Asian powers? What about President Magsaysay of the Philippines—a leader that represents the spirit of the new Asia, a staunch friend of the United States—what does he have to say?

The Secretary of State and the President owe it to the American people and to themselves to know exactly where these nations stand, and to seek their advice and counsel, before rushing headlong into conflict.

Our decision pertaining to the offshore islands likewise must take into consideration our future relationships with such countries as Indonesia, Burma, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Thailand, and the other south and southeast Asian countries. It is fair to say that our relationship with many of these nations already is strained. The Prime Minister of India has spoken out forcefully against our policies relating to the offshore islands, and even to Formosa. We must keep in mind constantly that what we do now may very well determine what we ever will be able to do in Asia. I am sure that the men of the Kremlin and their partners in Communist China sense that in this crucial decision concerning the offshore islands they may well have discovered the Achilles heel in American Far East policy. It would be nothing short of tragic if a decision to defend the offshore islands should lead to a complete break between ourselves and the free Asian nations. It is ridiculous to assume that the defense of these islands is more important than a cooperative and effective relationship between the hundreds of millions of people of the free nations of south and southeast Asia.

These are some of the questions that appear on the international political scene. The answer is not easy, nor can anyone ever be sure that whatever decision we may arrive at will be the right one. Nor can we predict the future. All we can do, or should seek to do, is that which is right, which is legal, and which is honorable. Above all, whatever decision we make must be in concert with others. We must not stand alone in this area, nor can we condone statements by responsible political leaders to the effect that no white troops will be used if we should defend the offshore islands. Statements such as these do us irreparable damage in the Far East.

BIG POWER CONFERENCE

We are giving consideration to the desirability of a big power conference in an attempt to ease the world's tensions. If we are to participate in such a conference, it is absolutely essential that we go there in full agreement with our allies, with no major questions unsettled, in our friendly family of free nations. We must remember at all times that the Soviet will use any international conference to drive a wedge between us and our European and Asian

friends. We must be absolutely certain, before going to the conference table with the Soviet, that the United States, Great Britain, and France have come to a meeting of the minds, not only on the unsolved questions in Europe, but equally so on the problems and questions in Asia.

The decision about American policy concerning the offshore islands is the single more dramatic problem that faces us today. Unless we can reconcile our point of view on this limited but crucial matter, a big-power conference would only lead to further differences and confusion among the Allied Powers. The leaders in the Kremlin know that so long as the free world remains united, so long as we are able to reconcile our differences, so long as we are able to agree on fundamental and basic policies, the Communist conspiracy cannot succeed. The immediate and long range objective of Soviet strategy and diplomacy is to divide us, to split us apart, and above all to isolate the United States from our major allies in Europe and the Far East. This we must not permit to happen.

In the months ahead our Nation will be faced with many more critical decisions and difficult challenges. If we are to have a big-power conference then every conceivable effort must be made to go there from a position of strength—I mean strength based on cooperation and understanding between ourselves and our allies. I mean strength derived from a positive and constructive policy for the Far East as well as for Europe. I mean strength that is based on scrupulous adherence to the principles of international law. Yes, strength that comes from doing what is right, not doing what may be politically expedient.

And also the issue has an effect on our talk of disarmament. Our President has appointed a special adviser in the field of disarmament. We are now participating in the United Nations Disarmament Conference. What could be more tragic in view of all of these future challenges and present problems, than for the United States of America to become involved in hostilities, standing alone without friends or allies. All we hope for could go down the drain. A war with Red China over the offshore islands would not be conducive to a big-power meeting. A war with Red China over the offshore islands surely does not lead to disarmament. Such a war would not serve the purpose of integrating West Germany into the great NATO organization. It is abundantly clear to me that the diabolical plan of the Soviet Union is to force our hand in the Far East, if we permit it to be forced, over an area that is questionable as to its importance and that involves us with grave differences of policy with our allies. If the Soviet is successful in this tactic and strategy, we may well have forfeited our leadership, both in Europe and the Far East. It is not improbable to assume that in case of hostilities over the offshore islands, that the Soviet may well threaten every ally we have if they should accede to American pressure to intervene and join with us, the war may be extended and enlarged. I do not say this will happen—but I do say we must take these eventualities into account.

Such is the world we live in today. On that scene, other nations are troubled and looking for solutions.

Bandung Conference:

We are nearing the date of one of the most significant conferences in the world's history—the African-Asian Conference next month from which white people are excluded. Have we no better bid for support of this vital block of the world's people than the threat of atomic warfare? Where is any positive, constructive policy to be offered these people as evidences of our goodwill and peaceful intent, evidence of our understanding of their own aspirations and our willingness to cooperate in their own progress and development?

A positiive program for peace: Let me advance a suggestion.

Let us get away from the negative and move to the positive. Let's show the Asian peoples we recognize their importance under the sun by taking the lead in proposing India for a seat on the permanent Security Council of the United Nations.

Instead of just saying "No" alone to Red China on admission to the United Nations—and it is a "No" I have always supported—let us counter with a suggestion of our own that would give recognition to Asia without letting Communist power blackmail its way into the family of nations.

It is a reflection of a very rapidly disappearing past for the United Nations to continue to seat China as a permanent member of the Security Council. China at the end of World War II was a powerful ally. The Communist China of today is an enemy. The Nationalist China of today on Formosa is weak and not representative of the new Asia. Neither of these Chinas deserves a seat as a permanent member of the Security Council.

Our Nation should instead call for a revision of the United Nations Charter so as to give India the seat now held by China. Such a dramatic move would attract the attention and support of our friends all over the world. If the Soviet Union opposes this suggestion, our position in Asia would be strengthened. If our suggestion is accepted, we would have a strong, democratic Asian nation sitting in its rightful place of leadership in the councils of the world. Let us not forget that India was our ally during World War II. That India was one of the few nations making a contribution to the Korean conflict by providing ambulances and medical assistance. That India is a democratically elected nation committed to the principle of freedom. The only major defeat inflicted on the Communists in Asia in the last year was inflicted by Nehru against the Communists in India.

Such a bid to India—even evidences of our interest in creating such a bid—could have a powerful impact in our behalf at the African-Asian Conference.

Then let us strengthen our friends in that conference with our assurances of a positive, constructive development program for underprivileged nations—assurances of economic aid, technical assistance, an expanded exchange program to better understand each others' cultures.

On the economic front we have wasted valuable time in meeting the challenge of Communist infiltration due to economic distress, particularly in Asia. It is in this area where our participation through the United Nations, in technical assistance, in health and education programs, can check and push back the inroads of Communist political and economic aggression. Then, too, we must more boldly and meaningfully outline to the Asians the extent and degree of our own economic assistance to them, with particular emphasis upon long-term loans at low rates of interest for capital improvement projects. The development of new instrumentalities of international financing is a challenge to our political and economic statesmanship.

And let us strengthen them in that conference with assurances to the now neutral people of the world that this democracy will never start an atomic war but will stand firm on our resolve to swiftly retaliate in force against a nation that does risk starting one.

ABOUT CHOOSING THE GROUNDS FOR A SHOWDOWN

The time is long past when we can afford to back away from threats of Red aggression. But the time and place of any showdown need not be at Red choosing. It should be obvious that Soviet strategy now calls for forcing our hand at Matsu and Quemoy, in the hope of making us attack the Chinese mainland—a move which they could interpret as intervening in a China civil war, and a move which they know we might be compelled to make without the support of our allies.

What is to prevent us from taking the intiative ourselves by shifting the scene of decision to Korea, where international law is solidly on our side in view of Red China's violation of cease-fire agreements? What is to prevent us from calling the Kremlin's hand on such violations by calling on our Korean allies, through the United Nations, to enforce the Korean truce? Is it not reasonable to assume that a sudden buildup of our forces in Korea would do more to upset Red China's calculations about Formosa than anything we do about Matsu or Quemoy? Moving of our bomber squadrons into Korea, where they would be in ready striking distance of both Red China and Moscow itself, would give the Kremlin more cause for concern than any threat to use A-weapons on the Chinese people.

At the same time, our Nation should assume the initiative in an attempt to resolve the issue of Quemoy and Matsu peacefully, we should propose the neutralization and demilitarization of those islands. We can propose that the Formosa troops be withdrawn from Quemoy and Matsu if Communist China agrees not to occupy those islands. They can then be placed under the supervision of neutral Asian countries or the United Nations itself. Such a suggestion places us in a peace-seeking, rather than warlike, posture, and would give our allies in Asia an opportunity to seek a constructive solution which will secure our national security in Asia.

Voice of Thruston, Hand of J. Foster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the April 1, 1955, issue of the Courier-Journal published in Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE OF THRUSTON, HAND OF J. FOSTER

What are they trying to do to our Thruston? No doubt the signature on that letter that Senator HUMPHREY scorned was the real signature of Thruston Morton. But we cannot believe that the opinions in the letter were his.

The letter was presumably a reply to Senator HUMPHREY, who had demanded to know who leaked the now famous Yalta papers to the New York Times one day before they were officially released, and whether the leak was a breach of security. The reply that Assistant Secretary of State Morton had to sign, in his capacity as State Department liaison officer, dodges the first part of the question altogether. It says that the papers had no security classification, but then it adds an astonishing hindsight excuse for the whole Yalta papers muddle:

Mr. Dulles had, according to this account, mulled over the thought that both Paris and

Bonn were preparing to ratify the German rearmament treaty, and that in the heat of debate some people were suggesting further talks with the Russians. So, publication of the papers, on 24 hours' notice and after an elaborately arranged plot to leak them to one newspaper, was soberly decided upon as a warning of "the dangers, as well as the possible values, of such talks."

We don't think our Mr. Morton could ever have concocted such a tale. It is so flimsy, so insulting to the intelligence of Paris and Bonn, as well as to that of Senator HUMPHREY and his fellow Americans that only a man capable of heroism beyond the call of duty would have put his name to it at all. No. We conclude, after doing a bit of mulling over ourselves, that while the voice may be the voice—rather strained—of Thruston, the hand most certainly is the hand of John Foster.

The Right-Wing Republicans

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], admonished the Republicans that they should not talk about a party of traitors, or the party of treason, or something of that kind.

Any statement, if such a statement was made, that the Democratic Party was the party of treason was, of course, an absurdity.

The Speaker quite properly, when this session of the House convened on January 5, gave us all to understand that we should be tolerant, rather than critical, when expressing an opinion of the opposition. Expressing that thought, he said:

> I want to say as I said on the stump last fall, that we as Democrats do not indulge in personalities; we are not an accusing kind of people; we do not have to be that way.
>
> It matters not what the heat may be, here or out there, we are not going to indict people en masse. (Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 5, 1955, p. 8.)

Yet yesterday in the Washington Post I read this statement:

> The 73-year-old Speaker, first Democrat ever to be so honored—

Of course, that honor was richly deserved, and we all join in honoring him—

> lashed out bitterly at the Republican right wing. He termed it a disloyal opposition.

If I know what that term means, I am a right-wing Republican, and I would like to know what the Speaker meant when he implied I was disloyal because I am classified as a right-wing Republican. Disloyal to whom? To the administration? To my country?

I wish the Speaker would read what he said some time ago about being careful about our language, about not indicting people "en masse."

I know of many former and present Members of this House, Democrats from the South, some from the Speaker's own State, as well as many Republicans who have political views with which I am in full accord. Many of them might be accurately described as right-wing Republicans. They certainly are far to the right of many of the views announced and followed by left-wing Democrats and left-wing Republicans.

Since when has it become permissible to characterize a political opponent, for example one who does not accept the views of the gentleman from Texas, whatever they may be, as above criticism or opposition, as being disloyal.

If we concede, as we do, that the Speaker is a man of exceptional ability, unquestioned integrity and patriotism, it does not necessarily follow that all or many who have a thought which is not in accord with his thinking are disloyal to either the party or to the country.

The Struggle of Rabbits Versus Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 17, 1955:

THE STRUGGLE OF RABBITS VERSUS HORSES

International trade is helped a little by lowering tariffs here and there and by removing import quotas, but in the middle of the 20th century such steps cannot recapture the trade patterns of the 19th century which the nostalgic free traders long for.

MORE THAN OPEN DOORS

So those who applaud President Eisenhower's plea to Congress that the United States be made a member of a 34-nation Organization for Trade Cooperation ought not to expect too much of it; it is only a subsistence payment to a world economy which needs more than open doors to return to prosperity.

It would surprise some of America's free-trade theorists to learn that the raising and lowering of United States tariffs over the last 50 years was not reflected by decreases or increases in the value of American imports. Tariffs affected the kind of imports to some extent (for example, reduced the importing of English woolens), but in general protective duties changed the type of imports, not the quantity.

American imports are high at this time, and they probably wouldn't be much higher if we had no tariffs at all. There is plenty of room for imports to increase under the present tariff structure but other countries are not making the goods Americans will buy.

Our representatives abroad have counseled foreign producers to study American markets if they want to sell more in the United States. But it is fashionable in some foreign circles, nevertheless, to proclaim that American tariffs bar European goods, thereby creating the "dollar shortage" which compels the United States to give dollars to the trading countries so that they can balance their payments.

The "Trade, Not Aid" slogan in Britain originated among proud people who deluded themselves that they would get enough honest dollars in the United States if the tariff barrier weren't so high.

EXPRESSION OF EMPIRE

What the free traders—or freer traders—will not do is study the trade changes that have taken place within their own lives. Free trade was the practical expression of British Empire when Britain, the first manufacturing nation in the field, produced goods for the world in return for the world's raw materials. Tariff-free imports in such a setup were an economic necessity. Some British economists made a virtue of the necessity and tailored the philosophy of free trade to fit a special case which they believed would last forever.

But it didn't last forever. Other nations became industrial, and within our time the captive markets of colonial empire began to wither. The age of competition followed the age of free trade, and today Britain has some of the highest protective tariffs in Europe. If a country's propensity for free trade in 1955 can be measured by its tariffs, the United States would stand as a freer trader than most of her friends.

Several European countries have resorted to the same expedient to combat competition. They have organized currency blocks in the remnants of their colonial empires and have traded on price terms which they could fix. They owe money, much of the debt having been incurred in war, and they pay the debts by exporting goods to the creditors at prices based on the unrealistic valuations they put on their currencies.

An operation in a currency bloc trading area goes something like this: A borrowed three horses from B and foundered them. In due time B demands return of the horses. A says he has no horses now; he is raising rabbits. Rabbits, says A, are quite as valuable as horses; in fact, A has passed a law declaring that 1 horse equals 1 rabbit. B reluctantly accepts 3 rabbits from A (he would recover nothing otherwise), but he still wants horses. However, he can find no horse market in the world which will accept A's valuation of horses in terms of rabbits.

No American trader, of course, will give 3 horses for 3 rabbits. So A and B join in proclaiming that the United States has created a horse shortage.

VERY TENDER CONSCIENCE

The United States, having a very tender and foolish conscience, thereupon gives B 3 horses outright and tells him to keep his rabbits. Then A complains that the United States should not be giving aid but should be encouraging honest trade. Everything would be well, says A, if the United States would decently acknowledge that 3 rabbits are worth 3 horses.

In a general way, the trading blocs, which resulted because none of the trading countries will let their currencies find an honest relationship with the dollar, are responsible for the decline of vigorously competitive international trade in the world's non-Communist markets. Everybody has a law now declaring that the value of a rabbit equals the value of a horse.

The result is that the countries with artificial money cannot overcome what they call the dollar shortage. In their zeal to keep a corner on their controlled markets they have been compelled to abandon those markets which used to provide them with a large amount of their dollar exchange. The economists have been calling such markets the "third countries."

Many of the Latin-American States used to be third countries. The United States bought coffee from Brazil or bananas from Guatemala with dollars. The European manufacturing and trading countries then sold these third countries goods for the American dollars. Exchange balances were satisfactory.

UNDER NO OBLIGATION

But the European countries could not resume this trade, even after the postwar recovery was well along, because the third countries were under no obligation or compulsion to accept the overvaluation of rabbits.

Lower tariffs and fewer quota restrictions, even if the Organization for Trade Cooperation is able to bring them about, will not help much until all the currencies of the world have been honestly revalued in relation to the dollar. Freely convertible currencies would not make world trade free in the 19th century sense, but it would make it freer. The rest is in the future.

Are Local Service Airlines Being Treated Fairly by Civil Aeronautics Board?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a basic question of policy has arisen as a result of a recent decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

On December 22, 1954, the CAB ruled in favor of trunklines on route 106, which is a local service route between Iowa and Chicago. Local service carriers are able to handle this route and it clearly falls into the category of a local-service route. This decision concerns me greatly. If this pattern is followed, the CAB will gradually drive the local carriers out of business, thereby depriving many small communities of airline service.

I have received the following letter from the president of Ozark Airlines, which I would like to include as part of my remarks. The letter is as follows:

OZARK AIR LINES,
LAMBERT FIELD,
St. Louis, Mo., March 18, 1955.

Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACK: January 25, 1955, I sent to you a letter of explanation, and a copy of Ozark's petition for reconsideration in reference to the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision December 22, 1954, on route 106, a local service route between Sioux City, Iowa, and Chicago, Ill. serving 8 medium sized cities. These cities have an average population of less than 54,000 and the average distance between them is 76 miles. Our company called this matter to your attention because we felt that there was a serious question of basic air transportation policy raised by the Board's decision. The question concerned the departure from the Local Service Airline policy by turning over a Local Service Route to trunkline carriers.

February 16, 1955, the Civil Aeronautics Board denied Ozark's petition for reconsideration, however, one week later, the CAB chairman testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to the effect that the CAB needed further opportunity to improve the route systems of the Local Service Carriers before granting grandfather rights to these smaller airlines.

To our mind, there is such a complete contradiction between representations made by the Civil Aeronautics Board before Congress, and the actions of the CAB in the 106 case (where the CAB had an exceptional opportunity to strengthen the routes of a Local Service Carrier), that we have again petitioned the CAB for reconsideration and rehearing of this matter. We believe this is a matter in which the Congress has a very definite interest. Since you have listened personally to the CAB testimony as an active interested member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last year and again this year, we thought that you also would share our bewilderment and our discouragement at the unexplained contradiction between what the CAB told Congress it was trying to do toward route improvement and what the CAB actually did in its 106 route decision.

As the attached petition for reconsideration points out, the present status of Local Service Route 106 is completely and hopelessly confused by the CAB's departure from policy and unrealistic approach.

In my opinion, neither the communities, nor the three carriers involved, are pleased with the present confused situation. The CAB, by attempting to force United Air Lines to serve Fort Dodge, Iowa, with a population of less than 30,000, is faced with the probability of a long involved court battle. The cities, which are being served unwillingly by Braniff, are not receiving a service tailor made to their needs.

This matter is of particular urgency to you and ourselves now, because if it is not settled properly this time, it will be 5 years before a similar opportunity presents itself. If the CAB is sincerely interested in improving the route systems of the local-service carriers, the first concrete demonstration of that interest is reconsideration of its decision in the route 106 case and the logical award of this local-service route to a local-service carrier.

From the point of view of the Congress in developing logically the local air-service program, and in reducing appropriations to support this program; from the point of view of these smaller cities which need a long-range program of air service suited to their specific needs; from the point of view of the carriers who are in business to perform specific types of air service, it is essential that the Civil Aeronautics Board, at this time, stay the effectiveness of its present decision in route 106, and grant reconsideration and further hearing to properly decide this case consistent with the representations it has made to the Congress.

We welcome the opportunity to provide further information to you.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,
OZARK AIR LINES, INC.,
LADDIE HAMILTON,
President.

No Superinternational Organizations, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal for April 18. This editorial raises the serious question as to the advisability of Congress approving an "Organization for Trade Cooperation"—OTC as it will now be known.

There is serious question, Mr. Speaker, that the argument advanced by the President is a sound one and Congress has the responsibility of giving his suggestion very close scrutiny:

ORGANIZATIONS AND ORDER

This newspaper thoroughly agrees with President Eisenhower that the elimination of restrictions on the movement of goods, services and capital among nations would have most desirable results.

The world's economies would be stimulated. Political and military cooperation would be considerably easier than it is now. And if those things were achieved the Communists would have suffered a setback if not a final defeat.

But whether those desirable objectives are to be reached by setting up an international organization to be known as an Organization for Trade Cooperation is a matter which Congress ought to study. Basically the presence of an international bureaucracy may be the antithesis of freedom.

Freedom of trade means that men can exchange goods and services over international boundaries free from restricting rules. It is the very nature of a body such as Mr. Eisenhower proposes to make rules.

You don't achieve freedom by setting up institutions. If we had, let us say, a Commission on Freedom of Speech it would be inherent in its existence that it would be decreeing what men could or could not say. It would be a restriction on freedom.

Very well, but it will be said that the world is beset by tariffs, quotas, and exchange restrictions and Mr. Eisenhower has proposed this international organization to get rid of them. But will it get rid of them? Or will it be forced to compromise, and by accepting some of them give to them a respectability that they do not now possess?

Two years ago Dr. Ludwig Erhard, the German minister of economics, warned that attempts to bring about integration through supra-national organizations is not order but disorder. True order, Dr. Erhard said, is most present when it is not noticed at all. Order does not depend on organization. The mere presence of an organization may be conductive to freezing those elements which are at the bottom of the disorder.

Senator BYRD, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, favors quick action to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act which gives the President power to revise American tariffs within certain limits. However, Senator BYRD intends to be careful that such extension should not be interpreted as congressional endorsement of the organization for trade cooperation or of the general agreement on tariffs and trade which the OTC would administer.

In favoring the extension of the Recriprocal Act but in insisting that the new proposals stand on their own feet, Senator BYRD, it seems to us, is on solid ground.

John Grounds, Who Knows Area, Says Echo Park Dam Should Be Built, and Refutes Many Stories About Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article which recently appeared in the Steamboat Pilot, of Steam-

boat Springs, Colo. This article, by John Grounds, a man having a great deal of personal knowledge about the general area of the Echo Park Dam, contains valuable background information on this important project. He was on the ground at the time many activities were undertaken, and he here spells out the important considerations as he views them. I suggest this review to the Members as an informative accounting of early developments concerning the Echo Park Dam site:

JOHN GROUNDS, WHO KNOWS AREA, SAYS ECHO PARK DAM SHOULD BE BUILT AND REFUTES MANY STORIES ABOUT SITE

(John Grounds, who spent many years in the Browns Park country and is a son of one of the pioneer cattlemen in that area, has written an article on the Dinosaur National Monument that has been sent to all the Senators for their information while considering the upper Colorado River development plan. Mr. Grounds now resides at Valentine, Ariz., and is vice president of the WF Cattle Co. He is a son-in-law of Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Curtis, of Steamboat. His statement on the Dinosaur Monument follows:)

In the past 2 years we have heard and read many angles and slants on the Dinosaur National Monument versus the Echo Park Dam site.

Many of the assertions and versions of the writers are erroneous or misinterpretations of what others have said.

It is impossible for anyone to realize how inaccessible this area really is until they've been on the ground.

There are 52 miles of river canyon within the monument and I've seen most of it many times due to occupational duties. My father was among the oldtime cattlemen who owned huge cattle empires. At times, cattle in his possession exceeded 20,000 head. His cattle grazed to the canyon bluffs throughout most of the present monument area.

Many of the more beautiful canyon sights can be seen only after hard rides on horseback.

There is a road from U. S. 40 leading north over Blue Mountain and down Pool Creek at Pat's Hole. From this point one can see the Steamboat Rock and the river junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

There is another road leading in from the Colorado State Highway 318 to the northern end of the monument. The nearest towns on this side are Rock Springs, Wyo., and Maybell, Colo. This north road leads into the entrance of one of the most beautiful of all canyons, the Lodore. This road was built by the Lodore Canyon Tourist Camps in 1936, and terminated at a boat landing. A boat line was maintained by the tourist camp. Passengers were carried by boat 3 miles down between the crimson walls of the Lodore to another established camp accessible only by boats.

I mention the tourist camp and the boat line as there is indeed much significance involved in the two items.

In many cases wars are declared and battles fought with few people knowing just why or where they actually started.

It was at this point that the enlarging of the Dinosaur National Monument first began taking shape.

The tourist camp in an effort to get better advertising, began searching for possibilities to have the canyon country set aside in a national park. They worked with members of the Lion's Clubs of Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., to get the Park Service interested. They also engaged one of the foremost specialists of canyon photography and photographed points of interest throughout the entire canyon stretches.

Eventually officials from the Park Service came to investigate. They decided much red tape could be sidestepped by enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument rather than to organize a whole new setup for a national park.

In 1938 the enlargement of the monument became a reality. The original 80 acre plot set aside in 1915 by Woodrow Wilson was increased to 200,000 acres.

Now let us glance at the situation from the viewpoint of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Back at about the turn of the century the Department of the Interior was spending time and money in search of a dam site in the thesa canyons. I have never seen records of this work on paper but can explain what everyone else can still see on the ground.

On arriving at the entrance of the Lodore Canyon there is a very noticeable straight line on the east side of the entrance running from a high ridge down to the river level. This is an old road built by the Government to get their machinery into the canyon. The road is too steep for automobiles. It leads to a little meadow right where the river enters the canyon walls. At the lower edge of the meadow there is a long rock foundation, apparently a cook shack, and numerous other foundations of smaller buildings. Only cellars are left intact. The surface structures have long since been swept away by ice jams and floodwaters.

On down along the canyon walls, accessible only by boat, are the locations, painted on the canyon walls, in black paint, of test holes. These holes were drilled from a barge into the river floor testing for the depth to bedrock. The location markings are numbered from 1 to 10 and located down the canyon for several miles. At one location are the words "Unfinished Hole."

This work was apparently no small operation for that day and age and probably required several years.

This canyon area and the land upriver within the intended lakebed was withdrawn from the Homestead Act and placed under the Bureau of Reclamation. However, prior to this withdrawal, most of the land of any value had already been homsteaded, as Brown's Park was considered a fine winter country as compared to the high mountain country around it.

Most of the settlers located their land on the river bottoms or, overflow land. Improvements on this land were at the mercy of the unpredictable Green River in the summertime. The high-water stage could usually be expected from about June 20 until July 1. In the wintertime the river took its toll of livestock along steep frozen banks and airholes in the ice. In the spring of the year local floodwater caused quicksand, one of the greatest river hazards to livestock. These drawbacks are not in Brown's Park alone but found more or less along all uncontrolled rivers.

It was only a matter of a few years until most of the homesteads were owned by a few large operators.

In the event that the Echo Park Dam is to be constructed, the Government will not have too much land and few owners to reckon with as compared with some sites.

It seems that the Department of the Interior has drawn its heaviest fire from conservationists denouncing the Department for suggesting the construction of a dam on Park Service land, if these people and the public knew and understood the truth about this matter it would be no longer an issue. When the Park Service began outlining the intended monument boundaries they had to obtain ground from the Department of the Interior which was still under the Reclamation Act for future dam sites.

The Interior Department was very cooperative and gladly released the land to the Park Service, with a provision: All power and dam sites reserved to the Bureau of Reclamation.

We have two proven businessmen, Secretary McKay and Under Secretary Tudor (who has recently returned to private business). Are writers going to continue heaping abuse on the shoulders of these two men for the location of this dam site?

We have a point that is being asked by thousands of people. Why should the Government enter into direct competition with private enterprise? No one believes more wholeheartedly in private enterprise than I do. We have to establish a boundary between Government business and private enterprise when a conflict arises. If a private company builds this dam, hydroelectric power is about all they have to sell. They will probably operate to a higher peak of efficiency than the same Government staff but they won't be able to foot the bill for at least 2 or possibly 3 generations as the dam will be out of proportion to their needs. If the Government builds the dam the tax dollars will be reimbursed to the extent of hydroelectric power (which will be sold to private distributors) plus the benefits that will be reaped by thousands of taxpayers living on highways and roads with businesses and establishments that will prosper for generations to come by the influx of tourist traffic to visit a great dam in a beautiful monument. Still another, irrigation water for many areas and water to allow expansion of cities. These items plus the generated power and numerous other phases of human life benefited by the dam are clear cut evidence that the Echo Park and other dam sites of the upper basin plan are national improvements to benefit taxpayers throughout the land.

These inland projects are also defense measures in case of war.

Writers opposing the upper basin projects usually elaborate on the cost to the taxpayers of $909,339,300, or roughly $1 billion, spent and gone.

At any rate this money is to be spent in our own country for our own labor and material and will be distributed over a period of about 30 years to complete the upper basin project.

If the estimates are correct on our growing population, that, by 1975 our census will exceed 200 million people within the United States, we had better not allow the upper river project plan to slide into many more pigeonholes. After the completion of the entire project, the upper basin States will not be able to attain maximum stages of development for 50 to 75 years so time is wasting if we intend to stand on our own feet with the ever-enlarging figures of our future needs.

We have the Colorado River compact drawn up in 1922 allotting each State their share of the river water. None of the States, according to the compact, shall gain a right by usage of another State's water, thus allowing the States to bide their time for developing water use.

The river line between the upper and lower basins is at Lee's Ferry.

In the compact the average flow of the Colorado River at Lee's Ferry was decided to be 15 million acre-feet of water per year.

The upper basin is to deliver below Lee's Ferry 7½ million acre-feet of water per year.

The fluxuation of the river is enormous, during drought years, it is calculated at less than 5 million acre-feet flow per year. Deep snow years in the upper basin States will cause a year's flow to reach 25 million acre-feet of water past Lee's Ferry.

These figures are proof that the lower basin would have a much greater dependable amount of water if the upper basin project was carried out. The present figures show about 60 percent of the Colorado River water flowing into the Gulf of California unused.

To sum up the "law of the river" (Colorado River compact), things look well enough on the surface. Nothing of serious consequence has turned up to suggest defeat or loss of rights to the upper basin States within the life of the "law of the river," a span of 33 years but now let us remember

the fact that three dams are completed in the lower basin and development is at hand.

If the lower basin has time to develop to their capacity of allotted water than proceed beyond that quota which would be the natural thing to do if there was a surplus of water, then, with their possession and prior usage of the excess water any law contrary to this action would be of little value to the upper basin States.

To say that any State would overstep their water share is only a suggestion. We are badly in need of a suggestion of some type to fill in a gap, and the gap is this: I have received a number of letters from various committees and associations telling me to write my Senators and Representatives to block the upper river basin projects. They generally support 2 main reasons: (1) "Our taxes will be raised"; (2) "California may not get her rightful share of Colorado River water."

These letters and pamphlets under different headings probably point to one central organization and merely a shrewd scheme to get people to act when they see so many groups all thinking alike. Anyone contemplating action after receiving literature of this nature should do some studying for themselves. The mentioned literature doesn't necessarily indicate that the State of California is backing up this maneuver, but the said maneuver may create a damaging effect on legislation in favor of the upper basin project.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, recently wrote a very accurate article on the Echo Park project.

A great amount of accurate information is released on the back of an excellent map of the Dinosaur National Monument. This map has been obtained at a very reasonable price at United States Department of the Interior, Geological Survey, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colo.

There is very little firsthand information on all the Yampa and Green River Canyon. To see the sights from the top of the canyon walls one must go through many hardships and spend much time and money; to see the canyons from the rivers he goes through the hardships of making portages around dangerous rapids and being wet continuously. Some say that the Yampa River is easy to run in a boat. That I don't know. I will say that "easy" is not the case on Green River. The fall of the river, the volume of water, and the size and number of boulders are too great for a boat on its own. At one point in the Lodore Canyon, at low-water stage, almost the entire river current goes under the west wall.

The Ladore Canyon received its name from Robert Southey's Cataract of Lodore, and very befitting it is.

Until the Echo Park Dam quiets the rushing, roaring, white waters of the canyons of Yampa and Lodore, it will mean nothing to tourists and sightseeking joyriders who have little time to spend in one place.

JOHN GROUNDS.

VALENTINE, ARIZ.

Americanism Is Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is a growing indication that our young people are fully equipped to discuss and meet the serious problems affecting our democracy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay written by one of my young constituents, Miss Karen Turner, entitled "Americanism Is Brotherhood."

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANISM IS BROTHERHOOD

"We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union; establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Here in America we are very fortunate because we have more freedoms and rights. This is a country of humanitarian interested, God fearing men; a country of great ideas worked for and sought for by everyone. Freedom of religion and free education are of greatest importance.

The church plays a most important part in the life of the average American. The close relationship between the American and his church is fostered by everyone's right to choose his or her own denomination, Catholic, Protestant or whatever it may be. We are not forced to belong to any certain religion.

We practice our religion in any way that we choose. We may even organize and manage our own local church parish. Catholic, Mormon, Baptist, Methodist, Jew or any other creed, white, black, red or yellow race, they all may and do mix with mutual respect and admiration. Can there be a finer demonstration of brotherhood in fact and theory.

All men are created equal and therefore are entitled to equal rights. Equal rights in government, work, religion, but especially in education. Nationality, race, creed, color, wealth or social position, they are no barriers in America's free, public school system. From kindergarten through college practically, free education is the birthright of every American that seeks to take advantage of it.

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to be free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The Statue of Liberty lifts her lamp beside the golden door of opportunity symbolizing the bonds of friendship between this country and people everywhere. Americans are every nationality, race, and creed. French, Swiss, Scotch, German, Irish, Norwegian, and all other nationalities of the world make up America, therefore an American is a nationality all its own, it is the nationality of all nationalities.

Providing a home for immigrants has always been a part of America. America's attitude toward the wretched displaced persons of Europe is one of the glorious pages of history. We not only practice brotherhood at home, but we extend our hand across the seas.

These people are not as fortunate as others so there has been a special program set up to help them get started in a better life in a new country. The program tells them about American history and teaches them the English language, even homes and jobs are found for these people.

Here again brotherhood is shown, because there is no restriction of race, creed, or religion of the immigrants. Who has the right to say the Negro isn't as good as the white? Who has the right to say the Negro is better than the white? No one, because they are all equal. Who has the right to say that one nationality is better than another? They cannot be in America.

America strives for brotherhood, brotherhood among men in this country and brotherhood among the countries of the world. It not only believes in brotherhood but it believes in world peace. That is why the United States is a member of the United Nations.

The purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security, to develop friendly relations among nations, to cooperate in solving international, economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems, and promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The most important fact is that the United Nations is a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in attaining these common ends.

We believe that all men are created equal, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the four freedoms, the point 4 program, the Marshall plan, the American dream—these are all part and parcel of the American people and their history. They are all evidence of our applying the principles we stand for.

The United States is working for world peace and national peace. The United States is working for brotherhood between nations and brotherhood between men, this goes to prove that—

Americanism is brotherhood.

Increase the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 22, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union.

INCREASE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Statement of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, before the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, CIO, Washington Hotel, April 19)

By word and deed, the administration is making no bones of the fact that it wants to put the skids under labor. After many protestations concerning the liberalization of the Taft-Hartley Act, passed over President Truman's veto, no action has been taken.

The administration policy is to shift as much power as possible to the States. This abdication of Federal responsibility thus gives big business in the States greater opportunity to break the back of labor. As a result right-to-work laws have been passed in Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Before the advent of the Eisenhower administration only one State—Florida—had passed such a statute. The election of a Republican administration in 1952 gave great strength to the antilabor forces. This is self-evident to labor, to business, and to the public. In essence, these right-to-work laws for practical purposes, forbid all forms of union security—the closed shop, the union shop, and any form of contract which would bind workers to the union for any period of time. These right-to-work laws are tantamount to a denial of the right to organize and bargain collectively. This is not freedom as the proponents glibly characterize the right-to-work laws. This is license for management to have its own way with the individual worker on terms of its own choosing, without need to answer to the collective protection of the labor union.

Some time back, Secretary of Labor Mitchell stated that he did not support these right-to-work laws. When questioned about Secretary Mitchell's statement, President Eisenhower said that this is merely an expression of personal opinion on the part of his Secretary and that he did not necessarily subscribe to nor deny Mr. Mitchell's thinking on the subject. To labor, this is a less than satisfactory reply because labor itself knows the issue is clear that right-to-work laws are antilabor laws. There can be no hedging on that.

Back in 1937 President Roosevelt, keenly aware of widespread wagecutting, increase of the workweek without overtime pay, asked that the Congress enact a Federal fair labor standards law. In doing so, he said: "A self-supporting and self-respecting democracy can plead no justification for chiseling workers' wages or stretching workers' hours. Our problem is to work out in practice those labor standards which will permit the maximum but prudent employment of our human resources to bring within the reach of the average man and woman a maximum of goods and of services conducive to the fulfillment of the promise of American life." This is the standard toward which all men must work, not for the sake alone of the individual laboring man and woman, which in and of itself is of prime importance, but for the sake of the country so that this country may march forward to the ideals proclaimed by the Roosevelt message.

In 1949 a Federal minimum wage of 75 cents an hour was established. It was inadequate then; it is shockingly inadequate now. Yesterday I introduced two bills: 1. Increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; 2. Removing the exemptions for retail establishments and processors of food and tobacco.

Why the increase to $1.25 per hour? Because:

1. Living costs have increased by 14 percent since January 1950, but since the lowest income group suffers the greatest price rise, for such group living costs have increased by at least 18 percent. Hence the 75 cents an hour is worth today only 65 cents an hour, or about $26 a week. In realizing the total picture, we must include not only the rise in prices but the rise in social security deductions since 1950 and the additional sales tax in many States.

2. While the 75-cent level has remained, productivity has increased at least 20 percent and the gap between what a man is paid and a man produces widens, and the glaring injustice of the 75-cent wage emerges from the gap.

3. Since January 1950 there have been five general wage increases in our major industries, ranging from some 39 to 53 cents per hour, of increase alone. This of course does not include fringe benefits, pensions, life insurance, sickness, and disability benefits which have been added to the payroll. There is a completely unrealistic relationship between the 75 cents an hour established by law and the existing wage structure of American industry.

It has been proven that even a working woman who lives with her family must have an hourly minimum wage of $1.22 according to the New York State Department of Labor, if the health, morale, and general economic welfare of the country are to be protected. Can the richest Nation in the world stand by and say it cannot afford a Federal hourly minimum of $1.25? Yet these are the facts. In 1953 we produced a record $365 billion worth of goods and services, yet 23 percent of all the families had total money incomes of less than $2,000.

The reasons for poverty are many—disability, old age—low rural incomes, prejudice and so forth. The fight against poverty must have many weapons, some of them subtle, some of them more direct; the most direct, the least complicated, the simplest to effectuate, would be to increase the Federal minimum wage to $1.25. An adequate minimum wage would not only affect the workers themselves but would raise the economic standard of the country generally. It means increased purchasing power, increased demands, from which inevitably all industry and all labor must benefit.

By extending coverage through the elimination of the exemptions for retail establishments and food and tobacco processors, such workers would no longer be in the position of job inferiority and would bring low wages areas into proper ability to compete with other areas with more than a living wage for the workers. Secretary of Labor Mitchell, in testifying before a Senate Labor subcommittee, went on to say that he knew of no sound reason why the minimum wage should not be extended to employees of chain stores, hotels and moving picture chains, including about two million in all. He said that of nearly 1,500,000 retail establishments, only 31,000 or 2 percent are in interstate commerce, but that the 2 percent employ 34 percent of those in business. "They are obviously," he said, "engaged in commerce affecting more States than one. Such commerce is appropriate for regulation by the Federal Government." I wonder if once again his remarks in testifying before a Senate Labor subcommittee will be characterized as personal?

We have witnessed in the past few years the springing up of ghost towns formerly inhabited by traditional business. The New England States and New York State particularly have been hard hit by the movement of industry out of these regions to the south.

I am giving you the facts, but you know them better than I do. You have lived with them in terms of bread and butter, and medical bills, shoes for the children, rent, and education. No amount of statistics can convince as can following the life of a single worker through a single day. No chart, no graph, no table of figures can convince as can the sight of a supper table of a worker and the sight of his clothes in the closet. America's lowest paid and neediest citizens are excluded from a proper share of this increase in the national wealth. This is wrong, cruelly wrong, and we cannot stop until these wrongs are righted. The American heritage belongs to all of us. The American dream belongs to all of us.

Petaluma Chamber of Commerce Endorses Trinity River Power Development by Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include a letter from the Petaluma (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce endorsing development of power on the Trinity River by private enterprise.

By their April 5 action this organization has alined itself with many others in my congressional district and in other parts of northern California in support of the proposal to allow private enterprise to develop and operate power facilities on the Trinity River. The advantages lie in less construction costs to taxpayers, and in the return of millions of dollars in tax revenue to Federal, State, and local governments.

In appearing before a subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last week, I urged power development by private enterprise be adopted. This would serve the best interests of all concerned and, in support of that position, I submit the following:

PETALUMA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Petaluma, Calif., April 6, 1955.

Upon completion of an intensive study of the Trinity project, this chamber of commerce has taken the following action at their regular meeting April 5, 1955:

The Petaluma Chamber of Commerce board of directors urge that should the Trinity project proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation be accepted our legislators give full consideration to the P. G. & E. Trinity partnership plan before any Government operation of powerplants is considered.

We consider the above proposal a decided advantage to the Federal Government.

Cordially,

CLAUDE D. BRADFORD,
Manager.

Misleading Diversions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a new tax dedline reaches us tomorrow, April 15.

The following item from the Brooklyn Bar Association publication, the Barrister, written by my good friend, Stanley Kreutzer, is therefore, apropos:

MISLEADING DIVERSIONS—A TAX ADDRESS: MODERN VERSION

Twoscore or so years ago, our fathers sent forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men accumulate plenty. Now we are engaged in great calculations, testing whether this taxpayer or any taxpayer, much confused and much impovernished can long endure.

We are met on Form 1040, of that field. We have come to allocate a substantial portion of our income to a final resting place with those now designated to spend our funds. It is altogether anguish and torture when we do this. But in a larger sense, we cannot evade, we cannot cheat, we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors (clever and so forth), who recheck it, transcend far beyond our poor power to add and subtract.

Creditors may little note, nor e'en remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue just won't forget that we report here.

It is not for us, the taxpayers, to question the tax which our representatives so nobly spend. It is rather for us to be here consecrated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanishing dollars, we increase our devotion to those remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will find us in a higher bracket; so that the lawyer, harrowed and underpaid, shall have time, ability, and money to figure our more deductions; and that this tax, on the people, by the Congress, for the Government, shall not drive us from the earth. (With apologies to another author)

Probation Officer's Comments on Children in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise my remarks, I include in the RECORD a recent radio address by Mr. Charles Eliot Sands over station WVOM.

This very interesting speech deals with the problem of juvenile delinquency and is presented by one who has the experience to treat of this subject with penetrating observations.

Mr. Sands has summarized his point of view very ably, succinctly, and well and I think his views would be very helpful in many places throughout the Nation.

PROBATION OFFICER'S COMMENTS ON CHILDREN IN TROUBLE

(Radio address by Charles Eliot Sands, February 4, 1955, Morgan Memorial Church of All Nations, over station WVOM)

As a probation officer for some years at the Boston juvenile court, I have observed quite a large number of so-called bad boys and their families, over a considerable period. These boys have been individuals, and some of them individualists, no two alike in mental ability, physical power, family upbringing, emotional adjustment, or experiences. However, if we leave out of consideration the children who get into trouble only once, or perhaps twice, and consider only the delinquents who more or less continuously break the law, we find that this group has certain characteristics which I should like to discuss briefly.

The most commonly observed trait and one which I believe to be basic is that they are unhappy. A fair number have really good mental ability, but they are not really good at anything—in school, in athletics or competitive games, in craftsmanship, or in art. In most forms of activity they tend to be mediocre to poor. Physical and mental deficiencies in some cases contribute to this, but not in general. A second contributing cause to this feeling of unhappiness may be the sense of insecurity resulting from discordant and irregular family life. Children need from their families essentially regular attention—warm affection and encouragement, and kindly but firm control and discipline. Children are not mature enough to be permitted to go their own ways; they must be guided and supervised. The parent who neglects his family for the bottle is no worse than the parent who from pressure of affairs or business has so little time to spend with the family, that the children grow up without necessary parental attention. Neglected children are unhappy children whatever may be the cause of the neglect. A third factor sometimes contributing to the delinquents' unhappy state is the development within him of a feeling of hostility, merited or unmerited, against some member of his family or less unusually, an outsider, a teacher, a policeman, or perhaps a probation officer. The working out of this resentment may take the form of delinquent acts of all sorts, and against people completely different from the original object of the resentment.

The conclusion is forced upon me that a large number of the boys and girls whom we see, misbehave for reasons of prestige or getting attention. They want to be considered as amounting to something by somebody. They don't want to be ignored. They greedily snatch the newspapers to read accounts of their crimes, even though names of juveniles are not printed. One of my most pathetic—and aggravating probationers, only recently is alleged to have remarked when he saw the account of the shooting of the filling station owner north of Boston, "I'll make the headlines yet." It is this desire to be noticed—for standing in the group to which they belong, which is their own undoing. There would be no point in "pulling a job" as they say, unless they told others about it—and that is usually what brings about their arrest. Policemen presenting complaints against children in court frequently begin their statements with: "As a result of a conversation," and continue perhaps, "I went to the home of the defendant who was in bed, but got up and showed me where he had hidden the articles he had stolen from so and so." In very few cases is the culprit able to refrain from bragging about his job; and prosecutions continue to be begun "as a result of a conversation." Among other characteristics frequently met within our delinquent population is an apathetic attitude, a lack of thought for the future, a sense of futility and discouragement, with regard to work involving sustained effort and interest, largely the result of irregular upbringing and lack of parental attention. The necessity of military service has been used by many of these boys as an excuse for not seriously attempting to find a steady employment. Many of them have actually found themselves in the service and acquire the maturity they lacked—in the regular life, duty, and opportunity for recognition afforded by the Armed Forces.

Some of the boys are influenced by hero worship. It is not uncommon for one boy to state that if his friend is to be sent away, he should go too Recently a bright youngster whom I knew, though he was not on probation, came to the office where my probationers report each week, to inquire about his friend who, already on probation, had got into more serious trouble He wanted to be committed if his friend was, and to prove his right to be committed recited a list of three breaks in which he had taken part, though no complaints had been made to the police I subsequently verified that he had been telling the truth.

For those of us who are parents, there is much to be learned from observation of children such as these. First, we learn the necessity of spending time with our children, of recognizing their actions by appropriate praise and reprimand as the case may be, of checking on their whereabouts, and their companions, but principally finding the time to be with them. It is important to set and maintain standards of honestry, truthfulness, duty, and consideration for others, to inculcate reverence for the spiritual values and truth which religion has passed on down through the ages. Such a task is difficult enough for both parents working in harmony to accomplish. When one of the parents is missing, or unable or unwilling to perform his duty, the burden on the other is greatly increased. I have the greatest admiration for the valiant efforts being made by those mothers who are handicapped by the loss of the husbands, to bring up their children to be God-fearing and law-abiding. They deserve every help, and our social agencies, Department for the Aid to Dependent Children, the Big Brother and Big Sister organizations, guidance centers, the Family Society, Morgan Memorial Goodwill Inn, and many others do a great deal to lighten their load.

In the last analysis courts such as the one I serve, and criminal courts in general, are a measure of our own inadequacy in the bringing up of our children. Courts or similar institutions we shall always have with us, but I find it somewhat shocking to contemplate that general observance of the Golden Rule would render all criminal courts obsolete.

The American Free Press Is the Voice of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the April 4 issue of the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat.

This editorial, entitled "Two Battles Waged for Minds of Man," compares the benefits to man as epitomized in the American free press—in contrast to the enslavement of man which is the goal of the captive press in countries dominated or controlled by communism.

The function of the American free press is to enlighten mankind and encourage his self-advancement by his own efforts. The captive press, on the other hand, distorts the truth and preaches a continuous barrage of propaganda designed to weaken individual thought and bring about enslavement and privation.

Our hometown newspapers are the constant defenders of the freedom and dignity which are the rights of every American. They accurately report and encourage our progress as individuals under a free way of life.

The difference between a constructive free press and a destructive captive press, is aptly defined in the following editorial:

TWO BATTLES WAGED FOR MINDS OF MEN

As you know, a vital part of communism's present war against the free world is for men's minds. Brainwashing, the brutal combination of inducing physical exhaustion while utilizing mental suggestion is only one phase of the battle to capture the minds of people.

Within Communist countries, the captive press and the captive radio are used to deprive the people of knowledge of true conditions in the free world, and to convince them that serfdom is the most free and most enjoyable way of life there is.

In the free world, Communist propaganda overlooks nothing to capture the minds of men. It seeks to incite class warfare in the free nations, to persuade people that the Reds are peace-loving, to discourage prudent readiness for enemy attacks.

Just by way of contrast, you might give a little thought to the uses of persuasion in the free world, contrasted to those in the Communist world.

In the American press, you will find many advertisements. In them, manufacturers, distributors and dealers are busy improving the American standard of living by creating mass desire for better and more convenient living. They tell you all about the new automobiles, the new labor-saving home appliances, the new clothing, the new homes. Their object is to persuade you to acquire these things. When you do so, you are increasing your own standard of living—and at the same time creating jobs for the people who make or build the things you buy.

In the Soviet press, you will find little or nothing designed to increase the standard of living or make things easier for the people. Instead, you'll find a continual propaganda barrage designed to scare the people into being willing to do without even the most

elemental necessities of life. The objective is to persuade people to do without consumer-goods, not to persuade them to enjoy more of them.

There seems to be two battles for the minds of men going on in the world. The Communist one is to persuade people to accept privation. The one in the free world is to persuade people to enjoy more of the good things of life.

Twenty-two Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty-three Red Spies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted hereinbelow an editorial appearing in the Shreveport Times, on Friday, April 15, 1955, entitled "Twenty-two Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty-three Red Spies." I feel this will be of interest to all Members of the Congress. The editorial is as follows:

TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THREE RED SPIES

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover told a House Appropriations Subcommittee a few days ago that Communist Party membership now comprises 22,663 in the United States. That is a decrease of 2,337 during the past year.

Some people still contend that 22,663 Communists in a population of more than 160 million is insignificant and unimportant. Mr. Hoover pointed out that these 22,663 are hardcore Communists, going deeper and deeper underground every day, becoming more and more difficult to catch in their activities, and carrying on their subversive and anti-American work endlessly.

In other words, there are 22,663 known representatives of an enemy who at the same time are pledged to destroy the American form of government by force.

It would not be stretching things too much to say that in this bloc of 22,663 we have actually 22,663 enemy spies. And they are enemies and representatives of an enemy regardless of whether the technical state of affairs between nations is war or peace.

Mr. Hoover added that the FBI estimates that for every known, working Red there are 10 fellow travelers and sympathizers. That means 226,630 Reds and assistants to the Reds. A fifth column or Trojan horse force of nearly a quarter of a million rabid and rampant workers against American Government and its liberties and freedoms is something that is important, indeed. It presents a grim situation.

Mr. Hoover says that new Federal laws against Communists and communism plus legal reverses in cases of communism in the Federal courts, have sent the Reds deeper and deeper underground and have made it more and more difficult for the FBI to keep track of them. He is not referring to such laws as the Smith Act, under which more than 100 Communist leaders at various levels have been sentenced to prison, but to laws which outlaw the Communist Party or which would make public activities by it illegal.

It is difficult to tell where to draw the line statutorily in regard to communism or any form of anti-Americanism. Legislation against any ideology usually defeats its own purpose. Efforts to control fanaticism by statute rarely get far. Yet somewhere there must be a line drawn—a line of law. Mr. Hoover has raised the point—without specifically arguing either side of the case—that some present Federal laws make it harder for the FBI to keep track of 22,663 known Communist Party members than it was to keep track of more than 100,000 party members when that was the total 10 years ago.

There is another angle to national security which deeply concerns Mr. Hoover and the FBI. That is the fact that there are 229 known alien subversives at large in the United States, potentially dangerous individuals that the Government has been trying unsuccessfully to deport.

A House investigating subcommittee under Democratic Chairman ROONEY, of New York, has come up with a report on this situation which is quite disturbing.

The report states, for one thing, that it was almost impossible to get information about these 229 alien subversives from the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

At first the Service said that all 229 were under constant surveillance. But a check developed that 18 of the 229 were missing, with no knowledge whatever by the Service of where they may be. The check by the subcommittee further revealed that actually there was virtually no check by the Service on the remaining 211.

This comes at a time when bleeding hearts and duped friends of immigrants and subversives are making light of the danger of subversion and are trying to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act, which is aimed at preventing immigration to this country of persons who are likely to become subversives when they get here.

Mr. Hoover said that he does not have enough men in the FBI to keep constant check on the known alien subversives, much less on the 22,663 members of the Communist Party and the estimated 226,000, including their friends and fellow travelers.

All of this raises the question of whether the United States is not really losing in the fight against subversion and subversives instead of gradually winning through cleaning them out of Government posts.

Bill Introduced Providing for Burial of the Six Participants in the Famous Iwo Jima Flag Raising Near Its Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 22, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to provide burial ground for the six valiant men who participated in the historic flag raising on Iwo Jima on February 23, 1945, close to the Marine Corps War Memorial. The magnificent photograph taken by an Associated Press photographer brought the courageous action of these men to the dramatic attention of every American, and epitomized the heroism and dauntless spirit of all the marines who ever fought in battle for our country. The Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation, through private subscription, raised the money to build this breathtaking monument and it seems both fitting and proper that the men whose images are emblazoned on it, should be permitted to lie forever within its sight. Three of the men lost their lives during the later phases of the battle, and the fourth passed away this year, after having found difficulty in postwar adjustment. Two are alive and well and we wish them every happiness that life can bring.

I hope this bill will find instant favor in the Congress; its purpose is clear and manifest.

If We Back Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article, written by Joseph Alsop, which appeared in his column, Matter of Fact, in the New York Herald Tribune of April 15, 1955:

IF WE BACK DOWN

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—Partly because of the extraordinary vacillations of the Eisenhower administration, trouble on Formosa must certainly be expected if Quemoy and the Matsus are finally surrendered to the Communists.

Try to do what our present policymakers seem never to do. Look at the record of American action on the issue of the offshore islands through the eyes of those most directly affected and you realize at once that the danger of demoralization here on Formosa is bound to be considerable.

Item one on the record is President Eisenhower's famous "unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek" and his sharp attack on the Truman administration for pursuing precisely the policy that the Eisenhower administration has now embodied in the Formosa treaty. To give reality to the "unleashing," the American policymakers strongly pressed the Generalissimo to occupy the offshore islands in force.

Until this pressure was applied in 1953, even Quemoy was rather lightly held. Everyone on Formosa assumed that the island positions were expendable before they were occupied in force. It was by American request, then, that the Generalissimo in effect committed himself, before his army and his people, to defend the offshore islands with all his power.

Item 2 on the record is the quick switch that the Eisenhower administration made last fall as soon as the Chinese Communist threat to the islands became serious. Overruling 3 of the 4 Joint Chiefs of Staff, President Eisenhower decided that the islands which the Generalissimo had committed himself to defend by American request were now to be abandoned without a fight.

The result was the administration policy paper widely known in the inner circles as '54/40—No Fight. As decided by the President, this paper took the firm position that the United States would not assist in the defense of the offshore islands.

But in January came item three, when '54/40—No Fight was suddenly junked in favor of a new decision to abandon the Tachens, but to defend Quemoy and the Matsus. This new policy was so firmly agreed on that on January 19 Secretary of

State John Foster Dulles formally promised Chinese Foreign Minister George Yeh that Quemoy and the Matsus would be publicly guaranteed by the President himself.

According to Dulles, the President was going to give this public guaranty as soon as the Congress had passed the Formosa resolution. On the strength of the minutes of the Dulles-Yeh conversation, American Ambassador Karl Rankin also publicly forecast a guaranty of Quemoy and the Matsus here in Taipei. Meanwhile other American military and political leaders were making fighting noises of the kind that were also heard in Washington in the early stages of the Dien Bien Phu crisis.

Finally, the fourth item in the record was the President's repudiation of his Secretary of State's promise; his refusal to give any public guaranty of Quemoy and the Matsus, and the resulting adoption of the policy—or is it the nonpolicy?—of keeping them guessing. This phase has lasted to the present day, with such incidents as Admiral Carney's background talk about atomic war by April 15 to give it spice.

From this truly fantastic record of continuous tergiversation, one point stands out very clearly. The importance that Quemoy and the Matsus have now acquired in the eyes of Formosa and of Asia is marked "Made in America." We might have got away with abandoning the islands after pressing the Generalissimo to occupy them. But we could not and cannot get away with abandoning the islands after the much publicized January decision to defend them. The first half of the Dien Bien Phu pattern, of big bold, brave talk, has again been traced out in Washington. If we also repeat the second half of that pattern, following the big, bold, brave talk with a quick slink when the chips are down, the effect will be shattering in Asia. And it will be most shattering of all here on Formosa.

With some reason, in view of the record, an American refusal to aid in the defense of the islands will now be regarded here as a shocking betrayal. It can at least be expected to produce the kind of anti-American manifestations that occurred at the time of the Tachen evacuation. And they are likely to be much more serious than the proausterity riot at a Sino-American charity fashion show which was then organized by the more antiforeign group in the Government.

How much further the thing will go, is far more difficult to tell. On the one hand, there is the record of 1950, the last time when the Communists were seriously threatening to attack this island. In the period before the outbreak of the Korean war ended the threat to Formosa, there were the most widespread and alarming signs of disaffection here.

Among a considerable number of traitors in key places, the most significant was the deputy chief of general staff, Gen. Wu Shieh. Gen. Wu Shieh led a considerable group recruited within the general staff and in other key positions, and he was in direct radio communication with Peiping.

According to well authenticated report, Wu Shieh and his group might never have been caught if they had not actually dared to hold an after-hours meeting in the government palace itself. A clean-up coolie blundered into the meeting with his mop and pail. One of the conspirators over-excitedly shot him on the spot. The noise brought the guards, and so the plot was revealed, and Wu Shieh was executed early in June 1950.

There is no doubt at all that the Peiping government is now trying to encourage new treacheries here on Formosa. The return to Communist China of the Generalissimo's old favorite, Gen. Wei Li-huang, was part of a well-planned and well-organized effort. Other such returns are to be expected. Part of the same effort, too, is the prominence accorded the turncoats already in Peiping. In the reorganization of the Peiping government, ex-associates of Chiang Kai-shek have been given over a score of places on the Communist National Military Council.

On the other side of the ledger, meanwhile, there is the stern and efficient police job that has been done on Formosa by the Generalissimo's son, Gen. Chiang Ching-kuo. However much key persons may be tempted to throw in the sponge if America abandons the islands, the fact remains that treachery on Formosa is no longer the easy business it once was.

Balance the strictness of Chiang Ching-kuo's police against the evidence on the other side, and you get a very real doubt. It is certain that if the United States does not assist in the defense of the offshore islands, the military and political demoralization here will be severe. But it is uncertain, because of the prevailing police measures, whether this demoralization will lead to more openly serious consequences. Most probably it will not, but the risk cannot be altogether ignored.

Death of a Monumental Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger of Tuesday, April 19, on the passing of Albert Einstein:

DEATH OF A MONUMENTAL MAN

There is a biblical quality to the story of Albert Einstein.

Like Moses, he was driven from his home, he fought against enslavement and for freedom, and he lived to see the downfall of his would-be conquerors. The armies of the Pharoah perished in the sea, and the armies of Hitler perished under tons of bombs, shells, and rifle bullets.

The ugly excesses of Hitler forced Einstein to flee to this country. We welcomed him, and he repaid us many, many times over.

It was Albert Einstein who put us on the path to the atom bomb. It was his research into mass and energy which paved the way for nuclear fission experiments. But that wasn't all.

Other men of science, who knew of the progress in nuclear research in Germany, tried to make our Government aware of the danger. When Einstein joined their appeal, the picture changed. His prestige gave President Roosevelt the courage to embark on what might have been the costliest wild-goose chase in history. Two billion dollars were spent to create the first atom bomb. FDR knew that the time and money might have been utterly wasted. Einstein's words gave him the prod—and the prop—he needed.

Thus, had Hitler not driven this man out of Germany, Der Fuehrer might have had the atom bomb first.

Albert Einstein said some things and did some things which raised eyebrows. He was not a conventional man. He wore his hair long, and his sweaters were shabby. Very often he spoke out on topics that he really knew little about. He never seemed to realize that idle chatter took on significance when it was Albert Einstein who was chattering.

Now that he belongs to the ages, the things that raised eyebrows will be easily forgotten, and they should be. What the world will remember are his monumental contributions to science.

Politically Speaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. The following is a pertinent and timely analysis of the recent address given by Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay at San Francisco. The analysis was written by Mr. John Corlett, staff writer of the Idaho Daily Statesman at Boise, Idaho, and appeared in the newspaper under date of April 13, 1955:

POLITICALLY SPEAKING

In a speech in San Francisco only recently, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay pointed out that the Nation's natural resources are a basis of conflict between two opposite philosophies of government—one that would develop them under the free-enterprise system, the other that would create a Federal bureaucracy to develop them under Government controls.

This battle between these two opposite philosophies basically is the issue in the Hells Canyon controversy.

McKay in his speech pointed out that the original policy of the Government was to place the Nation's natural resources into private hands for development. Here are his words on this point:

"Once, nearly all of that vast area (west of the Allegheny Mountains) was Federally owned. It was the public domain and it embraced 1,462,000,000 acres.

"Directives from Washington could have controlled the destiny of each acre. That vista has always been one to arouse the desire for power of advocates of a gigantic Federal monopoly over our natural resources.

"In other parts of the world today this philosophy of government monopoly has created a living nightmare for hundreds of millions of unfortunate people.

"In the United States, however, the enduring doctrines laid down by our Founding Fathers have assured development of our resources in a creative manner in accord with the basic tenets of a free society.

"There were never any doubts in the minds of the people or their leaders in those early days as to what should be done with the vast expanses of the public domain. From the very beginning the policy was clear. Public land should be transferred to private ownership for settlement and development as rapidly as possible.

"During the first century and a half of the Nation's growth, a billion acres of the public domain were disposed of—or, to coin a phrase, were given away. The 'giveaway' took various forms. First there were public sales to raise funds to support the new government. Land was given away in the form of bounties to war veterans. Grants were given away to the States in aid of education; to encourage development of railroads; and for internal improvements. Pioneers who had settled the wilderness were allowed to buy their holdings at giveaway preemption sales.

"The most successful of the giveaway programs was developed during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln by the passage of the Homestead Act of 1862.

"The West was settled under this law. Under it American citizens were encouraged to brave the dangers and hardships of the frontier to become owners of the land on which they settled.

"Under the homestead laws we gave away some 285 million acres of the most fertile soil in the United States. Under the mining laws of 1876, Congress provided for the giveaway of the richest of the mineral resources of the United States.

"Prospectors have been and still are encouraged to seek out hidden mineral resources under the open public lands. The miner can stake out a claim on the vacant land. If he finds minerals and develops them he can get a deed to the land.

"Some prospectors strike it rich. A far greater number do not. They 'give away' years of backbreaking toil and hardship and, in the end, their nonproductive claims revert back to the United States.

"As vacant fertile lands became scarce the Congress encouraged additional thousands of settlers to move westward through enactment of the desert-land acts, the timber-claims acts, and literally thousands of other public land laws, many of which although obsolete, still remain on the statute books.

"And so the Nation developed, prospered, and grew stronger year by year. The bulk of the public lands and the resources they contained passed into private hands where the Founding Fathers intended them to be. Under the free enterprise system those resources were poured into the economic lifeblood of the Nation. Great cities and industrial centers spread out over the lands homesteaders had once farmed.

"The minerals, ferreted out by the prospectors, poured from mines, developed with private capital, to provide the raw materials for the world's mightiest industrial machine.

"The productivity of our farmlands under enlightened agricultural practices continues to grow.

"The natural resources of our Nation, in which you, and I and all the people have a stake, are in good hands—in the hands of forward-looking private citizens of the United States of America. Almost all of our known mineral resources are privately owned. About 95 percent of our oil and gas production comes from privately owned land. About 85 percent of our timber production comes from privately owned forests. And about 71 percent of the surface area of the United States is privately owned.

"Those facts are not pleasing to some people. They don't like the way the country was developed. They believe they could have done a much better job. They can point to abuses that occurred in the past—abuses which all of us recognize and deplore—to support their contention that the development of this Nation has not been perfect.

"The rest of the world may think our forefathers did a pretty good job, despite their shortcomings, but not apparently some of our home-grown exponents of all-out Federal domination."

Look for the Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the brief article Look for the Light, by Russell Davenport, that appeared in This Week magazine of April 17, 1955:

LOOK FOR THE LIGHT
(By Russell Davenport)

In today's world, the United States is faced with a far greater task than most Americans have hitherto visualized.

This task cannot be defined just in terms of action. It cannot be achieved with dollars, however many we spend. Nor with atomic bombs, however many we manufacture. Nor can it be brought about by increased zeal and cleverness in psychological warfare.

These things are necessary, of course, since without them the entire free world would be exposed to the threat of Soviet force. To counter that threat we must have force at our disposal.

But this is only part of our task. American leadership may be likened to a stone of many facets, which is a thing of little value unless, like a faceted diamond, it is suffused with light. It is the light, and only the light, that can give meaning to American power.

We do not have to reach for this light: Its source is within ourselves. Something of its nature can be gleaned from the famous incident when a friend asked Abraham Lincoln how it could be that both the North and the South should expect God to be on their side. Mr. Lincoln replied, in effect, that he could not pray with much confidence for God to be on his side; his constant prayer, on the contrary, was that he should be found upon God's side.

Whatever may be our religious convictions, we can find the clue to our present task in that attitude of mind. For the light which has now become indispensable to American leadership is the light that is always kindled when men seek in a dedicated manner to relate themselves—not merely to their needs and prejudices—but to truth.

Nixon's Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Monitor, a Catholic newspaper published in San Francisco, Calif. This article, which appeared on March 18, 1955, discusses Vice President Nixon's highly successful trip to Central America.

The editorial follows:

NIXON'S TRIP

We are delighted that our country at long last has seen fit to turn a respectful gaze toward our Latin American neighbors. Vice President NIXON'S extensive trip to Central and South America may wake up some of our reactionary politicians to the need for changing the stupid policy pursued by us for so many years toward Latin America.

There has been a rampant anti-American feeling throughout Latin America which stems from insults they have endured in the past and from a lack of appreciation of their nationalist sentiments and their pride in their ancient culture.

Latin Americans have found it difficult to stomach the air of superiority assumed by their northern neighbors. They resent the North American's overlording attitude, particularly when they recall that the South American attempted to educate the native while the North American simply massacred the native—a peculiar claim to enlightenment as far as the South American is concerned.

They wonder about our logic. They notice, for example, that we constantly talk about our love of democracy and hatred for totalitarianism. But they also notice that the Export-Import Bank establishes a $60-million credit to help set up a steel mill for dictator Peron.

One of the historic weaknesses of our political position in Latin America has been our penchant for going out of our way to curry favor with the worst representatives of totalitarianism. Then we wonder when even the peon scratches his head and murmurs, "Crazy Americano."

Perhaps the greatest stumbling block placed in the way of mutual understanding has been our refusal to recognize the status of the church. The church, in Latin America, is a social force, a basic unifying bond inseparably associated with the national concept.

It is the one thing common to the vast majority of the people. And it is the one thing we will not recognize. Rather, we have given our support to the professional liberals who have done nothing but cause trouble throughout the continent.

What crimes have been committed in the name of fraternity.

Fair Labor Standards for American Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, fact sheet No. 1 prepared by the research department of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, on "Fair Labor Standards for American Workers." I do hope that the Congress will act to increase the minimum wage during this current session of the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS MINIMUM IS NOW OBSOLETE; MODERNIZATION OF ACT IS ESSENTIAL

The 75-cent minimum wage was adopted in 1949 as a compromise measure. The House Committee on Education and Labor reported that it was inadequate. Not only was it insufficient in 1949, but it has grown obsolete by reasons of changes in our economy since that time.

1. The cost of living has risen

The rise in the cost of living has made the current rate obsolete. The Consumer Price Index as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics rose by 14 percent between January 1950 (100.6) and November 1954 (114.6).

It has however been recognized, and previous studies have shown, that the price rise for the lower income groups is likely to be greater than for the group of urban wage earners and salaried clerical workers surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for developing buying patterns. A previous study for the period from 1935 to 1944 showed a 1.4 percent price increase for the income groups we are herewith concerned, for each

1 percent rise for the group in the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey. If we allow a 25-percent margin, the cost of living for the substandard workers has risen more nearly 18 percent. Correction must be made for this rise in the cost of living.

2. The 19-percent rise in the man-hour productivity of the economy must be reflected in the minimum wage

The Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report reports that the man-hour productivity rose in our private economy by some 15 percent from 1949 to 1953 (from $2.302 in 1949 to $2.641 in 1953 on a 1953-dollar basis). On an average annual basis the rise was 3¾ percent. In all likelihood this rate of improvement was maintained in 1954 so that the total rise in productivity since 1949 amounts to 19 percent.

Many workers now enjoy the benefits of the rising national productivity through specifically negotiated provisions called "improvement factors." With the growth of our national productivity the minimum wage should also reflect this rise in our economic proficiency. The Federal minimum wage should be adjusted by this amount.

3. The Federal minimum wage should be corrected for the rise in the cost of living and the growth in national productivity

The cumulative effect of the rise in the cost of living and the growth in national productivity would lift the Federal minimum wage by 41 percent. The direct application of this adjustment would demand a minimum of at least $1.06.

4. General wage increases have lifted America's wage structure since 1950 and require at least comparable adjustments in the Federal minimum wage

The major American industries have raised wages 5 times since January 1950 when the 75 cents minimum was made effective. The total of these increases varies from 38.5 cents to 52.5 cents on basic wages (table I). In addition workers in these industries have enjoyed tremendous advances in fringe benefits which are not directly reflected in the basic wage.

The overall average hourly earnings of production workers in the manufacturing industries have risen from $1.418 in January 1950 to $1.83 in December 1954, a gain of more than 41 cents per hour. In face of this immense advance in all American manufacturing industries, the 75 cents minimum has definitely become obsolete.

5. Minimum wages in union contracts are far above 75 cents

The prevailing minimum wage rates established through collective bargaining are far above 75 cents per hour.

Minimum wages in organized plants

Woolen and worsted textiles	$1.21
Synthetic yarn (American Viscose)	1.30
Aircraft (Lockheed—California)	1.44
Meatpacking (Armour)	1.47
Steel (United States Steel)	1.57
Shipyards (Bethlehem—Atlantic)	1.61
Automobiles (General Motors)	1.75

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

They in fact exceed $1.25 in many industries. A comparison between the actual minimums and the legal minimums shows how unreal the latter has become for broad segments of American industry.

6. Fair labor standards demand a "more adequate minimum wage"

The inadequacy of the current minimum of 75 cents was attested to by the legislative committee at the time it was adopted. It is not enough merely to correct for the rise in the cost of living or the increase in national productivity. We must also advance our minimum to establish wage levels more nearly approximating a decent American living standard. We can abolish substandard conditions not by keeping pace with the above changes, but by advancing more nearly to a level of adequacy.

One level of adequacy is that provided by the citys worker's family budget for 4 persons, calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is described as providing the "necessary minimum with respect to items included and their quantities as determined by prevailing standards of what is needed for health, efficiency, nurture of children, social participation and the maintenance of self-respect and the respect of others." This "necessary minimum" was priced by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for 34 cities in the United States in October 1951. The annual cost varied from $3,812 to $4,454. (See attached table II.) On the basis of a full work year of 2,000 hours, it would require a minimum rate of $1.91 to earn enough to meet the lowest budget figure ($3,812 in New Orleans) as of October 1951. Price rises of 2 to 3 percent since that date mean that the current hourly earnings needed are approximately $1.95.

Another level of minimum adequacy is that provided by the emergency budget for a family of four compiled by the Works Progress Administration. It is described by WPA as follows:

"The emergency budget is for an emergency standard, which may be necessary under depressed conditions * * * (It) is a direct concession to conditions produced by the depression, constructed in recognition of the fact that there are circumstances under which families can and do cut costs temporarily without physical discomfort. Followed over a long period, the practices called for in the emergency budget may prove harmful to both health and morale.

"The emergency level (which is below the maintenance level which represents normal or average minimum requirements for industrial, service, and other manual workers) takes into account certain economies which may be made under depressed conditions * * * The emergency level allows more exclusively, though not entirely, for material wants (in contrast to the maintenance level which 'also gives some consideration to psychological values'), but it might be questioned on the grounds of health hazards if families had to live at this level for a considerable period of time."

The above description of the emergency budget by those who constructed it indicates the dangerously low level at which it is set. There can be no dispute that workers whose earnings do not allow this standard are definitely predestined to poverty and substandards of living.

The annual cost of this buget on the basis of November 1954 prices would be $2,430; it would require a minimum rate of $1.22 for a worker working 2,000 hours a year to meet the emergency standard.

Finally, the adequacy of the minimum wage can be measured against the standards established under State minimum wage laws. In New York State, "the cost of a standard which provides minimum adequate maintenance and protection of health" was found by the State Department of Labor to be $2,442 for a working woman living with her family as of September 1952. This would require an hourly minimum of $1.22, assuming 2,000 hours of work per year.

TABLE I.—*General wage increases in major American industries, 1950–54*

Industry	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	Total
Aircraft (United)	13 cents plus [1]	14 cents plus [1]	9 cents	11 cents plus [1]	5 cents plus [1]	52 cents plus.[1]
Aluminum (Alcoa)	10 percent (average 14¼ cents).	12 cents plus [1]	20 cents plus [1]	8½ cents plus [1]	5 cents	50¼ cents plus.[1]
Automobile (GM)	10 cents	14 cents	8 cents	7 cents plus [1]	3 cents	42 cents plus.[1]
Automobile (Ford)	11 cents	14 cents	8 cents	7 cents plus [1]	3 cents	43 cents plus.[1]
Bituminous coal	8¾ cents plus [1]	20 cents	23¾ cents plus [1]			52½ cents plus.[1]
Electrical (GE)	10 cents (plus 1 cent inequity).	15½ cents	9 cents average	5¾ cents average	5 cents plus [1]	45¼ cents plus.[1]
Farm equipment	13 cents	14 cents	9 cents	2 cents	6 cents	44 cents.
Meatpacking	11 cents	11.3 cents	10 cents plus [1]	5 cents plus [1]	5 cents plus [1]	41.3 cents plus.[1]
Rubber	10½ cents plus [1]	13 cents	10 cents	5 cents plus [1]	6½ cents	45 cents plus.[1]
Shipbuilding (Bethlehem, Atlanta).	None	22.5 cents average	18 cents average	7 cents	5 cents plus [1]	52½ cents plus.[1]
Steel	12½ cents (plus 3½ cents inequities adjustments).		12½ cents (plus 3½ cents inequities adjustments).	8½ cents plus [1]	5 cents plus [1]	38½ cents plus.[1]

[1] "Plus" refers to substantial adjustments for inequities, fringes, etc.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE III.—*Cost of family budget of city worker in 34 cities in the United States, October 1951*

City:	Cost per year	City:	Cost per year	City:	Cost per year
Atlanta, Ga	$4,315	Jacksonville, Fla	$4,202	Pittsburgh, Pa	$4,203
Baltimore, Md	4,217	Kansas City, Mo	3,960	Portland, Maine	4,021
Birmingham, Ala	4,252	Los Angeles, Calif	4,311	Portland, Oreg	4,153
Boston, Mass	4,217	Manchester, N. H	4,090	Richmond, Va	4,338
Buffalo, N. Y	4,127	Memphis, Tenn	4,190	St. Louis, Mo	4,112
Chicago, Ill	4,185	Milwaukee, Wis	4,387	San Francisco, Calif	4,263
Cincinnati, Ohio	4,208	Minneapolis, Minn	4,161	Savannah, Ga	4,067
Cleveland, Ohio	4,103	Mobile, Ala	3,969	Scranton, Pa	4,002
Denver, Colo	4,199	New Orleans, La	3,812	Seattle, Wash	4,280
Detroit, Mich	4,195	New York, N. Y	4,083	Washington, D. C	4,454
Houston, Tex	4,304	Norfolk, Va	4,146		
Indianapolis, Ind	4,044	Philadelphia, Pa	4,078		

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

One Hundred Banks Control Half United States Bank Deposits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 30, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following item written by Ed Wimmer, president of Forward America Publishing Guild and vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business:

ONE HUNDRED BANKS CONTROL HALF UNITED STATES BANK DEPOSITS—LOCAL MERGER OPPOSED

(By Ed Wimmer)

If approved by stockholders and the Government, the merger of Lincoln National Bank of Cincinnati, with the Fifth Third Union Trust Co., will drive another nail into the coffin of the banking democracy that helped to build one of America's greatest trading centers.

Absorption of the Lincoln National would chalk up the eighth merger of Cincinnati banks in the last 4 years, and according to a conversation we reported some weeks ago, another consolidation of two prominent banking institutions is in the serious talking stage. All of these mergers were protested in this column, and we carried our objections to the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, the Banking and Currency Committee, Department of Justice, and to Members of the House and Senate—who are now taking the bank merger fight into the Halls of Congress itself.

Similar steps will be taken by our office to halt the Lincoln National-Fifth Third marriage, on the grounds that present trends to concentration of banking and business in fewer hands has already put the United States far down the road to socialism. Since World War II, more than 600 of the Nation's banks have disappeared in mergers. The 100 largest banks now control more than 50 percent of all United States bank deposits. Trans-America controls 43 percent of all the deposits in California, 44 percent in Oregon, 78 percent in Nevada, 20 percent in Arizona, and 5 percent in Washington.

On the corporate front, one-tenth of 1 percent of the corporations (1946) owned 49 percent of all corporate assets, while 12 percent controlled 98 percent of all corporate assets. More than 50 percent of the major newspapers have folded up or merged since 1920, and during this same period of so-called progress, the number of dairy plants, bakeries, breweries, steel mills, mine owners, automobile companies, soap manufacturers, flour mills, tire makers, and other lines, have been reduced accordingly. Every day we hear more and moer about a "big three," "big four," or "big five"—all the while prattling about free enterprise and the American way.

William Baxter, the most realistic economist in the country, has viewed this trend as leading to certain disaster. He says that "no prosperity in any part of the world, under any political regime, can continue when it is so cockeyed that the big fellow is taking over while the independent retailer, banker, manufacturer, and wholesaler is falling by the wayside." Baxter called present day competition becoming more and more the law of the jungle, and he points out that what we see in the auto industry as a result, "will be repeated in one line after another."

In recent months this column has been putting more emphasis on the moral issues involved in the exchange of goods and services, and in all steps taken to preserve the status of the independent enterpriser. We have argued consistently, that Christian and economic progresss is an inseparable problem, thus making unfair competition a violation of Christian principles. Recently the Churches of Christ issued a statement to this effect, declaring:

"The union of economic and political power is a dangerous road, whether it leads to complete state control of economic life, or control of the state by centers of economic power. * * * Christians should be guided by their ethics to seek such practices as will serve most fully the three values of justice and order and freedom."

The independent bank, independent business, and farm, represent the three pillars of a free society, and it should therefore be clear that if cutthroat competition, monopoly power or any other force is tending to weaken or destroy these pillars, then the world conquest of the Communists is made that much more certain. It is to be deplored that more independent bankers and businessmen do not rise up and defend themselves and their country against such threats as I have mentioned, but have the majority of the people ever resisted evil—until catastrophe was at their door?

We hope the stockholders of the Lincoln and Fifth Third Banks will refuse the stock bribes and soft berths of the new bank combine, and like the stockholders of the Bank of Ludlow, Ky., vote against this merger.

New Thinking on Our Asia Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, world attention is focused this week on the Nations of Africa and Asia who are meeting in Bandung to discuss their mutual problems. Of the free countries represented there, India is potentially the strongest ally of the democracies.

With good reason, we in this country are exasperated at times by the statements and actions of Prime Minister Nehru and his associates. At other times it is likely that we have misunderstood his motives and objectives, so perhaps it is well that we make a fresh attempt now to understand India and its leaders.

This effort may prove eminently worthwhile. Former Ambassador Chester Bowles, just back from India, reports spectacular progress in its economic program. Too, he notes that the Indian Communist Party was dealt staggering blows in recent elections. These developments are favorable to the cause of freedom, and, whether we like it or not, India seems destined to be the keystone nation for the democracies in the so-called Asian arc. This is reason enough why we should practice self-restraint and renew our efforts to understand Nehru and the people of Asia.

With these thoughts in mind, I present herewith two recent articles which discuss different aspects of the Asian problem. The first is a challenging report entitled "Memo on Our Policy in Asia" by Chester Bowles which appeared in the New York Times magazine on April 10. The second is a vivid piece on Nehru which appeared in the April 8 issue of Commonweal magazine and was written by Father Jerome D'Souza, S. J., who formerly represented India at the United Nations. Few better attempts have been made than Father D'Souza's to explain the Indian Prime Minister to the American people.

Here is the first article:

MEMO ON OUR POLICY IN ASIA

(By Chester Bowles)

I returned from a recent trip to Asia profoundly impressed with the progress being made in India and Burma, and in certain respects, in Pakistan. The picture in India is particularly heartening. The Indian economy is growing stronger and more productive year by year, the Nehru Government is as stable as any in Asia, the Communist Party has suffered serious reverses, and everywhere there is a sense of sober confidence about the future.

But I also found much in south Asia that was worrisome. No thoughtful person could fail to be disturbed by the low state into which our position has fallen, by the steadily growing power and prestige of China, and by the gap which exists between the views commonly expressed in America and those held by other non-Communist peoples.

I do not want to overstate my pessimism, much less to sound irresponsibly alarmist. I write only after sober reflection on the manifold, mixed impressions I have had in recent weeks, and after considering carefully the qualifications which must always be placed against such general judgments.

Reluctantly, I have concluded that our position in Asia will continue to deteriorate unless we modify sharply many of the concepts that we now seem to hold most firmly. Otherwise the day may not be far distant when we shall find the balance of power in Asia, and eventually the world, shifting inexorably against us.

I do not think it is too much to say that the danger to American objectives and interests is as great today in Asia as it was in Europe in 1947. Moreover, many of the fundamental advantages which we held then in Europe are not now available to us in Asia.

What follows is a 10-point memorandum setting forth the basic factors in the present crisis as I see them—and some suggestions as to what I believe can and must be done about our relations with non-Communist Asia. The weakness of our position in regard to Matsu, Quemoy, and Formosa, dangerous as it is, simply reflects these broader problems which must soon be faced.

1. The halting of communism in Asia is essential to the stability not only of that part of the world but also of the Middle East and Europe. Once the free world starts to crumble, it could go fast. In our present situation Lenin's observation that "for world communism the road to Paris lies through Pekin and Calcutta" has a dreadful validity.

2. Communist China's prestige and influence are steadily increasing throughout Asia, even among those who are ideologically opposed to communism. Asians are impressed by Red China's growing economic and military strength and by the fact that she is achieving a strong sense of political unity, ideological discipline, and patriotic morale.

3. We have dangerously minimized the influence of Red China because we have failed to understand the nature of Peiping's appeal to non-Communist Asians. From bitter experience we Americans have developed a justified, but stereotyped picture of the Peiping Government. We see a country allied

with the Soviet Union, and bitterly opposed to our interests, a country whose doctrines and practices, steeped in cruelty and dishonesty, we deeply dislike.

Most non-Communist Asians are also aware of these facets of the new China and in varying degrees are repulsed by them. But this impression is often obscured by other aspects of modern China which have a fundamental appeal in Asia. These peoples see China as a nation which has participated in the common struggle against Western domination and which shares with other Asian nations such basic problems as poverty, illiteracy, and lack of industrial development. Throughout Asia there is widespread admiration for the vigor with which Red China is attacking these problems.

Moreover, there is a steadily growing, anti-white racial consciousness, particularly in south Asia, which finds a powerful rallying point in the Chinese slogan, "Asia for the Asians," and which will be vigorously exploited at the forthcoming Asia-African conference in Bandung, Indonesia. Thus a majority of non-Communist Asians have arrived at a picture of Communist China which, although still not fully crystallized, is dangerously different from our own.

4. Communist China's dynamic rate of development, her strong appeal to many Asians, and her bitter antagonism to the United States make her at least as great a potential threat to the stability of Asia as the Soviet Union itself. China's huge population in a limited land area would produce important geopolitical pressures regardless of communism. Her dwindling margin of potential increase in food production makes it likely that within the next 10 years she may be sorely tempted to expand into the rich and relatively empty lands of Burma, Thailand, Indochina, Malaya, and Sumatra.

5. American military power supported by Formosa and South Korea plus an alliance which includes only such Asian nations as Thailand, Pakistan, and the Philippines, is unlikely to contain Chinese ambitions during the next 20 years. On the military maps these five nations appear as a formidable ring, but they include only 12 percent of Asia's people, and their power does not appear decisive.

The Chinese seem to have no idea of the destructiveness of atomic power. Mao's success has conditioned him to place his reliance on ideology, propaganda, central organization, and mass armies. He is probably correct in assuming that atomic slaughter of Chinese civilians would turn the world against us.

6. For the long haul, an affective counterbalance to China can only be provided by Asian nations strong enough and dedicated enough to defend their independence. The heart of such a counterbalance must eventually lie in India and Japan. Thus these two nations are the primary key to the peace and stability of Asia in the next generation.

As the French discovered in Indochina, the decisive power lies not in bombs, but in people. Between them India and Japan have one-fifth of the world's population. They also hold the strategic geographical positions on the periphery of the great Asian land mass. They have 75 percent of Asia's total industrial output, millions of skilled and potentially skilled workers, and India has vast natural resources. With her long religious and cultural heritage, India offers by far the most significant counterforce to communism in Asia. If she and Japan should slip under Communist domination, the rest of Asia would go, too.

7. India, like most other non-Communist Asian countries, is developing emotional ties with China. This is happening in spite of india's rapid economic progress, the lessening of the internal threat from communism, and the confidence of her leaders that they can meet the economic demands of their people through democratic means. And it is happening in spite of India's opposition to communism as an ideology.

At the same time India and America are drifting steadily apart. Three weeks of intimate discussions with Indian political, business, and religious leaders have convinced me that in a psychological and philosophical sense the gap between our two countries is already perilously great. Reports from Japan indicate the same unhappy development there. The Hatoyama Government was elected on a platform which promised the best from both worlds. If that government eventually fails, the drift of Japanese foreign policy is not likely to be more favorable to us.

8. The fact that the Soviet Union is now willing to provide economic aid for non-Communist Asian nations provides a further complicating element. Competent Soviet technicians are beginning to move into India, in some cases, I was told, following the refusal of the United Kingdom and the United States to meet urgent Indian requests for assistance.

Recently India turned to Russia for help on a steel mill after unsuccessfully seeking loan capital in the United States. Plans for a large mill are now well advanced, with Soviet capital assured. Within a few months, I was told, 200 Indians will be receiving advanced training in industrial management and technical planning in Moscow in connection with this one project. Since we have refused to offer the massive, long-term loans which India requires to meet the bold industrial goals of her Second Five Year Plan, India may feel forced by the heavy political pressure for rapid progress to turn increasingly to Moscow.

9. The ominous deterioration of America's position in Asia stems from many complicated factors among them the things we say as well as the things we do. Here are some of the major forces working against us:

(a) Many non-Communist Asians, tragically, have come to consider us a militaristic people because most of the things they hear about us are of a military nature. A recent survey of the newspapers in the Indian state of Hyderabad revealed that 82 percent of all mentions of America in a single month involved military subjects, many of which were reports of belligerent-sounding speeches by American military, governmental, and congressional leaders.

Most south Asians place their principal faith in the strength of people and ideas, and tend to discredit the power of weapons. They contrast the success of the militarily weak government of free Burma in suppressing a formidable Communist rebellion, with the failure of massive French military power in colonial Indochina backed by $3 billion of American military aid.

Asians feel that their future will be largely determined by their ability to create inner political and social stability through economic reform and development. Most of them admit that communism is a military danger, but they believe that a more immediate danger lies in Communist subversion feeding on lack of economic progress.

(b) Most Asians are convinced that we are violating, in our conduct of foreign affairs, those principles on which our Nation was based, and from which many new Asian nations borrowed freely in establishing their own constitutions. Asians are particularly critical of what they believe to be our continued compromise on the issue of colonialism. Many of them charge us with tying our Asian policies to Asian leaders whose economic, social, and political views are part of the discredited feudal past. Their Hindu and Buddhist religious beliefs lead them to believe that evil cannot be conquered by evil, and that we have lost sight of this fact.

(c) The Indians in particular believe that their judgment on Asian affairs has been proved by experience to be at least as good as our own. They cite these examples:

In September 1950 they warned us that Red China would enter the Korean war if the United Nations Army crossed the 38th parallel; in July, 1953, after heavy casualties, we settled for a truce at approximately the point where they had urged a cease-fire nearly 3 years earlier.

They prophesied that French military power could not hold Indochina even with unlimited American equipment. Their proposal for an Indochina cease-fire in January 1954, was abruptly rejected on the grounds it would aid the Communists. Three months later came the fall of Dienbienphu and the total collapse of the French armies.

They insisted that Chiang could not invade China without involving American forces in a major conflict.

Against this background most Indian leaders are greatly irritated by what they believe to be our failure to consult them or even to treat their views with respect. They are also annoyed by our assurance that the major objective of our Asian policy is to "save them from communism." They consider this approach to be patronizing and tactless, and to ignore the success of their own vigorous efforts to curb internal communism by creating the conditions under which a free society can survive.

(d) These formidable obstacles to understanding are compounded by the fact that most Asians, particularly the south Asians, are ignorant of the events which led up to the cold war impasse. While we were being conditioned by the harsh realities of the Stalin-Hitler pact, by the repudiation of the Yalta agreements, by the rejection of the Baruch atomic plan, by the coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, and by Soviet armament in the face of our disarmament, most non-Communist Asians were caught in the turmoil of their own independence struggle. They were largely oblivious to world events.

(e) Most Asians resent our efforts to force them to choose sides in the cold war. They point out that for 150 years we held ourselves aloof from the struggles of Europe and entered World War II only when we were attacked.

(f) Our energies and fears are concentrated on communism as the primary menace. But many of the present south Asian leaders, because of their own independence struggle, which often involved long jail sentences for them, are more deeply concerned with white colonialism than with Communist imperialism.

10. And yet there is solid ground for hope. Despite the tense attitude of South Asians, their sharp criticism, their frank disillusionment with our country, I am convinced that a deep underlying bond of respect and potential friendship continues to exist. With skill and sensitivity there is still time in which to build on that foundation.

On my recent trip I was struck by the concern with which Indian and Burmese officials descussed American-Asian relation, by the admiration which they continue to express for our democratic heritage, and by the friendly response I received to a blunt speech before the Council of World Affairs in New Delhi on "What is Right With American Foreign Policy." Although most of the audience may have disagreed with my thesis, they vigorously applauded my willingness to speak out frankly.

This reservoir of goodwill, however, is not bottomless. We will run grave risks unless we can soon bring our views into closer harmony, not only with those of most Asians but with those of our Western allies. If free Asia slips away, the support of the majority of Europeans will be difficult if not impossible to hold. The rush for the Communist band wagon will be heavy.

If this long-range analysis of our position in Asia is even partially valid the question arises, "What can we do about it?" It is

impossible in limited space to suggest more than the general direction which our policies might take.

In my opinion, we should start by frankly facing the fact that our ability to influence future events in Asia is strictly limited. India, Japan, and all of Asia may eventually end up under Communist domination, even though we do all the right things. They may remain independent and a growing source of democratic strength and stability, even though we do all the wrong things. Our role is at best marginal.

That margin, however, may be decisive and we cannot afford to throw it away. What we are now losing is our ability even to affect the final result, plus an opportunity to create a partnership with India, Japan, and the South Asian nations—a partnership which might conceivably determine the balance of power for several generations.

As I see it, we must continue to base our Asian policy on the assumption that the Atlantic Pact is the foundation stone of our national security. This means that we must give careful consideration to the views of our Western allies on Asian problems. The situation is complicated by the fact that their views are more radical than our own in dealing with Communist China and more conservative than our own in dealing with colonial problems.

Our present policy is correct in its insistence that a line be drawn against Communist aggression in Asia as in Europe and that this line be defended at whatever cost. However, it is essential for the line, wherever drawn, to be morally as well as physically defensible, and to have the clear support of our European allies and at least the unspoken approval of the great majority of non-Communist Asians.

If, as I believe, our present difficulties are as much the result of our words as our actions, we must find some effective means of reducing our public emphasis on the military aspects of foreign policy. For practical purposes this means a moratorium on warlike speeches and statements by military leaders. American military power must at any cost be kept at peak efficiency. But if we are to convince the world that we are genuine seekers after peace, our foreign policy statements must be less militaristic and less thundering.

Our diplomacy faces a particularly difficult challenge. Its objectives would seem to be, first, to achieve whatever degree of stability and coexistence the Communist powers will allow us; and second, to place on them the onus for whatever cold war differences and tensions continue to exist—and it would be folly to assume that they will not continue. The achievement of this double objective is by no means impossible. It will, however, require a quite different approach in our speeches, public statements, and diplomatic discussions.

In dealing with Asia and indeed with our allies in Europe we must start, not with our interpretations of the world situation, correct though they may be, but whenever possible with the interpretation of those non-Communist nations which may eventually determine the balance of power. Any manufacturer who failed to adopt this basic tactic in selling his products would not long remain solvent. Through diplomatic channels we should frequently discuss the tactics of peaceful solution with such Asian leaders as U Nu, Nehru, and Hatoyama, as well as with Churchill, Eden, and Adenauer.

In order to bring ourselves into a closer relationship with the non-Communist nations of Asia, it is important for us to develop a tenable colonial policy which faces the realities of the present world situation, and yet which remains responsible and practical. Africa requires a fresh, imaginative new look. We must approach Africa as Africa and not simply as a projection of Britain, France, Belgium, and Portugal. Our consideration of Indochina as a projection of France, rather than as an Asian question in its own right, has already cost us dearly.

In our information work we should, I believe, place greater emphasis on a positive affirmation of democratic faith and less emphasis on negative, fear-ridden anti-communism. Our information program should respect the first rule of experienced advertisers and start, not egotistically with what we want to sell, but tactfully with what others want to buy.

We must work earnestly and patiently to find a common ground with India and Japan. While living up fully to our other commitments we must develop a priority approach toward these two key nations; without them a free, stable Asia is impossible.

Economic holding actions may be necessary to keep some of the weaker countries from falling apart, but a major share of our aid should go to those nations which have demonstrated growing strength in their own right and which have the potential strength to determine the future. Again, may I emphasize, that this means India and Japan, and, to a growing extent, Pakistan. There is pressing need for a comprehensive aid program which will enable us to work as partners with such nations in their own economic development.

In the present deteriorating situation an adequate loan-grant-technical assistance program is at least as important as the equivalent effort devoted in Asia to military defense. Those who thoughtlessly or in the name of economy seek to block this effort may carry a heavy responsibility when the history of the present period is written.

It will be particularly tragic if we fail to find a means of harnessing America's industrial genius to the clamoring needs of fast developing, modern India. If we allow the Russians to beat us at our own game—industrial development overseas—it will be the ultimate folly.

I am aware that these proposals which I have made amount to a heavy shift in the present emphasis of our Asian policies. I am also aware of the contrary pressures which clamor for the attention of our policy makers.

The putting out of immediate fires in Asia is indeed a necessary objective of American foreign policy. But what we urgently require is a long-range policy geared to the basic realities of present Asian power and potential Asian power, which eventually will write the history of our generation.

A Fresh Attempt To Understand India and Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second article on Nehru from the April 8 issue of the Commonweal magazine:

NEHRU OF INDIA

(By Jerome d'Souza)

It is probable that no foreign statesman puzzles the American public so much as does Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India. There are, of course, those who do not admit being puzzled; they are sure that Nehru and his most prominent adviser on foreign policy, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, are crypto-Communists secretly playing the game of the Communist countries and unwilling to come out in the open in order the better to serve their purposes. It is not much use entering into a discussion with these people. I address myself rather to those who are generally sympathetic to India, realize the importance of her role in the defense of democracy, and yet find the declarations of Mr. Nehru, his comments on international affairs, his frequent disagreement with the stand taken by the United States, exasperating or frustrating.

The perplexity of many in the United States over Nehru's intentions has been increased by recent events. Foremost among them was the Prime Minister's visit to China and his public tributes to the achievements, and to the peaceful intentions, of the Communist regime. Then there is his strong disagreement with, if not active opposition to, the policy of the Western Powers in building up an anti-Communist Southeast Asian Defense Organization. On the domestic front, Pandit Nehru, soon after his return from China, declared that the objective of the Congress Party, hitherto said to be the setting up of a welfare state, was the creation of a socialistic pattern of society in which there would be social ownership of the more important sources of production and a better distribution of wealth and goods. All these seemed to be undisguised moves toward the left, leaving little room for neutrality or nonalinement. But to confound those who believed this came, soon after, Nehru's exceptionally vigorous denunciations of the Communists in India, his stern warnings against their use of violence, and his withering sarcasm for their old-fashioned and unprogressive dogmatism. To crown all this has come the resounding victory of the Congress Party in the Andhra state elections, fought on the issue of Communist versus Congress policy. Before the elections the Communists had 46 members in a house of 146. Now they have 15 in a house of 196.

What is the American observer to think of all this? Is it possible to discover a coherent pattern in this maze of apparent contradictions? I think it is possible to do so, and, owing to the relevance of the subject to the problem of international peace, I think it worth while to attempt it.

Pandit Nehru is not a cold intellectual whose approach to public affairs is that of the doctrinaire, manipulating abstract ideas without allowing the play of temperament and personality. Courage and sincerity are at the root of Nehru's character. His policy is the expression of that character, and its apparent contradictions are the projections of his efforts to see the light and follow it as he sees it. Hence to understand his policy we must understand the man, the qualities of his mind and heart, and the marks that life and its varied experiences have left upon him.

The basic thing to know about Jawaharlal Nehru is that he is a warmly sympathetic man whose instinctive approach to men and things is one of liking and understanding. Antipathies and hatreds are not the moving impulses of his life. His is not a negative but a positive character. He is for something, and only against its opposite because that is unavoidable; his instinct is not to worry about the opposite. This makes it difficult for him to be a strong party man. He sees too much of the other man's point of view to be intolerant. He speaks much and on all sorts of occasions. Yet he never gives the impression of making set speeches but always of thinking aloud, of making an effort to explore a problem along with his hearers. It is this which makes him a fascinating speaker, with a power to capture an audience unique in the country. A journalist once described him as the Hamlet of Asia. There is an element of profound truth in this. It explains his attractiveness as also his curious hesitations and uncertainties.

The outstanding fruit of his sympathy is his passionate love of the masses of India, once politically subject, and still very poor. Nehru discovered this India of the peasant and the worker in adolescence, after his upbringing in a rich family and a long spell of education in England—Harrow and Cambridge. When he returned to India he came under the spell of Mahatma Gandhi and consecrated all his time and energies to the task of Indian freedom. For him, and for Gandhi, freedom was not for the sake of power and the development of national pride but for the happiness of the masses, for the struggle against poverty, ignorance, and disease. Rather too sweepingly he attributed all these ills to foreign domination and foreign exploitation. But from the very beginning, freedom and social justice, political liberty, and some degree of economic well-being, have been indissolubly linked in his mind. All the paradoxes of his future action and speech arise from this double passion, the passion for liberty and the passion for social justice—for equality in the measure that it can be attained.

The passion for liberty, with special emphasis on liberty of speech and of thought—this is Nehru's major motivation. It is based upon the liberal tradition which he imbibed from his English education and from his opposition to the Press laws in India, which landed him repeatedly in British prisons. Moreover, the English liberal tradition came to him impregnated with pride in scientific and material progress. It gave him that tendency to intellectual relativism, that insistence on the dynamism of life and ideas, on the continued shifting of values, which would be disturbing and would make for opportunism in politics if they had not been guided in him by a strong sense of permanent moral values. This sense is no doubt the fruit of Nehru's Hindu background, and of his close association with Mahatma Gandhi. But his love of liberty makes him an unequivocal adversary of the Communists and their adhension to dogmas he considers outmoded and to economic theories he thinks are not applicable to the present epoch. And, incidentally, his opposition to dogma limits his sympathy for the Catholic Church for which he has, on other grounds, very considerable respect.

Next, there is Nehru's passion for human equality and for social justice. Now many reasons exist why this ideal of social justice cannot be realized in India by private effort. There are caste conventions and prejudices which perpetuate social injustice and which can be ended only by the action of the state. Hence the suppression of untouchability by law, as in former times the prevention of suttee and of child marriage. Then again as regards material improvement, there is in India a lack of industrial tradition, and an insufficiency of private capital to insure the fullest utilization of national resources so as to increase production and raise the standard of living of the masses. Hence the need for the Indian state to undertake many enterprises itself. Pandit Nehru has always believed in planning. Even before the independence of India, he had been instrumental in setting up a planning committee under the aegis of the Congress Party. The Planning Commission of Independent India and our two 5-year plans are the realization of that early dream. In this belief in the need for and the efficacy of planning, Pandit Nehru's faith in scientific methods for industrial progress and his love of the poor are combined in equal measure.

The system of democratic planning and state control which India has adopted has undoubtedly been influenced by the example of England. It is this faith in a planned economy which has led to widespread appreciation of the achievements of Russia and China in the industrial and social fields. The conviction that we have much to learn from those countries is honestly held by many in India, and sedulously spread by others. Hence, too, the popularity of Nehru's foreign policy which, while it is based upon the desire not to be involved in a possible third world war, implies more sympathy for, or at any rate less antipathy to, the Governments of Russia and China than is possible in other democratic countries.

We should be able to see why, in spite of the fundamental identity between India and America as regards devotion to the democratic ideal, there are points of divergence which Pandit Nehru cannot help emphasizing in his declarations of policy and in his intervention in international affairs. The American economy has developed in conditions of the widest industrial freedom. American resources and the actual and potential wealth of America are such that the widest differences of wealth need not interfere with general well-being and the maintenance of social and personal equality. The land of the millionaire has not ceased to be the land of the common man and of the most unconventional mingling of high and low. In India, however, it is impossible to achieve the same results by employing the same means. The historical antecedents in the two countries are totally different.

There are other dissimilarities between America and the India of Nehru's dreams, which increase the sense of divergence. Though not a believer in religion in the ordinary sense of the term, Pandit Nehru is very far from being a materialist in his practical approach to life. His appreciation of the things of the spirit, his love of science and art, his profound sense of history, and his personal austerity and simplicity of life are essential elements of his complex personality. Hence the practical materialism and the pursuit of comfort and pleasure, which to him seem characteristic of America, cannot but repel him. He certainly does not believe that the American way of life, particularly in those aspects which tend to be most easily imitated abroad, is a good or practicable model for India.

To aggravate these divergences on what may be called the attitude on life, there is definite disagreement between India and America regarding the means of preserving peace, and on United States policy toward the eastern bloc. There is no doubt at all that the objective of America is the preservation of peace, just as it is the objective of India. But America is convinced that this can be done only by the maintenance of military strength and by impressing upon the Communist bloc that aggression would mean a losing war for them. Nehru, however, believes that the policy of rearmament and the threat of massive retaliation leads only to a suicidal race in armaments, and that the negotiation of military agreements increases rather than diminishes the danger of war. Which of the two views is based upon a correct understanding of the psychology of the Communist powers? Possibly both are right: the Communists might not have held out any hope of coexistence if western strength was not so formidable; but now that they do talk of it, a reexamination of western policy may be desirable.

Whatever the reasons, India believes that the Communist powers are actually as much in need of peace as is the Democratic bloc, and that if mutual fears of aggression were eliminated the two sides would settle down to some kind of practical coexistence. India is convinced of this more particularly in regard to her own relations with China. Hence her support for the recognition of China and her efforts to live in friendship with her. India does not feel that she needs to arm herself against possible attack by China, at least not to the extent of entering into a military alliance with the West and accepting foreign military aid. She believes that Panchshila, the five principles of peaceful coexistence and mutual noninterference, can regulate her relations with China for good.

Behind this attitude on rearmament and military alliance, is there on the part of Pandit Nehru and the Indian people generally something of the traditional pacifism characteristic of India and reflected in the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi on Ahimsa, or nonviolence? This is more than probable. In the better minds of India there is an instinctive horror of violence and bloodshed. For Pandit Nehru this horror is reinforced by his passionate pity for the poor and his conviction that the masses, rather than the rulers of the country, have to pay for war. Weapons of mass destruction are for him the embodiment of evil as he once described the atom bomb. Though there are significant expressions of opposition in India and in the Indian Parliament to Nehru's attitude toward China, and warnings of the need to arm against possible Communist aggression—warnings strengthened by the ominous approach of China to the Indian frontier from the vantage ground of Tibet—it is safe to say that the vast majority of Indians support the Prime Minister's policy toward China and the problem of southeastern Asian defense.

The areas of divergence between India and the United States have been further widened by the decision of the American Government to give military aid to Pakistan. Nothing in recent years has done so much as this to strain relations between India and the United States of America. In addition to being another instance of the American policy of safeguarding peace by military alliances, this particular alliance had repercussions on the internal policies of the Indian subcontinent. It modified the balance of power between India and Pakistan and gave an advantage to Pakistan in the discussion of questions which divided India and Pakistan, particularly the problem of Kashmir. Undoubtedly the intention of the American Government was not to strengthen Pakistan against India, nor would it countenance the use against India of the military aid thus given. But the spokesmen of Pakistan made no secret of their feeling that the aid strengthened their bargaining position in their dealings with India. Indians generally did not believe that America would be able to control Pakistan to the extent of preventing all use against India of the aid given. Dr. Syngman Rhee had shown to Pakistan how even the one at the receiving end of the bargain could act independently, and cause serious embarrassment to America. The opposition in India was unanimous. All shades of public opinion were agreed in condemning the American move—the Congress Party representing the government, the Hindu right wing and the Communist left wing representing the opposition. What was undoubtedly a diplomatic victory for the United States of America was offset by a serious loss of good will in India.

An improvement of relations between India and the United States is certainly desirable. There are points of similarity between the two countries and identity of interests on most points which make collaboration between them natural and mutually advantageous. But is it possible under present conditions? I believe that a slight modification of these conditions will bring about an immediate amelioration.

There must, of course, be an easing of international tension, which will diminish the occasions for the two to be ranged on opposite sides. There must be improvement of relations between Pakistan and India. Both these eventualities may not be so unlikely as some may be inclined to believe. Moreover, it would seem that there is already a shift in the emphases of American foreign policy involving the eclipse of some of the more prominent advocates of toughness. In

fact, the resolute moderation and wisdom of General Eisenhower in his approach to international problems, his role in preventing crises on several occasions, have increased Indian respect and friendliness for America. This can certainly be augmented by more mutual tolerance in evaluating the policies of each other. But the underlying causes of divergence between the two countries make it clear that under present conditions, and under Pandit Nehru's leadership, there is little chance of India's abandoning her policy of nonalinement. The United States must understand this and work from there.

Gen. Peyton Conway March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in 1898, a fews days before the Battle of Manila Bay, I was born in the Ozarks of Missouri, when most proud parents named their horses, cats, dogs, and kids after Admiral Dewey. I suffered that common fate by being named after the Admiral at the very time that Peyton Conway March saw action in the assault and capture of Manila.

By the time I was able to read I learned not only about Admiral Dewey, but became interested in Peyton March, who had seen action with the admiral and became interested in him not only as a great military leader, but also as a human being.

At that time, as a youngster, I little realized that it would ever become my privilege to meet and know Peyton March personally. That time, however, came.

For 15 years, Mrs. Short and I lived only 2 or 3 blocks from him and his beloved wife Cora, and I count it one of the greatest privileges and rarest opportunities of my life to have become not only well acquainted with him but to know him and to love him. To really know Peyton March—and not to many people ever did—was to love him. Underneath his tough skin was a warm and friendly heart, a courteous, kindly, and gallant gentleman.

Yesterday we buried one of America's greatest soldiers, patriots, and citizens of all time. The outpouring of both military and civilian people was an attest to his goodness and greatness. Even those who disagreed with him in life were present to pay their sincere and genuine respect and admiration to an outstanding leader.

Peyton C. March was a man of steel. He possessed an iron will and uncompromising conscience, an inflexible devotion to duty and boundless energy. Forever he will remain the epitome of the true soldier. He was a stern and strict disciplinarian—but he never made demands on others that he did not make upon himself. He drove himself hard and he drove everbody around him hard. At times he may have seemed petulant, impatient, irascible, and ruthless, but always he acted in the high manner which he felt was best for his country.

Stiff and straight as a ramrod unto death at 90 years of age, he refused to be pushed around by anybody. At times he was defiant. Presidents, Secretaries, and Congresses did not frighten him.

Peyton March was a man of unconquerable courage, indefatigable energy, and utter devotion. He was not perfect, but he always strived for perfection. Nothing but the best would ever satisfy him. Duty and service to God, country, and his fellowman were the watchwords of his life.

In the dark hours of World War I it was his brilliant intellect, his organizing genius, his administrative ability, his unfailing faith and tireless labors that transported more than 2 million men to France—when our methods of transportation were much fewer and slower than they are today. It was an incredible accomplishment which seemed next to impossible in those days. He cut through Government redtape without hoping to make friends, and realizing at the time that he would make some enemies, in order to get a great and important job done.

General Pershing, my fellow Missourian, could never have accomplished what he did on the battlefield without the drudging efforts that General March put forth on the home front.

The glamorous and spectacular publicity and boxcar headlines never appealed to Peyton March as much as doing his job well without pomp and public acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, General March had a fine family. His father was a great scholar who taught at Lafayette College and bequeathed to his illustrious son many of his scholarly instincts and talents. Peyton March himself was a great scholar and an avid student of history. His impatience with those less fortunately endowed should be forgiven because of his rare accomplishments. His two lovely daughters are married to two distinguished and outstanding retired generals of the United States Army, Lieutenant General Joseph Swing, now Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Major General John Milliken. These generals won their own spurs in their own rights and never depended upon General March for personal advancement. General March's present and second wife Cora, a brilliant woman and a devoted wife, all but worshiped him. Their life together was most happy and successful. To her and to all the members of his family we all extend our deepest appreciation and sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I might say something to assuage the sorrow of these dear ones and the many friends who mourn the passing of General March. All of us can take comfort and inspiration from the noble life, rugged character, and unselfish service which Peyton C. March rendered undyingly to his country.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following newspaper articles that fairly, but inadequately speak of this great American—scholar, soldier, patriot, servant of his God, his country, and all mankind. Following these articles is the 91st Psalm, the passage of Holy Scripture which General March loved best and cherished most:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 14, 1955]

GENERAL PEYTON MARCH IS DEAD HERE AT 90

Gen. Peyton Conway March, Army Chief of Staff in World War I and America's oldest general, died at 5 p. m. yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 90 years old last December 27.

Death came peacefully to the tough, outspoken, loyal military leader in his third-floor suite overlooking the formal gardens of the hospital where he had been confined to a bed or wheelchair since he broke his hip 14 months ago.

His attending physician said he died of a degenerative condition of old age. His wife, Cora, was at his bedside.

The general amazed the Germans in 1918 by achieving the almost incredible task of ferrying more than a million doughboys to Europe to crush the foe. Later he won the Distinguished Service Cross for leading a charge on enemy breastworks in France.

CLASHED WITH PERSHING

The dynamic militarist was, however, overshadowed in World War I by his bitterest rival, Gen. John J. Pershing, who headed the Allied Expeditionary Force.

His verbal clashes with Pershing broiled on after the war ended. In 1921, after he lost his title of full general, being relegated to major general, he slipped into retirement. He continued to live a vigorous life, making his home in a spacious apartment with his wife at 1870 Wyoming Avenue NW.

But he avoided the public spotlight and was soon to be known as the forgotten soldier. In his vesper years, however, words of sage advice again came from his lips. At the outset of World War II, he advocated a cross-channel invasion with an Allied army of 3 million. He took sharp issue with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In 1930, General March regained his full rank, and in 1948, upon the death of "Black Jack" Pershing, he became the highest ranking officer of World War I.

General March's peppery temper and outspoken criticism did not gain him many implacable enemies. Among his fellow officers he had always enjoyed the reputation of being a brilliant military officer, organizer and strategist.

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson said in a statement last night that "the long and distinguished career of Peyton C. March is a lasting inspiration to the people of our country he served so long and faithfully. The Nation has lost a great American, whose military career will be long remembered."

Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens said:

"General March had a distinguished military career, spanning 33 years during which his leadership was an inspiration for all with whom he served. Long after he retired in 1921 as Chief of Staff, his devotion to the Army caused him to serve as a valued adviser on military matters."

INSPIRING LEADERSHIP

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, said March's "military record reflects an inspiring leadership which contributed immeasurably to the firm foundation on which our Army stands today."

Gen. George C. Marshall, former Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and World War II Army Chief of Staff, said March "was throughout his lifetime devoted to the interests and welfare of the Army." He said March played "an important and difficult role" during World War I and that "his contribution to that conflict and studious de-

velopment of plans for demobilization were of great significance."

Born in Easton, Pa., December 27, 1864, March graduated from the United States Military Academy June 11, 1888. Before he became Army Chief of Staff on May 29, 1918, he had served in France as artillery commander of the AEF.

MADE GENERAL IN 1918

March first saw active service in the Philippine Islands in 1898 when he participated in the assault and the capture of Manila. Later, he was detailed to Tokyo, in March, 1904, as military attaché on duty in the field with Japanese troops in the Russo-Japanese war.

When the United States entered World War I, he was a colonel on duty with the Second Division at Fort Bliss, Tex. He sailed for France in May of that year. The following year May 25, 1918, he was elevated to full general.

At his Wyoming Avenue apartment, which was studded with maps and files, March was an assiduous reader and had retained remarkable mental as well as physical agility.

His entire family was together with him last on December 27, where the rail-thin, goateed general observed his birthday with a quiet family party.

Beside his wife, he is survived by 2 daughters, both married to retired generals— Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Immigration Service Director, 3055 Foxhall Road NW., and Maj. Gen. John Millikin, 5915 Ramsgate Road, Woodacres, Md. Three grandchildren also survive.

Funeral arrangements were not completed last night.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 19, 1955]

ONE-MILE CORTEGE AT MARCH FUNERAL

Gen. Peyton Conway March, America's oldest general, was buried yesterday in Arlington Cemetery amid pomp and circumstance reserved only for the Nation's greatest military heroes.

The World War I Army Chief of Staff died Wednesday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 90.

Top military, civilian, and foreign dignitaries headed a mile-long funeral cortege bearing the body from downtown Washington.

Included in the special honor guard following the caisson were Vice President Richard Nixon, Bernard Baruch, Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Army Gen. John E. Hull, Army Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, and Representative Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri.

Baruch was chairman of the World War I War Industries Board while General March was Chief of Staff.

A 400-man cadet battalion from the United States Military Academy, the United States Army Band, and the Third (Old Guard) Infantry Regiment led units of all the armed services in the hour-long march from 15th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

Tanks from the Third Armored Cavalry, Fort Meade, Md., and an airborne field artillery battery from Fort Bragg, N. C., made up part of the procession down Constitution Avenue NW., across Memorial Bridge to the memorial entrance to the cemetery.

The general's body, borne in state on a caisson drawn by six white horses, was followed by a riderless black horse with stirrups turned backward in the traditional military service.

On a hilltop overlooking the Potomac, Brig. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Army Deputy Chief of Chaplains, conducted Presbyterian graveside services.

The service, in a grove of maple trees under a cold, gray sky, began as the band sounded Ruffles and Flourishes, then broke into a medley of hymns. General Tobey read the service and led in prayer as soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen held the American flag taut over the coffin.

The flag was folded and presented to General March's widow, who stood with Lieutenant Gen. Stanley Embick and other comrades of the late general near the coffin.

The military units presented arms and a 17-gun salute from one of eight 105-millimeter howitzers in the cortege echoed over the hills.

General March was born in Easton, Pa., and was graduated from the military academy in 1888. He saw action in the assault and capture of Manila in 1898. He became Chief of Staff in 1918 after organizing the movement and supply of the American Expeditionary Force in Europe. He retired in 1921.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 16, 1955]

GENERAL MARCH

Gen. Peyton C. March was the beau ideal professional soldier. His whole life—90 years of it—added up to make a great military career. An honor graduate of West Point, he commanded the Astor Battery in the Philippines in 1898 and returned to the islands to work under Arthur MacArthur in the guerrilla campaigns which resulted in the capture of Aguinaldo in 1901. With the Japanese he saw the Russians beaten at Yalu and Liaoyang in 1904—terrible battles which taught him the importance, in war, of "force, force to the utmost."

This was the philosophy General March put into practice in World War I. The first of his missions in that struggle was to organize the artillery in France. Secretary of War Newton Baker called him home to be Chief of Staff and to weld the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the National Army into a single fighting power. The story of how 2 million men were carried over the Atlantic to smash the Kaiser's mailed-fist defenses and compel his surrender and abdication has been told repeatedly. It may be summarized in the words which General March himself used: "We did it."

But the principal architect of the institutional side of the victory was not the rough, tough, hard, sharp, sarcastic, provocative mechanician some critics supposed. Washingtonians who were his neighbors found him, instead, a courteous, kindly, friendly, modestly chivalrous person. He had his own ideas, his own fashion of getting things accomplished, and he did not like to be crossed. Yet it also was true that he could pull in harness, was a skilled cooperator, and in hundreds of instances a faithful friend of fellow officers. Above all, General March was a patriot. He loved his country and its people.

PSALM 91

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

2. I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in Him will I trust.

3. Surely He shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.

4. He shall cover thee with His feathers, and under His wings shalt thou trust: His truth shall be thy shield and buckler.

5. Thou shall not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day;

6. Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.

7. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and 10,000 at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.

8. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked.

9. Because thou has made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation;

10. There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.

11. For He shall give His Angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

13. Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.

14. Because He hath set His love upon me, therefore will I deliver Him: I will set Him on high, because He hath known my name.

15. He shall call upon me, and I will answer Him: I will be with Him in trouble, I will deliver Him, and honor Him.

16. With long life will I satisfy Him, and shew Him my salvation.

A National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article by my friend and constituent, Miss Alvhild V. Holmes, entitled "A National Flower."

Miss Holmes, a talented writer, is a strong advocate of the laurel to be our national flower, and her cogent article in the Worcester Telegram, which was forwarded to me by the distinguished executive editor of that outstanding publication, Mr. M. H. Williams, forcefully sets forth her views. I am also referring this statement for the consideration of the committee considering House Joint Resolution 102.

A NATIONAL FLOWER

(By Alvhild V. Holmes)

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH has introduced a bill calling for a law to make the rose the official flower of America. Her fellow Senators have referred it to the Judiciary Committee.

Congresswoman FANCES P. BOLTON is also in favor of the rose as the official United States flower, and offered an identical bill to the House of Representatives. "The United States," she said, "is the only major country in the world without a national flower, and I feel we should add this symbol to the national identification of the United States."

Now far be it from me to malign any flower, particularly a flower so beautiful as the rose. I admit that my garden would be incomplete without its roses, and they are well worth the extra care and pampering they require.

But so far as a national flower is concerned I feel that the rose would be the worst possible choice. And for many reasons.

In the first place, the rose is the national flower of England. Why should we steal the official flower of England when there are hundreds of thousands of other flowers to choose from—almost any of which would be better suited to represent our country than the rose?

The rose is a tender hybrid which must be constantly coddled and pampered if it is to give satisfactory results. That characteristic is not typical of our Nation.

A few years ago a nationwide radio program (the Garden Gate, CBS) conducted a poll among its listeners. The laurel won overwhelmingly as a selection for a national flower. A petition was sent to Congress for a national flower, naming the laurel as the winning selection. But a war was in progress, and this petition probably was forgotten under the stress of more pressing legislation.

The laurel is a far more suitable symbol of our own hardy race. It grows and thrives under the most difficult conditions. It is native to every State in the Union. Its blossoms are star-shaped. They contain two of the colors of our American flag—red and white.

The laurel climbs undaunted up our mountain sides. It requires no care and pampering by any human agency. It defies the elements, and will stand any degree of temperature. It scoffs at adversity. It is ever green and contributes beauty to our countryside the year round.

I am sure that all students of Nature, and of horticulture, will feel that the rose would be a most thoughtless choice as an official United States flower. A choice in which beauty alone is considered. The short-lived beauty of a tender, pampered plant that will not thrive except under the most favorable conditions.

The rose is the favorite flower of both Senator SMITH and Congresswoman BOLTON, but where the selection of a national flower is concerned, the many millions of Americans should have an opportunity to express their opinions.

Don't get me wrong. I love my roses. Come spring, I will be out in my rose garden removing huge piles of spruce and pine boughs which have served as winter covering. During the months to come I will be carrying many bushels of mulching material and many buckets of water. I shall ceaselessly battle their multitude of enemies with dust blower and spray gun. And though my stockings and aprons be slashed to ribbons, and I may be bleeding from a dozen wounds, I shall still say that my roses are worth it.

But the rose as a symbol of our national identification—definitely "No."

Hon. John E. Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress as a youngster in 1929, one of the men I first became acquainted with was Hon. John E. Nelson, of Maine. He had served with high distinction and great honor in this body for 10 years, and few men impressed me as much as he did.

John Nelson possessed not only Yankee shrewdness, Southern chivalry, Midwestern warmth, and hard sense, but also the daring and adventuresome spirit of the Far West, and he also displayed a comprehension and understanding of our national problems which few men then or now possess. Always he fought for the interests of his own constituents, but he never overlooked or neglected the needs of others.

Modest in victory, strong in defeat, John Nelson worked hard in committee and was an able debater on the floor of this House. He was devoted to his family, helpful to his friends, and loyal to his country. He followed in and upheld the fine tradition of the statesmen whom Maine has given to this Nation. I shall not attempt to enumerate these great men of Maine, but John Nelson will follow along with Thomas Brackett Reed, James G. Blaine, Hannibal Hamlin, Frank Fellows, and others.

We are indeed fortunate to have serving with us today John Nelson's fine son, CHARLES NELSON, a respected and valuable member of our Committee on Armed Services. Like his illustrious father, CHARLIE knows the necessity for hard work, and is following faithfully in the footsteps of his distinguished father.

To our understanding and cordial colleague, CHARLES NELSON, of Maine, to all the family and many friends of John Nelson, we extend our sincere sympathy and can truthfully say that earth's loss is Heaven's gain.

National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted, I insert herewith in the RECORD, a communication addressed to me by Mr. J. W. Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society in support on my resolution, House Joint Resolution 231, providing for a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week:

AMERICAN MATERIAL
HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 18, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I would like to offer, in support of your resolution, House Joint Resolution 231 "A National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week," the following excerpt from a letter written to me by Donald W. Pennock, vice president, material handling division of the Society for the Advancement of Management.

He writes, and I quote: "The material handling division of the Society for Advancement of Management confines its activities to the management aspects of the materials-handling field.

"Its educational efforts are addressed primarily at management and college groups.

"We consider materials handling as a very important part of America's business picture. It is a tremendous activity, being experienced in one form or another, in over 2 million industrial and commercial establishments alone. Where improperly treated, it is the greatest single crippler of American manpower. Where properly adopted, its technological advancements offer the greatest immediate potential profit-making available to American industry.

"Perhaps the greatest achievement of the Society for the Advancement of Management Material Handling Division has been its work in helping material handling men of all societies and interests to find more areas of agreement. This has contributed substantially to inter-society cooperation among the big four of the Material Handling Society world, namely SAM, AMHS, SIPMHE, and ASME.

"Society for the Advancement of Management has been particularly active in presentation of material handling subjects of national interest in United States areas where intense material-handling activity has been indicated.

"It has created a means of enabling men to keep the technical and management phases of material handling education abreast of each other, and of bringing management closer than ever before to understanding the work and dreams of the material handling technician and engineer.

"Through its material-handling conferences, SAM has helped focus the attention of American management on the exceptional opportunities offered by modern material handling methods and equipment. This has contributed regular support to the efforts of the $2 billion dollar material handling industry, and of at least 23 magazines and 135 colleges, which have been working toward the advancement of the welfare and growth of the material handling profession.

"The Society for the Advancement of Management is presently preparing an award for annual presentation to that individual making the greatest and most significant contribution to the field of materials handling. It is believed that this award will, in a few years, achieve a position of such honor and national acclaim that it will encourage our best United States material handling engineers and management men to contribute importantly to the advancement of American industry."

As this letter is indicative of the interest that this management organization manifests in the material handling field, may I request that it be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the effort to establish a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of this month a subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held so-called grassroots hearings in the Northwest on the much-publicized Hells Canyon controversy. The editorial comments on April 8, 1955, of the two newspapers published at Portland, Oreg., give an interesting sidelight on those hearings. The following are from the Oregon Journal and from the Oregonian:

[From the Oregon Journal of April 8, 1955]

HELLS CANYON, POLITICAL FOOTBALL

The Journal long has contended that the Hells Canyon project should be evaluated on a realistic engineering-economic basis. But the project has become so involved in politics and emotion that it has been virtually impossible to do so.

This was never clearer than it became during the so-called grassroots hearings of the subcommittee on interior and insular affairs at Boise, Lewiston, Pasco, and Portland this week.

These hearings fairly reeked with emotion and politics.

They produced no new light on the engineering and economic factors on which a high Hells Canyon issue should be judged.

Instead, they gave Democratic proponents—especially Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, MURRAY and friends—another soapbox from which to exploit the public versus private power issue.

It set Democrats against Republicans, reclamationists against public power factions.

It laid the groundwork for a 1956 race between Senator MORSE, one of the principal sponsors of the Hells Canyon authorization bill, and Governor Patterson of Oregon, who accepted Morse's challenge by openly and forcefully alining himself with the Hells Canyon opposition.

And we're quite sure Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, MURRAY and friends planned it that way.

In such an atmosphere, it is impossible to judge S. 1333, the bill authorizing an all-Federal high Hells Canyon project, on a factual basis. And that's too bad for the Northwest, which sorely needs power and which sees the meeting of this need stymied by political horseplay.

To us the preponderance of credible evidence appears to be against a high, all-Federal Hells Canyon project, and to that extent in favor of private company, low-dam development of the middle Snake. Here are the reasons:

High Hells Canyon will cost a great deal of money. The two factions can't agree on the exact amount, any more than they can agree on anything else, including the time of day. But it's $400 million at least—not counting transmission lines or any assistance Hells Canyon might give the Mountain Home reclamation project in Idaho.

Even if the authorization bill were approved by the Congress—and we don't think it could be—what chance do you think we'd have to get Federal money for this tremendous and highly controversial project? Virtually none. And even if money were available to start work today, it would be 8 or 10 years before power could be produced.

Before we could get it built, we'd be in the power bind. And for that matter, the 1947 plans for Hells Canyon would be obsolete, as obsolete as the 308 report in which it is included and which is now almost 10 years old. On an engineering basis, the longer it would take to build high Hells Canyon the less valuable it would become. With the advent of more modern steam and nuclear power, its principal value might be for peaking purposes only.

Thus as a practical matter high Hells Canyon is a lost cause. So why beat our brains out over it?

Furthermore, we agree with Governor Patterson that high Hells Canyon is out of place in the logical timetable of Columbia Basin development. Other projects (John Day or Libby, for example) are more urgently needed, projects on which all factions could agree, projects which, frankly speaking, would be more beneficial to Oregon.

Finally, we believe that if storage is the prime consideration at Hells Canyon, as proponents maintain, why not develop it elsewhere, particularly on the upper Columbia or the Clearwater, where it would be more effective and is more urgently needed than on the Snake?

If we had all kinds of Federal money and no one else were interested in developing the middle Snake, it might be a different story. But we haven't, and private capital is ready to do the job, and do it promptly. For this reason we hope the Federal Power Commission grants Idaho Power Co. its permit to build three middle Snake dams.

We could then forget Hells Canyon, the disruptive political issue, and get on with the job of producing necessary power. The sooner the better, say we.

[From the Oregonian of April 8, 1955]

HELLS CANYON ROADBLOCK

The peripatetic hearings of the Senate's Interior Subcommittee on the Hells Canyon Dam bill—Boise, Lewiston, Pasco, and Portland in the space of 3 days—added nothing factual to the record. But the committee was neither looking for nor asking for facts. It asked for expressions of opinion. Witnesses who attempted to substantiate their opinions with factual data were in the minority.

Obviously, the purpose of the hearings was to bring the question of a Federal high dam versus a private utility's three lower dams more sharply to public attention. The Democrats sponsoring the high dam bill want that. This is frustrating to those who oppose the high dam for a variety of reasons and to those who believe the bill is faulty or that Hells Canyon should not have priority over other dams.

A result of the hearings was to broaden the cleavage between those who see Hells Canyon as the gleaming monument to all-Federal development of the Columbia Basin's water resource and those who demand that we get on with power development, one way or another, to prevent a critical shortage in the 1960's.

Senator MORSE, the principal sponsor of S. 1333, the Federal high-dam bill, made it abundantly clear that he intends to use Hells Canyon as a political symbol, as he and other Democrats have used the Dixon-Yates contract and "tidelands" oil. He has condemned in advance as "prejudiced" the Federal Power Commission, which has yet to rule on Idaho Power Co.'s three-dam plan.

"The only place to fight this out," said Senator MORSE, "is in Congress, and, next year, may I say, at the crossroads of the State of Oregon."

This statement, besides disclosing one of his planks for his 1956 campaign, recognizes that unlike the John Day project, a high dam in Hells Canyon has not yet even been authorized by Congress. Should S. 1333, which does authorize the project, be accepted in both Houses of Congress and by President Eisenhower, money to start construction would have to be voted by Congress next year.

It is, to put it mildly, misleading for Senator MORSE to say that a high dam would be ready to begin storing water by 1959 and full storage attained by 1961 "and its at-site and downstream firmup" be available that year.

For comparison, 1961, is the completion date set for The Dalles dam on which construction started in March, 1952. And completion of Chief Joseph dam is scheduled for December, 1958—almost 10 years from the start of construction. The first two generating units at The Dalles will go on the line in November, 1957—5 years after start of construction. The first three units of Chief Joseph will begin operating in September, this year—more than 6 years after work started.

There is virtually no hope of even starting the planning—which takes from 1 to 2 years—on a high Hells Canyon dam unless the present authorization bill is adopted this year and until after appropriations are voted in Congress next year. On the other hand a million dollars voted by this session of Congress for John Day planning—or even less, to permit the Army engineers to use funds on hand—would put completion of the already authorized John Day project years ahead of Hells Canyon.

The vicious part of the Democrats' concentration on Hells Canyon as a political symbol is that it is throwing a roadblock before orderly construction of dams on the Columbia's main stem—in which John Day has the highest priority, would provide the greatest benefits, and would be the cheapest to build.

Cruel Betrayal of the Polish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, March 28 marked the 10th anniversary of the treacherous betrayal of 16 Polish underground leaders whom the Soviet authorities in Poland arbitrarily apprehended, flew to Moscow and imprisoned and sentenced without due process of law in June 1945.

So far as we are able to ascertain, four of these Polish leaders are still detained in Soviet prisons and it seems appropriate and urgent at this time that our Government and the United Nations should demand their release.

A short summary of the background and developments in these cases will be helpful in understanding the monstrous unfairness and injustice of their plight. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the following is a factual account of the events leading up to their imprisonment and long confinement against the terms of the Yalta agreement and contrary to every rule of good faith that should obtain between nations.

In accordance with the Yalta agreement, the Moscow-sponsored provisional government of Poland had to be reorganized on a broader basis with the inclusion of leaders "from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

Mr. Molotov and the Ambassadors of the United States and Great Britain, residing in Moscow, were entrusted with the task to cooperate in the forming of a new government along the above lines.

It was assumed from the very beginning by the American and British Governments that the most prominent leaders of the Polish underground, at that time hiding in Poland, would eventually enter the coalition. During the war they had fought, in close cooperation with the Polish Government in London, a bitter struggle against the Nazi occupants and thus had largely contributed to the Allied war effort.

At the request of the British Secretary of State, the Polish Government in London disclosed for transmission to the

committee in Moscow the names and whereabouts of the Polish Vice Premier and government delegate for the homeland, and of the three members of the Home Council of Ministers. The Allied government gave assurance that they would do everything possible to insure the safety of the Polish underground leaders.

A short time after the Polish Vice Premier, Mr. Jankowski, and the last commander of the disbanded home army, General Okulicki, were approached by Colonel Pimenov, of the Soviet NKWD, with a request to attend a meeting with Colonel General Ivanov, a representative of the high command of the White Russian front. This invitation was confirmed by letter, on March 10, to Mr. Jankowski and General Okulicki. The purpose of the meeting, in Colonel Pimenov's own words, was "the clarification of the atmosphere and the coming into the open of the democratic Polish parties in order that they may take part in the general current of the democratic forces of independent Poland." Although absolute personal safety was granted by the Soviet representative, the 16 Polish underground leaders, when they arrived on March 28, 1945, at the meeting place, were arrested and flown to Moscow and imprisoned there.

The Soviets committed in cold blood another act of shameless felony. It was only on May 5, 1945 that the official Soviet agency Tass announced the arrest of the Polish leaders. This happened during the San Francisco Conference, and Molotov himself confirmed the news.

The British and United States Secretaries of State expressed grave concern to Mr. Molotov, and asked for full explanation. Their intervention remained nevertheless without response, and on June 18, 1945, a trial of the Polish leaders was held in Moscow by the military colleagium of the Supreme Court of the U. S. S. R.

Following sentences were passed:

First. Maj. Gen. Leopold Okulicki, born 1898, commander of the Polish Home Army succeeding Gen. T. Bor-Komorowski, after the Warsaw rising—10 years prison.

Second. Jan Staniskaw Jankowski, born 1882, member of the Christian Labor Party and Vice Premier of the Polish Government in London, appointed delegate in Poland—8 years prison.

Third. Adam Dien, born 1899, member of the underground government, Peasant Party—5 years prison.

Fourth. Staniskaw Jasyukowicz, born 1882, National Party, member of underground government—5 years prison.

Fifth. Kazimierz Puzak, born 1883, leader of Socialist Party and speaker of underground parliament—18 months prison.

Sixth. Alexander Zwierzynski, born 1880, National Party, deputy speaker—8 months prison.

Seventh. Kazimierz Daginski, born 1890, Peasant Party, deputy speaker—6 months prison.

Eighth. Staniskaw Nyerzva, born 1905, Peasant Party—4 months prison.

Ninth. Zbigniow Stkpuzkowski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party—4 months.

Tenth. Eugoniusz Czarnovski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party—4 months prison.

Eleventh. Jösef Chacinski, born 1889, leader of Christian Labor Party—4 months prison.

Twelfth. Francissek Urbanski, born 1891, secretary of underground parliament, Christian Labor Party—4 months prison.

Thirteenth. Staniskaw Michalowski, born 1903, Democratic Party, proved innocent.

Fourteenth. Kazimierz Kobylanski, born 1892, National Party, proved innocent.

Fifteenth. Jösef Stemler Dabski, born 1892, interpreter of Polish delegation, proved innocent.

Sixteenth. Antoni Pajdak, member of Socialist Party and of underground parliament was not tried in public, and the sentence, in his case, was not disclosed.

It is to be noted that in accordance with Soviet procedure the penal sentence is counted as from the day of arrest.

General Okulicki, Jankowski, Jasiukowicz, and Pajdak did not yet return to Poland. Okulicki should be released on March 28, 1955. Jankowski should have been freed on March 28, 1953, and Jasiukowski on March 28, 1950. According to information, Pajdak was sentenced by administrative decree to 5 years, and if so, had to be freed on March 28, 1950. It should be stressed that the fate of these four prisoners remaining in Soviet Russia is still unknown.

The remaining leaders were brought back to Poland after the period of their detention in Soviet jails had elapsed. Puzak and Mierswa were rearrested in Poland, sentenced, and Puzak died in prison. Czarnowski, Urbanski, and Chacinski died in Poland; the fate of Bien is not known, as well as of Zwiorsyoki and Stemlor-Dabski. Michazowski and Kobylatski acquitted during the Moscow trial, were again arrested in Poland, and are detained in prison. Stypuskowski is in England and H. Bagisaki lives in the United States of America.

In connection with the 10th anniversary of this shameless act perpetrated on March 28, 1945, against the 16 Polish underground leaders steps should be taken to, first, ask for full information as to the fate and whereabouts of these 4 leaders still kept in Soviet Russia; second, demand their release from prison; third, insist on the liberation of the underground leaders who have been submitted to new ordeals by the Moscow-sponsored regime in Poland after their return from Russia.

I urge, therefore, and sincerely request the State Department to make appropriate inquiries and efforts in these tragic cases.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*...3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*....The Capitol Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenloopor, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Buchanan, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Davidson, Bell, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, ———, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Fine, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Machrowicz, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Machrowicz, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Dingell, Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Harold M. Stephens, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 4-6420
	Circuit Judges	
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee, 3550 Springland Lane.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, 1500 Massachusetts Ave.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 1868 Columbia Road.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Washington, 4912 Brookway Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Paul W. Brosman
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*—1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—7304 Bradley Blvd. Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*—The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—3251 Q St.
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Granahan, William T., *Pa*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*—125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*—1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—The Coronet

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—3130 Wisconsin Ave.
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*—3250 T St. SE.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4420 Dexter St.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill.*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4634–B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—The Dorchester
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—The Senate Courts
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—3202 So. Stafford St., Arlington, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Address by the Chief Justice of the United States at the Marshall-Wythe-Blackstone Commemoration Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, September of this year has been designated as John Marshall Bicentennial Month by the action of the 82d Congress, and extensive ceremonies will commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall.

Chief Justice Marshall firmly implanted the precepts of judicial review in our constitutional system. History records this commentary of 1833 which has become a lasting tribute and memorial to his great wisdom and genius:

> Your expositions of constitutional law enjoy a rare and extraordinary authority. They constitute a monument of fame far beyond the ordinary memorials of political and military glory. They are destined to enlighten, instruct, and convince future generations and can scarcely perish but with the memory of the Constitution itself.

In this setting, and as a member of the John Marshall Bicentennial Commission, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, delivered at the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT MARSHALL-WYTHE-BLACKSTONE COMMEMORATION CEREMONIES, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., SEPTEMBER 25, 1954

It is our pleasure today to honor great men of another day, men who have contributed much to our national life and to the civilization of which it is a part. We speak of them, of course, in gratitude, but we have another reason, even more personal to present-day Americans and in keeping with the necessities of our time. We meet here to strengthen our own convictions concerning government and law; to fortify our belief in a government of laws and not of men. We seek rededication to the cause of justice, between individuals, between citizens and their sovereign, and between the nations of the world. We reach for perfect justice, but we do not expect to grasp it, because history, both profane and divine, teaches us that as long as time and human nature exist there will be issues to decide, causes to adjust. We learn from Holy Writ that even the angels quarreled and that Satan and his angels were banished to darkness for their wrongs. We know that the path of justice in every time and place has been rough, tortuous, and uphill. No nation has yet reached the summit. Exact justice has not been achieved. No mortal has embodied all its principles. We recognize, however, that civilizations of the past have advanced it; nations in all ages have made contributions to it, and individuals have either evolved or formulated or synthesized principles of justice in a way that has challenged the admiration and emulation of people in many lands—people who are interested in that kind of government which is premised upon freedom and the dignity of the individual. We honor those nations for their accomplishments and revere the memories of such individuals for their contributions.

As Americans, we are proud of our system of government and our standards of justice, although we claim neither originality nor perfection for them. We, too, have had our great men who have made contributions to the sum total of human knowledge in the field of justice. We do not deify them. Like the sages of other countries, they were people, subject to all the limitations of human beings. As a nation, we make no pretense except to a passion for justice based upon the dignity and rights of the individual. We stake everything we have on our belief that only through this kind of justice can there be order and contentment within nations and peace between countries of the world. We believe this kind of justice is the rightful heritage of every human being and that it is his right and duty to achieve it.

For three and a half centuries Americans, using the experience and wisdom of older countries from which we or our forebears came, have endeavored to develop in this section of the world a system of government and a body of law that will accord justice to everyone. We have made mistakes—many of them. People have at times succeeded in using our system for selfish and even oppressive ends. We have often been required to wipe some things from the slate and start again. At times we have been close to failure but we have never failed in our climb toward the pinnacle of true justice. And we are climbing today to meet the test of Thomas Jefferson that "The most sacred of the duties of a government is to do equal and impartial justice to all its citizens."

We do not assume that justice is indigenous only to our soil or in our own people. Waves of passion, prejudice and even hatreds have on occasions swept over us and almost engulfed us, as they have the people of other lands. In our efforts to guard against these things, we have called upon the wisdom of the ages. We have accepted unblushingly the contribution of those intellects of other nations and ages who, in accordance with the circumstances under which they lived, have placed foundation stones in the temple of justice.

Our own symbol of justice, the home of the Supreme Court of the United States, honors great nations of lawgivers. It is of Grecian architecture of the Corinthian order so loved by the Romans and used by them in a countless number of their public buildings. In the courtroom itself, we give public recognition to the lawgivers of all ages. On the frieze of one wall are the figures of ancients who made their contribution before the birth of Christ: Menes, Hammurabi, Moses, Solomon, Lycurgus, Solon, Draco, Confucius, and Octavian; and on the opposite wall the figures of those who came after Him: Justinian, Mohammed, Charlemagne, King John, St. Louis, Grotius, Blackstone, Marshall, and Napoleon. The most significant to us, of course, are the figures of those who expounded the two systems that are the most alike of any because premised on the affinity of lineage, language, concept, and emulation, the British and American. They stand side by side, William Blackstone and John Marshall. These men were contemporaries although not known personally to each other. The one had not been out of England; the other lived almost his entire life within a few miles of his beloved Virginia.

While Blackstone was writing his commentaries on the law of England, Marshall was studying the great events of history upon which the rights of Englishmen were predicated in order to establish here a comparable system of justice. At that time, he and his compatriots were concerned not so much with a better system of justice than the English system as they were with having the same rights as Englishmen. A few years later he fought with Washington at Monmouth, Brandywine, and Valley Forge to establish here a Nation for that purpose. Blackstone expounded the law of England as it had developed by tradition, charter, statutes, and judicial interpretation for a thousand years. Marshall expounded our Constitution, a document of 5,000 words, only a dozen years old, but which had been designed to establish for all times a more perfect Union of States that had but recently achieved their independence. That Constitution was an experiment in the science of government. Many people believed it to be a dangerous experiment. Many feared it and believed it would become another instrument of oppression. It was approved by the States only by the narrowest of margins. No one was certain if or how it would stand the test of time. One of the signers of the Constitution said, "Constitutions are not the same on paper as in real life." It fell to the lot of John Marshall to translate our Constitution from paper into real life, to enable it to meet the problems of a new, poor, war-tired, and divided country. To say that it took wisdom, foresight, patience, and courage to do this task is trite. But it is nonetheless true, and he did it for 34 years during the most formative and politically turbulent period of our national history, leaving at his death a greater imprint on our legal institutions than any American to this day has ever made. We honor him today at the beginning of the 200th year since his birth in testimony of the lasting and universal veneration in which his work is held.

It is appropriate that this recognition should be given him in his beloved Virginia where he lived all his life and in whose service he offered his life for the new Nation he envisioned, in whose legislature he labored for the Constitutional Convention, where he worked for ratification of the Constitution, and which State he represented in the Congress. It is also fitting that this ceremony should be held at beautiful and historic College of William and Mary where he received his only formal education under the benign tutelage of George Wythe, then occupying the first chair of law in this country. John Marshall was not an orthodox student. Born in the wilderness, he learned

from his parents and from an occasional tutor, but largely from the life of his time and from the great men of Virginia in the causes for which men struggled in those days. What men he encountered in his native State—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, Mason, Monroe, and a host of others immortal in United States history. Whether these men agreed in politics or not, they all had great minds, were passionately devoted to their own political philosophy and each sharpened the minds of the others either through friendly intercourse or political contention. Marshall was the beneficiary of these associations as much as any American of those days, whether it stemmed from the adoration he had for his beloved chief, George Washington, or from his almost lifelong political strife with his kinsman, Thomas Jefferson.

We are most fortunate that we can have with us on this occasion Dr. Goodhart, master of University College, Oxford, where English law was first taught and where Sir William Blackstone taught and wrote his commentaries. And how greatly we are honored by having with us on this occasion the Lord Chief Justice of England whose historic position makes him the guardian of the rights of all Englishmen as those rights have come down to them from Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and the Acts of Parliament. It gives us a sense of comradeship in a very troubled world.

John Marshall has rightly been called the "expounder of the Constitution." It was new to the point of being without precedent when he became Chief Justice January 6, 1801. The Nation was poor as a result of years of warfare. Means of communication between the States were sadly lacking; there was no national economy; our standing among the nations of the world was deplorable; the States were divided in interests and politics; men held passionate views concerning the relationships between the three branches of Government and between the Federal and State governments. The leaders were men of powerful intellect and passionate convictions. There were those who would center most power in the Federal Government. There were those who would leave practically all power in the States. It was Marshall's mission in life to pursue a course somewhere between those two extreme positions through the construction of the new Constitution in a myriad of cases that arose during his 34 years as Chief Justice. He had spent a horrible winter at Valley Forge with Washington, and the weakness of the Government under the Articles of Confederation had seared his soul. He believed in a strong, central government—Federal supremacy in all matters within the domain of the Federal Government. He believed the Constitution should be construed liberally to accomplish that end, and he confirmed the power of Congress to do so in these historic words:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

He believed that if we were to remain a nation we must have a national economy, and that any strong economy must be based upon the scrupulous performance of contracts, and the orderly regulation by the central government of commerce among the States and with other nations. He realized that if we were to command the respect of the world, we must meticulously fulfill our international obligations and honor the treaties we make. All of these desired results he achieved through decision after decision until they became embedded in our law.

But perhaps the greatest contribution he made to our system of jurisprudence was the establishment of an independent judiciary through the principle of judicial review. In a case instituted the first year of his incumbency, he rooted this fundamental principle in American constitutional law as our original contribution to the science of law.

This and many other of his decisions aroused a storm of protest as being beyond the words and intent of the Constitution, but for 34 years in accordance with his belief, stone by stone, he built the foundation of our constitutional structure, and he constructed it sufficiently strong to support everything we have since built upon it. In those 34 years of his incumbency, he wrote 519 of the 1,106 opinions handed down by his Court.

He did not go with the tide of public opinion or the course of politics. Often his opinions were contrary to both, but he continued to build, patiently, logically, courageously. His sense of duty is epitomized at the time of the trial of Aaron Burr, which he conducted fearlessly in spite of the intense feeling of the public and the national administration against the defendant. In the conduct of that case, as a circuit justice, he said:

"That this court dares not usurp power is most true. That this court dares not shrink from its duty is not less true. No man is desirous of becoming the peculiar subject of calumny. No man, might he let the bitter cup pass from him without self-reproach, would drain it to the bottom."

And he did his duty in that case, unpopular though it was.

He lived with this conviction, throughout his long career. When his work was done and he passed away in Philadelphia on July 6, 1835, in the 80th year of his life and the 35th of his Chief Justiceship, he was acclaimed by friend and foe alike as a man of virtue and great accomplishment.

His long-time friend and illustrious associate, Joseph Story, said of him:

"Chief Justice Marshall was the growth of a century. Providence grants such men to the human family only on great occasions to accomplish its own great end. Such men are found only when our need is the greatest. His proudest epitaph may be written in a line—'Here lies the expounder of the Constitution.'"

The people of Philadelphia accorded him a hero's farewell, and as his body was borne along the streets to the dock for transmittal to his beloved Virginia, the Liberty Bell tolled from the belfry of Independence Hall. Then a strange thing happened. A great cleft appeared in the side of the bell, and like Marshall's voice, it too became still forever. It was taken down and placed in the Hall. It remains there today for all to see—the symbol of our liberty—while the memory of John Marshall abides with all of us as that of "the great Chief Justice," and "the expounder of our Constitution."

Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the State, of Columbia, S. C., on April 17, 1955, dealing with the tribute paid to Gov. James F. Byrnes at a testimonial held at Aiken on April 16.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONOR GUEST BYRNES URGES FIRM STAND—HIGH TRIBUTE PAID RETIRED SOUTH CAROLINA GOVERNOR BY OVER 800—AIKEN RECALLS START OF GREAT SERVICE CAREER

(By Bob Pierce and Reese Daniel)

AIKEN, April 16.—More than 800 persons tonight paid tribute to James F. Byrnes in a rousing testimonial in the city where he started 45 years of public service.

The honor guest, himself, in a climatic speech, praised the progress of the South in racial relations, hit indirectly at the United States Supreme Court segregation decision, urged a "stand firm" policy on proposed four-power conference.

The text of Mr. Byrnes remarks follow:

"When I left the office of governor some members of the press were generous enough to make complimentary statements about my public service. No words were more appreciated than the statement of John Temple Graves, that after serving for years in the national Government, I could 'come home again.'

"Certainly, nothing could be more pleasing to me than to come home to Aiken, where I first became a candidate for public office and receive from you such a cordial welcome. The people of Aiken have always been good to me. I shall always be grateful to them.

"From the bottom of my heart I appreciate the generous statements of the friends who have spoken tonight.

"I confess, however, that while listening to the speakers I have been a little depressed. I feared my friends were under the mistaken impression that I was now to be counted among the departed instead of the retired. However, I have been comforted by the thought, based upon recent press stories, that some very prominent persons in the city of Washington evidently do not count me among the departed.

"I am indebted to the Chamber of Commerce for arranging this dinner.

"When the chairman of the committee wrote that April 16 had been fixed for the dinner, and hoped it was agreeable, I replied in the affirmative. Neither then nor later did these businessmen mention to me any political subject.

"I regret that this dinner should have so disturbed some of our friends in Washington. Their dinner has not bothered me. I hope it has not bothered you.

"From the printed list of public offices held by me, you know my life has been a busy one. I recall still another job. While living here I found time to join A. K. Lorenz in publishing the Journal and Review. Then it was a semiweekly publication. When I got into politics, I got out of the newspaper business. Then the Journal and Review began to grow. Now it is a progressive daily, published by the able Mrs. King, and I boast that I was once connected with the organization.

"Much has been said of my service in public office. The opposition I aroused while in office was exceeded only by the loyalty of my friends.

"The man who serves in public office soon learns that he cannot please all the people all the time. If he tries, he will please nobody.

"He should realize that the best politics is no politics.

"If he intends to make public service a career, he should do what he believes to be right and hope to convince a majority of the people of the rightness of his decision.

"Early he should realize he cannot seek riches and at the same time hold public office. He must decide whether his goal shall be to make money or to render public service.

"In this State our democratic primary elections are really democratic,—spelled with a small "d." In these elections, Democrats, Republicans, Socialists—men and women of all political faiths—can vote.

"The man who is nominated in the Democratic primary, is in effect, elected, because those who participate in the primary are pledged to support the winner in that primary.

"He owes his election to the people. He is obligated to them and not to any national political organization.

"The system has many disadvantages but at least one advantage. The successful candidate is independent. No political organization or political boss can tell him how to vote. In fact, it would be difficult for a man to be elected to office if he can be successfully labeled the candidate of a boss.

"During the period of my public service we have witnessed remarkable progress in this State.

"We will agree that during the past 40 years the Southern Negro has made greater progress than has any race in world history. It has been accomplished only by the cooperation and help of the white people of the South.

"I am proud of that progress. I hope it will continue, notwithstanding the efforts of those misinformed and misguided people who would endanger its continuance by seeking to change overnight by judicial decree the laws of our States and the customs of our people.

"We are proud, too, of the educational advancement of our white people. That progress has been reflected in the electorate. Education has made difficult the success of the demagog. Increasing educational opportunities have brought about increasing independence.

"In the Democratic convention in 1952 leaders of the national party did not listen to the protests of southern Democrats against the adoption of the loyalty oath. But the voices that could not be heard in the convention were heard in the election. This week the press advises us that next year the party leaders will change the rules of the convention and abandon the loyalty oath.

"I hope the leaders of the Republican Party will note that change of heart by the Democratic leaders. I hope they will realize that today when southerners say they are no longer 'in the bag' politically they mean they are not 'in the bag' for either the Democratic or Republican Party.

"They are determined hereafter to use the brains God gave them to promote that which is best for their country and their States. They will place the welfare of the country above the success of any political party.

"Listening to the eulogies by my friends, I realize you permitted me to participate in national and international affairs during one of the most interesting periods of the history of our country. It included service in the House of Representatives during World War I. It included service in the Senate during the great depression. In the Senate I saw the beginning of World War II.

"I was happy in my service upon the Supreme Court. However, when asked by President Roosevelt to serve during the war in the capacity he called 'Assistant President,' I did not hesitate to resign.

"As I talk in this personal way to old friends, I should like to say, as a matter of history, that when the end of the war was approaching and I resigned as Director of War Mobilization, President Roosevelt told me he regretted having asked me to leave the Supreme Court to help him, knowing how service upon the Court appealed to lawyers. He said he expected an early vacancy on the Court and intended to appoint me to fill that vacancy.

"I reminded the President that he had not asked me to resign; that he asked that I take a leave of absence. I felt that would be unwise, would hurt the Court, and insisted upon resigning. To his offer to reappoint me to the Court I said that would give his political enemies an opportunity to charge that he was complying with a previous agreement to reappoint me, and I would not accept it. This was in March 1945, 2 days before the President left for Warm Springs, where he died.

"I would not on this occasion attempt to discuss my services as Director of War Mobilization and, particularly, Secretary of State. I do say that in the light of the current discussions about another four power conference, my experience taught me that peace depends not upon what is written in agreements at the conference table, but what is in the hearts of the men at the table. What is in their hearts can be better judged by what they do than by what they say.

"I agree with the President, that before he sits down with Soviet leaders to discuss what should now be done to put an end to the cold war, the Soviets, by their actions, should have some concrete evidence that they want to meet in the interest of promoting peace and not for propaganda.

"The President's attitude of firmness and Soviet fear of a rearmed Germany has influenced the Soviets to agree to end their occupation of Austria. The action is encouraging but does not justify the praise bestowed upon them.

"In October 1943, the Soviets joined Britain and the United States in a declaration that Austria should be restored as an independent state. At Potsdam, in 1945, I heard Stalin say that reparations should not be demanded of Austria.

"Despite these declarations, the Soviets have occupied Austria for 10 years. They now demand reparations. For 10 years they have held thousands of Austrian prisoners of war in violation of international law. For 2 years, whenever I met with the Soviets, I pleaded for a peace treaty for Austria. They would not even consider the request. The efforts of my successors likewise failed.

"When they now agree to do what they should have done 10 years ago, it is only because they fear a rearmed Germany allied with the West.

"The President may decide to attend a four power conference. But I hope our Government will stand firm and remain strong, because the Soviets have respect only for firmness and force.

"The praise heaped upon me tonight has made me grateful and humble. If I thought there was justification for even a part of it, if as Director of War Mobilization, I contributed to the success of our war effort; if as Secretary of State, I helped the Western World to a keener appreciation of the danger confronting us; if, as governor, I made a worthwhile contribution to the program of industrialization, and, above all, to the education of our children, I would indeed be happy.

"In any happiness I might experience, the people of this community and this State must share, for it is they who gave me the opportunity to render public service.

"Like all of you here tonight, I could live elsewhere. But I would rather live in South Carolina than any place on earth. I am proud of its past and confident of its future. I love the State because of what it is. I love the people because of what they are and I love them for what they have done for me."

Senator THURMOND said: "There are so many things so well known about the man we honor here tonight that few things could be said which are not already familiar to all of you. However, there are several things, I am sure, the gentlemen who are to speak will talk about that all of us do not know about Governor Byrnes.

"Often it is true that great men grown in greatness in direct proportion to the distance we stay away from them or they grow in greatness with time after they are no longer in the public eye. Governor Byrnes is not like either of these two kinds of men.

"He is one whose greatness is realized even more when we are close to him. His ability and integrity have always stood unquestioned as he has been subjected to the constant scrutiny of critical appraisal throughout his career of 45 years.

"It is true that time has enhanced our respect for him, but not because we have been looking back on some one no longer active in public life. It has been because as he continued in public office, we have been better able to recognize the qualities covered by a simple modesty becoming one of such stature.

"Governor Byrnes gave up world renown to return home and earn for himself greater recognition and greater appreciation by taking up the responsibilities of a critical period in South Carolina history.

"Sometimes the facing of day-to-day problems, such as some of those which confronted him, was more difficult than the more remote and less tangible matters of world affairs. I am sure that he encountered no harder problems nor any less susceptible to solution than some of those he faced during the 4 years he served South Carolina as governor.

"I suspect there were times when he would not have been unhappy to have exchanged the governor's chair for a place across the table from old acquaintances who spoke in foreign languages.

"But whether James F. Byrnes occupied a chair at the conference table in Moscow, in Paris or in London—or whether he occupied the governor's seat—or sat on the Supreme Court—or at the President's right hand—or in the United States Senate, or in the House—he always kept a perspective which many covet but few attain.

"Whatever he has been and whatever his mission, Governor Byrnes has had the thoughtfulness and has taken time to remember those around him. He has made their problems his problems, he has made himself responsible for doing good for his fellow South Carolinians and for his fellow men.

"Many who attain high position—yes, even greatness—lose the relationship of friend to friend with the people they represent. But Governor Byrnes has deepened and strengthened the ties of friendship among the people of his native State, even though for long periods he seldom had the pleasure of seeing them and participating in the friendly relationships which he so deeply enjoys.

"I hope that he will have the opportunity in the years to come to catch up on those moments he has given up in past years while he so unstintingly served his State and his Nation."

Tribute to the Exiles of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Sunday evening last I was privileged to deliver a talk to the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, at the Carnegie Endowment Hall, New York City. The talk was entitled "Tribute to

the Exiles of Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE EXILES OF FREEDOM

(Remarks of Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, before the Second International Congress of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, at the Carnegie Endowment Building for International Peace, New York City, April 17, 1955)

Scarcely 2 weeks ago announcement was made by a Lithuanian newspaper in Chicago of the death of Canon Antanas Petraitis, a Christian martyr to the communistic terror. It was 14 years ago, serving as pastor in the Lithuanian community of Erzvilkas, that he was arrested by the robot agents of the dictator at the Kremlin and subjected to unspeakable tortures designed to crush his will and destroy his soul. He was one of the few survivors of the death march to the Cherven Forest, where thousands were shot down because they were deemed dangerous to the plans of the dictatorship because they preferred death to the loss of liberty.

I pay my tribute tonight to this noble priest, and to all others of the Baltic peoples who were the first victims of the vast plan of Soviet Russia to conquer the world. These men and women, who had the spiritual capacity to resist inhuman torture rather than surrender the freedom with which they were endowed by their Creator, have given us and all the people of the world the example that must be followed before liberty can triumph over force. They are not forgotten by the exiles who have escaped from Central Europe and who have gathered here to keep alive the basic concept of individual freedom which all christendom has cherished for 20 centuries.

With humility and a deep sense of my own inability to pronounce a fitting epitaph for those who have already made or are still to make the sacrifice of their lives in this struggle, I have accepted the invitation to speak here tonight and shall try to outline some of the facts which it seems to me we must never forget if civilization is to survive this, its most terrible crisis. Note I do not say if religion is to survive, because of that I have no doubt. The soul of man cannot be liquidated by the tortures of the tyrant because it is the breath of God. Men were made free by their Creator. This knowledge has sustained the people of Europe and the people of all countries to which the message of christendom has gone. It will sustain them now but we must all know that the triumph of the spiritual over the evils of materialism can be permanently won only by those who are willing to sacrifice the temporary material values of life in order to preserve the eternal values bestowed by God Himself upon every human soul.

The struggle in which we are involved is the conflict between the spiritual and the materialistic. The human race, through all written history, has made frequent compromise with the evil of materialism, and has endured wars in the hope that they would speedily pass away, that peace would be restored, and that mankind would once again return to the pursuit of spiritual and cultural objectives. But compromise has failed. The Napoleonic Wars ended at Waterloo in 1815. Not until 55 years later did the Franco-Prussian War begin. Only 44 years of peace intervened before World War I broke out and, after 4 years of the most terrible military slaughter in all the previous history of mankind, all the peoples of the world cherished the hope that with the foundation of the League of Nations peace among men had at last been attained, but only 21 years elapsed before the Second World War was launched in 1939. With vastly improved engines of destruction, with mounting casualties, with war raging on land, on sea, in the air above, and in the deep oceans underneath, the capacity of man to destroy himself reached its zenith. When the shooting stopped, once again men cried peace, but there is no peace. The few treaties which have been written and the termination of the shooting have not yet revealed how war may be abolished and justice among men and nations attained. In the 140 years which have elapsed since the capture of Napoleon, the intervals of peace between wars have been growing steadily shorter, and no answer has yet appeared to the question every man asks in his heart how can permanent peace be attained?

There was a time when wars were fought by only a portion of the population and under rules that save the open city from destruction, when women and children were spared. These were days when poets would have us believe that knighthood was in flower. There was chivalry, there was tolerance during the small wars fought during the Christian era, but we live in a time when such rules of warfare have utterly disappeared. This century has seen the development of planned total war in which not only the men in uniform are involved in conflict but when the unarmed civilian population has no protection from ruthless attack. In the war against Japan, this Nation dropped the atom bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was the ultimate in force. It stopped the fighting but it did not bring peace.

It should be plain to us, therefore, why even the greatest of military leaders tell us that war is outmoded. It was Napoleon, when his days of battle and conquest were over, who confessed as he looked back upon his life that he was amazed at "the impotence of force to organize anything." Even the most successful of modern military leaders see the futility of force as Napoleon did. "There are only two powers in the world," he said, "the spirit and the sword. In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the spirit." Napoleon died, an impersonation of the failure of force, but wars continued.

In our generation another great military leader who in World War II led the forces of the allies in Asia, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, came to the same conclusion. I was in the House of Representatives on the 19th of April 1951, when he spoke to the Congress of the United States about war. He was the commander of all the forces of the allies in Asia when, on September 2, 1945, on the battleship *Missouri* he accepted the surrender of Japan. All the memories of his experience in two World Wars were fresh in his mind when he spoke to the Congress. I give you his testimony:

"I know war as few other men now living know it," he told us, "and nothing today is more revolting. I have long advocated its complete abolition as its very destructiveness on both friend and foe has rendered it useless as a means of settling international disputes."

"Useless," he said it was, having in mind the capture of the Philippines by Japan while he was the commander, having in mind his return and his recapture of the Philippines, having in mind the dropping of the bombs and the surrender of Japan. He then quoted from his utterance made on the deck of the battleship *Missouri* when Japan surrendered.

"Military alliances," he said, "balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war." He was explaining why World War I had failed to bring peace to the world and why, when the Second World War occurred, we felt compelled to enter it and use all the inventions and weapons that science had achieved. He had seen at first hand what total war means and so he quoted from that speech on the battleship *Missouri*, giving us a message which we can forget only at the peril of losing the great western civilization which is the world's heritage from Christianity.

"The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative," he said, meaning, of course, the use of the most destructive weapons the human mind can conceive. Some other alternative than force, he was telling the world, has to be found, saying:

"We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door."

It is not necessary to depend solely upon the opinions of the great generals of the world. I could recite here how Alexander of Greece, when he had no more worlds to conquer, tried to turn to thoughts of peace. I could tell the story of the Christian concepts of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant and Gen. Robert E. Lee when the great trial of the Civil War came to an end in this country. But I shall be content to give you the facts which show that force defeats itself.

Even the dictators eventually kill one another off. Of Lenin's inner circle, only he and Stalin survived to die natural deaths. The others were liquidated. A dozen ministers were purged. High officials in the Communist Party central organization, more than half of the Communists who wrote the Soviet Constitution, military leader after military leader, all of them experts in torture, ruthless and faithless, were themselves the victims of the dictatorial system they were trying to enforce upon the world. It is a system which cannot last because it is a system without faith. It believes in neither God nor man, and because of this lack of spiritual faith it consumes its own adherents.

What then is the alternative to which MacArthur said man must turn? What is the method by which in this century the spirit will conquer the sword, as Napoleon predicted? Perhaps it is too simple to be understood. Surely no one knows better than the descendants of the people of Western Europe the great spiritual triumphs which marked the civilization of Christendom. All the terror and slavery of paganism were unable to crush the spirit and the will of the people who had the faith to believe in and the courage to live by the principle of the Christian religion that God lives and calls to those who will to be free.

Society, any society, is an organism which reflects the spirit of the individuals who constitute it. The relationship between God and man is the relationship between God and every man. When into any society there enters the materialism of paganism, that society inevitably falls to lower standards of character and morality. We have lived in a time in which too many individuals have set aside the concepts of religious faith and have worshiped before the image of the Golden Calf. That is the symbol of materialism. But it is not the symbol of the millions of the people who have received and accepted the heritage of Christendom.

The men and women who founded this country, the United States of America, were men and women of deep religious faith. That was why they wrote into the Declaration of Independence the plain and specific recognition of the fact that man has certain inalienable rights which were given to him by the Creator.

The men and women of the Baltic States and of Europe also have cherished the same faith. It was this deep conviction that enabled them to stand unyielding before the faithless and cowardly minions of the Communist dictators and endure the most inhuman torture rather than sacrifice that share of divinity which they had received from the Creator.

The conflict between the spiritual ideology and the ideology of materialism which now threatens the world with a third global conflict is essentially a moral struggle for the independence of the souls of men. It is not at all a struggle for wealth and power. It is a struggle to preserve the basic concepts of tolerance among men, mutual recognition of the dignity of the human individual faith, hope, and charity, the virtues recognized by all Christians and the Fatherhood of God.

This, if I understand the motives and purposes of the exiles of freedom, is the faith you hold. It is the faith for which you have sacrificed and your relatives and friends have suffered and died. It is the faith which binds you together in this organization, an organization which makes a link between the people of America and the people who live behind the Iron Curtain and along its fringes as well. It provides a means by which as individuals we can all carry the message of Christendom to all other individuals with whom we come in contact. No people want war, but wars come. Perhaps it is because leadership has been inadequate to the task of creating the organization that is capable of preserving peace, or individuals, faltering in their faith, have been willing for selfish and temporary gain to make a little genuflection to the Golden Calf.

You and your associates possess the moral fiber which every individual of every nation desiring to be free should possess. Moral fiber can be disseminated throughout the world by the example every believer in the spiritual motivation of mankind can give to those with whom he comes in contact.

The individual who, in this crisis of civilization, falls below the standards of faith in the spiritual concepts of Christendom weakens by that failure the moral fiber of every nation which really loves and wants freedom. Every such individual impairs the capacity of his nation to participate in the struggle of the free world against the evil forces of totalitarian dictatorship that have been released against it, but he who adheres to the spiritual concept of Christian civilization adds to the strength of freemen everywhere.

The character and morality which are cherished in our daily lives, in home life, in business and professional life, the faith we cherish in the bond between man and God, these and these only are the means by which the spirit shall eventually triumph over force.

Organized as you have organized them, men and women living by the faith that is in them can build a barrier of spirit that Communist force can never overcome.

Remarks of Senator Goldwater at Commissioning of U. S. S. "Hassayampa"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] honored the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by his presence at the commissioning of the U. S. S. *Hassayampa*, which is named for a river in the State of Arizona. He delivered a very interesting and able address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U. S. S. "HASSAYAMPA," PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 19, 1955

As we gather here this afternoon in sight of one of the landmarks of American history to commission this new ship, you might well wonder about the name that has been chosen. Surely to most of you here as to most people east of the Rockies the name Hassayampa brings nothing quickly to mind except that it is unusual and somewhat hard to spell. There is even serious question in my mind if many of you have ever heard it used before in conversation or have seen it printed in a story or on a map. Consequently, I approach my pleasant assignment this afternoon with mixed feelings—one, that my remarks might be educational to most of you, but, even more dominant, the feeling of humility, in that this name, Hassayampa, is one that every Arizonan knows and of whose history is deeply and rightfully proud.

Hassayampa is the name carried by one of Arizona's few but famous rivers. We are a dry State when measured by the standards of rainfall and moisture; ours is not a State of vast water resources, ours is primarily a desert area. Even our forests, and they are vast and among the largest in the world, are classed as desert forests because there are not many bubbling streams marking their soft carpets nor does one find moss and fern, usually associated with such growths of trees. Natural lakes are few but those we have sparkle with the exuberance of diamonds among the dark green of the pines. It is easy, then, for one to imagine the enthusiasm we Arizonans have for our lakes and for our rivers and, recognizing that, you can imagine how proud we out there were made when it was announced that this fine new ship was to carry the name of *Hassayampa*.

I said that this was a river. Yes, but not just another river. It is a special one, for within its banks flows the water that we need so greatly for our lands, and along its banks has occurred much of the history of this great State.

It is a lonesone river. Its birthplace is in a small canyon high up on the northern slopes of Mount Union, a peak rising over 7,000 feet into Arizona's glorious blue sky. It is fed by springs and by the melting snows of winter and by the sometimes gentle and sometimes violent rains of the summer months. Up high in those mountains, as it flows over rocks and soft sands, it tells a murmuring tale that has lulled me to sleep many a night as I have camped by its side. It tells of the men who first came to its headwaters to mine gold. It tells of the now ghost town of Senator where men gathered as they sought the yellow richness which the Hassayampa carried from ancient rocks. It breathes the wonderful story of nearby Prescott which was the first capital of our State, where our laws were written, where our early government was hewn out of argument and debate by solid American men who saw in this new country a place where their families could be reared in the American tradition. It whispers the stories of men made rich and men made poor and men who were strong and ruthless and men who were strong and peaceful. It is a wonderful story to hear and many and many a time my memory carries me back to the days of youth and to the upper Hassayampa and its bed lined with the pines whose tips touch the sky and go into the heavens to seek God.

But this is not all of this river; it is a lonesome river I have said, but it is also an ambitious one, for it would not die in those peaks, but sought the arid lands below where its waters could do more for men than just provide the carrier for gold. So it left those peaks for the greenness of the lower mountain valleys where the cattle would come to drink of its waters, down past the settlement of Waggoner it went, and then, leaving the cool and vast valleys it ventured out onto the desert floor of southern Arizona where it soon wore its own roadway of sand and rock. Here developed a battle with the sun as to whether or not this stream would carry its load above the earth or whether it would have to go to the coolness and the sureness of traveling beneath its sandy bed. The sun often wins out and for many miles of its travels across the desert one cannot see water but one knows, as generations of desert dwellers have known, that a scooping out of the sand will bring into that bowl cool and abundant water for drinking. In fact, one of the meanings of this famed word has been ascribed to the Indian meaning "water that is hidden." As one crosses this stream at Wickenburg on Highway 60, if one is a stranger, one might wonder why a bridge here at all for here the water is hidden. It is hiding from the ever-present suction of the sun who seeks its cool waters for its own empty daylight skies, but this stream, which is empty, can fill quickly. As the great thunderheads of summer fill their black bellies with the moisture stolen from a thousand lakes and vast oceans and meager streams, and finally disgorge themselves over the homeland of the Hassayampa and its smaller tributaries, this usually docile stream fills to the banks with raging and often damaging water, roaring and tearing its way down its mountainous course, carrying tree and rock before it, out onto the vast desert and past Wickenburg to lose itself finally in the dryness of its lower bed as the sky gives no more.

Wickenburg. This is the one settlement of any size on the banks of this lonely stream, but it is one of the West's most fabulous places. Its history goes back to the beginning of the West and to the swaddling days of our Territory. Just a few months after Arizona became a Territory of the United States, Henry Wickenburg, in 1863, discovered a vast cache of gold that the earth was tenaciously holding in her grasp. The resulting mine became known as the Vulture, and from it man took millions of dollars worth of gold. The mine needed a mill, and the waters of the Hassayampa provided the water to run it. It also furnished the growing town of Wickenburg, named after the obscure miner, with water for its population. The town grew fast, and by 1866 was large enough to have been considered as a site for the Territorial capital. Nearby, other mines were established, the Congress, the Constellation, and the Mack Morris, and all of them added to the new stature of the town of Wickenburg. It was a robust town, peopled by men and women of the hearty nature of our early pioneers. They were happy in this new town, and as the gold started to be exhausted, they did not wish to leave the banks of their friendly river, but sought, instead, new ways to perpetuate their community's prosperity and growth. The railroad came, and with it Wickenburg became a cattle-shipping point. The ranches grew, and so did the town, but then came modern man and his way of life, and the oldness of our western towns began to disappear before the chrome and gilt of newness, but not this place where the West had so long been a part of the daily lives of its people. Here the West stayed, and today it is the guest-ranch capital of the world, a city seen daily by thousands, a city where one finds all the newness of this age, but sees and senses always the true and real spirit of the West. Here, the high-heeled boot is not just part of a uniform, but it joins the large hat and the open shirt in their adornment of people whose "hello" is meaningful and whose "good day" comes from the heart long before it gets out of the mouth. Here it is warm in the winter and warm in the summer, but over all this warmth of nature is felt the warmth of people who, above all else, want to remain just people. Theirs is no desire for tall smokestacks, or the rat-tat-tat of the rivet gun, or the hustle that goes with the change

they would rather not have. They know that as long as man lives he will have a desire for peace and quiet and the calm reassurance of real friends. They know that this place on the banks of the river whose name this ship proudly carries can be that Shangri-la, can be a port where men can always come who come in the spirit of the West, seeking happy relations with neighbors who want the same. Wickenburg is the old with just enough of the new thrown in to make life comfortable according to our modern standards. It is the new, with an abundance of the old thrown in so that we can remember the faith and the hope and the spirit which made our West great. And the lonesome Hassayampa flows past it, sometimes under the sand and sometimes over the sand, as it goes on to its eventual union with the Gila River many miles below where the desert has given way to man's conquering march of reclamation.

That is the river whose name you will carry, but the tale cannot end there for the name itself has special significance in the minds of Arizonians. Many tales have come down through the years about the potent characteristics of the waters of the Hassayampa. We aren't quite agreed as to which fable is correct and history has not given us much help, either, in her constant tests. One version of it has it that he who drinks above the trail is ever truthful, while he who drinks below is lost to truth. In fact, some of my fellow Arizonians say that to call a man a Hassayamp is to call him a liar, but as I said, history has not been faithful to that and I have seen many truthful men whose life's liquid came from that stream and I have seen many of the other category who never quaffed its waters. Then there is the little poem of Orick Jackson's that denies a man the right to drink downstream or upstream as his choice for future veracity.

"You've heard about the wondrous stream
they call the Hassayamp.
They say it turns a truthful guy into a
lying scamp.

"And if you quaff its waters once, it's sure
to prove your bane,
You'll never forsake the blasted stream, or
tell the truth again."

This afternoon, as we face this most pleasant task, I have related to you a bit of the history and charm of this river, Hassayampa. I told you that the Indians called it hidden water, but they also construe its ageless name to mean beautiful water and that is the name I want to recall as we dedicate this ship to the useful purposes it will pursue. This bottle of water has been sent here by the people of Wickenburg. I hope it retains a prominent and perpetual spot in the wardroom so that those who sail this ship might be ever mindful of the pride we Arizonians have in that name, and be mindful too of the new pride which we will carry in our hearts as this ship cleaves the oceans of the world. Thus, the waters of the Hassayampa will go around the globe, seeking everywhere an answer to the question that has always been asked about the veracity of those who partook, for you see that answer has never come forth, since only honest men and women, dedicated to the perpetuation of our American way of life have lived along its course. What happened to those who partook and wandered on we do not know, but we do know that through truthfulness, honesty, and devotion to our fine cause our State has grown to great stature and her people to great respect. It is my wish, and I but reflect the wishes of the people of Arizona, that the course of this ship be ever honest, ever true, and that the close association with this great name will bring true at least a line of that poem I read. "You'll never forsake the blasted stream," and I assure you that neither it, nor the State I represent, will ever forsake you.

Proposed Revision of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week former President Harry S. Truman made a statement before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations studying possible revision of the United Nations Charter. It was a clear, forceful, and very thought-provoking statement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Truman on the U. N."

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

Senator GEORGE, members of the committee, Senators, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to testify before you today. I am grateful to Senator GEORGE for his invitation.

I understand that the subject you have under consideration is the amending of the Charter of the United Nations.

The United Nations is now almost 10 years old. This has been a rough and stormy decade for an organization dedicated to the cause of world peace. Since the Charter was signed in San Francisco, an international situation has developed which in many ways is far more serious, far more dangerous, than the international rivalries which produced World War I and World War II. The present international situation is worse than the one which wrecked the League of Nations and rendered it ineffective. Nevertheless, one of the most significant things about the world situation today is that the United Nations still exists. It is still a functioning body with a powerful influence. In spite of dissatisfactions and dissensions, none of the great powers has withdrawn. Whatever its weakness and difficulties, the United Nations is a power to be reckoned with, and no aggressor can afford to ignore it.

This, in and of itself, is a great achievement. The mere existence of the United Nations after a period of such terrible international tension, is an important and hopeful fact. It demonstrates the tremendous underlying desire of all peoples for international peace.

I will go even further than this. I believe that if we had not had the United Nations, the events of these last 10 years would again have plunged the world into unlimited international warfare. The fact that we have not had such a war is attributable in considerable measure to the existence of the United Nations.

In my judgment, the United Nations is an indispensable force for peace in the world today.

It is true, of course, that the present status of the United Nations does not correspond to the high hopes which were held for it when it was first created. Nevertheless, those of us who helped to set up the United Nations knew that it would have a long and difficult task. We did not go overboard on the assumption that once the Charter was signed, world peace was assured forever.

I remember very well the circumstances under which the United Nations was created. The first question that was asked me after I took the oath of office as President at 7:09 p. m. on April 12, 1945, was whether I wanted the San Francisco Conference to open as planned on April 25. I answered at once that nothing should interfere with that conference. It was my firm conviction on that night just 10 years ago that the establishment of the United Nations was absolutely essential to the maintenance of world peace and I knew that the great majority of the American people felt the same way. I recall my surprise that there should be doubt in anyone's mind about holding the San Francisco meeting to draft the United Nations Charter on schedule.

I soon found out that the eagerness we felt in the United States for the success of the San Francisco Conference was not felt universally. Representatives of the Soviet Union had participated in the preliminary meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, and Stalin had pledged the support of his country to the United Nations at Yalta.

But the victory in Europe now seemed certain, and the Soviet leaders seemed to feel that they could turn their backs on their promises. They implied that the United Nations was not so important after all, and that Foreign Minister Molotov would not attend the San Francisco meeting. This looked to me like a double-barreled challenge: First, would we accept without protest the breaking of an understanding that the Foreign Ministers of the principal powers would attend, and more important, could we permit the Soviets to torpedo the Conference by openly showing a lack of interest?

Just because the end of the war in Europe was in sight I had no intention of ignoring agreements that had been made during the heat of combat. The United Nations idea was too important for the future of mankind to be treated in an on-and-off fashion. I informed Premier Stalin that it was imperative for Foreign Minister Molotov to attend. The Soviet leaders reconsidered, and a few days later I had a rather frank meeting with Mr. Molotov in my office on his way to join the San Francisco Conference.

I explained to him at that time the unshakable desire of our people for an organization that could effectively solve political problems before they broke into conflict, and that could assist governments to improve the well-being of peoples throughout the world. I expressed these same thoughts in equally vigorous terms to Premier Stalin at Potsdam a few weeks later. Stalin was, I believe, extremely impressed with the overwhelming vote of 89 to 2 by which the United States Senate approved the charter on July 28. He, and many others, apparently had felt that the United States would lose interest in the rest of the world as soon as the fighting was over and would repeat the mistakes made after the First World War.

Speaking as a private citizen, I am very proud that the support for the United Nations, declared so vigorously by the Senate that day in 1945, has been staunchly maintained by both Houses of the Congress ever since then.

We knew at the time the United Nations was created that we were having difficulties with the Soviet leaders and that our difficulties might increase. We were determined, nevertheless, to go ahead with the creation of the United Nations and to get the Soviet Union into it, committed to the principles of international peace which are expressed in the charter. Without such a commitment on their part we believed that the United Nations would not be successful. Looking back now, I think this was the correct course. We were striving to prevent the East-West split which has now become known as the "cold war." We were striving to set up an organization which would bridge the split. Of course, no charter, no constitution can wipe out a power conflict. We must not blame the United Nations for all the bad things that have happened outside the United Nations and in violation of its principles. Soviet membership in the United Nations has been

an advantage to the cause of peace, because the peoples of the world have been able to compare the Soviet's conduct to the standards of international peace laid down in the charter and to see that the Soviets have violated the basic ideals of mankind.

When the charter was created at San Francisco, we did not believe that it was perfect. We were surprised that a charter could be agreed upon at all by so many different nations and peoples. In my address to the closing session of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco I said:

"That we now have this charter at all is a great wonder."

I also said:

"This charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into any fixed mold. Changing world conditions will require readjustments, but they will be the readjustments of peace and not of war."

And at that time we clearly left the door open for improvement.

I am sure the charter is susceptible of improvement. That is true of all documents written by human hands. But we ought not to underestimate the difficulties and dangers involved in trying to get improvements at this time. And we ought to be extremely careful not to lose what we already have in the United Nations, because what we have now is very essential to world peace.

We should consider that the circumstances were more favorable to getting agreement out of 50 different nations in 1945 than they are now. Difficult as it was then, and imperfect as the result may have been, it was far easier to set up the United Nations in 1945 than it would be to set it up today.

This was the world situation in June 1945: We were still fighting a world war. We had finished the war in Europe, but a long, bloody struggle appeared to be ahead in the Pacific and in Asia. We did not know how long it would take or how many casualties it would cost. We were just finishing the battle for Okinawa. The great army which the Japanese had on the continent of Asia was still untouched. The Japanese Air Force, Navy, and land forces were being concentrated for the defense of the Japanese islands. Weakened though they were by our successes in the Pacific, they were still capable of a fanatical defense of their homeland. Secretary Stimson informed me that it could cost 1 million American casualties to take Japan.

All around the world nations were prostrate and exhausted from 4 years of conflict. In this atmosphere of suffering, uncertainty, and continued fighting, the people yearned for peace. Statesmen were under pressure from their peoples to make concessions that would bring peace to the world. Peace and an end to suffering were the universal cry, even on the part of the Russians, whose losses had been among the worst suffered by any nation.

These were the circumstances in which the charter was drawn up and signed. I do not have to point out that it would be much harder to get similar agreements from national leaders in 1955 than it was in 1945. And I respectfully suggest that this is something you should always have in mind when you consider amending the charter today.

We signed the charter at San Francisco with a clear realization that the charter itself was not enough to guarantee world peace. As I said in addressing the closing session of the United Nations Conference, we had created a great instrument for peace and security, but we must now use it.

During the intervening years, we have used the charter, and we have found in it not only defects and inadequacies, but unsuspected resources. We have discovered some virtues which we did not know it possessed.

In spite of the obstruction of the Soviet Union and its satellites, we have had the united will and the firm determination of a great number of nations to make the charter work. And their will for peace has been so strong that they have used the charter in ways not foreseen at San Francisco. For example, let us take the history of the Security Council. On this organ of the United Nations most of the job of keeping the peace was intended to rest. However, the frequent use of the Soviet veto rendered the Security Council virtually powerless to meet any serious international difficulty. Consequently, in 1950, a good deal of the burden of keeping the peace was shifted from the Security Council to the General Assembly. This was done without an amendment of the charter but by the so-called "Uniting for Peace" resolution. Under that resolution, the General Assembly undertook to make recommendations for maintaining the peace where the Security Council was paralyzed by the veto.

This was an important change.

The fact that the General Assembly under the charter cannot require action by the member states but can only recommend action, is not so important as it seems. In any critical situation where a nation may be called on to use its armed forces or to apply sanctions, there must be assent. Few nations are going to go into that sort of a situation unless they feel they ought to do it. And a recommendation of the 60 nations, constituting the General Assembly, may be more effective as an expression of world conscience than the command of 11 nations on the Security Council.

I am not saying that the charter would not work better if it were possible for the Security Council to perform the functions that were envisioned for it, but I am saying that the veto power has not made the United Nations powerless to keep the peace.

I do not wish, at this time, to get into the technical problems of amending the charter. I believe that we should think about them. I believe that we should study them. If the majority of the nations desire a review conference, I do not think we should oppose it. I only believe that we should approach it with caution and with full realization that it may be impossible to get any worthwhile changes under present circumstances. If we go into such a conference with inflexible demands for particular changes, we can be sure that we will encounter strong Communist opposition, and there may be strong differences of opinion among the free nations, and the net result of such a clash may be concentration by the peoples of the world on the defects rather than on the virtues of the charter and a weakening of the United Nations just when strength is most needed. This could do very great damage so far as the effectiveness of the United Nations is concerned.

I do, however, think we should practice vigorously the idea expressed at the signing of the charter in 1945—the idea that we must use the United Nations to make it work. Wherever we can, we should use it. And we should use it now by bringing before the General Assembly the current threats to world peace.

Aside from questions of aggression and armed conflict, there is another wide area in which we should use the United Nations to the utmost—that is the area of social and economic betterment and progress.

An outstanding feature of the charter is the emphasis it puts upon international cooperation to promote higher living standards, full employment, and economic and social progress. One of the most important parts of the United Nations is the Economic and Social Council. This council has the responsibility for promoting international cooperation in the economic and social field, and for coordinating the work of the other international agencies specializing in particular fields of work, such as health, agriculture, and communications.

One of the reasons for the world crisis we are living through is the tremendous upheaval—in social and economic terms—among the peoples of the poorer or less developed parts of the world. Most of these peoples have lived for centuries very close to the margin of existence, with little hope for progress or improvement this side of the grave. In the last hundred years two tremendous things have happened to them. Contact with the highly developed nations has shown them that other peoples can overcome poverty and misery—that progress and improvement are human possibilities. The growth of population, however, has tended to make them even worse off than they have been. Added to these factors, the spread of western political ideas has given them an irresistible desire to be free and self-governing. The upheaval resulting from these changes has remade the face of Asia in our lifetime, and it is now changing the face of Africa.

We want to see these peoples advance and prosper. For many decades now, through our humanitarian institutions, we have extended a helping hand to the peoples of the less developed countries.

Today, we should realize that no force on earth can restore the old pattern in Asia and Africa. We cannot put the rising flood of human aspirations back into the ancient channels.

We can, however, help it to achieve its goals. And that will be to the advantage of the United States as well as to mankind as a whole.

This was what I had in mind when I proposed a program of assisting underdeveloped areas as the fourth point in my inaugural address in 1949. And this same concept of assistance on the path of progress underlies the economic and social activities of the United Nations.

In the years since 1945, nothing has happened to make economic development and technical assistance less important. Indeed, I think they are more important to world peace now than they were then. We should be doing more in the economic and social area than we are doing. We should stand, in the minds of other peoples, for the concept of orderly and rapid social and economic progress.

In this field, we have the answer to communism. In know-how, in the raising of living standards, in economic development, we can beat the Communists from the start. There is no atomic stalemate, no military standoff in this part of the struggle against communism. We ought to sustain a really significant program of aid in the economic development of Asia and Africa and Latin America. While we must, of course, continue our military programs for our defense and the defense of the free world, a vigorous program of economic development may, in the long run, prove to be more decisive.

In this effort the United Nations, with its economic and social organs and the specialized agencies, can be a great help. Providing technical and economic aid through international agencies offers difficulties in administration and often presents irritating problems. But an international agency sometimes can do things that direct United States aid cannot. The Soviets, in their propaganda, are trying to discredit our aid programs as an imperialist plot. But that kind of propaganda cannot be raised against the United Nations. Very often the governments of the underdeveloped areas are highly sensitive, and will accept U. N. help when they would reject United States aid. The question of who gets the credit is much less important than the need of the underdeveloped nations to get ahead, and to relieve the terrible social pressures that are pushing them toward revolution or communism.

We should, therefore, encourage the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in their economic and social activities, and support them fully. Wherever they can reach the poor and the suffering better than the United States Government can, we should encourage them to do so. I hope we will not cut the United Nations technical assistance program this year.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I urge you to continue to give your strong support to the United Nations. It is helping to build up international understanding and friendship among people by the nations working together on economic and social problems. It serves as a conscience for mankind. More than once it has kept the peace where a serious outbreak threatened—as it did in Iran and in Indonesia. And in the fateful summer of 1950, when the aggressor broke the peace of the world in Korea, the United Nations met the challenge. For the first time in history, an international organization organized effective collective resistance to armed aggression. This is the great lesson of Korea.

I'm sure the United Nations can be improved upon. If we continue to give it our firm support, I'm sure it will be improved upon. But let us be everlastingly careful not to throw away the good and great instrument we already have in a search for something better.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

TRUMAN ON THE U. N.

Former President Truman talked with restraint and good sense about the role of the United Nations in the present world situation and about the problem of revising the U. N. Charter. He took note of the many weaknesses and imperfections in the charter and expressed the wish that the United Nations could be a much stronger instrument than it is for putting down aggression and maintaining peace. But this did not blur his appreciation of what the U. N., with its limited powers, has been able to accomplish.

The complaint most often heard against the United Nations is that it has been rendered powerless by the Soviet veto in the Security Council. Consequently, there is much demand for abolition of the big-power veto. Mr. Truman was realistic in saying that the U. N. would never have come into being without the veto. Neither Russia nor the United States would have accepted a charter without the reserve power the veto provision gives. It follows that talk of abolishing the veto is so much wasted breath. Mr. Truman pointed out that it would be more difficult to secure agreement on the charter today than it was in 1945. We do not think there is a chance that the Senate would agree to an amendment that would permit the Security Council to order military action against an aggressor without specific acquiescence of this Government.

However, the veto ought to be eliminated in regard to the admission of new members, and that should not be impossible of attainment. Also, numerous improvements in the U. N. can be made by strengthening the capacity of the General Assembly to act against threats of aggression when the Security Council is moribund, as at present. The fact that the Assembly has to act through recommendations and consent of a majority of its members is not an insurmountable handicap, as the experience in Korea proved. If there is a will among the law-abiding nations to act against aggression, they can do so through the Assembly under the uniting for peace resolution. This line of development within the U. N. ought to have every encouragement.

While moving toward improvements of this sort, Mr. Truman cautions us "not to throw away the good and great instrument we have in search for something better." This is sound advice. And the best means of upholding and strengthening the United Nations is to make it a positive force for peace and to invoke its powers as effectively as possible whenever there is a threat of coercion by armed force.

Los Angeles Phenomenal Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the industrial growth of the city of Los Angeles has matched the phenomenal rise in population, and today Los Angeles is not only one of the largest cities in our Nation, it is one of the most important industrial centers in the United States.

Anyone who has visited Los Angeles in the last few years must find it hard to believe that a scant hundred years ago this area was part of the last frontier of our growing Nation. In 1850 when it was incorporated and made the county seat, it had a population of 1,610.

By 1900 the entire State of California only boasted a population of 1,500,000, but with the turn of the century the boom began, and by 1950 Los Angeles had a population of 1,957,692, greater than the population of the whole State of California just 50 years earlier. And during the last decade alone, population in Los Angeles increased by more than 48 percent.

Industrial growth has also soared, and Mr. Carl P. Miller, president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, reviewed the spectacular industrial development of the city in an article which appeared in the April 18 edition of the Los Angeles Times.

In this article Mr. Miller gives an excellent factual report of the industrial development of Los Angeles, past and present, which he predicts will continue to develop at a rate which should place Los Angeles ahead of Chicago as an industrial center by 1970.

The following is Mr. Miller's review:

LOS ANGELES INDUSTRY GROWTH SEEN AS UNRIVALED—CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HEAD TELLS OF RAPID CLIMB OF EMPLOYMENT IN AREA

"Los Angeles is the industrial capital of the West," said Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce president, Carl P. Miller, yesterday, commenting on the latest report of the chamber's research department which documents Los Angeles industrial development since 1919.

"The factual analysis of the Los Angeles metropolitan area's development points to an industrial growth unrivaled in modern history," he commented.

RAPID GROWTH TOLD

"This industrial boom has put Los Angeles ahead of Philadelphia and Detroit, surpassing Philadelphia in mid-1952 and Detroit in early 1954. Populationwise we expect to pass Chicago in 1960, and assuming no major change in trend, it would seem safe to predict that we will pass Chicago industrially by 1970.

"This marked industrial growth has occurred during the last 15 years. Based on wage and salary workers in all manufacturing in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, a total of 77,500 employees were engaged in manufacturing back in 1919; 127,000 in 1929, and 173,000 in 1939."

EMPLOYMENT CLIMBS

"In 1949, employment climbed to 378,000 in spite of predictions to the contrary. This represents a net 10-year increase of 206,000 employees or an average increase of more than 20,000 per year. The industrial climb during 1940 was about 4 times greater than the rate during the twenties and thirties.

"Our rate of industrialization so far since 1950 is 2½ times the rate during the spectacular forties and about 10 times the rate in the thirties and in the twenties. Since 1950 we have added to the Los Angeles metropolitan area what amounts to an industrial Boston, or an industrial St. Louis."

POINTS TO MAGNITUDE

"It is no wonder that our eastern friends or we here in its midst do not fully recognize or appreciate the magnitude of this development. It has happened too fast to be believed. The publication of the 1954 Census of Manufacturing will go a long way toward convincing everyone that this industrial explosion in Los Angeles is a fact.

"Los Angeles now accounts for 64 percent of all manufacturing employment in California," Miller continued, "and 42 percent of all industry in the entire 11 Western States. There is more than twice as much manufacturing employment as in the States of Washington and Oregon combined, four times as much as in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area, and more than 50 percent more industrial employment than in the entire State of Texas."

DEVOTED TO INDUSTRY

Proportionately, the local economy devoted to industry is approximately 32 percent of the total local employment in manufacturing as compared to Chicago's 35 percent, New York's 31 percent, Detroit's 44 percent, or Philadelphia's 39 percent.

Miller observed that Los Angeles' strategic position as a trade center coupled with its diversified economy will allow Los Angeles to absorb more manufacturing and prevent its becoming overindustrialized and too dependent on a few industries. Few areas can supplement and help balance their manufacturing development with basic industries other than manufacturing as can Los Angeles, he said. Agriculture, oil and gas, mining, fishing, motion pictures, and tourists contribute largely to balancing its economy.

Amendment of Civil Aeronautics Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that there is very little, if any, opposition to this legislation. The committee was unanimous in approving it. But I wanted to point out one facet of this

problem that is not covered by this legislation.

Although this legislation does not apply to helicopters I have noted with great satisfaction the great strides that are being made by the certificated helicopter carriers particularly in the commercial field. It is recognized that this new and radically different type of transportation is being ably developed.

Passenger helicopter service, on a scheduled basis, is now a reality and has been for nearly 2 years, with American aviation leading the way.

New and larger and more economical equipment is already in the air. Greater density of population in our large metropolitan areas means that the helicopter is now a part of our everyday life, both for commercial as well as civilian defense reasons.

In addition, the civilian fleets now in operation have already proved an invaluable training and testing laboratory for our armed services.

We are confident of the continued rapid growth of scheduled helicopter service and I hope that legislation similar to that being considered today be considered for the certificated helicopter lines.

May I say to the chairman of our committee that in the near future we should consider comparable legislation with regard to helicopter service. These certificated helicopter carriers who are in the field at the present time are up against the same difficulties and uncertainties as the small feeder airlines that we have been discussing here, and I hope that before long we can consider similar legislation with regard to the helicopter service.

Did Roosevelt Era End With His Death?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, April 10, 1955, by John Harris, regarding the dynamic leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt:

DID ROOSEVELT ERA END WITH HIS DEATH?—WHEN THE PRESIDENT DIED, 10 YEARS AGO THIS WEEK, THE MILITARY CAMPAIGN WAS ABOUT WON—THE STRUGGLE FOR MEN'S MINDS MUST BE DECIDED NOW

(By John Harris)

Humble men and women, many of them Negroes, stood on Pennsylvania Avenue outside the White House just a decade ago and shed tears. They had gathered silently, reverently, for no evident reason save a feeling of shock and intense personal grief at the sudden, sad news from Warm Springs, Ga.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, vacationing there, had suffered a stroke and died.

The passage of 10 years has served to temper many of the emotional reactions, not all of them by any means sympathetic, to the dynamic leadership Roosevelt gave this Republic for a period longer than any President in our history.

END OF ONE ERA

As we now look back we recognize clearly that his death came as an era was about to close—the costly beating down of Fascist power intent on world conquest, the ruthless power which Winston Churchill so scathingly and tellingly denounced as the "Hun."

This life-or-death challenge to our freedom, which Roosevelt called our generations rendezvous with destiny, was faced and the military victory was won.

But was that an end, a solution?

During the last days and weeks of World War II, many a serviceman said jestingly: "I'm glad this war is over and now we can go back to fighting the Civil War." Others in service, more perceptive of the antagonistic forces that have dominated this century dolefully suggested: "Don't throw away your uniform—you may need it soon."

The challenge of one totalitarian power, the Fascist, was followed by the challenge of another totalitarian colossus, the Communist.

Thus when Franklin D. Roosevelt died an era did come to an end and another began. Unfortunately the two were almost twins, alike in their militant menace and implacable, sardonic opposition to our democratic way of life.

These two eras, in the broad prospective of time, are in reality two phases of a continuing antitotalitarian struggle in which Roosevelt, 10 years after his death, has still a vital part.

DEPRESSION AND FREEDOM

To maintain there was an end in 1945 is to insist upon an illusion.

When future historians, unencumbered by the partisanship which often befuddles accounts of current events, set about writing the record of the Roosevelt period, two of the main chapters will be on Roosevelt as a leader in the wars against depression and against totalitarianism.

These are not to be taken as separate accomplishments. They were intimately intermingled in the free world's fight for survival. We have only to think back to the desperate plight of our country in 1932—millions without jobs, breadlines, banks about to close their doors, people dismally prophesying that Roosevelt would be either a successful President or our last President.

But the social and economic reforms which have become closely connected with Roosevelt's name and memory were not exclusively his. In some similar form or other they were tried in many other countries during the same period of the fateful 1930's. They have been worked over and modified since. A basic core of them has remained in Europe and here.

Perhaps many are still tentative and subject to more changes. After all they have been products of a time of violent changes and of a desperate struggle to fit our ancient forms of society into the utterly changed conditions of the 20th century and yet to preserve the basic principles of our ideals and beliefs.

ANCIENT AND MODERN LESSON

This struggle still continues, but part of it has already been won.

When the war crisis came, this Nation was able to become the arsenal of democracy and supply the planes, tanks, and guns that blasted down the Fascist totalitarians.

Roman rulers long ago learned that empty stomachs make people restive, dangerous, a prey to demagogues and adventurers. That lesson applies to modern as well as ancient times. In the struggle to persuade people of other lands to embrace the teachings of democracy, our greatest ally is their sharing at least some of the simple blessings of life. Social and economic improvements abroad, an American export, cannot fail to win recruits to the free world. Men with a choice do not choose chains.

A third important chapter of the Roosevelt period will undoubtedly be his devising the United Nations, which is still, after 10 years of effort, more a promise than a fulfillment.

There was historical continuity in this endeavor. Roosevelt had served under Woodrow Wilson who sought futilely, in the League of Nations, to design an instrument for world peace.

In Roosevelt's quest for the United Nations there was also a historical necessity made more urgent by experiments he fostered, but which did not bear their fearsome fruit until after his death: the atomic bomb, which has brought thermonuclear weapons which could, we are told, make our planet uninhabitable.

DOUBLE LEGACY

The world has then a double legacy—an instrument, however imperfect, for contriving a permanent peace; and a weapon that may have already made worldwide conflict unthinkable.

Winston Churchill, who has just retired from the summit as an East-West meeting he so long sought has become a possibility, assured the West it could win in an atomic onslaught but we would be "victorious on a heap of ruins."

Mankind looks anxiously to its leaders to acknowledge these facts of the atomic age into which the struggle between totalitarians and the free world has extended. Ultimate victory would then rest with those who shall win rather that destroy the minds of men. There is no sane alternative.

And in order to win the minds of men we must prove that democracy is flexible enough and strong enough to give us a world order freer, richer, and better than totalitarianism. This is the struggle which began in the early 1930's and which must be won in the 1950's.

Nearly 1 Million Jobless Coal Miners and Dependents Need United States Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, according to Mr. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, there are now 200,000 unemployed coal miners with nearly 700,000 dependents in the bituminous and anthracite coal industries of the Nation.

Mr. Kennedy furnished this information on April 15, 1955, to the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare which is holding hearings regarding the cause of unemployment in the coal and other industries.

Mr. Kennedy testified as follows before the Senate subcommittee:

My name is Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America. I appear before this committee to give you a rundown or a recapitulation of the unemployment situation in the anthracite and bituminous coal regions of the United States, together with some comments and suggestions.

We had a survey made of unemployment in the coal industry, together with the number of dependents affected thereby, and also the average number of days worked per week by those that are still employed in the industry. This survey covers 27 districts of the United Mine Workers of America located in some 20 States. These figures show as of the first of February that 180,650 men

were unemployed in the coal mining industry. According to our own reports for the month of March, there were 207,000 unemployed. Conservatively speaking, I would put the figure at 200,000. The number of dependents affected by this situation is 669,776.

The average number of days now being worked by our employed workers is 3.2 per week. In many of our districts thousands have exhausted their unemployment benefits and surplus food is being supplied to many of them by the Federal Government. However, these figures do not report the whole picture because when we take into consideration the population of the various coal producing States and the number of people unemployed therein, we find that the economic situation of the entire State is adversely affected. For instance, at least 20 million individuals are affected by the lack of work in the coal mining industry in the States of Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and West Virginia, and in other States where coal is produced. If we take Pennsylvania as an example, we find that unemployment in the coal mining industry is so pronounced it became necessary for the Governor of Pennsylvania, Hon. George M. Leader, to recommend to the general assembly to increase the tax for unemployment compensation and to outline additional plans to help out in the coal fields. The bill was passed.

Some of the factors responsible for this situation can be readily found, as for instance the importation of waste or residual oil and the dumping of this fuel on the eastern seaboard at prices which can be declared as completely unfair in competition with solid fuels. Adding further to the shamefulness of the situation is the fact that most of this residual oil comes from Venezuela, a country which is dominated by a military dictatorship form of government, and where freedom and independence are denied to all working people. As one delves into the root of this problem, many factors are discovered which are completely amazing. For instance, one of the generals from Venezuela was recently decorated in Washington by the Secretary of the Army, Robert Stevens. Why special honor should be paid by our Government to a representative of a dictatorship form of government is rather hard to determine. Furthermore, the matter becomes more confusing when one takes into consideration the fact that the principal military objectives of the Venezuelan Government are to put labor unions out of business and place all labor leaders in jail. Down through the years, some of the actions of the representatives of our Government have certainly provided grounds on which any number of protests could be lodged, and it is my opinion that the medal which was awarded to this general from Venezuela could be placed in the same category as the Gilbert-Sullivan medals worn quite frequently by any number of smokeless generals.

As this committee well knows, residual oil displaced over 30 million tons of coal in 1954. This situation cannot be corrected by the imposition of a tax, in our judgment, but it could properly be regulated by the adoption of a quota system which we strongly favor on the basis of a 10-percent regulation. Another factor involved in our problem is the importation and dumping of natural gas. Recently the White House issued a statement on this practice under the caption, "Sales Below Cost by Interstate Pipeline Companies," and the report goes on to declare this practice to be unfair competition and inimical to a sound fuel economy. To sum up our views relative to the natural-gas situation, I quote from a report which we issued under date of March 13, 1955:

"Under the section 'Sales Below Cost by Interstate Pipeline Companies' the general recommendations have substantial value, if affirmatively implemented by congressional legislation. The widespread practice of the gas pipeline companies in making sales below actual cost is so ruthless and devastating in its effects upon the coal industry that it, upon its face, 'constitutes unfair competition' and is 'inimical to a sound fuels economy.' As an illustration, a quick look at the practice of using natural gas as raw boiler fuel makes this 'inferior use' of an irreplaceable and rapidly diminishing natural resource stand out like a sore thumb. As stated in the Paley report in 1952, it must be clear (although the present report does not specifically treat the subject) that 'The desirability of eliminating low value general uses (such as boiler fuel at points distant from the fields) as rapidly as possible is universally recognized.'

"In the face of this 'universally recognized' fact, the Federal Power Commission continues to allow and the pipeline companies continue to 'dump' gas for raw boiler fuel purposes at an ever-increasing rate. While no definite distinction (from facts presently at hand) can be absolutely drawn between 'boiler fuel use' and what may be some justifiable uses in industry, there is available a pretty fair guide as to what is happening. According to a Bureau of Mines 'mineral year book' the total industrial consumption of natural gas in 1940 was in excess of 995 billion cubic feet. In 1952, this had increased to approximately 3½ trillion cubic feet—an increase of 246 percent. In 1940 electric utilities reporting to the Federal Power Commission used approximately 183 billion cubic feet of natural gas as boiler fuel. In 1953 this had increased to over 1 trillion cubic feet—an increase of 446 percent. There can be no question as to the need of conserving natural gas in this country, so surely some way should be found to put a curb on the extravagant and wasteful use of this gas as boiler fuel. Certainly this practice of the gaslines should be prohibited, for its continuance is unquestionably unfair competition and is ruinous in its effects on the anthracite and bituminous coal industry."

The question of coal freight rates is another item that is referred to in the report from the White House and I quote our views pertaining to this situation from our statement of March 13 as follows:

"Coal freight rates recommendations are general. Vigorous compulsory action by the Interstate Commerce Commission and other governmental agencies is necessary and urgent to remove the excessive and disproportionate contribution that coal rates are making to meet the cost of other unprofitable services of the railroad industry."

The Government fuel purchasing policy also needs correction. It is also a factor that contributes to unemployment in the coal mining industry. Another question that should receive serious consideration is the tax situation. For instance, in the depletion tax setup there is a 27½ percent writeoff on oil and gas, where as the figure is only 10 percent as it concerns coal mining. Our exports of coal should and could be built up to 30 million tons, if we had any sense to outline a proper policy. We should have a national fuel policy that would treat all fuels on a fair, equitable, and just basis, and where each could find its proper and logical place in our economy. The Government should also take steps to inaugurate a plan whereby new ways could be developed for uses of coal.

I think it is also wise and important to bring to your attention the fact that our Government readily admits coal mining is a basic industry and is in reality a national defense industry. The United Mine Workers of America is concerned and we have always contended that if this country ever becomes involved in an emergency, we would be on a coal economy almost overnight, not only to help ourselves, but also for the benefit of our allies. Down through the years this fact has been proven over and over again. As conditions now exist in the coal mining industry, however, we could not properly rehabilitate some of our shutdown mines and put them in working order to the point where we could meet the fuel requirements of our Nation or of our allies in much less time than 6 or 8 months of preparation. In fact in many instances, the preparation of some of our mines would take a great deal longer. Just what could happen in the meantime as a result of this unpreparedness is unthinkable.

Adding to the irony of the situation is the fact that some of our citizens like Paul Hoffman of the Studebaker Corp., and Charlie Taft, "the Duke from Cincinnati," both sound off rather frequently as free traders and seem to be more interested in foreign trade than American prosperity or securseems to be the chief apologist to Europe ity. Looking over the situation, Hoffman seems to be the chief apologist to Europe and Asia for everything we do in this country, whereas Taft is the chief apologist for everything we do concerning Latin America. It would seem to us that both of these individuals should be more interested in the United States first, and to remember that we must remain strong in order to help those who are weak.

On the international front, it is our judgment that the first thing which should be done in Europe, Asia, and Latin America is to build up the purchasing power and living standards of the people to a point where they will be able to buy the products of their own industry. It is a well known fact that these people cannot do so now. If the standards of living and wages in Europe and Latin America could be improved from 15 to 20 percent, it is our opinion that such steps would do more to bring about stability and relative prosperity in those countries then all of the money we pour into them in our efforts to help them.

That, gentlemen of the committee, sums up some of the views and some of the collective thinking of the United Mine Workers of America with respect to the coal situation in the United States. We look to the present Congress to come up with some new ideas and some plans to stabilize coal mining in our country and we sincerely hope that some of the suggestions that we have outlined here today will merit consideration and attention by this committee and later by the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

The time to do it is now.

Tax Refund Bill Discussed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Panama City News, of Panama City, Fla., Friday, March 18, 1955, which gives an analysis of a bill introduced by me, H. R. 2879, to amend section 6415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to provide that fishingboat owners who have been required to pay a transportation tax may now obtain a refund since the courts have

held that the statute did not apply to fishing boats in the first place.

The enactment of H. R. 2879, or of some similar measure, appears desirable because of the following facts and circumstances:

The statute (sec. 4261, I. R. C.), while enacted and effective in 1941, was not applied to fishing boats, at least in my district, until about 1946, or later. The decision in *Smith* v. *U. S.* (110 F. Supp. 892), in part, reads:

> Section 3469 was enacted by Congress and became a law September 20, 1941. This section imposed a tax for the transportation of persons by rail, motor vehicle, water or air within, and, under certain conditions without, the United States. The record in this case is not clear as to when the Internal Revenue Bureau attempted to apply the section to charter party operations by fishermen, but so far as this case is concerned, the record shows that no tax was ever imposed on plaintiff until 1951 and the complaint in this case alleges that in 1951 the tax was imposed at some places and not others where charter boats operated. The complaint alleges also that the tax imposed at different places varied materially. From the record in the case it may be safely stated that no serious effort was made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue to impose and collect the tax on charter parties prior to 1950.

The law imposed a tax on "transportation" and on nothing else. Obviously a man riding a plane, train or bus from Miami to New York would be subject to the tax because "transportation" is clearly and unmistakably performed. "Transportation" is the clearly designated article, here activity, on which the tax was imposed or levied. The law made no mention about any tax on "fishing," the principal and primary activity here involved.

About the year 1946, or subsequently, it seems that someone in the Internal Revenue Service, precisely whom appears to be unknown, concluded that "fishing" was "transportation" and therefore taxable. In a more or less irregular manner, assessments were made accordingly and when not paid as demanded warrants for distraint were executed and liens were filed in the public records of the boatowner's county, all of which resulted in financial embarrassment to the taxpayers, adversely affected their standing in the community, socially, professionally and otherwise and finally led to a reduction of his bank account or cash on hand in a substantial sum since some assessments were in excess of $1,000.00 This procedure appears to have reached a climax in 1951 after the fishing industry had employed an attorney in 1950 who immediately protested the tax, pointed out that if the statute, as a matter of law, imposed any tax, the rate of the tax on a $5.60 fishing fare was, or should be, only about six cents rather than the sum of sixty cents as demanded by the Internal Revenue Service at Panama City, Florida.

With the employment of counsel in 1950, the boatowners were informed and advised that the law did not impose any tax on fishing. A rather extensive investigation followed extending over an area of several States from Louisiana to Florida. This inquiry readily disclosed the lack of uniformity in assessing and collecting the tax on fishing boats. In some areas no taxes were being imposed while in other places, as in Panama City, the tax rate was fixed by the Internal Revenue agents at 60 cents for each $5.60 fishing trip. It is not clear how, or why, the tax agents presumed to fix the tax rate at sixty cents in Panama City unless it was because the boatowners denied any tax liability and refused to pay any tax.

In any event, when counsel was retained by the boatowners the first order of business was to establish a fishing fare at Panama City at $5.60 per person which sum did not include any tax. With the determination of the $5.60 rate, exclusive of any tax, the boatowners then proceeded to determine their tax liability, acting on the assumption that the law did, in fact, impose a tax on fishing. Their findings and conclusions, after an analysis of their operating costs, the approved method of ascertaining a tax liability in such cases, was that the tax varied on different occasions and on different boats depending on a number of facts such as boat value, size, type, load capacity, season of year, winds, tides, etc. The average tax, however, was found to be approximately six cents per person or one-tenth of the sum demanded, and in some instances collected, by the Internal Revenue Service. A few boatowners who employed counsel and established the fishing fare at Panama City in 1950 at $5.60 per person, exclusive of any tax, paid the tax, under protest, at the six cent rate, filed a claim for its refund and in a few cases have received a refund in full of all taxes paid, as well as penalties and interest resulting from late filing of returns or delayed payment of the tax illegally assessed. This group has been fairly and equitably treated insofar as refunds will accomplish fair and equitable treatment. There is another group, however, who did not have the benefit and advice of counsel, who, when liens were filed against them, in order to save their boats and other property from seizure and forfeiture, paid the tax, including penalties and interest as demanded by the tax agents. It is this group which my bill H. R. 2879 is designed to help. They were directed, by the tax agents, in no uncertain terms, to "collect" the tax. They were misinformed as to the law, that is, if we may assume that the Court in *Smith* v. *United States* (110 F. Supp. 892) has correctly determined the law. In that case the Court said:

> Clearly an operation of this character is not transportation upon which a tax may be imposed under the provisions of section 3469.

Parenthetically, I may say that section 3469 of title 26, United States Code, is now section 4261. This group were told that their fishing operation was subject to the tax and that they must collect it. They assumed they were correctly informed by the tax agents and concluded that the tax was included in their fishing fare of $5.60 but their charge for a fishing trip of $5.60 was the same identical sum as other boat owners who, on the advice of counsel, were not collecting any tax but paying at the 6-cent rate under protest, which sum has since been refunded. The group without counsel's advice who were misinformed by the Internal Revenue Service, paid the tax at the 60-cent rate and have been denied a refund. This group will not be unjustly enriched, if and when a refund is made to them since there was a more or less fixed fee of $5.60, exclusive of tax, on all boats. It is the group that was compelled by the Revenue Service to pay a 60-cent tax that my bill is designed to help. To deny a refund to them it seems would result in discrimination prohibited by the fundamental law of the land.

The news article reads as follows:

PANAMA CITY MAN ELECTED BY BOATMEN

Florida Boatmen's Association, Inc., yesterday elected J. E. Brunson, of Destin, president of the organization and at the same time named S. Walter Anderson to the post of vice president.

The officer election was held at a meeting of the Boatmen's Association at Destin which saw unanimous adoption of a tax-refund bill introduced in Congress by Congressman BOB SIKES.

The boatmen also adopted a three-point legislative program which will ask the legislature to (1) place fishing, a food-producing industry, in the same class with farming for the purpose of taxation; (2) exclude fish bait from the sales and use tax; and (3) exclude the cost of construction, sale, and repair of boats from the sales and use taxes.

The Sikes bill will require the United States Treasury to refund taxes which the courts have held illegally collected from some members of the Boatmen's Association, a tax that other members were not required to pay. When Congress imposed a tax on transportation the law was applied to party fishing boats—but a Federal court has since ruled that fishing boats are not transportation within the meaning of the law.

In fighting the illegally imposed tax, attorney for the association pointed out that no collection effort was made for several years after the law was adopted and even then was not collected from all boatmen at the same rate.

Total collections amount to approximately $100,000, since 1941, the year the transportation tax law was passed, David W. Palmer, association attorney, pointed out last night.

In introducing the refund bill, Congressman SIKES declared:

"The law was enacted in 1941 but no effort was made to apply it to fishing until 1950, according to a court decision. As the law was not uniformly imposed in all areas and in view of the fact that refunds have been made in some cases but denied in others, the bill is designed to provide equal and uniform treatment taxwise to all citizens."

The Boatmen's Association is represented in Panama City by Attorney W. G. Cornett.

No Conservation Then

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following edi-

torial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

NO CONSERVATION THEN

A number of Midsouth tributary floods have inspired the "headwaters enthusiasts" to sound off on their favorite argument that all floods can be controlled if somebody—preferably the Federal Government—will build enough little dams and reservoirs on all the creeks and bayous that feed into the rivers that make the floods.

Maybe so, but we can't help thinking about Gracilaso De La Vega and what he saw in 1543. It was the building of a flood. As De Soto's diarist, he was with that explorer on the bank of the Mississippi just below the mouth of the Arkansas. He recorded that at the beginning the river "overflowed the wide, level ground between the river and the cliffs. Soon it began to overflow the meadows in an immense flood and as the land was level, without any hills, there was nothing to stop the deluge."

The Spanish diarist has left a complete and vivid account of how it took the flood 40 days to crest. "On each side of the river the water extended over 20 leagues of land, and all of this land was navigated by canoes, and nothing was seen but the tops of the tallest trees."

De La Vega saw one of the greatest floods which had ever occurred in the lower Mississippi Valley, and in an era when there had been none of the abuses to which all floods are now being attributed by some. There was no deforestation to speak of. This was an extremely lush valley with an overabundance of the type of plant life which pins soil down. Conditions favored saturation rather than runoff, yet the Spanish explorers looked upon one of the biggest of recorded Mississippi River floods. There had been a tremendous runoff despite all of nature's retarding devices.

The truth is that there is no single cure for floods. What would work for one valley might not work for another. Realistic flood control calls for both big and small dams, huge reservoirs, small impoundment areas, good erosion control, and sound land management practices. Floods cannot be cured or controlled by theoretical fads.

The Postmaster General's Disregard for the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, because the Members of this honorable body are today considering H. R. 4644, a measure which gives the Postmaster General unusually broad authority to reclassify Post Office Department employees, I feel it incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of the House certain circumstances that cause me a considerable amount of misgiving in supporting such legislation. Despite the recent vehement protests by the Postmaster General before congressional committees that political considerations do not enter into his administration of personnel matters and his assertion that there is less politics in the postal service today than at any other time in history, I find it most difficult to reconcile his statements with the facts I am presenting to you. They convince me the Postmaster General has utterly disregarded the law.

If ever political consideration and connivance have entered into the appointment of a postmaster—or rather the failure to appoint one—the record with regard to Portales, N. Mex., stands out as a shameful example.

The postmaster at Portales retired on April 30, 1953. An acting postmaster was named and an open competitive examination was called, with the closing date set for August 11. On December 18, 1953, a register of three eligibles, all with 10 percent disabled veterans' preference, was sent by the Civil Service Commission to the Post Office Department. After a delay of 6 months, during which the Postmaster General made no appointment, the examination was reopened on June 16, 1954, at the request, according to civil-service records, of six applicants who claimed to be disabled veterans. Three of them took the reopened test. Three others failed to prove eligibility as disabled veterans. Two of the three who took the test were held ineligible for lack of required experience. The other, who had not taken the first examination, flunked the reopened test.

On October 5, 1954, the identical register of eligibles that had been sent to the Post Office Department on December 18, 1953, was sent again by the Civil Service Commission. Again no appointment was made by the Postmaster General, although all of the eligibles were disabled veterans, with passing marks of 87.5 up to 97.25 percent, and, further, notwithstanding the requirement of law that there be no delay in postmaster appointment.

On January 24, 1955, nearly 4 months after the second register was in the Postmaster General's hands and more than 13 months after he had received the identical first register, no appointive action had been taken by him. Strangely enough, neither the officials in the Post Office Department nor in Civil Service would tell why the second long delay, although frequent reguests were made by my office for an explanation. The answer came, however, in the form of a telegram from the man who had flunked the first reopened test, requesting a second reopening, so the register of eligibles was sent back to Civil Service on January 26, 1955.

The man who flunked the first reopened test again failed to make the required grade in the second reopened examination with the result that the original list of eligibles, carrying the names of the same three disabled veterans, has been returned again to the Post Office Department by the Civil Service Commission. Yet no action has been taken because, as was explained to me by the Post Office officials, "we are waiting for recommendation from the Republican National Committeeman in New Mexico." They have been waiting for 1½ years. The Portales post office has had no duly appointed postmaster for 2 years. The people of Portales have been denied the service that can be rendered only by an administrative authority which has permanency of tenure. Officials of veterans' organizations in New Mexico have protested strongly about this discrimination against three disabled veterans who are entitled to preference under our law.

Not only has the Postmaster General given his sanction to this gross violation of the Veterans' Preference Act but he has ignored the mandate of Congress as contained in the law concerning appointment of postmasters, which states that they shall be appointed without undue delay.

The Postmaster General cannot plead ignorance of this willful disregard for the law and the rights of these disabled veterans because I discussed the Portales situation with him 3 months ago. At that time he said he would conduct an inquiry into the matter and advise me. To date I have not heard further from him. I can only assume that by his silence he is seeking to cover up his wilful maladministration. If it is to be his continued policy to play politics at the expense of disabled veterans and of proper administration of post offices under his direction why does he not come out openly and say so?

Not only should we safeguard the provisions of H. R. 4644 with regard to classification of employees by a proper amendment to require the Postmaster General to give the Congress detailed reports of the actions he takes, but I believe we should go further and authorize a thorough investigation by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of such apparent law violations as are indicated in the situation at Portales.

It is evident that the Postmaster General feels that he is above the law, that he has dictatorial authority over his Department. He has indicated that by his take it or leave it attitude in appearing before congressional committees with regard to this legislation, particularly in respect to the pay increase of postal employees. Therefore I feel that it behooves us to see to it that the Congress retains sufficient control over the administration of the Post Office Department to prevent further disregard for its mandate as expressed in the law. The rights which we have provided for veterans, particularly the disabled, should be fully safeguarded. It is manifestly our duty to see that they are.

Truman Peps Up Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 19, 1955:

TRUMAN PEPS UP TWO-PARTY SYSTEM—REFRESHING WARMTH IN NATIONAL POLITICS SEEN IN FORMER PRESIDENT'S VISIT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It was nice to have Harry Truman back in town for a few days—and how refreshing.

Since he went away 2 years ago Government has become aloof and stuffy, and sort of exclusive, lacking the human warmth he gave it. It's become more of a private affair, like a board of director's meeting behind closed doors, or a session of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, very hush-hush. Government doesn't seem so close to people any more.

It's funny that you don't realize what has happened often, what is missing, until it suddenly becomes very clear, just as when Harry Truman came back, and moved about our city and among the folks, friendly and smiling—and then you could understand.

You wouldn't think the spirit of one man could so permeate something as big as a whole government.

You suddenly realized, too, what is missing from our national politics, which has been so full of high-minded talk about "bipartisanship" and "cooperation" and "goodwill" that it became chilly and cheerless and boring.

Not until Harry Truman came back, and got himself a platform, and made one of his bristling speeches full of stout adjectives and burning indignation and honest concern for what government ought to do about plain folks—why, you wouldn't know we still had the two-party system in this country.

In just one speech he brough tthe two-party system back—but it probably left town again with him. Always amusing is the way he stirs up Republicans whenever he opens his mouth, and they are crying now to high heaven about his criticism of the Eisenhower administration as if it were a crime. Then you remember the names they used to call him. But he could take it.

He seemed hale and hearty again, and maybe he can take the two-party system on tour later and show it to the people and bring some life back into our politics which is so much a part of our national life.

When Harry Truman came back, you had the feeling he was coming back home—and yet this is not his home. That's out in Missouri. But he had become a part of this community, and never seemed just a transient. To so many people this city is just a place to hire a furnished house and a caterer and a butler to give cocktail parties to other people also here temporarily—though to lots of us it is home, and the home town. Harry Truman had become a part of that home town.

That explains the friendly feeling that people for whom Washington is the home town have for him, which was so obvious in the warmth toward him by people wherever he appeared on his visit, and for the question heard so often:

"It's good to have Harry back, isn't it?"

They crowded up to where he sat at the long table at the big Democratic dinner for Speaker SAM RAYBURN Saturday night to say hello and to bask for a moment in his smile. So great did the congestion become there that the chairman had to plead with the people to clear away so the waiters could get through to serve the $100 dinner.

So it was wherever he went. He packed the Senate caucus room when he appeared there to testify about the United Nations. It was very plain from the rousing, standing ovation he got when he entered the big room that the audience had come to see him and not to hear about the United Nations, though he had some very sound sense about that international institution which was created at San Francisco early in his administration.

He arrived early and took the witness seat on the side of the long committee table across from the seat he had occupied for so long as chairman of the famous Truman committee that had investigated various aspects of our defense and Second World War program when he was a Senator from Missouri. As various Senators would come over to speak to him and he would rise to greet them, the audience would break out in applause again.

What must have warmed his heart was the spontaneous and noisy ovation he got from crowds in the Senate gallery—tourists from everywhere—when he entered that Chamber and took the seat on the back row which had been his for 10 years. When he rose to speak briefly, he got another boisterous round of applause from the gallery, as well as from his colleagues on the floor.

About the only place this VIP tourist did not visit was the White House. He has not been invited there since he left, though he has been in the city before. The present occupant of the mansion was not in the city, but down at Augusta, Ga.

But Harry Truman did not seem to mind not going there. He knows how it looks inside and his old friends who worked with him are not there anymore.

Democrats' Thomas Jefferson Was Really a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following article which appeared in the Thursday, April 14, 1955, issue of the Fauquier Democrat, Warrenton, Fauquier County, Va.:

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT: DEMOCRATS' THOMAS JEFFERSON WAS REALLY A REPUBLICAN

(By L. M. Hamilton)

My column last month, in which I referred to the coincidence between the $20 tax cut proposed by the Democratic leaders in the House and a $20 bill which bears the portrait of Jackson, has brought me many comebacks. Some, possibly most, have been complimentary; others have been unmistakably uncomplimentary. To one of the latter I owe the inspiration for what I have to say this week.

My semihumorous reference to Jackson's having been promoted to a place of equal honor with Jefferson—at $100 a plate—by the New Dealers and the Fair Dealers drives one of my critics to near apoplexy. He accuses me of being "a Republican in disguise" and of being a carpetbagger who ought to go back where I came from.

Please bear with me while I reply to my choleric friend and try to open his eyes to some facts of proven history about Republicans and Democrats.

The first Republican Party in this country was that set up by Jefferson and his anti-administration colleagues. It was very shortly named the Republican-Democratic Party, sometimes reversed into the Democratic-Republican Party but popularly known simply as the Republican Party. (When Jefferson first ran for the Presidency against John Adams in 1796, contemporary accounts refer to him as the Republican candidate who was defeated by the Federalist candidate. When he was first elected President in 1800, he was still referred to as a Republican. Jefferson's unstinted support of the French Revolutionary cause may make this assumption of the adjective Republican more easily understandable, for the establishment of La Republique made the word common to all ears. It was his home-spun antipathy toward what he regarded as the aristocratic tendency of Washington, Adams, Hamilton, and other Federalists which led him to stress the democratic angle.

If we pass quickly over the next 244 years, we find enemies of Jackson forming the National Republican Party. Led by Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams, this party succeeded in defeating Jackson and electing Adams in 1824. With Jackson's successful comeback in 1828, the National Republican Party faded out of the picture and Jackson started the first of his two terms as a Democrat, to be followed by Van Buren.

Not until 1854, after the Kansas-Nebraska bill had driven various splinter parties known as Free Soilers, Abolitionists, and Know Nothings into coalition with erstwhile Whigs and Jeffersonian Democrats, does the name Republican recur. Then, at the memorable meeting in Ripon, Wis., when a name was sought for the new party which had just been born, that part of the name of Jefferson's party which had been discarded by Jackson was chosen. Thus was the Republican Party of today baptized by disgruntled Jeffersonians 101 years ago.

Until the New Dealers took over the Democratic Party by abrogating the two-thirds rule (which had given the "solid South" some control over the party which had been for over 70 years the defender of Jeffersonian tradition) Jackson was just one of several ex-Presidents. That political hucksters should need to set up a new patron saint is easy to understand. The New Deal and the Fair Deal are both far more reminiscent of Jackson and Van Buren than they are of Jefferson, Cleveland, or Wilson.

I happen to be one of those—and I believe they are legion—who feel that the traditional differences between Democrats and Republicans have long been lost sight of by both.

Today expediency—political expediency—seems of paramount interest to so-called leaders on both sides. In their efforts to cater to envy, to generate bias and to satiate selfishness they appear to be totally blind to national interest and political integrity. If one promises the moon, the other goes further by promising a fuller moon; if one claims to be liberal the other claims to be willing to be ultraliberal.

What party is left to which people of conservative political faith can turn? Only on a State basis can one find a standard to which to repair; on a national basis there is none from a partisan point of view. The nearest thing we have had to a bipartisan administration in my lifetime has as many stalwart defenders among the Democrats of Jeffersonian tradition as it has carping critics among registered Republicans.

I beg my critic to reexamine the tenets of his political creed. Let me point out to him that when Washington won our independence, Missouri was not even a colony.

Federal Control of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great concern to me as a Texan to see the governmental invasion of free enterprise, and I would like to call this matter to the attention of my colleagues through the following resolution offered by the Dallas Geological Society:

RESOLUTION BY THE DALLAS GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Whereas following the decision in the Phillips case, the Federal Power Commission by various orders has taken jurisdiction of

the producers and gatherers of natural gas; and

Whereas the producers and gatherers of gas are not public utilities by nature, and the fixing of field prices is unsound and against the best interest of the producer, the consumer, and the general public; and

Whereas such regulation will destroy the incentive to search for gas reserves, resulting in less gas to the consumer and higher prices; and

Whereas such regulation of the producers of gas is a threat to free enterprise and promotes a strong bureaucratic central government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Dallas Geological Society, assembled in regular meeting at the Baker Hotel, city of Dallas, on January 5, 1955, hereby calls upon the appropriate Federal officials and members of the Texas delegation in Congress to vigorously work for the enactment of clarifying and remedial legislation providing that the Natural Gas Act does not apply to the production and gathering of natural gas, the local sale of gas by producers or gatherers, and the price received by the producer or gatherer from such sale; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be published and placed in the hands of the representatives of the State of Texas in the Congress, and that each individual member of this society work for the enactment of the legislation herein mentioned.

G. FREDERICK SHEPHERD,
President.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Hillsboro Sentry-Enterprise, Hillsboro, Wis., March 24, 1955. This very fine editorial deals with a portion of our foreign-aid program.

I feel it would be well for all to read what Editor Edwin Shear has to say:

FOREIGN AID

Speaking recently at a dinner in La Crosse, a man who had served as an officer in the Korean war rather sadly commented that the majority of South Koreans do not like Americans and that they are very critical of the Yankee way of doing things. This was one man's impression of the attitude of South Koreans even though the United States has helped and is continuing to help the South Koreans at great expense in human life and effort and the expenditure of millions of dollars.

In the last issue of Coronet, an Italian author, Indro Montanelli, explains why Americans are unpopular in Italy. Comparing Americans and Italians the author says that Americans are "better intentioned, more candid, more trustful of others, and ready to see the good rather than the bad side of things."

But does the Italian author say this is because Americans are naturally better? Oh no, he says that Americans are "only the beneficiaries of certain circumstances, due to chance and good luck rather than to their merits." Thus—according to this reasoning—if it be that Americans are more generous, more sincere, more charitable, more trusting—it is not to their individual credit, but only because of our democratic and capitalistic system which produces our good fortune and our humane outlook. One gets the impression that Americans who demonstrate international charity are greatly envied and roundly hated for the good will and kindliness that motivated that charity.

The speech about Korea and the article about Italy are admittedly the result of isolated observations. They may or may not reveal the facts of attitude as they truly exist—but they do give a fleeting glance at some of the anti-United States feeling that exists in the very lands that America has helped.

This Nation has sent billions in aid across the oceans to help both allies and former foes. This was the money of taxpayers who worked to earn the dollars which liberal-handed national administrations have given away. Too often the payment for this assistance has been resentment and noncooperation.

One begins to wonder if the pouring out of financial aid has been worth the expense and effort. It seems very discouraging to have generosity repaid with jealousy and hate. Is it asking too much to request that Federal agencies begin to review some of the assistance given to foreign countries, to discover whether such assistance is resulting in winning friends or potential enemies for the United States?

We know, of course, that many of these nations are selling their friendship to the highest bidder—and that to keep them from either going over to the Red side or being swallowed by the Communist menace, America must continue to pour money into these needy lands. The idea is basically all right and the Marshall plan has demonstrated that it will work. The only questions are—how efficiently does such a plan win good will, and how long can the United States keep on paying out money for the support and rehabilitation of other nations?

Prof. Norman Neal: Fighting Badger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call attention to a situation that existed in our Foreign Operations Administration and its predecessor for some time, which resulted in a waste of American taxpayers' money and unfair dealing with some of our friends abroad. At the same time, I would like to pay public tribute to an intrepid professor of agronomy at the University of Wisconsin who battled bureaucracy, refused to be strangled by Government redtape, and almost single-handedly brought about a correction of the unsatisfactory situation previously existing.

That man is Prof. Norman P. Neal, of Madison, Wis. It has been my pleasure to work with him and help him in a small way in this task. Others who have assisted have included Dean Rudolph K. Froker, of Wisconsin's College of Agriculture, as a member of the Commodity Credit Corporation advisory committee, and Raymond H. Lang, head of the nationally known seed company in Madison, Wis. But the rest of us have sort of run interference for Professor Neal; he carried the ball over the goal line.

For some years Wisconsin has pioneered in the development of hybrid seed corn and its varieties have won international recognition. Wisconsin experiment stations have cooperated with a number of our friendly European nations since 1947 in efforts to help them establish satisfactory corn stocks.

In the past few years, the University of Wisconsin exported to Italy parental foundation inbred and single cross seed valued in excess of $25,000 to facilitate production of hybrid seed of Wisconsin varieties in that country. Notable progress has been registered.

In addition to Italy, Wisconsin has furnished a very substantial volume of both breeding stocks and parental foundation seed stocks to The Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal and Greece.

In 1954, I received complaints that through American funds supplied by FOA, another European country was importing Wisconsin hybrid seed corn under very questionable circumstances. The corn was not raised in Wisconsin, was not certified as being Wisconsin hybird seed corn, and was being purchased for a little over $2 a bushel, whereas true Wisconsin hybrid seed corn was selling for $9 to $12 per bushel. Agriculture officials in our State notified me that in their opinion there was not sufficient true Wisconsin hybrid seed corn raised outside Wisconsin to supply a 64,000 bushel order. They pointed out that one bidder offered to supply 600 bushels of a certain Wisconsin variety whereas only 26 acres of that variety had been raised in all of Wisconsin.

"It was reported that one of the suppliers from outside Wisconsin who furnished seed for export actually sold a mixture of all of his reject seed from all varieties," Professor Neal wrote me. "I am firm in the conviction that if the United States Government is financing the purchase of hybrid seed corn for export, it should do so only on the basis for seed that complies in respect to varietal purity. If such seed is not worth planting in this country, it is not worth planting elsewhere. It not only is an injustice to the farmers of the importing country, but also is a shameful squandering of American taxpayers' money, as well as a travesty of the American sense of fair play and America's equity in world affairs."

From my investigations in Washington, I learned that seed corn FOA was sending to Europe in 1953 and 1954 was inspected only to determine if it would germinate, if it had been treated for disease, and was free of weeds. The only assurance FOA had that the European country was receiving its requested Wisconsin hybrid seed corn was the supplier's statement that it corresponded to Wisconsin types.

The amazing thing about all this to me was the attitude generally expressed by FOA officials: "What is the difference, as long as no one is kicking about it?" One Washington official sought to dismiss the matter with the statement that "the supplier is happy, the buyer is not

complaining, and the only people making any complaint are you folks in Wisconsin."

Eventually, however, complaints began to be heard, reports from FOA inspections in Europe were not so favorable, and the European buyers began to demand that they get what they requested, even though the money was coming from Uncle Sam.

"Because of the significant role that Wisconsin hybrids have played in the past, and now play in European corn culture, we feel keenly the existence of practices that, in our judgment, prejudice not only the reputation of Wisconsin corn hybrids, but even more importantly, the prime objectives that are basic to the very existence and purposes of the Foreign Operations Administration," Professor Neal wrote me last year.

This year, there is a different story to tell. European nations in their specifications have been requiring official certification, tagging and sealing of the seeds. In consequence, a substantial portion of the seed order has been filled in Wisconsin, and the buyers may be certain that they are getting Wisconsin hybrid seed, and not feed corn corresponding to Wisconsin types. Wisconsin growers assure me they are sending only first class seeds to their farmer friends in Europe. There seems no question that better crops will follow, and our friends abroad will have a better opinion of Uncle Sam's agriculture as a result, thanks to Professor Norman Neal of the University of Wisconsin.

The Late Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of February 17, 1955, this Nation lost a distinguished and intrepid soldier, statesman, and diplomat. I lost a dear and valued friend with whom I had the honor of serving in Congress from 1938 to 1949.

Pete Jarman left behind a record of accomplishment which time and age shall never dull, which shall always remain prominently in the memory of those who knew and loved him.

Pete served as a lieutenant in the First World War in France with distinction and honor. He fought courageously for the honor and ideals of his country, and until his death he sustained a deep and active interest in military affairs, ever mindful of the continuing need of a strong United States in the face of alien threats to its security. From 1924 to 1940, he served as division inspector of the 31st Infantry Division, and in 1927 was elected commander of the Alabama Department of the American Legion.

This great American came to Washington in 1937 as a Member of the 75th Congress. Immediately he distinguished himself as a statesman of peerless courage and sagacious foresight, as a faithful representative of the interests of his people in the Sixth Alabama Congressional District. As his colleague I had the privilege on numerous occasions of observing and admiring his tireless and conscientious endeavor in the interests of his district, State, and country.

In 1949 Pete was named United States Ambassador to Australia. As a friend and former colleague who was personally acquainted with his ability and convictions, I regarded this appointment as one of significant wisdom and foresight. And most assuredly my confidence and expectations were never blunted. I doubt that the United States has ever before enjoyed the position and prestige in Australia as that manifested during Pete's ambassadorship.

From various and sundry sources, the appraisal of Peter's attainments as Ambassador to Australia was the same—outstanding. In this connection, I was told by Dr. Bob Jones, founder of the Bob Jones University in Greenville, S. C., that on one of his evangelistic trips to Australia he was profoundly impressed everywhere he went in that country by the reception of Government officials and people in all walks of life to Pete's representation of the United States. Dr. Jones was very high in his praise of Pete's achievements in this foreign land.

Yet Pete left behind more than the memory of his warm friendship and dedicated service to his country. Pete left behind a person who was always at his side in spirit and faith and inspiration. The union of Pete and Miss Beryl Bricken, lovely daughter of the late Honorable Charles Bricken, presiding judge of the Alabama Court of Appeals, was as formidable as their equally shared ideals and aspirations. Pete and Beryl constituted a partnership that never deviated from their individually elected roles as public servants and ministers of the American way of life.

Soldier, statesman, and diplomat, Pete Jarman was laid to rest in the Arlington National Cemetery with military honors. As the last reverberations of the volleys fired at his graveside spent themselves in the far-reaches of that hallowed ground, I am sure that those in attendance felt that Pete had come to rest among friends. He is now with the other soldiers and great Americans who have given their very best for their country.

Our Country's Aim Is Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the 19 Scripps-Howard newspapers from throughout the Nation gathered in the Nation's capital yesterday. Out of that meeting came a timely warning and some sage advice to the leaders of our Government. No one who is sincerely interested in maintaining peace throughout the world can find fault with the statement that came from that conference. "Our country's aim is peace" is the theme that this distinguished gathering of molders of public opinion would proclaim to the world. The Washington Daily News today highlights in a front-page editorial the kind of action our Nation should follow. I recommend it to the Members of this Congress:

OUR COUNTRY'S AIM IS PEACE

Editors of the 19 Scripps-Howard newspapers meeting here yesterday agreed unanimously that a dramatic restatement of America's position in relation to world affairs is due soon.

The editors concluded that it is high time something be done to dampen the widespread notion—which seems to be shared even among some of our friends and allies—that America is hellbent for war.

After hearing detailed reports from Scripps-Howard foreign policy experts, after many hours of discussion which expressed the viewpoints of men representing communities from coast to coast and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, the editors formulated this statement of Scripps-Howard policy:

America should take the peace initiative away from Moscow. We should prove to civilized opinion that we, more than anybody else in the world, want and need peace because we, above all others, have more to lose by war.

This is a job which the President of the United States can do far better than anyone else.

The time and place also are of vital importance. And they are near at hand—as if made to order.

In June the United Nations will hold a special commemorative session in San Francisco on the 10th anniversary of the signing of the charter. Many of the Foreign Ministers of the world—maybe even Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov—will be there.

We respectfuly suggest that it would be fitting for President Eisenhower to open that conference in person with an appeal for a new effort to establish peace. He should put before the world America's case for peace in a new and vivid light.

It would be a chance for the President again to demonstrate the lengths to which the United States is willing to go to attain peace. He could—

Offer to disarm to any limit the other powers would be willing to go under strict regulation.

Propose to ban mass-destruction weapons if others would agree to cheat-proof supervision and inspection.

Suggest that the United States would agree with others and with adequate guaranties of compliance to limit the proportion of key resources that could be used for arms so that more could go into peaceful goods.

Reiterate the right of civilized peoples everywhere to governments of their own choosing, at free elections, by secret ballot and without outside interference.

Emphasize that we seek nothing that belongs to anyone else; that there are no strings attached to our offers; that all we ask in return for reciprocal arms reduction is the dropping of iron and bamboo curtains—the opening of frontiers not only for international inspection teams but also for plain ordinary people.

The President could catalog the peaceful moves by this country, its participation in peaceful projects, and its genuine desire to do more. He even could recall his 1953 offer to devote a large percentage of the savings from any real disarmament to a world fund

to help man enjoy the fruits of this tormented old earth.

He would have to emphasize, of course, that the United States was not seeking abject appeasement. Distasteful as military life is to Americans, they also know—as the President himself has so aptly put it—that a soldier's pack is not nearly so heavy as a prisoner's chains.

President Eisenhower has done all this before. But it is now 18 months since his atoms-for-peace proposal to the United Nations and 2 years since his last full dress speech on peace. Efforts to attain peace and to portray the United States in its rightful peaceful role require constant stimulation.

All we seek is peace. But the Communists claim they want peace and we want war. Too many people, unfortunately, believe the Communists.

Ten years ago this June the hopes of man were focused upon the newly born United Nations. Ten years of bitter experience in a divided world has tempered those hopes.

But that experience has not lessened the hope that surges in all men's breasts that somehow, someway, somewhere a way will be found to implement the first line of the U. N. Charter—

"We, the people of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

At San Francisco next month, President Eisenhower has an ideal place before the United Nations to remind the entire world that American policy is peace and that America is prepared to go to great lengths and to make great sacrifices to attain it.

Sugar Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the Hallock Lions Club of Hallock, Minn.:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural life of Kittson County, Minn.; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of Kittson County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic industry and restoration to the domestic industry of its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Hallock Lions Club is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Minnesota, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by the Lions Club of Hallock, Minn., on October 28, 1954.

R. PAPPEN,
President.
ORLIN C. HANSON,
Secretary.

Japanese Rice Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, for standing firm against the dictates of our State Department in the matter of the Japanese rice negotiations. I am informed that at a meeting of the Council on Foreign and Economic Policy yesterday the views of Mr. Benson prevailed and under these negotiations some 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice will be released to the Government of Japan under the provisions of Public Law 480.

These objections in the past on the part of the Department of State have created grave apprehension in the ranks of agriculture. There have been rumors that the Department of State has concluded agreements with certain Asian nations pledging that we would not seek markets in southeast Asia and that we will subvert the intent of the Congress of the United States when we enacted the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, known as Public Law 480.

The specific action of the State Department in opposing sales of rice under Public Law 480 in the southeast Asia markets gives credance to these rumors. The views of the Department of State in this instance would deprive our American rice industry of a market that contains one-half of the world's population and constitutes the greatest rice market of all time.

If the State Department can make such agreements and the Congress does not protest and take action to curb the Department's power, we may see other agreements made depriving us of the opportunities and privileges of selling our goods in world markets.

Mr. Speaker, even with the release to the Japanese Government of this 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice, there will still be a total supply of 15 million hundredweight available for export. We cannot deny this rice to world markets—especially the great southeastern Asian market, where rice has been the staple for centuries. We cannot limit our trading activities at the will and demand of the Secretary. For such an action would destroy our American rice industry.

Such an action in one commodity can lead only to similar actions on other commodities—and we would soon see the destruction of our agricultural economy—and with it, the collapse of our Nation's strength.

If the Department of State succeeds in keeping our rice out of far-eastern markets, it may just as well put on a campaign against export of cotton, tobacco, and wheat in various parts of the globe.

A few days ago a great outcry was raised because the Secretary of State fired one man. This action on the part of the State Department has the effect of depriving untold thousands of families in the United States of their jobs—because just as surely as this policy of the State Department is permitted to prevail then we will see the end of the American rice industry as we see it today. We have already suffered drastic cutbacks in rice acreage across the Nation—and this action on the part of Mr. Dulles and his nonagricultural experts in the Department of State would make it necessary to further reduce rice acreages by a large percentage in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed appeasement throughout the time that I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. I do not believe in appeasement. Nor do I favor this policy of the Department of State, which is, in my humble opinion, nothing more than economic appeasement.

Reciprocal trade, a bulwark of our American foreign policy, cannot be a fact if our Department of State, in the secrecy of negotiations, gives away our export markets and exerts veto powers over actions of other branches of our Federal Government seeking to implement Public Law 480.

Back in September the President issued an Executive order stating it to be the policy of the United States to dispose of our surplus agricultural commodities on a competitive world market. Yet, for some reason, the Department of State, while recognizing this order, seeks to restrain agreements under Public Law 480 and speaks belittingly of "subsidized sales."

Mr. Speaker, there has been introduced in the House H. R. 5568 which would pin down the intent of the Congress in reference to Public Law 480 and would prevent the Secretary of State from exerting such veto powers. I favor this bill and I urge the Congress to take speedy action in adopting this bill to protect our agricultural families and to keep open the channels of world trade.

I wish to commend again the firmness of our Secretary of Agriculture. He has done a valiant work to save markets for our agricultural commodities. I trust that he will continue to stand firm, and I do hope that next week when the Dodge committee meets again that they will heed the intent of the Congress and refuse to permit the Secretary of State to give away our export markets and disrupt our domestic agriculture.

Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions pertaining to construction of the high Federal dam in Hells Canyon:

Whereas the supply of hydroelectric energy in the Pacific Northwest has presently forced the curtailment of production of aluminum and other goods essential to defense and national prosperity; and

Whereas reliable surveys indicate that by 1960, unless adequate steps are taken now, this region will face even more critical shortages; and

Whereas advance planning for the integrated development of the water resources of the region, as represented by the findings and recommendations of the Army's 308 report, calls for the construction by the Federal Government of a high dam at the Hells Canyon site on the Snake River; and

Whereas such a dam, operated as an integral part of the Bonneville system, will bring untold benefits to downstream areas in the form of increased power production and flood control: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Friendly Grange, No. 897, go on record requesting immediate enactment of S. 1333, which would authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregon; Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, the chairman of the Senate Insular Affairs and Interior Committee; Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon; the National Hells Canyon Association, and to the Oregon State Grange.

MILDRED NORMAN,
Master.
CLAIRE ELLIOTT,
Secretary.

Approved March 24, 1954.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
MOUNT HOOD LODGE NO. 1005,
April 8, 1955.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: It is the wish of the membership of Mount Hood Lodge No. 1005, International Association of Machinists, to be placed on record as endorsing and supporting House of Representatives bill 4730.

It is our belief, and history has proven, that Federal contract and operation of such projects in the Columbia River Basin are most desirable.

With sincere approval of your past efforts on behalf of this bill and best wishes for future success, I remain,

Very truly yours,
RALPH F. KAUFMAN,
Financial Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is at this time an effort being made to substitute a plan for multiple low dams for the Government proposed high dam in the Snake River, and the high dam being necessary for the development of the Columbia River to its fullest capacity; and

Whereas for the past several years, since the beginning of this development, we have seen the benefits accruing from the low cost electricity to the people of the Northwest, particularly to the small farm operator; and

Whereas under Government control this increase in the use of electricity has demonstrated the fact that the public utilities have had the major part in the growth of the Northwest and in bringing to us the many advantages of low cost power; and

Whereas with even the low rates for electricity, the dams are returning to the Government amounts of money annually to insure the repayment in the allotted time all of the cost of the dams; and

Whereas the high dam is a part of the system of development which takes into consideration the multiple use of water for production of electricity and also the great added advantage of flood control, irrigation, and water transportation, as well as recreation facilities; and

Whereas the construction of low level dams would break the chain of planned development of the rivers, give a smaller amount of development, result in a higher cost of electricity to the present and future users, and

Whereas the entire Northwest area is dependent to a great extent on the furnishing of cheap power to many present and potential manufacturers, as well as the small independent users of electricity; and

Whereas the past has shown us that the private power interests are more interested in profit than development, and that they have failed to make the moves necessary to get cheap power to a large number of people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Siletz Valley Grange, No. 558, earnestly urges that every effort be made to see that the orderly and planned development of the Columbia River and its tributaries be carried out for the benefit of all the people as opposed to a comparative few; and be it further

Resolved, That the full development of this area will be hindered by substituting the low dams for the high one.

This resolution passed by the members of Siletz Valley Grange, No. 558, at the regular meeting April 4, 1955.

WALTER POMPEL,
Master.
J. E. BLOOM,
Committee.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Senate bill 1333 has been introduced in the United States Senate for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River Canyon by Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and many other Senators; and

Whereas to get the full benefit of all the possible power energy, flood control, irrigation, navigation, recreation, and all other accruing benefits to all the people of the Northwest for more industries and fuller employment for an ever-increasing army of working people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Women's Division of Labor Leagues for Political Education of Portland, Oreg., so sincerely endorse and pledge full support of United States Senate bill 1333; and be it further

Resolved, That those Senators be sincerely commended for their progressive action in introducing Senate bill 1333.

A. E. LARSON.
C. J. LASALLE.
ARVILLA E. LIVERMORE.
MARY L. BISHOP.
HELEN BLAKE.
PEARL POTTER.
FLAVIA SKINNER.
ZOE WILSON.

Whereas the necessity for building the high Federal dam in Hells Canyon, on the Snake River, is very vital at this time; and

Whereas this high dam will provide flood control, storage, and unlimited electric energy for the Northwest; and

Whereas the shortage of electric power now present in the Northwest makes it imperative that this high dam be authorized and started now: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Westland Grange, No. 827, in regular session this 8th day of April 1955, does urge immediate action on S. 1333, and asks this Congress to pass legislation authorizing the start of this high dam in Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Representative in Congress, to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, GRACIE PFOST, and the executive secretary of the Hells Canyon Association.

W. B. SMITH, *Master.*
LILLIAN M. SMITH,
Secretary.

A Rose on F. D. R.'s Grave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Trainman News of April 18, 1955, entitled "A Rose on F. D. R.'s Grave."

The article is as follows:

A ROSE ON F. D. R.'S GRAVE

We rejoice along with all mankind that victory is within civilization's grasp in the war against that dread, crippling disease whose chief victims have been children.

The eternal gratitude of all the peoples of the earth, all races, colors, and creeds, is due Dr. Jonas E. Salk and the many other scientists who played roles in the development of the antipolio vaccine which now promises to wipe out some of the death and suffering in this unhappy world of much death and suffering.

We are certain that as soon as possible and practicable, the United States will make the vaccine not only available to all the peoples of the world but see to it that they get it. Polio, like all other disease, knows no colors, no creeds, no national boundaries, and no political differences. It knows children, and attacks children—and children are everywhere. Here is one scientific advance, unlike nuclear fission which has inspired fear of us, that can and should make friends for us. If it does that, then maybe we won't be saving our children to sacrifice them later to war.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen humbly expresses its thanks to Dr. Salk and the host of others who have finally made this momentous achievement. We speak for more than 200,000 railroad families who live in the cities and way points of the United States and Canada, wherever the silvery threads lead, and whose hopes for a happier, healthier life are lifted.

We are proud that this great scientific advance was made in America. And it is not without a small bit of satisfaction that it was made with our participation and cooperation. As an organization, and as individuals, we helped spark the March of Dimes, stimulated interest in the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and went down the line 100 percent in every drive and appeal. Many others were with us, from labor, from management, from all parts of our society. The success wouldn't have been possible without everyone's help.

One important thing for the entire world to note is that the antipolio drive, the research, all was voluntary and selfless.

The war on polio was started by Franklin D. Roosevelt, a great President and humanitarian who himself had been afflicted with it. His great heart gave the campaign impetus and inspiration, and it was fitting that victory was achieved and announced on the 10th anniversary of his death. It was like putting a rose on his grave.

H. R. 5115

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] recently introduced H. R. 5115, to prohibit the disposal by contract or Executive order of work traditionally performed by civilian components of the Department of Defense unless it can be proven that the disposal is economically sound and that it will not endanger our national security.

This measure interested me, Mr. Speaker, because I have received protests in connection with the curtailment of certain types of activities performed by the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in the legislative district I have the privilege of representing. I am sure other Members of Congress have had similar protests.

On receiving these protests I made appropriate inquiries and was advised it was the policy of the Department of Defense to foster free competitive enterprise and to avoid the use of Government-owned and operated commercial and industrial type facilities. I was further advised that pursuant to this policy, the Navy had issued directives providing for study of such activities in our naval shipyards.

The criteria to be used in eliminating any Government operation I was informed would be on the following basis:

The necessity for meeting the military demand at all times without delay, particularly where abnormal or fluctuating military demand makes private sources or operation impractical to the extent that the current or mobilization need cannot be met.

The absence of private facilities of sufficient capacity located within a reasonable distance from the point of demand.

The need for maintaining facilities for the training of personnel (for operation in a zone of action or advance base or overseas operations where commercial facilities will not be available) where an organized training program for the type of skills involved, specifically requires the use of the facility in question.

The danger of compromising information which would aid potential or known enemies, or which would otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States, where adequate provision can be made only through Government operation.

Any other criterion demonstrating a particular Government operation to be in the public interest.

In compliance with these directives, and based upon the criteria set forth therein, the laundry services at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard have been discontinued, box and crate manufacture has been curtailed, and the office machine repair shop will be closed, effective June 15, 1955. In addition, studies are presently being undertaken to determine the desirability of continuing the acetylene, oxygen and nitrogen plants, the automotive repair shop, the tree and garden nurseries, and the photographic equipment and chronometer repair facilities.

The Navy assured me that implementation of the above-mentioned policy is being carried out with due regard to the importance of maintaining our naval shipyards in a condition of readiness to accomplish their appointed tasks both now and in the event of a future national emergency.

The Navy further assured me that when services or the manufacturing of items required at Puget Sound are curtailed in the shipyard, these items and services will be contracted for with local private firms when practicable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out one glaring omission in the criteria which I just recited as having been given me by the Navy, which is covered by H. R. 5115; namely, the transfer of work to a private contractor would have to be economically sound. Efficiency and economy require the integration of many operations. Some of these may be such that individually they could be performed by private contractors outside of Government property, but it seems to me, if you are going to follow the Navy's criteria, the net result could greatly increase cost and reduce efficiency. Take automobile repair as a case in point. In a Government garage work can be performed when cars are not in use. This cuts down on the total number of automobiles required; also, by upkeep and preventive attention, the overall repair cost is greatly reduced.

I do not want to appear in the position of opposing competitive free enterprise. After all, I have supported elimination of costly barge lines and other Government operations directly competitive with private enterprise and costing the taxpayers vast sums of money. But I think Congress should watch our purse strings and be sure the Department of Defense is not going off on an ideological spree. I hope the Armed Services Committee will take a careful look at this whole matter.

The Sugar Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Kennedy (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural life of the Red River Valley of the North; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of the valley: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the secretary of the Kennedy Chamber of Commerce is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Minnesota, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by the Kennedy Chamber of Commerce, April 13, 1955.

ROBERT PETERSBURG,
President.
WILLIS LILLIQUIST,
Secretary.

A Trip on the Inter-American Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Sunday contains an extremely interesting account of a trip on the Inter-American Highway written by Hon. Robert C. Hill, our very able Ambassador to the neighbor Republic of San Salvador.

Robert Hill has served as Ambassador in both Costa Rica and San Salvador, and I am proud to number him among my friends. He is young, energetic, capable—just the man we need to represent the United States in the important task of cementing our friendship and building mutual respect in Central America.

From his own experience, driving up from San Salvador, Ambassador Hill gives us good reason for supporting the President's recent proposal to complete the Inter-American Highway. I ask leave to include his article as a part of my remarks:

DRIVING UP FROM SALVADOR—OUR AMBASSADOR TO THE GOOD NEIGHBOR REPUBLIC REPORTS ON A TRIP ALONG THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

(By Robert C. Hill, United States Ambassador to El Salvador)

President Eisenhower has urged strongly that the Congress give its most favorable consideration to accelerated completion of

the Inter-American Highway to Panama. Recently, he wrote the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, calling attention to its importance and to the economic development of the countries through which it passes. He also pointed out that the road will help increase trade and improve political relations among these countries and the United States. I believe the President's recommendations warrant the most careful consideration.

I first traveled the Inter-American Highway when I was assigned as Ambassador to Costa Rica. The highway in Costa Rica is all-weather and passable from the capital, San José, north to Managua, the capital of Nicaragua. A good portion of it is concrete paved. After I was transferred from Costa Rica to El Salvador. I again drove the Pan-American Highway between San Salvador and Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras. There again I found a passable all-weather road, the paving of which is now underway.

My travels along these portions of the highway made me want to see more of it, and it wasn't too long before my wife and I began planning a trip to the States via the highway from San Salvador.

TALL TALE

Every so often you hear about some intrepid adventurer who, with four-wheel-drive jeep, Thompson submachine gun, sleeping bag, and K-rations, has managed to drive the highway. When interviewed he usually says something like: "Well, it really wasn't anything once I managed to fight off the savage natives and recover from the attacks of tropical insects."

Some of these stories are, of course, exaggerated. It would be an equal exaggeration, however, were I to say that it is now possible for a tourist to leave the southern border of the United States and drive south to the Panama Canal Zone along a fully paved all-weather highway. The truth lies somewhere in between these extremes and in between the gaps where the road is yet to be built.

The only preparation we made for our recent trip was to make sure that our 1953 car was in tiptop condition. We didn't buy a gun. We didn't buy camping equipment. We didn't buy any special clothing. We did purchase a tankful of gas and acquire an Esso map and on March 8 began what turned out to be a wonderful trip.

It is a journey which I am certain will interest thousands of people in the United States. It convinced me that early completion of the road will be in the interest of both inter-American economic development and hemispheric security.

COFFEE COUNTRY

We drove north on an all-asphalt highway through beautiful coffee country until we reached the Guatemalan border. Ezalco, the famous Salvadoran volcanic mountain, exploded as we were traveling along the highway, and that beautiful sight—the volcano erupts every 10 or 15 minutes—made the road trip interesting and very worthwhile.

In Guatemala we were impressed by the beauty of the country—the rolling plateaus and the Guatemalans in their colorful native costumes working in the fields.

The highway from the border to Guatemala City is all-weather gravel. Asphalting and paving are now under way. The distance is 174 miles, which we traveled easily in 5 hours. We spent the night in the capital and in the morning we encountered the first of our "troubles." Our battery was dead as a doornail. However, this we shortly discovered could not be attributed to wily jungle savages, but instead to a friend of ours who had borrowed our car the evening before and neglected to turn off the light switch.

We purchased a new battery (spare parts are available for practically all cars in each of the Central American capitals) and took off for the Mexican border city of Tapachula. The distance is 220 miles, and that was the difficult part of the trip.

ROUGH ROAD

At times we had to slow our car to 5 miles an hour, but although the road was rough it was always passable. I might add that in the entire trip, with 5 persons in the car and 14 pieces of baggage, we did not hit bottom until we crossed the bridge at Laredo, Tex.

The scenery from Guatemala City to Tapachula is spectacular—tall mountains on both sides of the road, beautiful lakes, and thick pine forests like those in northern Maine.

We had been advised to carry firearms but we decided instead to fly a small American flag on our front bumper. This created considerable interest, and in the back country of Guatemala we received many a viva las Estados Unidos. When we stopped for gas the car would be surrounded by curious, friendly Indians who asked many questions about our trip.

We had no difficulty in finding food. The motels are moving with the highway and are already as far south as the Guatemalan border.

One must plan to cross the Mexican-Guatemalan line before 6 p. m., as the border closes at that hour and does not open until 6 a. m. Border crossing in Central America is easy; all one needs is a tourist card and papers showing that the tourists own their car. We spent the night of March 9 at Tapachula where we found very fine accommodations.

RAIL CONNECTION

In the morning we had to make arrangements for our car to be transported via freight car to Arriaga, Mexico. It cost $41 for 4 tickets on the train and the automobile, plus a charge of $2.50 for loading and $2 for unloading the car. Travel on the train through picturesque southern Mexico was very comfortable. The trip took 12 hours.

We noticed that there was no dining car on the train. Shortly after we got underway, a man came through the train hawking soft drinks. He showed up every 10 minutes for the rest of the trip.

Lunch on the train was a wonderful experience. We pulled into a small town and, descending from the train, found ourselves surrounded by hawkers of tortillas, black beans, baked, fried, and boiled chickens, and savory smelling cuts of meats which were being broiled over hot charcoal fires. We made our selection (finding it impossible to resist buying also bouquets of cut flowers) and returned to our seats to eat. It is hard to describe the pleasure one gets traveling along through southern Mexico at a slow pace, eating fried chicken and gazing at the scenery.

We arrived at Arriaga at 8:30 at night, and were disappointed to find there were no hotel accommodations and gasoline. After dinner we were able to locate a gallon of lighter fluid and nine gallons of kerosene which we used to get us over the mountain and back onto the Inter-American Highway where we were able to find a filling station.

STOP AT TEHUANTEPEC

We drove on to Tehuantepec and spent the night there. On this part of the trip, we found accommodations and gas available everywhere. The next day we drove to Oaxaca and stayed there overnight and the next morning drove in to Mexico City.

From Mexico City we drove to Tamazunchale where we had good accommodations, and the following day we drove to Laredo, about a 12-hour trip. We had no unusual incidents on the highway. Much of the scenery is like traveling through Utah, Nevada, and Colorado. The people are very friendly, the accommodations good, and the officials most courteous all along the way.

Rural Mail Carriers Lead Interesting Life of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the rural mail carriers of our country are post-office employees and public servants in the best sense of the words. An interesting story of the work and experiences of one of them appeared in the March issue of the Farm Journal. It is entitled "Confessions of a Mail Carrier."

The article was written by Josh Drake, Jr., with Richard C. Davids.

I am sure that the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Members of Congress will find the article informative and interesting:

CONFESSIONS OF A MAIL CARRIER

(By Josh Drake, Jr., with Richard C. Davids)

(Josh Drake enlisted as a private in the infantry in World War II, came home with the Silver Star, Bronze Star, and Purple Heart—took a job as rural mail carrier in Oklahoma. We think his article speaks for mailmen across the United States, so if your mailman hasn't already sneaked this copy of Farm Journal to read, show him this story.)

One day last summer I found this note in a mailbox on my route: "Josh—I can't get the car started—I've got to get groceries, and the men folks are across the river with the tractors—Alice."

Back at the farmhouse a half mile down the lane, Alice Flynn was sitting in her car waiting for me. I drove up and gave her car a push. Just as it started, our bumpers hung. In all my years of pushing cars for boxholders, I've never seen bumpers locked the way they were.

Down at the barn I found a big wrecking bar, with which I pried, twisted, and pulled but no go. Finally I jacked up one car while Alice pried with the bar. That worked, and I continued on my route—an hour behind schedule.

A day never passes that I don't do something like that. Thank God I can.

I haven't always felt that way about my job, or the people I serve. In fact, I started this job on the outs with the world. I came back from World War II minus my right hand, part of my left, and with 35 pieces of shrapnel in my legs. I, Josh Drake, the athlete, who'd been so full of dreams.

All those big plans were out the window now. Might as well drive the mail—not much else that a cripple could do. I was morose and sullen those first few months.

But people along the way didn't seem to notice. On a sweltering day there'd be notes like this:

"Josh, if you have the time, there's cold lemonade for you at the house."

Or they'd meet me at the mail box with iced tea and cookies.

Gradually I saw that my daily visits meant something to them. I was more than just a delivery man that the Government paid to drive those 62 miles every day.

They needed someone to laugh and joke with, someone to run an occasional errand for them in town.

Slowly, patiently they made me see that just about the greatest gift to man is to be needed, to be able to help out others.

I've helped write English themes, deliver medicine, change tires, fix pumps, run cattle out of fields.

I've even found lost children. I saw 3-year-old Johnnie Holt one day following his dog across the road into a willow thicket a mile from his home. It was cold, so I put boy and dog in my car and drove them home.

Not a soul was in sight, so I honked my horn. Scared nearly frantic, Johnnie's mother came running across the field from hunting for her boy.

But if children along the route are sometimes a problem, they're always my greatest pleasure. From the time they can toddle out to the mailbox, they're my pals.

One of my favorites was Roy Kelly, a boy who was in love with big words. His mother had ordered an air rifle for him, and the very next morning he met me at the mailbox to pick it up. I tried to explain that it would take a week or 10 days.

But every day for a week he met me, and each time, I disappointed him.

On the eighth day Roy stood on tiptoe and looked at the big pile of parcels in the back of my car.

"Mr. Mailman," he said, "are you sure my gun isn't there?"

"Roy," I said gravely, opening the door for him to look inside, "you can read. Look for yourself. But I am deeply hurt to think you would question my honesty."

Roy went through the packages without looking up.

"It's not your honesty I'm beginning to wonder about," he said, "it's your sufficiency."

The next day the air rifle came. I started honking my horn half a mile from the house. The little rascal heard me, leaped off the porch, and came hot footing it out. He couldn't talk as he ripped the parcel to shreds.

It was worth a day's pay to see the look on his face as he pulled out the gun, carefully turned it over and over, then slowly lifted it to his shoulder and aimed, squinting from its shiny newness, at a fence post.

Suddenly he looked up at me and said, "Mr. Mailman, I'll bet you're the most sufficient mailman in the whole world."

That boy is a character. The day after he finished his first year in school, he showed me his straight-A report card and proudly said he'd been "emoted" to the second grade.

To the older folks, I guess I'll always be Josh Drake's boy, or Junior, despite my 37 years. You see, I was born and raised on the route I serve.

Last December, Mrs. Nichols, a sweet old lady, called my wife on the phone.

"Honey," she said, "does Junior make a commission on the stamps he sells?"

My wife told her that I got a straight salary and mileage, but no commission.

"Then I'll buy my stamps in town," she said. "I just didn't want Junior to miss out if he could make anything on these 20 packages I'm sending my grandchildren."

There's an old fellow named Flynn on my route who raises wolfhounds and some of the prettiest Bantam chickens you ever saw. Every few months he loads his hounds in a trailer and goes wolf hunting, sometimes for 2 or 3 weeks.

When he goes, he leaves a note for me to feed his prize Bantams. By now I know most of those biddies by name.

You find yourself doing little things like that, things the Post Office Department doesn't know about—much less require—probably rather you wouldn't do. Folks size up a new carrier pretty fast. If he's a stickler for the rules, they'll be careful not to ask favors. If they like him, they're soon treating him like one of the family, and won't hesitate to ask for help.

But I've been paid tenfold for every extra mile and every extra minute. Farm people have ways of paying a rural carrier. If I have car trouble, they lend me theirs, or take me to town for parts. To offer to pay is an insult.

The man with the wolfhounds? Last fall after the road past his place had been graded, he pulled me through a mile of mud that was nearly knee deep. Each morning he'd be waiting on his tractor. I told him I was pretty sure I could get through, but he insisted.

"No use tearing up your car," he said. He pulled me for 6 days—so fast that I was barely behind schedule.

That woman whose car I helped start makes the best fruit cakes I ever tasted. For the last 7 years, there's been a big one in the mailbox before Christmas, along with a note that means more to me than she'll ever guess.

And so it goes. Some days it seems I take as much out of the mail boxes as I stuff in: fruit, vegetables, sausages.

I remember one winter day in 1948. I plowed through one snowdrift after another and had to dig out or be pulled out with tractors. I finished my route 4 hours late.

Nine different patrons met me with sandwiches and hot drinks. I had to gulp down one sandwich after another under the watchful eyes of kind ladies, all sure I must be starving.

What a privilege it is to matter to such wonderful people.

During the last two wars, the rural mail carriers of America were asked to do a special job, that of carrying in person, night or day, that fateful message which began: "We regret to inform you." It was the most painful job a rural carrier ever did.

Every morning that I sorted mail during the Korean war, I lived in fear of finding such a telegram. But the Lord was kind to my patrons, and although three boys were wounded, all returned home.

This is my chance to say thanks—for my job and my friends, and what they've done for me.

And to the kids, my great pals, always helpful. A while back, I had a flat in front of the Sexton mail box, and Roxie, a cute little 4-year-old, came out to help. She was so eager that, in order to get her out of the way, I said: "Roxie, if you want to help, why don't you get a bucket of water and fill my radiator?"

She hurried away, pigtails flying, while I congratulated myself for my tact.

I changed the tire without further interruption. When I had let the car down, I said: "Roxie, did the radiator need any water?"

"Yes, sir," she said. "The front radiator didn't hold but a cupful, but the back radiator held a whole bucket."

You guessed it. My gas gage registered 6 gallons—2 of them water. I finished the route in Roxie's father's Ford.

The Indian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Commissioner Scott offered the following resolution, and moved its adoption:

"Whereas the deplorable condition of the American Indian has again been brought before the citizens of Minnesota and this county board; and

"Whereas the well meant efforts of a board member to solve the problem by giving a job to an unemployed Indian can only be a temporary solution to a single case while there are thousands existing in America, and

"Whereas the white settlers of a previous century seized from the original owners, by force and superiority of weapons, land, minerals, timber, and power sources of untold value; and

"Whereas our attitude toward conquered peoples has changed, and instead of appropriating the wealth of the conquered, we rebuild the bombed homes and public buildings, rehabilitate the sick and wounded, and restore the shattered economy of the conquered nation; and

"Whereas our debt to the former owners of this broad land is greater than to the Nazis, the Japanese, and others conquered in recent wars: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we call upon the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to alleviate current suffering among the Indians and to appoint a commission for a thorough study of the Indian problem to the end that all may be trained to become employable and self-supporting, and that attention to the problem of the original Americans be given priority to the subject of displaced persons from foreign lands. Integrating the Indian into our economic life will do much to erase from our history one of its blackest pages."

The question was on the adoption of the resolution and the roll being called, there were five yeas and no nays, as follows:

Ainsworth, yea.
Christensen, yea.
Hanson, yea.
Scott, yea.
Chairman Matthews, yea.

Resolution adopted.

Rearming of Western Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, during the recent consideration of the Paris protocols, the Committee on Foreign Relations received a statement from Mr. James P. Warburg, which should have been inserted in the printed committee hearings on the subject. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this statement from Mr. Warburg, together with his letter accompanying it, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 16, 1955.*

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I understand that your committee is going to hold hearings on the Western European Union agreements in the near future. I do not wish to request a hearing, but having testified on a considerable number of occasions before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with regard to our European policy, I should like respectfully to submit the attached statement for your consideration and for possible inclusion in the record.

I do not request a hearing because the question before your committee is whether or not to recommend ratification. I could not, in good conscience, recommend against

ratification at this stage of the game because the United States has gone much too far in urging other nations to ratify to make a withdrawal possible. I should, however, like to repeat in the shape of the attached statement the major points of the warning against our present policy, which I have on various occasions in the past submitted to your committee.

Very respectfully yours,

JAMES WARBURG.

PAPER PRESENTED TO WINTER CONFERENCE OF THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS AT TORONTO ON MARCH 26, 1955

(By James P. Warburg)

My point of view about rearming West Germany can be stated in four words.

I am against it.

I have written and spoken in opposition to it for the past 7 years, in your country as well as in my own. I shall go on opposing it so long as there remains the slightest chance of preventing it from coming to pass.

In this brief opening statement I shall confine myself to making a few categorical assertions which are open to challenge and which I am prepared to defend with supporting argument and evidence. First, two military assertions:

1. The only reason for rearming Germany is the belief that Western Europe cannot be defended against Russian invasion without German troops. This is, no doubt, true. But it is also true that Western Europe cannot be defended against a Russian invasion with German troops—least of all if the German contribution to western defense is limited to 12 divisions in order to prevent the Germany Army from outweighing that of France. The fact is that the only way to defend Europe against a Russian invasion is to prevent that invasion from being launched.

2. The only reasonable case for maintaining that 12 German divisions would make the difference between a defensible and an indefensible Western Europe rested upon an assumption which has been invalidated. This assumption was that, with both sides in possession of nuclear weapons, neither side would use them for fear of reprisal. Therefore, it was argued, conventional ground forces would regain their former importance. This never very realistic assumption was knocked into a cocked hat when the NATO Council declared on December 18, 1954, that, in the event of a Russian attack, the NATO forces would at once use tactical atomic weapons, to offset superior Russian conventional strength. Field Marshal Montgomery had already made this quite explicit in a lecture delivered on October 21 in which he had said:

"I want to make it absolutely clear that we at SHAPE are basing all our operational planning on using atomic and thermonuclear weapons in our defense. With us it is no longer: 'They may possible be used.' It is very definitely: 'They will be used, if we are attacked.'"

It is, therefore, perfectly clear that if Russia launches an invasion of Western Europe, world war III, fought with atomic and hydrogen bombs, will have begun. In such a war 12 German ground divisions will afford about as much protection to Western Europe as a World War II Anderson shelter will afford to your family. So much for the military argument.

Let me turn now to the political side:

1. The consummation of any plan to rearm West Germany as a member of the NATO alliance will foreclose all hope of ending the partition of Germany in the foreseeable future.

2. So long as Germany remains partitioned, it will remain a time bomb ticking in the heart of the European community.

3. Given the existing balance of power, neither Russia nor the West can hope to gain control of all of Germany, except perhaps through a war which would leave little worth controlling in Germany or any other part of Western Europe.

4. The key to a European peace settlement is the peaceful reunification of Germany on terms which will eliminate it as a bone of contention and provide the maximum assurance that it will not again become a pawn, partner, or prime mover in aggression against either East or West.

5. An all-German settlement of this nature demands that Russia abandon its hope of gaining control of Germany through undemocratic processes and that the West abandon its demand for a German military alliance. Russia has indicated its willingness to retreat from the position taken a year ago at the Berlin Conference. The Western Powers have never given the slightest indication of willingness to retreat from their demand that a reunified Germany shall be free to enter the NATO alliance.

6. No plan for making the rearmed two-thirds of a permanently partitioned Germany into the keystone in the arch of West European defense will command the wholehearted allegiance of the West European peoples, so long as the possibility of reaching an all-German settlement has not been fully explored. Neither the French, the German, nor the British Parliaments would have ratified the EDC or WEU treaties, were it not for fear that the United States would withdraw from Europe altogether if West Germany were not somehow rearmed. Parliamentary ratification in these circumstances creates not a situation of strength but a situation of dangerous weakness.

7. Once the West Germans have been given sovereignty and the right to rearm, they will have obtained from the West all that the West has to give. They can then achieve the liberation of their 18 million compatriots and the recapture of their lost lands in the East only by war or by negotiation with Russia.

8. To the extent that the Western Powers obstruct negotiations with Russia, they will alienate the Germans and turn them toward the East.

9. If, while they still have the power to do so, the Western Powers do not negotiate the reunification of Germany on terms which immunize it against Soviet seduction or penetration, the Germans will sooner or later take matters into their own hands. In that event, the terms of reunification may well be such as to constitute a serious danger to the West.

Finally, let me add one observation as to Germany itself.

The German people are not ready to be trusted with a military establishment. If given arms before they have developed a far more firmly established democratic tradition, their nation is likely once more to become "not a state possessing an army but an army possessing a state." For this assertion I can give you two authorities: John Foster Dulles and Konrad Adenauer. Both of these gentlemen stated what I have just said as their chief reason for supporting the now defunct European Defense Community. Chancellor Adenauer used this argument to obtain ratification of EDC by a reluctant parliament. Secretary of State Dulles made an eloquent speech to Mr. Molotov at the Berlin Conference a year ago, warning that a national German army would constitute a terrible threat to peace. Both are now striving with might and main to create that army.

In summary:

There is no valid military reason for West German rearmament. If there ever was one, it was destroyed on December 18, 1954.

From the political point of view, the ratification of WEU merely restores the bargaining position which was destroyed by French rejection of EDC. Unless that bargaining position is used to bargain before a West German army actually comes into being, the future of Europe will rest in the hands of the Bonn Republic. The nature of that young republic is, at best, wholly unpredictable.

The conclusion is, I think, obvious.

Price Support and the Wisconsin Dairyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each week there arrives in my office, as in the offices of other legislators, a great variety of daily and weekly newspapers from my State.

One such newspaper is the Sharon Reporter, published weekly in Walworth County, Wis.

On the front page of its most recent issue, it carried the grim story of an aroused meeting of grassroots dairy farmers who had, in my judgment, very rightly assembled to protest the inadequate return which our farmers are getting for milk. Some 400 to 500 farmers crowded the local grange hall to ask over their problems and to try to get some action upon them.

The farmers pointed out that in the last 3 years their milk returns have dropped $1.50 per hundredweight, and that right now Wisconsin dairymen are receiving only approximately $3.25 per hundredweight, which is less than 7 cents a quart. That is certainly a meager return for the farmer's labor—7 days a week, 52 weeks a year—and for his heavy investment in cattle, machinery, and buildings.

These facts point up problems which I, for one, have raised on the Senate floor time and time again, and which I have reviewed in detail with the Department of Agriculture and other Federal authorities.

I congratulate the farmers of the Sharon area for taking steps to secure justice for the great dairy segment of our economy, and I pledge my own continued efforts toward that objective.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial which was carried in the April 14 issue of the Sharon Reporter which described this grassroots meeting. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER IS UNHAPPY ABOUT HIS PRICE FOR MILK

The price being paid the farmer in the Chicago milkshed for his milk is the most important matter in his mind at this time. One must admit as much, after witnessing the assembly at Grange Hall last Tuesday night.

To bring 420 farmers out to an 8 p. m. meeting, after they had worked in the fields all the day, is a Herculean feat. But the "protesting farmers" announcement of a meeting to discuss the matter on a real grassroots level did just that.

It took county sheriff's deputies to handle the traffic; there were cars parked almost a mile on either side of the hall. One farmer told us, "I parked my car a mile away, walked to the hall, then couldn't get in." The writer had trouble edging his way through the packed hall to a position where he could get within camera range.

"Keep farm organizations out of this," Mike Dorocke, who did much of the speaking said. "We aren't here for the purpose of battling them. We want, instead, to do what we can as producers to get a more equitable share of what the consumer pays for fresh milk in the Chicago market area."

There was ample opportunity for all to be heard. At times it was hard to hear, and a tap of the gavel from the chairman was necessary to maintain order. But this was the real "grassroots"—these were not polished organizers who had called this meeting to order.

W. T. Carlson of Walworth presented a letter from Colorado's Department of Agriculture to prove that dairymen in the Loveland-Greeley-Longmont area get only $1.42 for grade-A milk—and their farms are worth $200 to $400 per acre. "Things could even get that bad," he said.

There was a definite majority of those present who believe the lawmakers in Washington can help to improve the local milk price situation. Of course some spoke openly in opposition of "going to Washington for help," but the assembly returned to the majority desire to do just that.

So they distributed mimeographed letters. These are to be signed by producers and members of their family and mailed to their Senators and Congressmen. "We want no handouts, but demand a decent livelihood," they say in part. "We will fight through the ballot box for our rights and justice."

If nothing more were to come of the meeting, the very fact that 420 turned out should stir all those concerned with dairying to the point of doing whatever is humanly possible to get the milk producer his fair share of the retail price.

But more may come soon from this meeting. There was a committee of producers formed—farmers from Sharon, Elkhorn, Clinton, Delavan, Harvard, Capron, and Alden. This committee will determine to keep the ball rolling—to carry the fight for a fairer share of the consumer's milk dollar along, until they feel the results of their fight in the milk checks.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of another Pan-American Day I again want to assure our friends south of us in this hemisphere that we are bound by ties more solid, more sincere, and more understanding than ever before. We form a great bloc of free nations under God, and with God's help we will go forward together for better lives and all those things that mean peace and prosperity under a Christian system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my personal tribute to Rev. Joseph F. Thorning for his unceasing work to further cement our relations with our southern neighbors. He is always in the forefront of every movement that tends toward closer cooperation, and how fortunate we are to have such a man giving of his time and talents to this most worthy cause.

Dismissal of Edward J. Corsi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, one of the most reputable fraternal organizations in America, the Order Sons of Italy in America, recently directed its national head, George J. Spatuzza, to send a telegram to President Eisenhower commenting on the dismissal of Mr. Edward J. Corsi, and on the question of our immigration and citizenship policies. In this telegram, Mr. Spatuzza urged the President to support changes in the McCarran-Walter Act, with particular reference to the national origins quota system.

Mr. Leonard H. Pasqualicchio, national deputy of this same lodge, sent a supplementary telegram to President Eisenhower concerning this whole matter.

I ask unanimous consent that these 2 telegrams, copies of which were made available to me by the Order Sons of Italy in America, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, *April 12, 1955.*

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

News of the dismissal of Edward J. Corsi as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State on Refugee Problems came as a shock to every member of the Order Sons of Italy in America. They join me in protesting the unfair, unwarranted, and unjust treatment accorded to this great American, whose devoted public service to the Nation and to his State has endeared him to his fellow men. Indeed, to no better man could the refugee program have been entrusted to than to Corsi, who the Secretary of State described "the best qualified man for the job."

We fear that the success of the refugee program so dear to your heart and to the hearts of the freedom-loving people is now in danger. Therefore, we respectfully beseech you to take effective steps to expedite its accomplishment. And in the name of justice we respectfully request your benign intercession to the end that changes be effectuated in the McCarran-Walter immigration and nationality law, particularly to the national origin faze of it, so that said law may be in consonance with the American principle of fair play and to democratic ideals.

GEORGE J. SPATUZZA,
Supreme Venerable, Order Sons of Italy in America.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 13, 1955.*

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing the telegram sent you by Supreme Venerable George J. Spatuzza, of the Order Sons of Italy in America, regarding the dismissal of Mr. Edward Corsi, as special assistant to the Secretary of State, as national deputy of the organization in Washington, I have been requested to inform you of the hundreds of complaints received here from all parts of the country, protesting the disgraceful dismissal of Mr. Corsi. The Order Sons of Italy, organized over 50 years ago, and now having thousands of members in 37 States of the Union, considers such an action a direct insult to Mr. Corsi and to the 10 million Americans of Italian origin. We respectfully suggest that you take a personal interest in this matter.

L. H. PASQUALICCHIO,
National Deputy, Order Sons of Italy in America, Washington, D. C.

The Anniversary of Bataan Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year in 1942 a battle was raging in the Philippines. In both American and Philippine history the defense of Bataan will long be remembered, not only as a chapter in the story of man's struggle against tyranny but as a crowning testimonial to the historic friendship between Americans and Filipinos. Today the government and citizens of the Philippines are meeting the challenges which confront their independent republic with that same courage demonstrated on the battlefield at Bataan.

We in the United States are prone to look upon the Philippines somewhat as a father looks upon a son who has grown into manhood. While recognizing the maturity and independence of the Philippines, we retain those bonds of amity which have their foundation in a tradition of close association of our peoples. We take pride in the fearless energy with which President Ramon Magsaysay and his government act in the welfare of the new republic.

In our relations since Philippine independence was proclaimed in 1946 there has been evident a spirit of cooperation both in achieving the domestic aims of the Philippine Government and in jointly supporting the aims of the free world in Asia.

In the forefront of the problems with which the new Republic has been confronted have been those relating to the Philippine economy. There has been the need for rehabilitation and reconstruction in the wake of the damage inflicted by the war. There have been a myriad of economic and financial problems which are closely related to independence itself and to the withdrawal of the United States. There have been problems related to the general economic development of the Philippines including the expansion of light industry. Perhaps at the very heart of these complexities has been the haunting question of the ultimate effect of independence

upon Philippine trade, a trade based upon the export of Philippine sugar, hemp, hardwood, and other products to the United States on a preferential tariff basis.

The United States did not leave the Philippines to cope alone with these economic problems. Since independence it has offered its economic assistance. Among other measures taken, it has been considered in the best interest of the two countries that a tariff not be imposed on imports from the Philippines. We have recognized that both countries benefit directly from this trade and, in the larger view, that the building of a strong Philippines is in the interest of the United States and the free world.

In addition to its economic development, the Philippine Republic since independence has made great gains in the development of its political institutions and in further enhancing the public welfare. A Communist-inspired rebellion has been dissipated by the combined use of force and such constructive measures as homestead grants and land reforms. The firm alinement of the Philippines with the countries of the free world is reflected in the initiative taken in the development of the Manila Pact for the collective defense of Southeast Asia and in the Pacific Charter.

The people of the Philippine Islands are building a democracy in the Pacific. They are facing their present difficulties with vigor and courage—the same qualities they manifested in such a conspicuous manner 13 years ago in the defense of Bataan.

Building Boom Fits the Needs of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article, which appeared in the current issue of the Correlator, a magazine published by the National Association of Home Builders. This article is a condensed version of a speech by George C. Johnson, president of the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn, delivered before group V, Savings Banks Association. It is a clear delineation of the housing problem today, and represents a thoughtful and logical answer to critics of the expansion of home building:

WHY THE OUTCRY ABOUT OVERBUILDING?

(By George C. Johnson, president, Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn)

I am becoming quite concerned with recent articles in newspapers and magazines to the effect that present financing for homes is too liberal, and that the Nation's home mortgage debt is too high. Some of these conclusions seem to be based on a superficial examination of insufficient statistics, and they ignore many basic economic facts. Liberal mortgage credit, soundly applied on the basis of a borrower's ability to pay, is one of the strongest props we have for a prosperous national economy.

It is very true that mortgage lending today is on a far more liberal basis than at any time in the past, but these loans are sound. The long-term self-amortizing mortgage with low downpayment has proved the greatest single factor in putting good homes within the reach of families in every income bracket. Is this bad?

Less than a month ago, I heard an economist say that we are building too many homes for sale; that because there is no particular encouragement from government or elsewhere to build rental housing, families are being forced to buy homes. Induced might have been a better word than forced. I wonder if that economist, and others who share similar views, realize that the American family has an inherent desire to own a home of its own. I wonder why these people fail to realize that the purchase of a home with an amortized mortgage is a form of systematized saving, and to recognize the fact that home ownership is a basic part of our economy.

Some of the economists who say we have too liberal mortgage lending terms use the argument that the present rate of family formations is not large enough to support a building volume of a million-plus homes a year. Naturally, formations of new families do have an ultimate effect on the demand for homes. However, I think it is an entirely erroneous premise to use the rate of family formations as the only yardstick.

In trying to learn at what stage family formation becomes a factor in the home-buying market, I have raised the question: Does the couple that gets married this year immediately go out and buy a home, or does that couple buy a home next year, 5 years from now, 10 years from now—or when?

I believe I have the answer: It is the family with children which is the biggest factor in the market for homes—not new marriages in themselves.

I found this answer in an examination of the last 500 mortgage applications filed at my bank. These included homes selling from $10,000 to $42,000. This survey showed that 84.2 percent of those 500 families had one or more children. Of the 15.8 percent who have no children, a vast majority are older couples. Very few were newly married, and these were in the higher income brackets.

Another revealing survey was made by a large-scale home building firm on Long Island last year, following completion of a 480-home operation. This showed the average age of the head of the family buying these homes to be 32.3 years. I consider this particularly revealing because it should refute the claim made by some alarmists that "mere kids are being enticed to buy homes because of easy credit terms."

The Census Bureau estimates that 600,000 new households were formed last year. In 1953, the number was 800,000. In 1952, the estimate was 1 million. Nevertheless, in each of those 3 years, the home builders of America built and sold more than 1 million homes.

If we accept the theory of those who assert that the declining rate of family formations should immediately lower the rate of dwelling unit production, and thereby disregard all other demands for homes, the Nation should have built only 600,000 homes last year. Instead, a total of 1,215,500 dwelling units was produced, and, in most areas, all were immediately occupied.

That brings up a very important consideration that seems to be overlooked by the people who contend that we are confronted with an overproduction of housing.

In the area in which members of the Group Five Savings Banks Association operate, very, very few homes are built on speculation. No builder wants to be, or can afford to be, left with an inventory of unsold homes. Therefore, the general practice of development builders in this area is to erect 1 or 2 exhibit houses and then sell 25 or 30 homes from these models. Only after purchase contracts are signed for these houses, does the builder start construction.

On this subject of whether or not we are likely to overbuild, I would like to emphasize my belief that the market itself regulates the building volume. There is a certain and sure test. If people do not want homes, or cannot afford them, they will not buy, and builders will not build.

Also, the supply and demand for materials can serve as a brake on production. For example, suppose we look at just one key material—cement. If all the roadbuilding and other construction which is now scheduled gets under way, where is the cement to come from? Do we have enough productive capacity?

The word "boom" has recently been used very carelessly in connection with present housing activity—activity which has been moving at a rate of 1 million-plus dwelling units for each of the past 6 years.

I do not think we have a boom, in the popular idea of the term. Instead, it is natural expansion of our housing to meet the needs of a fantastically increasing population, with incomes to afford modern homes.

The 1955 total construction expenditure is estimated at 39.5 billions of dollars. At today's valuation of the dollar, the 1923–29 annual volume of construction was 24.2 billions of dollars. Does the difference between $39.5 and $24.2 billion, or $15.3 billion, constitute a boom? I think not; particularly when we realize that population has increased since the 1920's from 118 million to 162 million.

I also disagree with the theory of alarmists that the Nation's present home-mortgage debt of about $75 billion is too high. This is 25.1 percent of estimated national income for 1954. In 1940, the $17.3-billion mortgage debt was 22.7 percent of national income. But of equal, or perhaps greater importance, is that today there is a much broader base for carrying the home-mortgage debt than was the case 15 years ago. The debt is distributed among a far greater number of families. In the period from 1940 to 1950, the number of families responsible for payment of the mortgage debt had more than doubled. Furthermore, the mortgage debt in 1950 was only 96 percent of the income of the families living in their own homes, whereas in 1940, the debt was 166 percent. While we have no data beyond 1950, it seems reasonable to assume that this trend has continued.

I would welcome real proof—not theory—that this is inflationary, as some assert, or a serious danger to our economy.

It is very true that builders today have no difficulty in arranging mortgage terms that buyers can afford, which makes selling easy. This is due to a considerable extent to the splendid operations of the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration home-loan-guaranty program.

The VA has done a magnificent job in helping war veterans acquire good housing. The FHA has done an equally fine job for the non-veteran. But it has long been recognized that the non-veteran was the forgotten man when it came to liberal terms for the purchase of a home. That is why the more liberal terms were written into the Housing Act of 1954. Now, less than 7 months since that law became effective there seems to be a concerted effort to eliminate these easier terms.

But of even more seriousness—and this is very definitely a builders' problem—is the well-defined movement in some quarters to abolish the FHA entirely. Suggestions to curtail the activity and functions of the FHA should be taken with a grain of salt. The source of these suggestions should be examined very carefully. Could some of these suggestions be made with a view to limiting competition? Have some of the opponents of the FHA an ax to grind, namely to exclude from the making of high ratio loans, all but the type of institution they represent?

Last June, I said publicly that the FHA has been the greatest single boon ever conceived to benefit the home-buying public. I want to reiterate that statement here today with all the force at my command. Those opposing the FHA and the VA have advanced the argument that today's low downpayments and long mortgage terms do not provide enough equity, and that the credit terms encourage families to buy homes they cannot afford.

What kind of reasoning is that?

The buyer is not approved for the loan if he cannot afford the carrying charges. Approval of credit and suitability of home to buyer is fundamental to this type of lending.

Any equity at all is better than a handful of rent receipts, and it has been the experience of my own bank where we have some $91 million, or about 19 percent of our total mortgage portfolio, invested in FHA-insured mortgages, that these home-buying families do establish equities. You would be surprised at the number and amounts of prepayments.

The more liberal mortgage terms now available create a much broader market for the builder's product. Limiting mortgage lending to conventional financing would deliver a body blow to the local, State, and National economy by restricting the volume of home construction.

One must remember that practically no rental housing has been made available in the price range that the average family in moderate circumstances can afford. Most of the rental housing has been either the Government-subsidized type for low-income groups, or the luxury type for high-income families.

However—and this must not be lost sight of—the one-family home builders, assisted by liberal financing terms, have been able to step into the breach and supply homes for families under terms that these families can afford. Also, home-owning families are the backbone of any community.

There is a basic economic brake on builders overextending themselves in the matter of sales. We made a study of sales and building operations at the end of January on builders' jobs we are financing. This covered some 11,000 homes. We found that sales were good in 82 percent of the jobs, fair in 14 percent, and poor in only 4 percent. This indicates that demand is still strong from the home-buying public and that apparently builders are really merchandising their product. I might add that in almost every case where sales were regarded as poor, it was near the conclusion of a development, or was a very small operation to start with.

It is imperative that costs should not rise to the point where buyers cannot afford the homes that are being built. But I doubt if the mortgage lenders will permit that to happen. We have the tools with which to put on the brakes when necessary.

Pan-American Day and Hemispheric Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1890, was a historic day, for it marks the inauguration of what we know today as the Pan American Union. On Pan-American Day, as indeed on every other day in the year, the American Republics can be proud of the conception of pan-Americanism. Under it we demonstrate to the world that different cultural traditions can join in common cooperation, that 21 sovereign nations can respect each other's rights.

If pan-Americanism has been a success, this has been due in no small measure to the work over the years of the Pan American Union.

The pan-American idea derived its inspiration from the vision of Simon Bolivar, the Liberator, and from our own statesman, Henry Clay. Active American participation dates from 1890, when the first International Conference of American States was held here at Washington, under the able leadership of Secretary of State Blaine. As a result of that conference an International Union of American Republics was created, represented by a Commercial Bureau located in Washington. The name, Commercial Bureau, reflects the purposes of this early organization. It was not a political union; rather its purpose was the promotion of friendship and good relations among the republics of the American Continent, through the fostering of trade. In 1902 the Commercial Bureau was renamed the International Bureau of American Republics, and the scope of its activities was broadened. Finally, in 1910 the name of the Bureau was changed to the Pan American Union, which came in time to be the popular name for the broader Union of American Republics, of which the Pan American Union was but the agent.

As the popular embodiment of pan-Americanism, the Pan American Union was a most useful center of information on all topics of concern to the nations and peoples of this hemisphere. It provided import and export data, and general commercial information. It stimulated the exchange of students and professors, and promoted closer cultural relations among the member republics. While perhaps undramatic, these activities have contributed materially to the growth of hemispheric solidarity.

In 1948, the Union of American Republics was reorganized at the Bogotá Conference into the Organization of American States. The Pan American Union was designated as the central, permanent organ of the new organization. In this capacity it serves as the general secretariat for the Organization, and is thus of crucial significance to the efficient functioning of the Organization as a whole. Inasmuch as the United States bases its policy in this hemisphere on cooperation through the Organization of American States, the Pan American Union is of great significance for our policy as well. The mutual interests of all American states are bound up in its program and its operations.

Today the Pan American Union still serves as a center for the exchange of information and as the means by which individuals and private groups can become most directly apprised of the activities of the Organization of American States. It carries on the work assigned to it by the decisions of the various conferences and conventions of American Republics. Finally, and perhaps, of greatest importance today, is its work, together with other organs of the Organization of American States, in sponsoring programs of technical cooperation.

It is in such basic and vital activities as these that the Pan American Union is continuing today, as in the past, to serve the highest interests of world peace and progress.

Mental Hospital Facilities in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska to treat the mentally ill in the Territory is imperative. The population of Alaska has boomed, with nearly 180,000 people reported in our northern Territory.

At the present time Alaska mental patients are transported thousands of miles from their homes to a privately operated hospital in Portland, Oreg. At the same time mental patients are forced to undergo confinement, frequently in outmoded territorial jails, while awaiting transportation to Portland. Commitment procedures are archaic and outmoded.

To meet the important need for mental facilities in Alaska, I have introduced Senate bills 1027 and 1028. Congresswoman EDITH S. GREEN has introduced identical bills in the House of Representatives.

I am very pleased to learn of the reported general support Secretary of the Interior McKay has given these bills, and I am especially pleased by the support afforded my bills in the city of Portland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the columns of the Oregon Journal for April 12, 1955, which supports the immediate need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska and for urgent overhauling of outmoded commitment procedures.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA NEEDS OWN MENTAL HOSPITAL

In general, we support Senator NEUBERGER's two bills (S. 1027 and S. 1028) to provide mental hospital facilities for Alaska in Alaska and for modernizing Alaska's obsolete commitment and treatment laws. And so does his stanch political foe, Secretary of the Interior McKay.

Since 1904 mentally ill patients from Alaska have been sent to Morningside Hospital in Portland, a privately owned and operated facility, for care and treatment. And while this hospital has an excellent reputation, it is generally conceded that Alaska has long since reached the point where it is entitled to its own mental hospital facilities.

It also is conceded by health authorities in the Territory and in the States, including the director of Morningside, that Alaska's

commitment procedures are "archaic and extremely inhumane."

Thus these bills, sponsored in the House by Representative GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, attack both these problems simultaneously.

One of the problems, naturally, is that of cost, for both the construction of mental hospital facilities for outpatient and inpatient treatment, and for modernizing Alaskan commitment procedures.

But Secretary McKay suggests an answer: Annual Federal grants on a declining scale for the interim period; expenditure of $6,500,000 over a 10-year period for construction of facilities, and transfer to the Territory of 500,000 acres of public lands, including mineral rights, from which Territorial mental hospital costs could be paid. Senator NEUBERGER's hospital-construction bill merely provides for the appropriation of "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." S. 1028 also suggests that Alaska eventually should assume responsibility for its own mental hospital program.

Based on our own observation of the handling and care of Alaska's mentally ill patients, some such program is imperative. The ordeal disturbed patients have been forced to go through while awaiting transfer to Portland—including incarceration in cramped and obsolete Territorial jails like ordinary criminals—is harrowing indeed.

That is one procedure S. 1028 would prohibit. Section 14 provides that persons ordered hospitalized in Alaska may be held in a local hospital or foster home or other suitable facility pending commitment, "but he shall not, except because of and during an extreme emergency, be detained in a nonmedical facility used for the detention of persons charged with or convicted of penal offenses."

In his speech before the Portland City Club the other day, Senator NEUBERGER predicted that if Secretary McKay would support his bills they would pass. Now that McKay appears to have done so, the chances of approval are at least good.

It's about time.

Twenty-Dollar Bid for Your Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article published by the Fact Finder relative to the action of the Congress regarding the measure providing for a $20 income-tax deduction. This article embodies many sound arguments which should be of interest to those responsible for the fiscal policy of our Government.

The reactions of the Fact Finder follow:

TWENTY DOLLARS BID FOR YOUR VOTE

Remember how much you could buy for a dollar in 1939? You could walk out of a grocery store with a pound of coffee, a pound of hamburger, a dozen eggs, a quart of milk, a pound of shortening, and a loaf of bread. What's more, you'd have a few cents change.

Today you couldn't even get the coffee and bread for a dollar. And you'd have to pay another $1.90 to get the other items.

Just 15 years ago the average family of four could eat a week on $9.00 worth of groceries. Today the same food costs $24.00.

If that makes you mad, how do you think it affects people who have to live on fixed incomes, like annuities and pensions. Their life savings are being wiped out. Dollars they saved in 1939 are worth only 50 cents today, and even less when it comes to food. Inflation has been slowed down in the last 2 years; but the cost of living will rise again of the majority in Congress have their way to reduce income taxes by $20 a person without reducing the amount of money the Government spends.

You see, it was deficit financing—the Government borrowing to live beyond its income—that helped create this inflation. And if the Government reduces its income now without reducing its spending it will start up the spiral of inflated living costs all over again.

In playing up this tax reduction of $20 per person, dishonest politicians are playing with dynamide in order to get themselves reelected.

WHAT'S A DEMAGOG?

A demagog is a leader who claims to be for the people and promises them things that he can't deliver, or what will hurt the country, just to get their vote. Many demagogs in Washington have now led people to believe that the tax load could be lightened for the average man simply by adding more taxes to the wealthy people. Every honest American should answer the demagogs with these facts:

The major share of income taxes on individuals is paid by those in the $3,000–$10,000 bracket. This group now pays 48 percent, almost half, of individual income taxes.

If all income over $10,000 per year were confiscated, the total additional taxes would be only $4½ billion, or enough to run the Government for just 27 days.

If all income over $4,000 per year were confiscated, the additional take would run the Government just 2½ months. These figures are from a recent report by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, which proves that our Government is mainly supported, not by rich people, but by the mass of people like you and me. Quote these figures the next time you hear some demagog promise to lighten the tax burden on the average person by "soaking the rich."

The only way we can ever get relief from high taxes is by making the politicians reduce Government spending. Here's what Government costs us today: If you are an average family man earning $4,500 a year and working the usual 8-hour day, the Tax Foundation says you work 2 hours and 35 minutes of every working day to pay your taxes, direct and indirect. They say that's longer than you must work to buy your food—high as it is today. It's almost twice as long as it takes to earn your housing costs. And it's four times as long as your clothing or transportation costs. So Uncle Sam is riding your back the heaviest of all.

A GREATER DEBT LOAD

What happens if politicians try to buy our votes by cutting taxes without reducing Government spending? Senator HARRY F. BYRD, the Democratic statesman from Virginia, is always pointing out the danger of continued deficit spending which increases the Federal debt. He says that our present debt of $280 billion is "equal to the full value of all the land, all the buildings, all the mines, all the machinery, all the livestock—everything of tangible value in the United States. We are now mortgaged to the hilt."

Senator BYRD says young men and women born in 1930 have lived under a Government operating in the red virtually all their lives—21 out of the last 24 years. Today the interest alone on the Federal debt takes over 10 percent of our total Federal revenue and now totals more than the entire expenditure of the Federal Government 20 years ago.

Some people say, "So what? Why worry about the debt? We only owe it to ourselves." We owe it to those who own Government bonds. Even if we hold Government bonds, it isn't good: We must pay extra taxes today to pay the interest on our own bonds.

Senator BYRD says, "Public debt is not like private debt. If private debt is not paid off, it can be ended by liquidation. But if public debt is not paid off with taxes, liquidation takes the form of disastrous inflation or national repudiation. Either would destroy our form of government."

Is it possible that this long-term program of spending to increase the public debt is an insidious plan to destroy our form of government? Socialist Tract 127 says, "To the socialist, the best government is that which spends the most money."

WHERE IS THE MONEY GOING?

In 1939 less than 5,000,000 persons were receiving a Federal check every month. In 1953 regular monthly Federal checks went to over 20 million.

In 1939 armament cost the American people $1½ billion. In 1953 such expenditures were over $45 billion. In 1939 no foreign land received any significant financial support from the United States, but in 1954 alone over 5 billion American tax dollars went to 54 foreign lands.

Some say we must spend this money for national defense. The wisdom of this spending for defense security is highly questionable, according to many experts on communism. But the strain on our ecenomic security, both nationally and individually, is a much more serious matter. The purchasing power of our dollar has been reduced 50 percent in 15 years. At this rate, by continuing this policy, the United States will be bankrupt in another 15 years.

What can we do about it? You and I can do this:

1. We can arm ourselves with the truth to resist the demagogues, who bid $20 for our vote.

2. We can pass the truth on to others, who need to know the facts, to protect their future, too.

3. Then all of us, armed with the facts, can speak up with courage and arouse millions of Americans into patriotic action.

4. We can act as a voting bloc of millions of informed Americans who will say to petty politicians and demagogues in both parties, "We're wise to you, mend your ways. Reduce Government spending at once, reduce inflation, then cut Federal taxes so that we can save more and every State and town can have more in local taxes for better schools, more for teachers, police and fire departments. We want statesmen instead of demagogues."

Thus, we, the people, will regain control of our Federal Government.

Valley With a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago Mr. David E. Lilienthal, who for many years was Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, made a most interesting and informative speech

at Athens College, Athens, Ala. The speech was on the subject, Valley With a Future. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALLEY WITH A FUTURE

(Address by David E. Lilienthal at Athens College, Athens, Ala.)

It's now 22 years since I first came to live and to work in the Tennessee Valley. In these early days, my office was mostly in my hat; most of the time I spent "on the road," traveling up and down a region almost as large as Great Britain, getting to know the folks who live in the valley and their problems, as nearly as I could.

In those days, you and I talked chiefly about one thing. We talked about the future. We kept our eyes ahead. We laid plans and we worked hard, all of us, to make our dreams for the future come true.

What was the "future" 20 years ago is today's "present." And many, indeed most of our dreams, most of the things we looked forward to, planned for, worked for and often had to fight for, 20 years ago, have become realities. They're here. They are all around you. You can see the results on the hillsides, the pastures, the new homes and churches and hospitals and power lines and laboratories, and most spectacularly, of course, in the great factories and the majestic dams.

You are proud of these accomplishments. You have every right to be proud. And fair-minded people everywhere, of all sections and shades of opinion, share your pride. For this is an American accomplishment.

Moreover, you can take satisfaction in the fact that this great public works effort is paying for itself, paying in dollars, paying in a greater national defense, paying in economic and human benefits to the region and the country.

No Federal public works of this magnitude anywhere in this country is being paid for by the people directly concerned as fully or as rapidly as you are paying for the TVA—in your monthly power bills and in the greater Federal income taxes you are now in a position to pay.

But the people of the Tennessee Valley are not the kind who are content to live in the past or rest on their laurels, however great.

It was the future that interested you in 1933. It is your future that primarily interests you in 1955. It is about that future that I want to talk to you in this homecoming visit.

It seems to me appropriate to be talking with you once more about the future of the Tennessee Valley, in the setting of the campus of this beautiful and historic small college. For if there is one thing that symbolizes a forward-looking, hopeful, optimistic and youthful outlook on life—the outlook on life that thinks always about the future—it is education.

Athens College, its ambitions and hopes and needs for growth and development, represents and symbolizes the hopes and ambitions and needs of all other educational activities throughout the Tennessee Valley. The presence here tonight of a cross-section of the citizenship of this part of the valley who are enlisted to help Athens College get along toward its enlarged objectives is representative of citizens in other parts of the valley who, too, are working for the strengthening and development of education in their communities.

The friends of Athens College recognize that the spectacular growth and development of the valley's agriculture and industry and commerce must be accompanied by an expansion and acceleration of its facilities for the education of her young people. This is not for the limited purpose of training future employees of the valley's industries and businesses, though of course that is needed. The underlying purpose is not to supply industry with trained people, but to supply the needs of human beings for increased opportunity to grow and develop as individuals.

You cannot build a great future for this valley by great dams or factories alone. The greatness of a valley is measured by the stature of the individuals who live in that valley.

Whether the future of the Tennessee Valley is a great future will not be measured by statistics about the productivity of goods. It will be measured by the quality of the life of the people who live here.

If anyone has any doubt that simply achieving a high level of income, of having a great deal of money, is in itself and alone a very worthy objective, or that it guarantees a good quality of human beings, just let him take a look at some of the characters who forgather at Las Vegas, Nev., or Miami, Fla., or around the fleshpots of any great city, or smaller one, for that matter. There you can see people who demonstrate again today what philosophers and religious teachers and historians have known for hundreds and hundreds of years, namely, that there are many people who just can't stand prosperity. No, achieving a high level of income—by individuals or by a region—doesn't necessarily mean achieving high standards of life.

The Tennessee Valley as we think of its future, it seems to me, stands in somewhat this position: The objective of raising the level of income—the goal we talked about and worked at so hard over 15 and 20 years ago—may not have been fully realized; but clearly the valley is over the hump.

When we get together here again 10 years from now—and I hope all of us will be here, for I certainly intend to—we will be able to see better than we can tonight that our problem today is not how to obtain prosperity but what to do with it.

But the problem: What do we do with ourselves as we attain prosperity is essentially a problem for individuals. For it concerns individual goals, purposes; what it is that the individual values highly, his standards of conduct, what he chooses to do with his new-found leisure, and similar issues.

Our great issues now—and this is true of the country as a whole—are no longer primarily ones of new agricultural techniques, or how to use a river for navigation, or how to put electricity to work for us. The great issues for the valley's future are not such economic or engineering or business issues as these. Instead, they deal with individual life, the civic spirit of individuals, the development of character, of honor, of self-respect and respect for one's neighbors, of compassion, and of decency.

The future problems of the Tennessee Valley deal with the spirit of men, with the quality of human life that will develop, grow and flourish here in this magnificent region of America.

This is a great opportunity. In the process of rising to that opportunity, great responsibilities rest upon your existing institutions in two areas: the area we call religious and the area we call educational. It is concerning the educational area that we are gathered here tonight.

If I understand the temper and the mood and the capacities of the people of this valley—and I have certainly had an opportunity to learn about these things—you respond to great, simple, basic issues.

The TVA idea of the unified development of the physical resources of the region provided a great unifying central issue about which the valley's energies and loyalties rallied, during the 20 years past.

Looking to the coming years, what issue, what broad and fundamental program, is there that can, in time, take the place of that rallying cry of regional development?

I don't know what it will turn out to be. But will you permit me, as a former neighbor of yours, to suggest at least one component of that new objective for the valley? It is this: A determined, all-out effort directed to the development of the finest possible educational facilities and opportunities for the young people of the Tennessee Valley.

Nothing will give you greater satisfaction as individuals. Nothing will pay greater dividends in the creation of leadership. No single thing, except only religious conviction, will better protect the valley against the deterioration of character which too often accompanies the achievement of high material standards of living.

Most important, a great program of developing education at every crossroads, in every community neighborhood, on every college campus, will come closer than any other single thing, again excepting religion, to build strong the fiber of the spirit and integrity upon which, and only upon which, a great civilization can be erected.

We know and all agree, I think, that a region or a community whose support of its schools and libraries is niggardly is bound to stagnate.

I suggest the valley's folks ask themselves such questions as these:

Do the schools in our communities, rural as well as urban, offer programs that meet the needs of this new and changed valley? Are the programs of education the kind that stimulate and broaden the thinking of boys and girls?

Are the colleges and universities of our region expanding to meet the challenge of colleges in other areas, so that our young people will not have to leave home to get a modern education?

Are we making sure that those priceless assets—the exceptionally talented young person—can get a chance to go to school and college, even if he hasn't the money? Remember that your valley and the Nation must not, at our peril, waste or lose a single one of these rare individuals. Are there enough scholarships available to provide help to all those who need it to complete their education?

Are our teachers' salaries such as to give assurance that a fine type of person will be in charge of the guidance of our young people?

Visitors come to this valley now from all over the world to see what you have done. Since I left the TVA, I have traveled around the world a good deal. In the most remote and out-of-the-way parts of the world as well as in the centers of London and Paris, I found people intensely interested and enormously admiring of your achievements here. I found that they had taken the trouble to inform themselves about the TVA with a detail and understanding which I wish existed among more people in our Government in Washington, from the White House down.

Just as your physical and economic developments here are today looked upon as a great and inspiring model, the time may well come 10 years or 20 years hence when a program of development of education in the Tennessee Valley will also be looked upon the country and the world over as a great and insipring example.

From what I have said, I don't want it to be implied that I don't think you have any current problems, problems that deal with your economic development and growth. You certainly have.

Moreover I am fully aware of the controversy raging about how to supply the greatly needed additions to the valley's pow-

er system. So that I may not be misinterpreted as dismissing this as a matter of little consequence—which is certainly not my point of view—let me say some words about the future of the valley in relation to its power supply.

Your memory and mine are clear on one point: From the time in the summer of 1933 when I stood not far from where we are tonight and on behalf of the TVA accepted custody of the Muscle Shoals operation from the Army Corps of Engineers, TVA has never had enough power to supply the growing needs of a growing region. Never.

This is a tribute to the potentials for growth of this valley, and a commentary on the short-sightedness of the critics who always said we had a "surplus" of power.

So let's remember that it is nothing new, this chore of persuading the Congress, against both fair and unfair critics, that this valley needs more and more electric power.

In the second place, bear in mind that in its efforts to secure adequate power supply, TVA has had set-backs now and then, but they have always been temporary ones. Today you are the most highly electrified large region on the face of the earth. The TVA power system is the largest integrated power system in the world, and one of the best managed.

The high caliber of TVA's management, the low construction and operating costs attained by TVA engineers, are recognized and respected in almost every major industrial concern in this country. Don't forget too what the plain facts show: the Tennessee Valley region has won the confidence of the major industrial companies of this country as a place to do business.

Why have these great industrial companies located new plants here, representing a total investment so large as to be almost unbelievable? Because this valley is fast becoming and in a decade will definitely be one of the three leading industrial centers of this whole country. These concerns are here—and more of them are planning to come—because this valley is a good place for industry, a good place to make money.

And because this is a place to make money, these concerns will expand their operations here. About this there cannot be the slightest doubt. As they expand, auxiliary industries will grow up. This has been the record of the past; it is what the future holds.

Where is the electric power coming from to supply this great and steady and continuous growth?

Let me state my firm conviction on this score. In spite of all attempted roadblocks, this region is going to have the electric power resources it needs.

Nothing can stop economic facts—and the fact is the valley is growing and it needs more power. Its major industries are growing and they need more power.

Power from coal can be produced here in this valley at extraordinarily low cost. The industrial importance of this crucial fact is now becoming more fully realized.

Your valley's steam power costs are as low, or lower, than the costs in any place in the United States. You have the natural advantage of access to excellent coal reserves, and exceptionally low costs of transportation of that coal, largely by water, from the mines to powerplants along the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Mississippi Rivers.

Bear this in mind: the navigation aspects of the TVA, in cutting the cost of steampower, are now almost as important valley advantages for industry, as your hydroelectricity.

Moreover, those costs are likely to decline even further. Technical developments are just around the corner that can cut fuel costs for future powerplants, at the same time they provide the basis for major chemical industries based on coal.

Who will supply the capital for these power plants?

This certainly isn't the time nor place to discuss in any detail the several ways in which the needed capital can be raised.

It is possible that Congress by appropriations or TVA bond issues, or both, may provide the capital for expansion. Or it may conclude to provide appropriations for that part of the added power said to be required for the power-eating atomic energy program. After all, a power plant for the AEC operations at Oak Ridge or Paducah is as much a part of the atomic energy program as the gaseous diffusion factory that uses the power; those factories, of course, are all built with funds appropriated by Congress.

Congress may reflect on the fact that the Federal Government is getting a handsome money return from its investments in the TVA power system. Congress knows that when it directs TVA to build a power plant for national defense needs, it gets the services of the most efficient engineering organization in the country. Why throw away that public asset? And when TVA builds a power plant, as at Shawnee, Ky., the costs are not $51,000,000 over the estimates as they were at the Electric Energy Inc. plant just across the river at Joppa, Ill.; the scheduled completion dates are not months and months in arrears, as they were at Joppa. Congress has learned that TVA engineering saves the taxpayer lots of money.

The Dixon-Yates device is not an alternative way of providing power for the valley. I won't go into the merits of that scheme. Suffice it to say that the people of the valley have made it clear that they just won't have it; and there is no way by which your Government or TVA or AEC or Dixon-Yates can ram it down your throats.

Clearly, the Dixon-Yates method is out, as an alternative way of supplying power to this valley. It may supply Arkansas but not Tennessee.

But the demise of Dixon-Yates will not provide an affirmative answer. What other alternatives are there for providing the capital for economic power expansion?

The valley itself, through a region-wide, non-profit corporation, or by one or more of its municipalities, may decide to secure the funds and take over the function of building the needed steam-power additions to the TVA system, the power to be handled by the TVA itself. A good deal of thought has been given to this by the valley leadership, as you know.

Personally, I happen to think this is the best course, for the long pull, and the sooner the better. You are paying for these plants; you ought to own them. You ought, in my opinion, to put an end to this annual kicking around you've been taking.

But whatever the method of raising the funds and providing the huge amounts of power needed—and the answer will be known in a matter of a few months—of this one can be sure:

Where there is a great economic need for power, and that power can be produced, from coal, at a total cost of less than four mills a kilowatt hour, as you folks can in this valley, the capital will be forthcoming, and the power produced. From a long-range viewpoint, the future of this region will be a future of increased power supply for an assured growth.

The problem of power supply, and the other aspects of your economic problems will take hard work, hard thinking, determination, ingenuity, and steadfastness. But power supply and other economic and physical problems of the valley are not the theme of my remarks to you tonight. Nor are they, in my opinion, the most important nor the most pervasive issues as we look to the future. It is that conviction that has led me to talk to you tonight about education, education here at Athens College in Northern Alabama, education for the young people in every part of this new valley.

Years ago the valley rejected the idea that it was the country's "Economic Problem No. 1." We said instead that we were the Nation's valley of opportunity. So it has been. And it is still the Valley of Opportunity, the valley with a future. In that future the development of the valley's educational institutions should play the leading role.

The Bricker Amendment Battle Is On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that an overwhelming majority of American citizens would be fighting for the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the Bricker amendment, if they knew about it and what it means in terms of preserving our sovereignty.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the May 1955 issue of American Mercury, The Bricker Amendment Battle Is On, by Lucille Cardin Crain:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT BATTLE IS ON

(By Lucille Cardin Crain)

Americans are the best-informed people in the world about things that concern them; yet more Americans know less about the Bricker amendment, again introduced in the Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 on January 6, than any other important issue of our times.

This is no accident. The master semanticists—the word-mongers and idea-manglers of the left—have planned it this way. They are carrying out Lenin's dictum on basic political issues, to confuse the vocabulary, and therefore the issue.

Yet the issue is quite clear. A Protestant clergyman who had studied the matter stated it succinctly when he said: "The future of every single person in the world—including you—has been planned by 18 people." These are the members of the United Nations Human Rights Commission, the 18 universal, all-purpose planners, who developed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The declaration would be made legally enforceable by the U. N. draft covenants on human rights. The U. N. Human Rights Commission had four avowed Communists in its membership—the delegates from Byelorussia S. S. R., the Ukrainian S. S. R., the Soviet Union itself, and Yugoslavia. The commission's chairman was Eleanor Roosevelt.

What, you ask, could these and other treaties proposed by the United Nations do to us if they were approved by the Senate?

This is what they could do:

You might no longer be allowed to own your own home.

You could be forcibly enlisted as a medical guinea pig.

You could be compelled, if engaged in a legal controversy, to appear in a foreign court, where there might be no jury, where there might be a secret trial—and without any right of appeal, your fate would be decided by a foreign tribunal, having at best only one American judge.

You could be restricted in your right to worship God.

These are only a few of the threats embodied in the United Nations Covenants on Human Rights. There is still time to protect ourselves, however, for the covenants still have not been submitted to the Senate.

But even if the United States were no longer a member of the United Nations, the U. N. has advanced the fantastic notion that we would still be subject to its power, because article 2, paragraph 6 of the U. N. Charter provides:

"The organization shall ensure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This is confirmed by A. H. Feller, former general counsel of the U. N., in his book, United Nations and World Community:

"Thus, the members of the United Nations have undertaken an obligation to require nonmembers to abide by certain principles to which these nonmembers have not specifically subscribed. In the light of orthodox rules of international law, this was an unprecedented and bold advance toward providing a general law for the whole world through the act of only a part of the states. These states, however, represent the overwhelming majority of the international community and there is every warrant for holding that they had the right to enact law for the entire community."

What rights this international body could invoke, and by what warrant, the U. N. general counsel did not specify. It should be borne in mind, however, that we are a U. N. member by virtue of an existing treaty—the U. N. Charter.

However, the U. N. is not alone in threatening our constitutional rights. Treaties, and innumerable agreements not even published, have been and are being constantly negotiated by our State Department. These also need to be brought under more specific constitutional and congressional restraint.

One of the most notorious of these existing arrangements is the Status of Forces Agreement, too hastily ratified by the Senate on July 15, 1953. This mischievous agreement fortunately has attracted considerable attention by now, and is giving the Senate some uncomfortable second thoughts on its action.

According to Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, it "gives away the inalienable constitutional rights of American soldiers who are offering their lives, if need be, to defend the very Constitution that I, as a Senator of the United States, am dutybound to support. The flag follows our soldiers abroad. The Constitution must likewise follow them. I cannot acquiesce in, or regard as permanent, the dangerous procedure established by the criminal jurisdiction provisions of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement under which, for the first time in American history, American soldiers abroad are subject to trial under foreign law and denied the constitutional protections to which they are entitled."

Efforts are now under way to test the constitutionality of this treaty, and the power of Congress to rescind a treaty also may be invoked.

How did this abandonment of American sovereignty and American rights come about? Under the Constitution, the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, may make treaties with other countries. The proper subject matter of these treaties, necessarily, is in the sphere of international relations. It is abundantly clear that the Founding Fathers never intended otherwise.

Now, however, treaties and executive agreements are being perverted by the internationalists to deal with internal matters affecting personal and States' rights. Under our Constitution, only the Congress and the States should have the power to make laws dealing with these internal matters. It is this abuse of the treaty power which has come to be known as treaty law.

The precedent was set in a series of cases decided by the Supreme Court, some of the most pertinent of which go back to the 1920's. In these, the Supreme Court upheld international agreements which overrode State laws, and disregarded what had previously been considered as the "unalienable rights" with which all men are "endowed by their Creator," in the American view. Because the matters at issue did not involve large numbers of citizens, these decisions provoked little comment. They did, however, tend to justify officeholders in recent years in subscribing to the dangerous proposals already mentioned.

Some recent cases should prove arresting. For instance, a Virginia produce merchant was sued by the present administration for $150,000, not because he had violated any Federal or State law, but because, it was claimed, he had sold Canadian potatoes for food rather than only for seed in violation of an international agreement effected by an exchange of letters between an Assistant Secretary of State and the Canadian Government. This executive agreement, a glaring example of the abuse of treaty law, was never submitted to the Senate. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals held the agrement to be void because the President, by employing the executive agreement device instead of allowing the Tariff Commission to deal with the matter, as Congress has directed, had contravened the law and exceeded his powers.

Early in February 1955, the matter was decided by the Supreme Court; but the highest Court in the land chose not to deal with the constitutional issue involved in the question of executive agreements overriding congressional directives.

As the Wall Street Journal said, commenting on what is now known as the Potato Case; "It is puzzling to us why there is so much opposition to spelling out in exact language just how far such international agreements should go. It is even more puzzling why such a basic question as safeguarding the Constitution should be, politically, such a hot potato."

However, in an earlier case, the Court did protect us, by a 5 to 3 vote, holding against the seizure of the steel mills, which are, of course, privately owned.

Here is what the late Garet Garrett, noted author and publicist, said about this:

"There was a steel strike. On the ground that it put the national defense in jeopardy, President Truman seized the steel properties, which he had no constitutional right to do. The steel people appealed to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court decided that the President was wrong, but it was a split vote. And it was the Chief Justice himself who argued that under the United Nations Charter, which is an international treaty, the President had the power to do that which under the Constitution he was forbidden to do. His seizure of the steel properties, therefore, was legal—not under the Constitution of the United States but under the Charter of the United Nations. The Chief Justice, happily, was in the minority, supported by only two other members of a court of nine."

If the Chief Justice had won over to his view only 2 of the 5 who stood by the Constitution, a most dangerous precedent would have been established. As Frank Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, stated: "The United States would in effect then and there have ceased to be an independent republic, and we would have been committed and bound by whatever the United Nations does or directs us to do. We would have had a full-fledged world government overnight."

These excesses of "treaty law" are not perils of the future—they are faits accompli today, and there are more ahead. Over 100 U. N. proposals whittling away American constitutional liberties are in various stages of preparation. Perhaps even more worrisome are the countless executive agreements, the existence of many of them unknown to the American public.

What is the basic conflict here? It is one that goes back to the genius of our unique charter of government, the Constitution. Here, for the first time, it was acknowledged that liberty is inherent in man, rather than a gift of the state or sovereign, and that the primary duty of government is to protect citizens from encroachments on their liberty. Implicit in this is the concept that government itself is the principal potential enemy of liberty.

Those to whom this concept is still precious owe a debt of gratitude to a group of lawyers, members of the American Bar Association. As early as 1948, they saw the danger, and the bar association members got into the fight.

These American lawyers, largely at the instigation of the 1949 bar association president, Frank Holman, induced the house of delegates of the association to adopt a resolution recommending an amendment to the Constitution relating to the treatymaking power. Senator BRICKER, having followed the studies made by the bar association, drafted and introduced in the Senate an appropriate corrective proposal, which was supported by the bar association group.

Eventually, a substantially similar proposal was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee by a vote of 10 to 5, and the suggested amendment was reported to the Senate in June 1953. During the debate in the Senate, however, the Bricker proposal gave way to one introduced by Senator GEORGE, which, while unsatisfactory to the supporters of the Bricker measure, still covered the basic principle; but it lost in the Senate by one vote less than the required two-thirds.

By this time the Bricker amendment had become a live national issue. This widespread interest had been aroused by a number of citizen organizations whose members circulated petitions for the amendment. Many of these groups also adopted resolutions favoring it.

But the fight has only started, and it will be waged most vigorously, now that the amendment has once more been presented to the 84th Congress. It is particularly important to note how significantly the Communists look upon the issue. Political Affairs, a Communist monthly which lays down the line for the leaders of the Red conspiracy, said in its April 1945 issue:

"At the time of the Moscow Conference, October 1943, the Senate voted 85 to 5 in favor of United States participation in a world security organization, even changing the phraseology to accord with the Moscow Declaration. * * * Great popular support and enthusiasm for United Nations policies should be built up, well organized, and fully articulate. But it is also necessary to do more than that. The opposition must be rendered so impotent that it will be unable to gather any significant support in the Senate against the U. N. Charter and the treaties which will follow."

Thus, to overcome the pressure by opponents of the Bricker amendment, the drive must go on to educate Americans to the real purpose of the amendment—to protect them in their rights, and to preserve the power of the Constitution, which is their best safeguard.

Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, despite the smoke screen created by the Corsi affair and other attempts to discredit our immigration program, the Eisenhower administration will allow almost

four times as many Italians to enter the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, than are normally allowed under the immigration quota. This is a little known fact which has been deliberately obscured by certain elements who for political purposes are attempting to sabotage a great humanitarian undertaking.

The refugee relief program is designed to bring 209,000 deserving aliens to America by December 31, 1956. Under the act Italy is far in the lead with some 21,000 visas expected to be issued by June 30. This is in addition to the normal Italian quota of 5,645 visas per year.

The refugee program is now operating so well that there can be issued by December 31, 1956, sufficient visas for all who can qualify under the act and for whom there are required assurances. Those who are sincerely interested in the success of the refugee program can perform a great service by fostering the granting of assurances for the benefit of those who desire to come to America. An assurance, of course, is a guaranty that the alien will not become a public charge.

The refugee relief program is now at the half way point in its 40-month life. Some 108,000 persons have entered the pipeline—those are the applicants who have been notified of documents required to speed their cases toward a visa. Remember that the act calls for 209,000 admissions. Consequently, there is no reason why all qualified applicants cannot be processed in due course. The Department of State, starting from scratch in 1953, has established a worldwide visa issuing organization to administer the law.

What Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Democracy Means to Me," written by a 16-year-old Tucson, Ariz., high-school student, which appeared in the National Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DEMOCRACY MEANS TO ME

(By Joan Carolyn Swanson, 16-year-old Tucson, Ariz., high-school student)

I am thankful that I am a young American citizen, living in the great constitutional Republic of the United States of America. This means to me, first and foremost, liberty—God's greatest gift to mankind. It means I have inalienable rights from God which cannot be taken away from me. These rights are protected by the Bill of Rights, which is part of the Constitution of our Republic.

Our form of constitutional Republic is unique and precious, because throughout history other forms of government claimed that rights such as freedom of religion, of speech, or of the press were given by the state; so, therefore, could be taken away from the individual by the state. In a republic "the sovereignty resides in the people under God, and the administration is lodged in officers elected by and representing the people." We are not just another democracy in the new social order, and should be careful not to identify our form of government with today's distorted version of democracies.

Liberty means we are free to do what is right according to God's law; it does not mean we have the right to do whatever we please. For example: The right to teach means the right to teach truth; the freedom of the press is the right to print what is true only; liberty of conscience is the right to know and obey God's laws. Man is never free from God's authority; but in our great land of liberty, we are free to rule over our own actions. We are obliged to follow right reason in order to achieve our destiny, which is to save our souls. This right is safeguarded in American freedom, under God.

This true Christian liberty is not found in the democracies of our time. They often adhere to a progressive, socialistic philosophy which demands conformity in the name of unity. Moral laws can be discarded since they do not believe in fixed truths, according to Christian principles. This prepares for a mass anti-Christian organization under dictatorship. This type of democracy as propagated by progressive education, is a type of materialistic religion of its own. Our Christian American constitutional Republic protects our right to stand on our own principles independent of the majority rule.

Humanitarianism of today's democracies is based on an effort to cure the evils and ills of the world by supplying man's material needs and desires while ignoring God. Such democracies believe we can coexist with communism, even though communism has declared its intention not to coexist, but to conquer the entire world, so that all must conform to the Communist idea of peace, the brotherhood of man, without Christ, the Prince of Peace.

Loyal Americans want to retain our constitutional Republic, and not be deceived by atheistic, one-world democratic ideologies. Christ came to earth to teach Christianity, not socialism. Some Christians today are dangerously identifying Christianity with a false humanitarianism; they forget that it is the improvement of the individual that improves society, in freedom under God. The type of social reform taught by Christ, and on which our form of Government was founded, is an outgrowth of personal virtue, marked by love of one's neighbor. The democracies of today are bent on making a Utopia of this world with no thought or belief in the next. They believe that the biggest mob and the loudest voice wins, regardless of moral laws. They are of the opinion that liberty, which they use as license, gives them the right to destroy the Constitution, and they use academic freedom to cloak subversion. They do not understand the true meaning of human liberty. They cannot understand human nature because they ignore man's spiritual nature. Liberty is of the spirit more than physical.

Today we are seeing liberty delivered up to tyranny because our intellects have been deceived by substituting the lie for the truth. This is referred to as brainwashing. These lies are given us in the form of fascinating political propaganda; particularly the one-world variety, which is un-Christian and un-American. Slavery begins when man declares himself free from reason in the name of freedom, and thinks he is at liberty to reject the truth in favor of his personal desires. Society becomes the slave of its own unreasoning, and this is especially tragic in the spiritual realm. Our Bill of Right was designed to protect our Christian freedoms; let us not stupidly relinquish them under the pretense of democracy.

Those who today claim that true liberty consists in service to the state are crusading in the cause that the democratic state shall make you free. True liberty rests in faith in God, our eternal king.

If we do not want the American concept of freedom, based on the fundamental traditions and laws established by our Founding Fathers to be abolished, we must not confuse our priceless heritage with any other type of government; we must not cowardly retreat to the state for security; we must acknowledge our duties and responsibilities as free Americans. Our security rests in God—not in man. Love of God is the greatest, and the only sufficient motive to maintain true liberty with its ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. It is imperative that we resort to prayer, and strengthen the religious beliefs upon which this great Republic was founded.

American youth pleads with you, our elders, not to surrender our sacred heritage under Old Glory, which has been deposited in your trust by those who knew the meaning of liberty, and who fought and died for it so that we might have it. Our American freedom is still worth fighting and dying for. But, please do not send your sons, and our brothers, to foreign soil to fight and die for "democracy" under the godless United Nations flag.

Conceivably there could arise a situation where the United States Armed Forces might have a moral obligation to help a small, defenseless nation resist Communist aggression; but that does not mean we should constantly try to police the world. Under the status of forces treaty (treaty law, which now endangers our American sovereignty), our boys lose their rights as American citizens and the protection of the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights while on foreign soil. They can, and, shameful to say, have been, tried and sentenced by foreign courts which do not have the same conception of justice and rights that we enjoy as American citizens.

The very soul of America is liberty, as it is of the spirit. Let us not be such fools as to sell our soul in exchange for nebulous promises of a materialistic utopia.

What a glorious, unequaled privilege it is to be a free American.

Latin America Expert of State Department Lauds Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of Wednesday, April 20, 1955, describing the remarks of Mr. Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Holland, now in California, has lauded the recent trip of Vice President NIXON to Central America.

The article follows:

LATIN AMERICA EXPERT OF STATE DEPARTMENT LAUDS NIXON

In Vice President NIXON California has a product worth his weight in gold to this

country, the State Department's top expert on Latin America said here yesterday.

Warmest praise for NIXON's great job on his recent tour of the Caribbean and Central America was expressed by Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

WILL SPEAK HERE

Holland arrived in Los Angeles to prepare for an address on Our Stake in Latin America before a joint luncheon in the Biltmore tomorrow of the Los Angeles World Affairs Council, Foreign Trade Association of Southern California and the World Trade Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

The Assistant Secretary, who accompanied the Nixons and was their interpreter on the 4-week trip in February and March, said in an interview at the Biltmore that as a Texan he wanted to congratulate California on having produced NIXON and sent him to Washington, D. C.

"He is one of the hardest working humans I have ever seen," Holland recalled. "He nearly killed me with his terrific schedule—morning breakfast conferences, visits to schools and hospitals, lunches, dinners, and then sitting up to 3 a. m. with presidents and prime ministers.

"His accomplishments in the 10 middle American countries were enormous. NIXON has the unusual ability of being able to talk to people and convince them of his absolute sincerity and interest. He did a most effective job of convincing middle Americans of the genuine interest this Government has in them and their problems.

"I particularly want to congratulate Pat Nixon, his wife, who works as hard as he does in making friends."

Mr. Welteroth Concludes Active Water Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Recently one of Idaho's most distinguished citizens and certainly one of the greatest friends of reclamation in the west retired as manager of the North Side Canal Co., which has its head office at Jerome, Idaho. The following is an editorial from the North Side News published at Jerome commenting on the retirement of Mr. Charles Welteroth:

MR. WELTEROTH CONCLUDES ACTIVE WATER CAREER

The News would go amiss for sure if we did not comment on the occasion which made headlines in this area last week when the North Side Canal Co. appointed a new general manager to direct the operations along its 11,000 miles of canals and laterals serving the farmers of the three segregations from Hazelton to King Hill.

To the new manager, Carrol Wilcomb, we extend best wishes for success in administering the vital ingredient of water for the farms in this area. Mr. Wilcomb is extremely well qualified and able to serve in this capacity, representing the board of directors in its policies and plans dealing with local water problems.

But we want to pay special tribute to Charles Welteroth, the retiring manager, whose years of devotion to the company and to the water users is significant. For 38 years, he served the company, the last 12 in executive position where he shaped and directed the policies during the most critical periods of water rights establishment.

Harking back from the old school, Welteroth truly typifies that period of our early water history when men used to shoot each other for water to moisten their parched lands. Too many of us today, especially the younger farmers and ranchers as well as many of the older generation take this precious water for granted. We are matter of fact—it's here, we use it freely, forgetting too often just how it got here.

Long years of struggle were waged by such men as Ralph Shepherd, Ervin Rockwell, Addison Smith, Frank Banks, Frank Weymouth, Maj. Fred Reid, Frank Gooding, Noah Sharp, and most recently Charles Welteroth whom we would most certainly place in the same category of recognition.

In one of his concluding remarks issued upon retirement, "Charlie" as everyone calls him said, "You might have a water right and also have the water, but you must watch it closely" which lead to the reference that "We must camp at the water hole"—a western custom over the early years. No more fitting tribute has been paid to "Charlie" than was made by R. P. (Pat) Parry, Twin Falls attorney and widely known water rights authority at the time the all-important Bureau of Reclamation contract was signed in January of 1953. These were his remarks and we repeat them now:

"No other individual has done so much nor worked so tirelessly on this contract. When conditions were most discouraging in the course of this long battle, he never faltered once in the determination to advance the claims of the water users of this project."

Mississippi Legislature Urges Limiting Court's Appellate Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi for reference to the proper congressional committee. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the resolution be included as a part of my remarks:

House Concurrent Resolution 15

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

Whereas Federal courts, and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of Government; and

Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts, and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to control and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts, so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator from Mississippi, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from Mississippi, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 15, 1955.

WALTER SILERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate March 24, 1955.

CARROLL GARTIN,
President of the Senate.

U. N. Has Empty Record as Peace Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., news editor, Statesman Press, which appeared in the Sunday Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., on April 17, 1955:

EDITOR SAYS U. N. HAS EMPTY RECORD AS PEACE BUILDER

(By Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., news editor, Statesman Press)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Only 10 years old, the United Nations is dead on its feet. Will reorganization, under a new charter, revive hopes for world peace? Must Russia be expelled?

Monday, April 25, marks the 10th anniversary of the U. N. founding conference at San Francisco, where Alger Hiss was secretary general of the ill-starred deliberations.

World peace was the core of the U. N. dream, but somebody had made the terrible mistake—at Yalta—of inviting Communist Russia to join the family of nations.

The monumental failures of the Hiss-type U. N. are soon told:

The U. N. has not stopped aggression.

U. N. has not stopped cold-war infiltration, sabotage, and subversion the world around.

U. N. has not limited armaments, or contributed anything to the peacetime application of atomic power.

U. N. has not contributed to world prosperity through broader commercial intercourse; nor has it helped encourage foreign capital investment in undeveloped regions—the one great need of the postwar world.

Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH (Republican, Wisconsin), urges immediate expulsion of Russia from the U. N.

"The United Nations, now 10 years old, has not yet learned to walk," SMITH says.

"Far from building world peace, the U. N. has established a permanent international snake pit, where godless communism is given daily forum for hate, recrimination, psychological warfare against freedom, and unrelenting moral aggression against peace."

Since 1945 Russia has frustrated constructive peace proposals with no less than 67 U. N. vetoes.

"The principal world impact of U. N. operations during these first 10 years," says Congressman SMITH, "has been to increase the prestige and vocal range of world-wrecking communism in all its evil works.

"When the U. N. was established in 1945, communism enslaved only about 200 million people in Russia. Today, terroristic communism holds sway over some 900 million souls in Europe and Asia. More than one-third of the world's population is now under Communist influence or control."

Direct support of varied U. N. activities has cost the United States Treasury approximately $2,600,000,000, including relief and resettlement programs—an average of $260,000,000 a year.

In Korea, the world saw its first United Nations war. It lasted 3 years, and ended about where it began. It cost the United States 143,000 battle casualties and some $20 billion in cash. Today, Korean freedom still stands frozen and frightened at the 38th parallel. The American aviators illegally held by the Chinese Communists since the Korean armistice still have not been released.

In his press conference of February 23, President Eisenhower alluded to "the tremendous lack of success" in recent U. N. history.

Since Russia joined the U. N. peace front in 1945, world communism has conducted open warfare in Greece, Iran, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Tibet, Korea, Indochina, and now in the Formosa area.

"Communism thus is branded a complete outlaw and international brigand," says Smith. "Not until communism is disbarred from all civilized intercourse may the world even hope to resume the true paths of peace."

"You can't do business with communism."

Local Service Airlines Should Receive Permanent Certificates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a statement made on behalf of Central Airlines, Fort Worth, Tex., some time ago:

Central Airlines of Fort Worth, Tex., has been serving Duncan, Okla., for over a year. This air service has been most valuable to the Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. as we have many employees who ride Central, making connections with other airlines for trips throughout the United States and many foreign countries. We send much of our mail by air and this helps to expedite our communications with customers and our field personnel. We have many calls daily for materials to be sent on a short notice. These materials consist of manufactured products, tools, etc. They are sent by air-freight in order that we might have as little delay as possible in receiving the materials in our various operating points. The certificate that Central has been operating under is not of a permanent nature and we earnestly solicit your help in giving Central all aid possible in granting them a permanent certificate.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of a permanent certification for local service air carriers. This statement is typical of statements of many of my constituents in behalf of permanent certification for local service air carriers. I am for the certification, both Central Airline and other lines seeking such certification.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this body is aware of my support of the Bricker amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the May 1955 issue of American Mercury entitled "In the Mercury's Opinion," by Russell Maguire:

On January 7, 1953, 63 United States Senators joined their colleague, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, in introducing a proposed constitutional amendment which would prevent treaties similar to the United Nations Charter from overriding the laws of this country and to prevent any President from bypassing the Congress by carrying out Executive agreements with other nations which would have the effect of treaties canceling out United States laws which conflicted with them.

What has happened to the Bricker amendment?

Prior to his becoming Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles supported it wholeheartedly. When the Eisenhower administration took over, both Mr. Dulles and the President were influenced to change their minds and announced they were against it. By so doing, they defeated it in the 83d Congress.

The reasons for this action seem to be principally based on the premise that General Eisenhower is an honest man, and under no circumstances would he do the things the amendment seeks to prevent. So it was agreed that there was no necessity for this vital amendment being passed by Congress.

The Nation assumes that our President is honest, and they also have to assume that he is not the permanent President of these United States.

What about his successors? Senator BRICKER himself has explained the entire situation in these words:

"This resolution would protect the doctrine of inherent rights against erosion by treaties and other international agreements. The preservation of our inalienable rights would not depend merely on the beneficence of the President and the Senate.

"The American people would be the exclusive repository of their inherent rights, and even they would be incapable of surrendering their rights except by further amending the Constitution."

Very likely, nothing will be done on this resolution unless the people of the United States themselves do it. It is their future at stake. It is their decision to make. We strongly urge that they do something about it and advise their congressional Representatives how they feel.

Unless favorable action is taken on the Bricker amendment, the people of the United States continue the danger of losing their priceless independence to the dangerous United Nations or to some other global organization which undoubtedly will be dreamed up by some impractical or sinister group.

We urge you to be a Paul Revere. Push through Congress approval of this honest safeguard. You owe it to yourself and the generation to follow.

Amendment of Civil Aeronautics Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from Texas has raised an excellent point which deserves full consideration by the committee and the Congress, and I am sure that his discussion of that point has clarified the record of this debate and will be of great value in terms of the interpretation of this law, which I am sure will be passed with unanimous approval. However, I did note that Mr. John Floberg, chairman of the conference of local airlines, seemed to address himself to this matter in part, at least, in a letter which he sent to the committee and which is incorporated in the record, and which I question whether many of us have seen.

I would like to read into the RECORD two short paragraphs which I think bear upon the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]:

The argument was advanced at pages 62, 64, 66, and 68 of the printed record of last year's hearings and again in point 2 in Mr. Gurney's statement and frequently throughout the course of his questioning that one of the principal reasons for keeping certificates temporary was the desire of the Board to strengthen the routes of the local service carriers. Aside from the fact that section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act adequately answers this point, it may be further pointed out that the history of the Board's actions in this respect inspires little confidence. In the first place you can count on the fingers of one hand—with fingers to spare—the number of route improvements of the local carriers which have been the result of spontaneous inspiration on the part of the Board in the course of a certificate renewal. Nearly all the route improvements have been the result of either a route case as such (e. g. the Fayetteville case as pointed out by Mr. Harris) or have been the result of the proof of public convenience and necessity by the carrier and other interested parties in the course of a renewal proceeding. This proof of public convenience and necessity could have just as well been made in a separate case as in the renewal itself and at considerable economy to all concerned. In any event, the carriers have had to prove to the Board their right to any such route modification.

The Board's argument is also effectively answered both by its recent decision in the North Central Airlines application for a temporary exemption permitting service between Chicago and Duluth-Superior via Milwaukee and Green Bay and also by its decision in the route 106 case in which the Board dis-

membered a route which the Chairman's own statement on page 12 calls a "local service route," divided it between two trunklines, and thereby destroyed the opportunity of either of the two local carriers to strengthen its route with what could have been the strongest segment in its entire system.

I hope that may be helpful in terms of legislative history.

Again I want to make a statement of my own conviction, having some knowledge of one of the local carriers involved that has done an excellent job, the Civil Aeronautics Board having admitted that it should be just about ready to receive permanent certification. I do not believe this legislation would be on this floor today if the Civil Aeronautics Board had done its duty. I think they have been stubborn and unrealistic and have forced us to do something that possibly some of us might have some reservations about in terms of individual carriers. I think the net result is justice and equity in terms of all these local carriers which have done a magnificent job in building up their routes and serving our many communities well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

A Plea for River Development

SPEECH
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wish to join the gentleman from Colorado in expressing appreciation to my good friend from Arkansas for the real contribution he has made to an understanding of what is going on in the field of reclamation and flood control when he opens up the discussion on the floor of the policies of the Bureau of the Budget, either actual or intended policies, which have recently come to the attention of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation was just discussing, that matter has been before the committee and it has been under very careful scrutiny of the very able chairman of the full committee. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] questioned the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at some length concerning just what the effect of the application of this revised Circular A–47 would be if it were actually placed in operation. I think in fairness to the Director of the Budget it should be stated that he told the committee that this circular was in a preliminary stage or advisory stage at this time. But at the same time it is being widely circulated throughout the Government, and it is receiving the full authority which would accompany a directive of that kind from the Bureau of the Budget in the different Government departments. On questioning by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and other members of the committee, we sought information on the point as to whether the gentleman concerned with this policy could name any flood control or reclamation project in the United States—not just in the Southwest, mind you, but in the entire United States—which would qualify and receive the approval of the Bureau of the Budget under this new procedure set up under revised Circular A–47.

To the best of my recollection, they were able to name only one small project in the United States which they were satisfied would qualify under this new formula that is being set up on benefit-cost ratios. When they were questioned about specific projects which were of great importance in many States of the Union, they were unable to give us any instances, they were unable to give us any clear indication as to whether those projects would receive approval if the formula in Revised Circular A–47 would be adopted. Unless the Congress does assert its authority, unless the Congress steps in vigorously at this point, it is my apprehension that we are going to see the adoption of the formula in Revised Circular A–47, and it is going to throw a roadblock across the progress of the country in the field of reclamation. I think the gentleman will certainly do a service if he does introduce in the Congress a bill which will assure congressional control over this important question of the benefit-cost ratio on these important projects.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Let's Do It and Say We Did

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the April issue of Electric Appliance Service News relative to abandoned refrigerators becoming death traps for innocent children. I was saddened to learn that over this past weekend two toddling babies became the victims of refrigerator deaths in Los Angeles. It should be apparent to all of us that the only safe way to eliminate refrigerator deaths is not to build them. The Federal Government should require that all refrigerators moving in interstate commerce should be so constructed that they can be opened with very little pressure from the inside. Senator SPARKMAN and I have introduced legislation which would require this of all refrigerator manufacturers and I hope that Congress will enact this legislation before any more unnecessary deaths occur.

The editorial follows:

LET'S DO IT AND SAY WE DID

Spring is here and summer is on the way. This is the time of year when schools are letting out our children for spring vacations. And housewives, aided now and then by reluctant husbands, are doing their spring cleaning. It is the time of year when those icebox-refrigerator deathtrap accidents start to happen; the time when tots learn early about death, as a friend or cousin is found suffocated in an abandoned icebox or refrigerator. The irony of the whole thing is that too often the trap has been innocently set up by the victim's parents or relatives—in the backyard for the junkman to pick up, or in the basement, cellar, or attic for future use or sale.

This is not the first time we've discussed this subject in our editorial column. Nor will the deathtrap refrigerator stories you have read or will read in the current and future issues be the first ones to appear in EASN. It seems that spring and summer are the times of the year when tears of pathos, remorse, and pity flow the most; when these accidents happen to sadden and tax the human mind and heart.

But, thank God, through all the sorrow come the heartening fact that although Congress is slow in taking steps to avoid these tragedies, at least the States are passing their own legislation toward this end.

In Congress, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama, are still trying to push through legislation that would apply to all 48 States.

In Pennsylvania, both houses of the State legislature have almost unanimously enacted and passed legislation that would impose a 30-day jail sentence or $50 fine, or both, upon the individual found guilty of abandoning icebox or refrigerator of 1½ cubic feet capacity with doors or lids still attached. The measure awaits Gov. George M. Leader's signature.

Last August we discussed here our "idea for an icebox latch" that would allow opening the door or lid of an icebox or refrigerator by a push from the inside. We are pleased to see that six refrigerator manufacturers are presently conducting such tests on their products with a patented lock that has been created by a firm in Virginia.

In the meantime, we urge our readers, when making their service calls, to pass the word around of the need to dismantle the doors or lids of discarded iceboxes and refrigerators, to keep them from becoming deathtraps for our children. We also urge all our readers to indicate their support of proper State and National legislation by writing to their representatives in their State capitols and to their Senators and Representatives in Congress.

We talk about making our streets safe for our children. Let's all help make our backyards safe for them, too.

Red China and the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in early February I was interviewed by Mr. Don Larrabee, the Washington correspondent for the New Bedford Standard-Times. Under unanimous consent I present his article, which appeared in the February

4 issue of the Standard-Times, to be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

PHILBIN WARNS AGAINST SEATING RED CHINA IN U. N., URGES ALL TO BE ALERT TO BANDITRY

WASHINGTON, February 4.—To reward Red China with admission into the United Nations would be a "monstrous travesty upon justice," Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, declared today in an interview.

The Clinton, Mass., Congressman, expressing grave concern over Communist tactics both here and abroad, also blasted the notion that the free world can live in so-called peaceful coexistence with international gangsterism.

"I am greatly concerned about growing Communist strength and every American must be so concerned," PHILBIN told the Standard-Times. "World communism will adopt the tactics it deems necessary to secure world conquest and world control. That is its aim. It will go as far as it can. It will do what it thinks it can get away with.

"When the time is ripe," he added, "and the military timetable permits and its chances for victory seem bright, it will not hesitate to strike along a broad front."

One of the real obstacles to halting the Communist world menace, PHILBIN asserted, is the "indifference and unconcern of many Americans about the affairs of representative government at every level." Not only should Americans be shaken out of their lethargy, but also, he said, the United Nations must inaugurate "cooperative measures" to thwart Communist aggression and check dangerous subversive activities in many parts of the world.

"We have a right to expect the United Nations, if its membership still subscribes to the purposes of the Charter of maintaining the peace and defending human freedom, to move decisively and speedily against Communist malefactors.

"Many people see in recent events the beginning of a move designed to bring Red China into the United Nations. Nothing would be better calculated to shatter confidence of the American people in that body. The idea of permitting a bandit nation, which has secured power and dominion over a great * * * ancient, but helpless people through conspiracy, subterfuge and force * * * to be rewarded for its iniquities by admission into the United Nations would be a monstrous travesty upon justice," said PHILBIN, who is starting his seventh term in the House from the third Massachusetts District.

The Congressman, a member of the Armed Services Committee, warned the Communist movement has made steady advances in remote areas of Asia, in Africa and South America and in Europe. He said communism will pursue the tactics of infiltration and penetration, playing everywhere on discontent aroused by antiquated colonial systems or capitalizing on social injustices.

Citing Korea as an example of Communist aggressive action, he mentioned Indochina, Burma and the Malayan states as good examples of subversion.

"But the thing for us to remember is that the Communists have their own answer for every situation. They act boldly and do not hesitate to set up a conspiracy anywhere that suits their purpose. This kind of treachery and deceit requires continuous vigilance and a tough-minded attitude on our part. It cannot be dealt with by bleeding hearts or patience-loving, dilatory Fabians urging delay.

"The Fabian approach of trying to wait the situation out is fraught with real peril because every day the Soviet is building greater military strength," PHILBIN asserted.

Turning to the question of Communist activity in this country, the Clinton Congressman made this unequivocal statement: "There is hardly a scientific secret which has not been filched from us through espionage agents and traitors in the innermost, top-secret archives of this Government."

He compared communism in this country to an iceberg—"four-fifths of it is under water." The number of card-carrying Communists is relatively not great, but the "poison of Communist ideas has been spread widely throughout the land."

CLEVER ATTACK MADE

"Pro-Communist and Socialistic-minded people can be found in most segments of American life. Clever and insidious attacks are constantly made upon basic religious, social, economic and political institutions.

"A constant flow of propaganda is directed against the American people at every level, embracing everything from straight Marxism to eccentric notions about the universe.

"All this," said PHILBIN, "is designed to promote hysteria and uncertainty and to undermine the confidence of the people in representative government, in our economic system, in our religious beliefs, our moral ideals, family loyalties, and business structure. The objective is to break America's faith in itself, its principles, its life and its destiny."

He denounced as outrageous the shooting down of American planes on peaceful missions in the Far East, adding: "These incidents of Communist insult and provocation are absolutely intolerable and as completely unconscionable—as well as illegal and inhumane—as the continued imprisonment of American flyers in Red China on trumped-up spy charges."

STRONG ACTION ESSENTIAL

The unanimity of the House vote on the Formosa defense resolution (there were only 3 dissenting votes) was pointed to by PHILBIN as the "first real declaration of determination to face up courageously" to the Communist menace since the end of the Korean war.

This kind of strong, decisive policy and affirmative action is essential, he said, not only to protect Americans but also to maintain our prestige in the Orient.

The Congressman frequently referred to "apathy, indifference, and unconcern" on the part of many Americans over governmental affairs and called it "one of the most disturbing developments of our time." He insisted the Nation must revive the "spirit of patriotism and loyalty and revitalize the commonsense, industry, and enthusiasm of the individual."

PHILBIN has warned about the Communist menace in the past. Records show he was one of the first Members of Congress to point up the spread of world communism during World War II. In his first major speech in Congress early in 1943, PHILBIN predicted the possible realinement of alliances in the postwar period.

While he sees "unfavorable, disturbing spots everywhere," PHILBIN also points to signs that people are becoming more aroused to the dangers, and more aware of the "sham, falsehood, deceit and iniquity of communism."

"The United States," he said, "must not fail to let it be known that she will use her strength if necessary, to protect her way of life. Once that idea penetrates the Communist mind," he added, "there will be no further aggression and then, perhaps, we can take the lead in world councils to establish universal disarmament and control of nuclear substances. This will be no primrose path," said PHILBIN.

The Yalta Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Julius Epstein brings sharply to our attention the fact that the Yalta papers, as released, give only a part of the whole story.

Mr. Epstein feels, and I am inclined to agree with him, that the forced repatriation of many anti-Communist Russians should be investigated by Congress. It was a tragic affair and brought discredit to us in our hour of victory.

In his letter of April 12, 1955, Mr. Epstein says:

Our State Department sent an official diplomatic note to the Soviet Embassy on February 1, 1945, informing the Soviet Government that we would not forcibly repatriate prisoners of war captured in German uniforms and that we would extend the protection of the Geneva Convention to these prisoners and civilians of Soviet origin who did not want to be repatriated.

Acting Secretary of State Grew radioed to Secretary of State Stettinius in Yalta and warned him against any agreement with Stalin which would violate the Geneva Convention and the American tradition of ready asylum.

Our Yalta delegation simply and arbitrarily—under British-Soviet pressure—overruled the State Department's policy and violated the international law of the Geneva Convention and the American tradition of the right of asylum.

In the light of these new and unknown facts, a congressional investigation of forced repatriation seems to be more urgent than ever.

Mr. Epstein's article follows:

[From the Tablet of April 9, 1955]

SAYS YALTA PAPERS FAIL TO RELATE WHOLE STORY—MR. EPSTEIN CITES AMERICAN CORROBORATION IN CRIME OF FORCED REPATRIATION OF ANTI-RED RUSSIANS

(By Julius Epstein)

The Yalta documents, as released by the State Department, contain incontestable evidence to the effect that members of the American delegation at Yalta, especially the Secretary of State, Stettinius and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were warned against entering into any agreement with the Soviets which could be construed as in favor of forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians in our hands.

This truly sensational revelation can be found under the heading "Statements on war prisoners and other matters as drawn up by the Conference."

There, a top secret radio dispatch of February 7, 1945, from the Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew to the Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., is reproduced. In this remarkable dispatch, Mr. Grew, representing the conservative wing within the State Department, urged Mr. Stettinius to accord the protection of the Geneva Convention to those Soviet citizens in our hands who were captured in German uniforms as, for instance, the followers of General Vlasov.

REDS CLAIMED NONCITIZENS

Mr. Grew also referred to the traditional American policy of granting asylum to liberated persons who did not desire to return to the Soviet Union. Mr. Grew also called Mr. Stettinius' special attention to those persons in western Europe who were not citizens of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics prior to the outbreak of World War II, but nevertheless were claimed by the Soviet Union as Soviet citizens.

As the Yalta documents show, Mr. Grew's labors were in vain. The top secret radio answer from Mr. Stettinius—dated February 9, 1945—destroyed Mr. Grew's and his friends' last hopes to prevent the American Government from violating the Geneva Convention as well as the American tradition of granting asylum to political exiles.

To illustrate the wanton attitude of our representatives at Yalta and the way in which they sacrificed the lives of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians, the following parts of the diplomatic exchange may be quoted:

From Mr. Grew's radio message to Mr. Stettinius:

"Top secret—Washington, February 7, 1945.

"War Department has just made available message dated February 7 from Marshall which indicates that JCS on February 7 approved, with certain changes, British preliminary text on agreement with Soviet Union for exchange of prisoners of war and apparently also for liberated persons."

STATES SPECIFIC POINTS

"The agreement would not appear to cover the following specific points which were incorporated in the United States counterproposals forwarded to JCS staff with you.

"1. Protection of Geneva Convention which we have informed Soviet Government we will accord to Soviet citizens captured in German uniform who demand such protection.

"2. Soviet citizens in the United States not prisoners of war whose cases the Attorney General feels should be dealt with on basis of traditional American policy of asylum.

"3. Persons liberated by United States forces no longer in their custody.

"4. Question of the liberation and repatriation of other United Nations citizens.

"5. Persons claimed as citizens by the Soviet authorities who were not Soviet citizens prior to the outbreak of war and do not now claim Soviet citizenship.

"It is felt that these questions and others referred to in JCS 1266 and 1266/1 should be brought to your attention in order that consideration may be given to them before final agreement is reached."

From Mr. Stettinius' answer to Mr. Grew:

"Top secret—Yalta, February 9, 1945.

"Here the consensus is, including our military, that it would not be wise to include matters regarding the protection of the prisoners-of-war convention and Soviet citizens in the United States in an agreement which covers primarily the exchange of prisoners liberated by Allied Armies as they proceed into German territory. In regard to 'claimants,' despite the fact of the danger of Nazi retaliation, we believe that unless we reach prompt agreement on this question there will be serious delays in the release of our prisoners of war."

ANSWER IS NOT REVEALED

Thus, it evolves from these official dispatches that, in order to prevent "delays" in the release of our prisoners of war in Soviet hands, we were ready to surrender millions of anti-Communists to Stalin and their sure death. No American official at Yalta could have entertained any doubts about the ultimate fate of those forcibly repatriated to the Soviets.

What the Yalta papers do not reveal is—among other things—Mr. Grew's answer to Mr. Stettinius' dispatch of February 9, 1945. Was there no answer, or was it deleted by the editors?

It is in the light of such revelations that a congressional investigation of forced repatriation seems to be more urgent than ever. Only such an investigation will be able to answer the multitude of questions about the responsibilities of certain persons in the White House, in the Pentagon, and in the State Department in connection with the crime of forced repatriation.

There is now Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH'S H. Res. 137 pending before Congress. This resolution calls for the creation of a select Committee to Investigate Forced Repatriation.

Congress should act upon this resolution as soon as possible. Courageous and independent Democrats should offer their own resolutions for the same purpose.

Only then, there is the chance that the American people will get what they want: An impartial investigation of one of the greatest crimes of recent military history.

Let the chips fall where they may.

A Bill To Amend Section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deduction of trade or business expenses.

This bill is a companion measure to a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM PURTELL, of Connecticut.

The purpose of this bill is to permit nonprofit economic development corporations in depressed areas to charge stepped-up rent for a period of the first 5 years adequate to pay off borrowed money and interest, and permit the renting corporation to deduct such stepped-up rent in the determination of taxable income during those 5 years.

This measure will be of great assistance to depressed areas in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England. It will bring new industry into our community and will ultimately provide employment and generally stimulate our economy.

The bill which I have introduced reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of trade or business expenses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For purposes of paragraph (3), in the case of a lease of property (A) which is owned by an organization described in section 501 (c) (4) (relating to civic leagues or organizations for promotion of social welfare) which is exempt from taxation under section 501 (a), and (B) which is subject to a mortgage or other lien securing indebtedness incurred in the acquisition or improvement of such property, such rentals or other payments may, during the term of such mortgage or other similar lien (if such term is not less than 5 years and ends on or prior to the date of termination of the lease as fixed therein), be in annual amounts sufficient to discharge such indebtedness at the end of such term, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective wtih respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

Isolation of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, our State Department is unfortunately and mistakenly bent at this time upon a policy of isolation of Israel. In doing so, the Department seems to protest to the world "not that we love Israel less but we love our defense pacts more." It does not seem to matter one whit to our policymakers that this infant nation, the standard bearer of democracy in the Middle East has, despite every manner and kind of obstacle placed before it, progressed toward maturity in wondrous contrast to the lack of progress, the illiteracy and the despairing population of the surrounding seven Arab nations. The attitude seems to be that Israel can take care of herself and hence all aid and comfort must be given to the Arab nations.

The question occurs to me whether, if Israel, with all its technological advantages, with its skilled labor force, with its strides in scientific achievement, with proven military skills, were to kick and to fuss against allying itself with the West, were to demand that she, too, be wooed and won, would she thus be dismissed and pressed into disregard? There is a considerable irony in the fact that Israel, being so definitely and conclusively oriented toward the West, should now be permitted to live in jeopardy by the very powers of the West. At Bandung, at the Asian-African Conference, Dr. Fadhill al-Jamali, Minister of State of Iraq and leader of the Iraqi delegation to the conference, named in the same breath colonialism, communism, and zionism as evils which disturb world peace and harmony. He calls zionism "the worst offspring of imperialism." He said he hoped the conference would brand Israel an illegitimate state and an aggressor and see to it that "Arab rights in their own home in Palestine are recognized and restored."

This man speaks for the nation to whom we are sending arms.

His associate, Premier Nuri Said, of Iraq, said only a little while ago that he considered the Zionist danger took precedence over the Communist danger.

Have we not here the evidence of a perspective in international affairs that spells danger to the interest of the United States?

It is tragic that this conceit of Arab policy is now to be spread through the Far East and Africa. The Premier of Iraq has called upon her new ally, Turkey, as well as Pakistan, to support the

Arabs in a battle against Israel. There is none at the conference who will counter the spread of this antagonism into Asia and central Africa.

Sir Anthony Eden has given top priority to the search for a solution for Middle East tensions. It is an historical fact that world conflagrations start in areas that do not occupy great prominence on the map of the world. Hence, it is imperative that our State Department join in this search for solutions to bring peace to the Middle East. Every day of delay increases the danger. Only thus can the best interests of the United States be served, and we, as citizens of this beloved country, cannot silently acquiesce to a policy which cannot possibly enhance the search for peace.

Albert Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 19, 1955, is a fitting tribute to a great scientist and a fine human being:

EINSTEIN THE REVOLUTIONIST

Man stands on this diminutive earth, gazes at the myriad stars, and upon billowing oceans and tossing trees—and wonders. What does it all mean? How did it come about? The most thoughtful wonderer who appeared among us in three centuries has passed on in the person of Albert Einstein. If Minerva is the goddess of science, her head must be bowed. This one man changed human thinking about the world as only Newton and Darwin changed it.

Mathematical physicists in Einstein's class are the epic poets of our time. The universe as we conceive it is their intellectual creation. And what a creation Einstein's was. He dealt with it as if it were closed and not infinite; he deduced that matter and energy are different manifestations of the same thing; he substituted his conceptions of time and space for the assumptions on which scientists and philosophers had relied for 2,000 years. The world was shocked when it learned of these revolutionary conclusions. They seemed like the fantasies of a dreamer who ought to look about him, see the world as it was, and wake up.

But Einstein had looked about. Not only this, but he had thrown away the prejudices that had hampered others who had been looking about before him and the traditional conclusions of centuries. When relativity first startled the scientific world, Einstein's cogitations were dismissed by the average man as of no practical use. That view was finally dispelled by the part that relativity played in the development of the atomic bomb. Einstein's simple algebraic equation, which expressed the equivalence of mass and energy, pointed the way both to the "A" and "H" bombs. The dreamy philosopher and mathematician proved to be a hard-headed realist. In fact, he was so much of a realist that he brushed aside his pacifism and persuaded the late President Roosevelt to begin the development of the atomic bomb as a weapon against fascism.

What distinguished Einstein both as a scientist and as a man was his passionate devotion to the truth. He hated arbitrary laws, conventions, coercion of one group by another, any form of pedantry. Thomas Huxley once prayed, "God, give me strength to face a fact though it slay me." Einstein had that strength. It is this that set him apart as a scientist and the mathematician who saw relationships in the outer world to which other men were blind.

Discharge Petition on Bill H. R. 501 to Revise McCarran-Walter Imigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have today signed a discharge petition to bring out my bill, H. R. 501, to revise and amend the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I urge all my colleagues who favor a liberalization of our immigration laws to sign this petition as soon as possible so we can get some action in the matter.

The recent dismissal of Edward J. Corsi as special assistant on immigration problems points up again the fact that the McCarran-Walter Act and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 are unworkable and should either be replaced or drastically revised.

During his brief incumbency in office at the State Department Mr. Corsi tried to make our immigration laws work in a humane way. The opponents of liberal immigration in the Department of State and outside the Department stopped him by slandering his unquestioned loyalty and smearing his record of patriotic service to this country. In so doing, they affronted large groups of Americans all over the country who are interested in a decent immigration law decently administered.

The Corsi affair goes beyond partisan politics. It effects millions of people who placed high hopes in Mr. Corsi's efforts to help liberalize our immigration policy and make it more humane. Now these hopes have been largely shattered because of the unwarranted and shameless treatment Mr. Corsi received at the hands of the Secretary of State.

On April 9, when it became known that Mr. Corsi was being dismissed from the State Department, I dispatched the following telegram to Secretary Dulles:

Was shocked to read that Mr. Corsi, with many years of distinguished public service in New York, was summarily dismissed from his national post. I am not satisfied that his appointment was for only 90 days, nor that security was at all involved with his dismissal. Mr. Corsi's loyalty was never under question before although he held the highest administrative office in New York State by appointment of former Governor Dewey. If, as it is claimed, Mr. Corsi's dismissal was the result of his liberal interpretation of our immigration laws, then the basic principles of our Constitution and laws have been violated. This thing goes beyond partisan politics, and since another Congressman has been accused of causing the dismissal, I demand a complete explanation in order that I may make known all the facts to the Congress and the American people.

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New York State, whether Democrat or Republican, are incensed and aroused over the State Department's disgraceful action. They see it not only as an act of bad leadership and poor advice, but also that it stems from a lack of ethics in Government and from opinionated men in high positions of power. The whole situation is particularly puzzling when we are assured that the problem of security was not involved in Mr. Corsi's dismissal, and that only a short 3 months ago Mr. Dulles referred to Corsi as his old friend and the man best qualified to handle the job as his special assistant on immigration problems.

What has happened since then? How is it possible that within such a short period of time Mr. Corsi should be dealt with so outrageously and fired from his job in such humiliating manner by the very same people who lauded him to the skies? The people of New York are entitled to an explanation of this whole sordid affair. They are not satisfied with the explanations given thus far by Mr. Dulles, or Mr. Scott McLeod or other State Department officials.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 13, 1955, entitled "Department of Confusion," which clearly explains the state of confusion over this matter in the Department of State. The editorial is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF CONFUSION

Secretary Dulles and the State Department appear somewhat less than satisfied with any one of the reasons they have offered for the dismissal of Edward J. Corsi. Accordingly they now offer a selection, as follows:

1. Mr. Corsi's post was temporary, and has been abolished.
2. Mr. Corsi had completed his assignment.
3. The 90-day period for security clearance had expired and the Secretary therefore lacked authority to keep Mr. Corsi on any longer.
4. Mr. Corsi was unqualified for the job.
5. Mr. Corsi did not want to take on administrative responsibilities.
6. Mr. Corsi wanted to take on too many administrative responsibilities, trying to become actual administrator of the Refugee Act.

Some of these protestations, like 5 and 6, contradict each other, and the others are contradicted by other statements from the State Department itself.

Mr. Corsi's assignment was, in the Secretary's own words, "to help solve the difficult problems presented by the Refugee Act of 1953." Obviously that is no 90-day task; it is the work of a year, 2 years, or longer. Far from having completed his assignment, Mr. Corsi had not completed the preliminaries to beginning it. His security report, by Mr. Dulles' own later admission, had come in before he was dismissed, but the Secretary said there was not enough time remaining to evaluate it.

In this connection, the Department said Secretary Dulles' offer of another assignment to Mr. Corsi should clearly put to rest any implication that his change of assignment involved any question of security. Secretary Dulles himself, however, pointed out that the post from which Mr. Corsi had been re-

moved was "a sensitive one," a remark which had the effect of putting the implication into active motion again.

Mr. Corsi's qualifications for the job were vouched for by Secretary Dulles when the appointment was made January 10. Referring to the appointee as my dear friend, the Secretary called him "the best qualified man in the United States to help solve the difficult problems presented by the Refugee Act of 1953."

The explanations given for Mr. Corsi's dismissal are almost childish in their implausibility. Edward Corsi was United States Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner under President Hoover, and New York State Industrial Commissioner under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. His professional life has been spent in public administration. Secretary Dulles' assertion that Mr. Corsi "indicated to me that he was not interested in and not qualified for administrative work" is therefore amazing, to say the very least. It is lamentable that the person to whom this statement was attributed should have felt it necessary to accuse the Secretary of State of falsehoods.

As of now it seems clear that Secretary Dulles dismissed Mr. Corsi because Representative WALTER of Pennsylvania had accused him of having associated with some Communist-front organizations 20-odd years ago. Mr. WALTER is co-author of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Mr. Corsi says Secretary Dulles "told me he was dismissing me because he had to maintain good relations with Congress" and "it would endanger bills with reference to the refugee program if I stayed."

So once again Secretary Dulles has demonstrated, as in the case of John Paton Davies, that if his appointees are attacked they cannot expect him to stand by them, but can only look forward to being thrown to the wolves. What this will do to morale—which Mr. Corsi says is one of the stiffest problems in administration of refugee relief—should be plain. Its effect on the response of capable men to appeals to serve the Government—at their own risk—should also be plain.

The only possible consequences are deterioration of the quality of the men and women who can be attracted to important posts, and demoralization among those who do accept.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me add that there are implications in this entire affair which may prove damaging not only to the present administration or to a particular party or some individual. I am worried over the damaging effect this scandal may cause abroad and its repercussions there when it is fully realized that the refugee relief program is nothing more than a hoax and a fraud, and that it is administered in such a way as to keep refugees out of this country instead of facilitating their entry. The honor and prestige of our country is involved here.

To prove my assertion, I want to place in the RECORD a United Press story from Rome, Italians Charge Corsi Case Bias, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald last Friday, April 15, 1955. Following is the United Press dispatch:

ITALIANS CHARGE CORSI CASE BIAS

ROME, April 14.—The independent right-wing newspaper, Il Tempo, today said the ouster of Edward Corsi as adviser to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on refugee problems involved racial and religious discrimination.

"Every hope of increased Italian migration to the United States has vanished," as a result of Dulles' action, it said.

Corsi's removal "has caused great surprise and some bitterness in Italy," the newspaper commented.

It charged that a powerful influence has been brought to bear recently to prevent the nonquota emigration of 200,000 persons, recommended by President Eisenhower.

"This was done by well-known racial circles favoring Nordic and Protestant immigration from southern Europe," Il Tempo said.

"When one practices an open policy of racial and religious discrimination, it is hard to talk of democracy in relations with other countries. And when such a policy so openly hurts Italians, after the visit of our government leaders (Premier Mario Scelba and Foreign Minister Gaetano Martino), to the United States, it is hard to talk about deep friendship.

Mr. Speaker, both the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and the Refugee Relief Act have come under serious attack lately. The Corsi incident is just a demonstration of public indignation against these two acts. The McCarran-Walter law has been called discriminatory and un-American. The refugee relief measure has been called a fraud and a phony by Congressman WALTER.

For the sake of America's greatness, its international prestige, and its position of moral leadership among the nations of the world, I urge this Congress to revise the McCarran-Walter Act at the earliest possible date, and to make it so workable and fair that no special immigration legislation will be needed in the future.

Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1955, the first day of the current session of Congress, I introduced an omnibus immigration bill, H. R. 501, to revise and rewrite the McCarran-Walter Act. The bill was referred to the House Judiciary Committee, but no action has as yet been taken by that committee on my bill. In view of the fact that more than 3 months have elapsed since I introduced my bill, I have asked the Clerk of the House for a discharge petition and have placed that petition on the Speaker's desk.

I want to appeal to all my colleagues to sign this petition so that we can bring this bill out on the floor for early action and a complete revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law.

Liberation of Oppressed Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following guest editorial from the Polish Daily News of January 10, 1955. This editorial was originally written for the Polish-American Journal by my distinguished and esteemed friend, K. Stefan Pomierski, of Glen Cove, N. Y.

The material follows:

LIBERATION OF OPPRESSED PEOPLES

One of our readers recently submitted a memorandum to President Eisenhower, suggesting positive ways and means to strengthen our historical ties of friendship with the captive peoples of Poland and other countries enslaved by the evil forces of communism.

Pointing out that at present the policy of the United States toward the enslaved nations is certainly not very encouraging to them, the author of the memorandum proposes as the first step the creation of an agency within the State Department or a Presidential commission with a view:

(a) To press a closer relationship not only with representatives of the free Poles, being obliged to live outside of Poland, but also with patriotic individuals and groups within the boundaries of enslaved Poland.

(b) To hold hearings in the United States and abroad for the purpose of determining the best ways and means to obtain information from reliable sources other than our consular and diplomatic officials.

(c) To assemble, scrutinize and evaluate such information, to recheck same and pass it on to the proper officials of our administration.

(d) To encourage captive peoples in the organization of a well-planned program of a passive movement, which in case of war would change into an active armed resistance cooperating with our high command.

(e) To adopt ways and means of mutual cooperation in means of communicating with each other by all modern devices, so that in case of war, we may know where to drop propaganda leaflets, even supplies and arms to the resisting forces.

(f) To study ways and means as to the possibility and practicability of the creation of several divisions composed of free Poles.

A creation of a Polish Army as a part of the Western Powers Defense Organization will offset propaganda initiated by the Communist regime that Western Germany once armed will again ravish the Polish people by fire and sword.

(g) To study and propose such other means and ways that may lighten the darkened road of the future—continuous serfdom, persecutions, and exploitations, which followed the Yalta agreement, and at the same time regain a courageous ally, a more loyal and reliable friend than perhaps some of our so-called allies who are now the recipients of military and financial assistance from us.

The author believes that the creation of such a Commission composed of persons genuinely interested in this matter, would perhaps also pacify a large number of individuals and groups who a little more than 2 years ago listened to campaign promises of both major parties relative to a positive liberation program, short of war, to be adopted, and who are dismayed, disheartened, and resentful of the apparent abandonment by this Government of the efforts it began toward liberation.

However, he argues, the most important point is the fact that if we should have an agency or commission having objectives such as are generally outlined in the memorandum, we may do our country a great service in case of an emergency which may threaten our own existence.

We agree with the author of the memorandum and trust that President Eisenhower, who knows him personally, will give serious consideration to his proposal.

On the other hand, we urge the Congressmen of Polish descent, our Polish-American organizations and their leaders, members of

the clergy, and individuals to support the above practical idea in every way they can.

Our Polish-American solons should introduce appropriate resolutions in the Congress of the United States, and our organizations should adopt resolutions regarding this matter.

In fact, everyone interested in the Polish cause should write to President Eisenhower expressing approval of the plan for the liberation of the oppressed peoples.

Should Public Education Cost $19 Billion in 1965?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., archbishop of Philadelphia, which appeared in the Catholic Standard and Times on March 18, 1955:

SHOULD PUBLIC EDUCATION COST $19 BILLION IN 1965?

The question is asked because such expenditure has been proposed as feasible by the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. The speculative proposal, 1 of 3, and the arguments in its support are set forth in a brochure of 62 pages issued in December, 1954, under the title "Financing Public Education in the Decade Ahead."

The commission is not unimportant. A cross section of its list of 39 members is furnished by its Public Education Finance Committee, as follows: Beardsley Ruml, James F. Brownlee, John Cowles, Samuel C. Gale, George Gallup, Lester B. Granger, Robert Heller, Roy E. Larsen, James G. K. McClure, Victor Reuther, O. H. Roberts, Jr., Harry Scherman, Louis B. Seltzer, Richard Joyce Smith and Sidney G. Tickton.

Its financial backing is impressive. Listed as contributors to its work are the Carnegie Corp., the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the Fund for the Republic, the General Education Board, the New York Community Trust, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

Its basic principles are praiseworthy: "To help Americans realize how important our public schools are to our expanding democracy. To arouse in each community the intelligence and will to improve our public schools."

To complete the background, it should be added that this brochure is a model of typographical excellence, its text is replete with tables and footnotes, it has the appearance of a scholarly work and a disarming air of frankness. It might have rendered a great service to the American public, and especially to the Members of Congress who are called upon to consider year after year the question of Federal aid to education.

It has failed to accomplish this high purpose because, (1) it has relied too much on assumptions, sometimes when facts were available; and (2) it has picked up a figure from the right-hand column of a table and applied it to the left-hand column, where it has produced a variance of several billions of dollars.

In the four broad fields covered by the study (population, production and income, educational expenditures, cost of construction) there are assumptions which can be tested at will. This analysis will be confined to a few of these.

One assumption which concerns Catholics is that private education has reached the saturation point. After setting forth certain projections of the poulation offered by the Bureau of the Census, the author selects as his basis of calculation the child population aged 5 to 17 years, "because it represents the gross liability of the American people for education." Then he adds: "A small fraction of the child population is educated privately, some children are not in school, but the increase in these groups is not likely to be important in the decade ahead."

The "small fraction" to which he refers is reported by the Bureau of the Census (Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 54) for the current year as 13.9 percent of the white registration in all elementary schools of the United States, and 9.4 percent of the white registration in high schools. Among the nonwhite registrations, the percentages are 4.4 and 3.4 respectively.

Compare the author's assumption with the statement of fact in the Census report just cited:

"Growth in private elementary and high school enrollment has taken place twice as fast, percentagewise, as it has in similar levels of public schools since 1948, the first year for which census data are available on school enrollment by type of control of the school. During these 6 years, the number of public school pupils has increased by 4.8 million, or 20 percent, whereas the number of private school pupils has increased by 1.2 million, or 49 percent." (Should we correct the census comment to read, two and one-half times as fast?)

An unwarranted assumption closely connected with this is that educational expenditures for the private and parochial systems on a nationwide basis are proportional to the percentage of children educated in nonpublic schools. With this assumption, the author estimates the parochial and private school expenditures in 1954 at $1,100,000,000.

Against this assumption stands the fact that more than 80 percent of the teachers in Catholic schools receive no salary, only subsistence; and the further fact that, at least in the smaller parish schools, many of the maintenance items are shared with the parish church in such fashion that costs are at a minimum. Add to this the fact that, as a result of eliminating waste space, many parochial and diocesan schools are constructed at costs far below the local public-school costs, and the discrepancy is greater. Further, interest charges for Catholic schools are generally at a minimum, for school debts are usually paid within 5 years (as against the 30- to 40-year periods involved in bond issues which add 50 percent or more to the cost of public-school buildings).

The material for the sleight-of-hand operation (surely unintentional) to which reference has been made above is found on pages 48, 51, and 53 (tables 6, 9, and 10—pt. B). Table 6 has statistics on the number of school children reported by various Government bureaus, 1950–65. We select the only year (1952) which has entries for all the columns, as follows:

Children, aged 5–17 (Census Bureau)	33,100,000
Enrollment, kindergarten, through grade 12 (Office of Education)	30,200,000
Enrollment, grades 1–12 (Census Bureau)	29,100,000
Average daily attendance (Office of Education)	23,700,000

The reader will note that there is a difference of $9,400,000 between the right- and left-hand columns of the above table.

In table 9 the author projects expenditures for all elementary and secondary schools in the United States, with estimates for 1954 totaling $10 billion. We have rejected the $1.1 billion for private schools, and we may prefer to use as our basis of calculation for public schools not the $8.9 billions, the author's estimate for 1954, but the factual $6.7 billions of 1951, as presented in the Statistical Abstract for the United States, 1954. We might also question the projection of school-age children, from 36 million in 1954 to 48 million in 1965, but that would go beyond the scope of the present analysis.

Table 10, part B, contains the manipulation. It stands thus:

Illustrative projection of school expenditures in 1965, assuming teachers' salaries increase [1]

1954 situation:	
1. Number of school-age children (table 1)	36,000,000
2. Expenditures on education (table 9)	$10,000,000,000
3. Per capita expenditure, including allowance for debt service	$278
1965 situation:	
1. Number of school-age children	48,100,000
2. If $278 per school-age child is spent, total education expenditures will be	$13,360,000,000
3. If $356 [1] per school-age child is spent (equivalent to actual current expenditures plus operations in 1954), total education expenditures will be	$17,100,000,000
4. If $400 [1] per school-age child is spend (equivalent to actual current expenditures plus debt service in communities where education standards are highest) total education expenditures will be	$19,200,000,000

[1] Expenditures of increased amounts per school-age child will involve higher salaries for teachers than now paid. These should be accompanied by greater productivity per teaching unit, through modification of historical teaching practices, consolidation of school districts, utilization of new teaching devices, visual aids, etc. Research in the field of education will improve productivity, as has already been accomplished in industry and agriculture, and will soon begin for clerical activities.

The author has taken the New York figure for column 4 of table 6, and applied it to column 1 for the whole United States. Thus he arrives at $19 billion. In other words, the expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance in the public schools of New York State (the number was 1,771,000 in 1952) was applied to all the children of the United States projected as of age 5 to 17 in 1965. The New York children of those ages numbered 2,739,000 in 1952—almost a million more than the number on whom the educational budget was spent; that is, the public school pupils. A further illustration of the New York picture can be presented by the factual data for 1951: the expenditure per child in daily attendance at public school was $332; per child enrolled, $282; per child 5 to 17 years of age, $220.

It would be interesting as a mental exercise to reverse the process followed in the bro-

chure. The new table would be something like this:

1965	
Total population—5 to 17 (projected)	48,000,000
Less 10 percent not in school (assumed)	4,800,000
Enrolled in school	43,200,000
Less 20 percent in private school (projected)	8,600,000
Enrolled in public school	34,600,000
Less 12 percent absentees (projected 1950 data)	4,152,000
In average daily attendance	30,448,000
Cost, at $220 per pupil in average daily attendance	$6,698,560,000

This unfair projection is, of course, no more worthy of acceptance than is the one proposed by the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.

If the author of the brochure will revise his assumptions and stay close to facts, he may yet make a valuable contribution to the debate on a very serious national issue.

Albert Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 19, 1955:

Albert Einstein, one of the intellectual Titans of his time, was a man of exceptional gentleness, sweetness and simplicity. He brought to the America which welcomed him as a refugee from Nazi tyranny great scientific gifts; he was, indeed, one of those rare creatures set apart from ordinary men, an authentic genius, a Promethean figure of the magnitude of Galileo, Euclid, or Newton who radically changed man's concept of the universe he inhabited. His speculations and researches in higher mathematics, translated into the area of nuclear physics, laid the essential groundwork for the development of atomic energy. Thus he made an immeasurable contribution to the strength and security of his adopted land.

But he made what may, in the long run, be reckoned an even richer contribution through his devotion to those ideals of personal integrity and individual liberty which drew him to the United States. Driven from the country of his birth by Nazi intolerence, he had the courage to speak out here when he saw symptoms of the pressures toward conformity which had brought Germany to disaster. Despite his occasional naivete in political matters, he became for Americans a symbol of their own best values, a symbol of the America that has always been a haven for the oppressed, and a symbol of the America that has achieved unity through diversity and security through freedom.

During his latter years, Professor Einstein lived a life of quiet scholarship in Princeton, revered and loved no less by his neighbors than by his eminent scientific colleagues. One of his neighbors was a little girl who stopped in to see him every afternoon on her way home from school. Her mother, fearful that the child might be making herself a nuisance, asked the professor one day what on earth he could find in common with her. "It's perfectly simple," said Dr. Einstein. "She likes me to help her with her arithmetic homework, and I like the jellybeans she brings me." He was, above all else, a man who loved his fellow men.

Quo Vadis America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point an address by Dr. A. P. Coleman, president, Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa., delivered before the National Slovak Society at Pittsburgh, Pa.

I commend this address to all Members of the House:

QUO VADIS AMERICA?

(By Dr. A. P. Coleman, president, Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa.)

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to deliver a warning to my fellow schoolmen and to all Americans. I intend to show, in as striking a manner as I am able, a situation of gravest danger existing in our American schools. Yes, with your permission, learned judges and distinguished attorneys, I even intend to argue a case. I shall endeavor to convince all of you, as rational beings and patriotic citizens, that the changes in the school curricula which I advocate are vital to our well-being as a nation. I shall try to show you that through certain missed opportunities in our classrooms the United States is missing the boat on two fronts: internally, in the crucial problem we have here of integration within our own frame and body; and internationally, in the basic problem of our age, that of creating an effective counterpoise to communism and its fanatical propagators in the Kremlin.

Today you all know the foreign policy of the United States, still under the Russophile influence of opinion makers like George Kennan, is one of containment of the Soviet and quarantining communism. Negative, and thus inevitably failing, this policy can be redeemed only by the injection of one great and vital ingredient.

The ingredient is obvious: Intelligent and enlightened self-interest have but to be applied, and the ingredient stands automatically self-revealed. To any true student of Eastern Europe it is the natural course: The active and purposeful wooing of the souls of the races now enslaved by the Soviets which, alas, we have all but succeeded in discouraging altogether. Originally these relatives of many of my listeners were of our own mind and temper. American policy has almost driven them from our side, from their natural allegiance. We have got, for our own sakes, to woo and win them back.

I feel moreover that this wooing must be done soon. As our own Alliance College student, the heroic Polish flier, Frank Jarecki, often says, we must do it now.

Why so soon, Americans ask?

Because, left alone, apparently abandoned by the West, the people of countries like Slovakia and Poland are suffering beyond endurance. And their children hearing nothing by Communist propaganda may imperceptably be educated into Communism because: as a traveler in the desert drinks from a foul, contaminated spring, rather than die of thirst—so must young people in Eastern Europe today at least pretend to accept communism, or perish. It is as simple as that, friends.

In the meantime what do the young people of Eastern Europe hear? Little about our progress; everything about our failures.

To make matters worse our Government actually receives, yes recognizes, envoys from the U. S. S. R. and the Soviet-dominated regions, thus providing the argument to the folks back home that we here in the United States, so it appears to the East European, approve the various Communist regimes. Else why would we receive the envoys of murderous dictatorships?

Ladies and gentlemen, if I had my way, I'd follow the advice of the president of Polish National Alliance, Charles Rozmarek, and give the Washington ambassadors of all Soviet-satellite embassies, the good old Pittsburgh Slovak farewell "bud-baj." And I say to you, our American policy should be: "No traffic with hangmen."

"Ne ver komunistovi, kym je teply"—is an adage our frontier fathers of Fort Duquesne would expect us Pennsylvanians to translate: "The only good Communist is a dead Communist."

The sooner Washington learns the truth of the following old Slovak saying the better: "Nebude zo psa slanina, ani z vlka baranina."—"You get no bacon from a dog, nor mutton from a wolf."

We Americans, in the light of the long history of our woes since President Roosevelt lamentably recognized the Soviets, ought at last to know there just isn't any mutton to be got from doing business with a Communist wolf.

Intelligence and self-interest aside, where is our former American evangelism? How have we come to the point of being able to desert our spiritual brothers of Central and Eastern Europe, and, not only desert them, but even worse, not even know we are deserting them?

For the hundred and more millions of our fellow Western folk dwelling in the great Middle Zone of Europe, from Finland down through Poland and Slovakia to Romunia, now under Soviet rule, "containment" and "quarantine" are but abandonment. In the end they spell "divorce"—severance utterly from the western orbit to which by every right of choice and tradition these people belong. Let's rather move the Iron Curtain east. To mention only two, America must no longer abandon Slovakia and Poland.

Americans are able to seem to desert their natural friends and ideological allies because they do not, as a Nation, here in the United States, genuinely feel, in the marrow of their bones and in their hearts, that the folk from the Middle Zone are yet part and parcel of America. They do not feel them to be us. Here is the root cause of the tragedy for the Slovaks and other suffering peoples from Eastern Europe, the explanation of how a generous America could perpetrate the infamy of Yalta.

Of course it goes without saying that there are a few Americans of whom this sweeping charge of unfeeling ignorance is not true. There are some who genuinely and with spontaneous intuition feel that deep kinship with the folk of the Middle Zone that means oneness. But the number is too small. Except for those who themselves come from this region, or whose ancestors came from there, the number is insignificant. And many, if not most of this paltry few, are without influence, more's the pity. Some are expatriates, with no roots in our own American soil, and therefore without weight or prestige. Worst of all few who feel this mystic kinship with the Middle Zone are in any degree articulate or influential. This must and will change.

This is where, President Pankuch, Honorary President Platek, members of the su-

preme council, and friends, the National Slovak Society, joining with your distinguished fellow citizens of Pittsburgh, Judge Blair F. Gunther, censor of the Polish National Alliance this year celebrating its diamond jubilee, and with all other patriotic organizations with ties behind the Iron Curtain—this, ladies and gentlemen, is where you by your mighty collective efforts can carry on a vast effort in education to the eternal good of our glorious United States of America.

For our American national good, numbered as the few should be those who fail to recognize the oneness of the midzone races with ourselves; as the many, those who understand, and even more than simply understand, perceive with all their senses that the races we have mentioned are but ourselves, with aspirations and longings identical with our own, and a deep-rooted tradition of full spiritual integration with our own West. Such enlightened Americans know that Poland and Slovakia do not belong behind the Iron Curtain. They belong to our Latin civilization.

How can the balance be reversed? Only by the schools. The schools are the sole agency that reaches enough of our people to do the job. And here I am not referring solely to the schools of higher learning, nor even to them at all. I mean the elementary and secondary schools. Only through these can the desired reversal of orientation be brought about.

But, you argue, the crisis is urgent and immediate. The schools might be able to do the job, but it will take a generation at least for their influence to be felt. The fruit of a school's sowing is seen only after the years have passed. The product is inevitably long deferred, never appearing at once.

This is true, and the argument is valid, or would be if the present struggle were simply of the moment. It is, of course, not this at all. At least twice before our time the races of Europe from which we are sprung have wrestled on the battlefield for a period of a hundred years at a time over issues that divided them. They are doing the same thing again, this time with Asia as an added factor in the duel.

Ours is a third hundred years' war, though still a cold war. It did not begin yesterday, and will not be over tomorrow. Too many people have yet to be purged of the madness of our age for the struggle to end quickly. Too many Americans must still have the lure of escape into totalitarianism banished from their imaginations and exorcised from their souls. Communism must be stripped of its fine clothes and exposed as the bloody, murderous reaction that it is. When fellow travelers and pinkos in the seats of influence in our beloved land pose as experts on Eastern Europe they must be labeled for what they are: Nearsighted dupes of Marxist sophistry or simple opportunists.

Some Americans, even Senators, need to realize that you cannot fight Communists with gloves on. "He who wants the kernel must crack the shell."

Meanwhile the schools do have time. What changes then should be made in our curricula so that the oportunities at present being missed may be turned into opportunities grasped?

The principle governing the changes I propose is easily stated. The rich cultural stream of middle zone thought and aspiration, past and present, must be integrated fully with the stream of culture we are now passing on to our children through the schools as American. As presently offered, the stream is not, in the fullest sense, American. This fact was brought to my attention with a shock some years ago in my own Connecticut hometown. A schoolgirl bearing a Slavic name was reading an essay she had written on the First Thanksgiving Day. In the course of it she spoke eloquently of how her ancestors had taken part in this moving celebration. Her words galvanized my thinking.

"Yes," I thought. "You are right, Laska. Those Pilgrim Fathers were your ancestors, though their names were so different from your own and their race so foreign. They were your spiritual ancestors, because your parents made them so, by deliberately making the country which they so largely fashioned their deliberate choice as your future homeland. When your fathers left Bratislava, Trnava, Nitra, Turciansky Svaty Martin, Brezno, Dobsiana, Margecany, or Kosice, they made as brave a choice as did ever the first members of the Greene family of Rhode Island—my own ancestors—in leaving the British Isles over 300 years ago." This I freely grant.

In the larger sense the Pilgrim Fathers were your ancestors, Laska. Spiritual ancestors, however, not racial. Yet you had racial ancestors living in the year of the first Thanksgiving Day. And they, too, were doing things of importance in that year, things as significant as founding a colony in the wilderness. They were holding back the Turkish horde from the heart of Europe, offering their living bodies as a bastion against the invader, in an earlier chapter of the ever-recurring struggle of West against East. Those ancestors of yours in Slovakia were making it possible in a word, for a colony to be founded in the New World, and you should be very proud of them. Furthermore, if, I found myself addressing Laska:

"If we Greenes let you have our racial ancestors as your own, some way must be found so as to permit me and mine to have your ancestors. It is only fair to us both as makers of the ultimate America."

How can this be accomplished? How can the gate be opened so as to let the Tatra hero, Janosik, enter freely into our garden of heroic memory, as our Elder Brewster has so freely entered into yours through our American schools?

Was it not your great Slovak apostle of Slavic unity, Jan Kollar who wrote, according to the late Peter Yurchak:

"Literary reciprocity is * * * a sharing of all the national groups in the spiritual product of their nation?"

Right here in this great new American city of Pittsburgh let us, Americans all, demand that the school textbooks be revised to show in some small measure the background of the Slavs, and of all Americans. Only in one way: By a thorough refocussing of our school textbooks, and a rewriting of them from start to finish as we go together marching down our Avenue of the Americas, can we build a united America.

Actually, of course, the heroic ancestors I have been speaking of arrived on our shores very early, even before the coming of the Pilgrims. They arrived as part of the spiritual baggage of the Poles who are known to have been present in Virginia's Jamestown settlement, which was founded in 1607, 13 years before Plymouth Colony. Thus Zolkiewski and other heroes of 17th century Poland have been American figures even longer than Governor Bradford and John Winthrop or the romantic John and Priscilla Alden. But for all the long time they have been here, the Poles of Jamestown Colony still have not impenetrated the main stream of our culture, or fused with it to a perceptible degree.

The situation with regard to the Slovaks is even worse. What American boy loving adventure has heard of Moric August Benovsky from his school library?

And yet, with letters of recommendation from Benjamin Franklin, Benovsky, born in Vrbova, Slovakia, came to America in 1775 and later served under the Polish hero, Count Kazimierz Pulaski, in our own Revolution. How many boys and girls of Slovak, or any descent, learn about this in American schools? Who among American school boys know Benovsky's exciting adventures in America and later in Madagascar? None. Somehow we must work for a full two-way cultural exchange to strengthen American unity.

The heroes and symbols dear to our fellow citizens from the middle zone of Europe must not be kept standing on the shore of our on-sweeping cultural stream. To change the metaphor, they must not be kept waiting outside the door of our national Pantheon, like spiritual DP's, hoping, hat in hand, as it were, for some entrance visa that never is granted by our educational leaders.

What great things this full impenetration may accomplish for our general American culture we can scarcely imagine. It is not too much to predict that it may even be the means at last of fertilizing our New World Renaissance.

Today even here in Pittsburgh our young people of middle zone origin go through school receiving an Americanism which takes no cognizance whatsoever of any pre-American past save the English, the German, the French, and possibly the Spanish and Italian. Yet in their homes and churches, lodges, and at celebrations like ours tonight, these young people hear extolled such heroes as Janosik, if they are Slovak. They learn, if they are Polish, about the warrior Bolesiaus the Bold, who sleeps in the mountains, awaiting resurrection and deliverance of his people. They hear of poets like Swetozar Hurban Vajansky, whose words had the power to keep alive an enslaved Slovakia.

I believe that a boy or girl can be a better American if he feels, with Vajansky in Kramoris' translation:

"I am proud that I am Slovak
Sweet my language wells,
Like the music of archangels,
Like the sea-tide's swells.
Hymns of ours purest pearls are,
Diamonds depth along.
In our myth dwells secret rapture,
Wisdom do our proverbs capture,
Beauty fills our song."

Literally with a Slovak or Polish song in their hearts, these your children have gone to our American schools, and then, as I have said, heard not a single word of any Slovak figures, nor what they stood for in history. The result is that American young people too often become conditioned to distrusting the parents to whom these old-country heroes meant so much. They come to believe their elders have been selling them, as they say, "a bill of goods." And so we have growing up in America a race of young people with split souls.

One of our Alliance College students brought this fact to my attention with shocking force one day when he cried in despair, "But why didn't I hear about him in school?"

At Alliance the boy had at last learned of Mickiewicz, the poet par excellence of the Polish heart, whose death in 1855 we are commemorating this whole year, climaxing in a "Mickiewicz Festival" at our college the last week of next July.

At first at Alliance when Mrs. Coleman spoke of Mickiewicz the boy resisted but finally his bitter young mind softened, and yielded to the charm of Mickiewicz's verse.

"Why shouldn't I have thought you were just trying to trap me with some second-rater," he asked, "when in 12 years of public school I have never once heard the name Mickiewicz mentioned? Why wasn't he given to me in his proper place, in his true perspective, along with Byron and the other romantic poets of the world?"

Well, ladies and gentlemen, why not?

Yes, the Middle Zone has got to come into its rightful place in our American stream of culture. Until it does, the stream is, as I have said, not fully American. Too many of the heroes and symbols that should be within its tide are absent. They are as if

illegitimate. They must be legitimatized, and we had better begin in Pennsylvania, American homeland of the Slavs.

Out of the process of legitamization and impenetration, we may, as I have indicated get our own renaissance, too.

Consider for a moment the manner in which Europe received her Renaissance in the 15th and 16th centuries. After ages of being cut off from its past, Europe was reunited with that past through the rediscovery of classical culture. The newly discovered source of inspiration was carried by a handful of geniuses to England and France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. Here, in the space of two centuries, the classics proceded to impenetrate fully the cultures already in being on the various local soils. "The glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome" became in the fullest sense the possession of the Frenchman, the Italian, the Spaniard, and the Englishman. A tremendous refreshment and rejuvenation of the native culture in each case took place. Shakespeare devoured Plutarch, distilled him through his own imagination, and then, far from keeping him to himself, gave the creator of the Roman Valhalla and all the heroes who were enshrined in his great creation fully and bountifully to the meanest clerk in London, who in turn made him his own. Note, in recalling Europe's Rennaissance, that it was no new culture which served as the fructifying agency, renewing the life of Europe. It was an old culture, ancient and hoary and hallowed by time as compared with the cultures which it stimulated into more abundant life. Seemingly strange to us in the United States who so worship the young, it was a case of an older culture fertilizing those still in the prime, as we say, of their youth.

The same phenomenon can start here in Pittsburgh now. The culture of the midzone is old, old and mellow, tried in the furnace of time and proven valid. Impenetrating our own native culture, it can give it the zest and buoyancy of the people of the Vah, the strength and refreshment of those that dwell along the Vistula.

Whether you agree with my thesis or find my arguments sound, what I am saying will happen, is bound to happen. Whether we wish it or not, the special heritage of each and every race present in America today will in the end be admitted into the stream of American culture. The only question is, how soon—whether soon enough to do us any good in the present ideological duel; and by invitation or through pressure.

However the change comes about, the reorientation will be accomplished through the schools. Already progress has been made along this line in our colleges, where since the Second World War courses in world literature have burgeoned. Most of the courses, however, are afflicted with astigmatism, the reason being, of course, that the textbooks on which they are based are gravely out of focus. One would get the impression from texts used in our schools that between the river Oder and Dniester, which bound the midzone on west and east, lay a gigantic black swamp, inhabited only by animals. Up to the Oder from the west and the Dniester from the east, the various nations are accorded their deserved and proper space. For the nations lying between, there is a great void. I have been told that the wealthy East European Fund of the Ford Foundation publishes no books in Slovak or Polish. Why?

Are not Slovak and Polish important East European languages? I ask you.

Clearly, we need volumes dealing fairly and adequately with the dozen or more national groups dwelling in the midzone. Simple prudence requires that these not be left out, as the Ford Foundation seems to have done. Are we to give the impression in our school texts that the ancestors of our boys and girls of Slovak and Polish origin have no culture? Will this studied discrimination increase American unity? Never.

And if we do forget historic lands like Slovakia and Poland, how are American boys and girls to reconcile what they hear at home with what they hear in school? If, as in many texts, ample space is accorded Russian literature, which, as our young people have been taught by their parents, is relatively new—and it is; while no space whatever is accorded to Slovak and Polish, which they have been taught are relatively old—and they are—will not youth be confused? It most certainly will.

New textbooks, new interpretative volumes, new anthologies must be written. And here I should like to deliver a warning. Great care will have to be taken to make these new texts and anthologies appealing. Those in charge of planning them will have to be careful never to forget they have two masters to serve, not one: the Nation whose culture they are presenting, and the American student. In the tradition of every middle zone country there are heroes and symbols of vital import that will appeal to the young American, and "sel lhim," as it were, on the race in question. There are other heroes who will be totally unintelligible to him, because of his different, that is American, background. It is the heroes and symbols of the first category that the textbook writer of the future must concentrate on. And above all, he must bypass the figures that are dull.

Up to the present, the portion of our American population which has its roots in Slovakia, Poland, and the rest of the midzone has been inarticulate. This, distinguished toastmaster, Mr. President, guests, and ladies and gentlemen, is not going to be the case for long. Soon you in this hall are bound justly to become vocal and to demand the thing I have been talking about. How much better for the cause of harmony within our country if American schoolmen answer the yearning of you folks before it rises to a demand. The schools of Pittsburgh should lead by proving that American educators appreciate Americans of Slovak origin, organized in the great National Slovak Society, because American fair play demands that your heritage be taught in clear focus with those of other races.

For one thing is certain in this uncertain world:

No matter what the future holds for any of us, for America, and for the world, the Slavs will have unmeasurably more influence in the future than in the past.

Ladies and gentlemen, the greatest potential, still unexploited, source of resistance to communism in the world today does not lie in the neutralist Orient dominated by Nehru, but in Eastern Europe, where dwell hundreds of millions of loyal lovers of freedom. The free spirit of Janosik still dwells in Slovakia and everywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

Many millions of hearts in Eastern Europe have just greeted the New Year with anxiety and yet with courage. In the words of Jan Botto's Janosik they have bravely cried:

"Freedom, freedom, dear, dear freedom mine,
For thy sake the lords are preparing the gallows for me."

In conclusion, my friends, we have just been through the joys of Christmas. Shall we then not all the more, as did Janosik, abhor the hangman's gallows going up today throughout Eastern Europe? Can we longer remain indifferent to the fate of the Slavs, fellow Christians of the western tradition?

From the smoking embers of Eastern European Christian culture, even the pagan Slavic god Rodhost cries: "No! No! No!"

Janošik still lives and will go abroad against his land's oppressors as soon as America with an understanding of the historic contribution of the mid-zone obtained in our schools shakes off the bonds of ignorance. Then the voices of the exploited people will echo through the wide reaches of the Tatras:

"Bude volat do všech stran: Janíčko! Kdeze si?"

"Will cry in every direction: Janošik, where art thou?"

I believe before God America must and will answer, provided our schools honestly present Slavic culture in all its beauty and its power. America will turn against the hangmen of Marx who bind the Slavic soul of Eastern Europe, as our hearts here tonight turn once more to the heights of Caktice in Slovakia.

America will approach the gallows of sacrifice in the spirit of Janošik, Robin Hood of the Tatras, for our souls will tell us that there burns the torch of freedom for America and for the world today. As the peoples of Slavdom rise, the Communists will fall.

Coexistence with Communists, my friends, is like making your bed in a snake pit. Bad education in the past would have us even consider the preposterous plan of coexistence with those who in 10 years have enslaved nearly a billion human beings. We need the spirit of Janošik and we must for the inspiration of America, tell again the old tales of Slovak heroism. On the scaffold Janošik found freedom. By releasing eastern Europe America will preserve her freedom.

Albert Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 19, 1955, is an indication of the high esteem in which this great scientist was held by the entire Nation:

Just as the shoulders of the mythological Atlas strove to support the heavens, so did the mathematical equations of Albert Einstein seek to balance the universe. This was a scientist who as no other in his century symbolized to mankind a knowledge and comprehension that reached rarefied heights where few minds but his could venture.

It was a striking phenomenon that a physicist and mathematician dealing in abstractions that eluded the grasp of the untrained millions should have attained such widespread renown and affection. Those to whom relativity, the space-time continuum and the unified field theory were indecipherable phrases nevertheless felt the presence of the gray-haired, pipe-smoking, comfortably dressed old man at Princeton, and knew almost instinctively that it was a presence at once benign and beneficial.

To assay the contributions of Dr. Einstein to human knowledge is a formidable task, for mathematics, rather than perception through the senses, was the tool he used for understanding the universe. And yet his hypotheses, written in enigmatic symbols, became palpable and overwhelming facts within his own lifetime. His general theory of relativity predicted the bending of starlight in the gravitational field of the sun; in 1919 an eclipse permitted astronomers to confirm by observation his equations and establish his theory as fact. In 1905 he wrote the formula $e=mc^2$; 40 years later this statement of the relationship between mass and energy was transfigured into the atomic

bomb. His work lay at the base of many developments in electronics and television, as well as of industrial advances that depend upon underlying laws of matter and energy.

Yet the greatness of Dr. Einstein lay less in the everyday achievements he contributed to than in the awesome breadth of the concepts he brought to the post-Newtonian world. He sought one key to unlock all the portals of the universe, and he believed that he had fashioned it at last in the unified field theory, propounded in 1953, in which he united electromagnetic and gravitational phenomena in a cosmic harmony. Here, as in his earlier hypotheses, he did not say whether he was right or wrong—though he undoubtedly suspected the former—leaving it to those who came after to prove the reality of his concept.

Although he shunned fame and publicity, both sought him out. Americans could be proud that he had found, in a house on Mercer Street in Princeton, a refuge from the enmity which had driven him, a Jew, from Nazi Germany. Here, too, he found the free scientific climate that enabled him to pursue his work unhampered, even when, unfortunately, his name and fame were used by Red front groups. Honors poured in on him throughout his life—a Nobel prize, an offer of the Presidency of the State of Israel, awards and citations of all kinds. Other scientists came to him for guidance and support; school children found him ready to help with their geometry problems. A man of genius, he also was a man among men, and he knew that humanity holds a sacred and central place within the expanding universe.

Although he never claimed philosophy among his attainments, his belief that the basic laws of nature were fundamental and not casual, that cosmic order and harmony exist, that God does not "play dice with the world" helped make his thought part of the mainstream of human aspiration, just as his supremely useful and devoted life was an inextricable part of the universe in which he lived.

Bill Jacobsen: A Good Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I want to pay further tribute to the memory of William S. Jacobsen, former Congressman from Iowa's second district, by printing the following fine editorial from the Davenport (Iowa) Morning Democrat of April 12, 1955:

BILL JACOBSEN: A GOOD PUBLIC SERVANT

Scott County friends of William S. Jacobsen, former Second District Congressman, will join with Clinton County residents in mourning his sudden death.

Bill Jacobsen represented the district from 1937 to 1943, when Scott County was a part of that district. Like his father Ben Jacobsen, whom he succeeded in Congress, he was always well liked here and ever ready to perform services for Davenporters.

The Jacobsens, father and son, were representatives of the high type of German-American who helped to develop this section of the Mississippi Valley, and who regarded public service and working for community betterment as a part of their debt to the free Republic that offered them a new home.

Kings County Surrogate Maximilian Moss Receives New York University Honor Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following citations and articles in recognition of the achievements of Maximilian Moss:

THE CHANCELLOR AND COUNCIL OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

To All Persons To Whom This Writing May Come, Greeting:

Be it known that we, by virtue of authority granted us by charter of the State of New York, and in recognition of distinguished services and attainments, do confer upon Maximilian Moss the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters, with all the rights, privileges, and immunities thereunto appertaining.

In witness whereof we have caused this diploma to be signed by the duly authorized officers of the university and sealed with our corporate seal, in the city of New York, April 3, 1955.

[SEAL]

HENRY T. HEALD,
Chancellor.
HOWARD O. VOORHIS,
Secretary.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

PRESENTATION, CITATION, AND INVESTITURE OF MAXIMILIAN MOSS WITH THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANE LETTERS

Maximilian Moss: A lifetime member of this community, he has devoted his life to its service as few men have ever done. Born and reared in Brooklyn, he attended the public schools that he was later to govern, received the bachelor of laws degree in 1917 from the university that honors him today, and throughout the intervening years has brought honor to the university by notable service to law, education, and a myriad of civic, philanthropic, and religions causes. Distinguished and successful member in years past of the venerable law firm of Cullen & Dykman, universally acclaimed member of the board of education of the city of New York from 1946 until 1951, and for three terms its president, elected a justice of the supreme court of the State of New York in 1951, named acting surrogate a year ago, he is now, by recent action of the Governor, surrogate of Kings County, a capacity particularly appropriate to one of his professional skill, probity, innate compassion and humanity. The breadth and diversity of his community interests both strain the imagination and exceed the limits imposed upon this citation. Especially active in the religious and philanthropic activities of his own faith, he has served as president of his temple, as president of the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, as chairman of the New York University Hebrew Chair Endowment Fund, as chairman of the house staff, the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, and as trustee of the Brooklyn Hebrew Orphan Asylum. He is presented for the doctorate of humane letters.

RUSSELL D. NILES,
Dean, School of Law.

Judge Moss: In the manifold service of your fellowmen at the bar, on the bench, in public education, and in leading humanitarian enterprises, you have consistently brought honor and glory to your alma mater, wherefore from the depths of our gratitude we tender you this symbol of highest esteem.

HENRY T. HEALD,
Chancellor.

Dated April 3, 1955.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 4, 1955]

N. Y. U. DEGREES CONFERRED ON EBAN AND FOUR AMERICANS

New York University, in recognition of the American Jewish Tercentenary Celebration, conferred yesterday the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters on 4 Americans and 1 Israeli at a special convocation in Vanderbilt Hall, 40 Washington Square South.

The five degrees, conferred by Dr. Henry T. Heald, Chancellor of the university, went to Abba S. Eban, Israeli Ambassador to the United States; Rabbi David de Sola Pool, of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue; Surrogate Maximilian Moss, of Kings County; Dr. Abraham A. Neuman, president of Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, in Philadelphia, and Rabbi Leo Jung, president of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Ambassador Eban, discussing the relationship between his country and the United States, drew a parallel between the American Revolution and the establishment of Israel. He said the two countries are joined by three basic links: A common body of historic experience, a common devotion to democracy, and a common allegiance to the same system of moral values.

"Israel's task in creating a unified discipline of loyalty and culture from scores of varying tongues and backgrounds has only one parallel in history," he said. "It is the creation of American civilization by the synthesis and harmony of many races, creeds, and tongues which have composed the symphony of American life today."

N. Y. U. had conducted a series of six public lectures in February and March on "Jewish Ideals in American Civilization."

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1955]

FIVE JEWISH LEADERS HONORED AT N. Y. U.—UNIVERSITY CONFERS DEGREES AT CONVOCATION ENDING TERCENTENARY PROGRAM

New York University, in recognition of the American Jewish tercentenary, awarded honorary degrees of doctor of humane letters yesterday to five prominent Jews. They included Abba S. Eban, Israel's Ambassador to the United States.

The academic convocation, held at Vanderbilt Hall, 40 Washington Square South, culminated the university's observance of the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in the United States. The degrees were conferred by Henry T. Heald, chancellor of the university.

A tercentenary program of six public lectures entitled "Jewish Ideals in American Civilization," was conducted by the university during February and March. It was planned by the department of culture and education, headed by Prof. Abraham I. Katsh, in cooperation with the American Jewish Tercentenary Committee.

In addition to Ambassador Eban, recipients of the degrees were Rabbi David de Sola Pool, spiritual leader of the Spanish and Portuguese synagogue, Central Park West and 70th Street; Maximilian Moss, surrogate of Kings County; Dr. Abraham A. Neuman, president of Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia; and Rabbi Leo Jung, president of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences and professor of ethics at Yeshiva University.

Ambassador Eban was cited for the "courage, understanding, and diplomacy" that "catapulted him to leadership in Jewish

statehood," for his "devotion to the cause of universal understanding," and for his "inexhaustible effort to further democratic ideals."

Dr. Neuman was commended as a spiritual leader, scholar, "educational statesman," and "distinguished student of Jewish history, who combines the knowledge of the historian with the fervor of a prophet."

Surrogate Moss was cited for his "notable service to law, education, and a myriad of civic, philanthropic, and religious causes."

Rabbi de Sola Pool, who delivered the invocation, was hailed for his leadership of the oldest Jewish congregation in the United States. The citation called attention to his place as "a world leader in Sephardic Jewry" and to his translation and editing of seven sephardic prayer books.

The citation of Rabbi Jung noted that his "academic prowess is a hallmarked by degrees from Cambridge and London Universities and a doctorate of divinity, honoris causa, from Yeshiva University." He was also praised "for contributions to Jewish life and letters and for distinguished leadership in the community."

Rabbi Jung pronounced the benediction.

[From the New York World-Telegram of April 4, 1955]

JUDGE MOSS RECEIVES N. Y. U. HONOR DEGREE

Kings County Surrogate Maximilian Moss received the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters yesterday from New York University. Similar honors were conferred on four other Jewish leaders.

Judge Moss was cited for his "notable service to law, educaiton, and a myriad of civic, philanthropic, and religious causes."

The convocation at which the degrees were given ended the university's recognition of the American Jewish tercentenary celebration, marking the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in this country.

Israeli Ambassador Abba S. Eban, one of the five honored, said Israel parallels the United States in "creating a unified discipline of loyalty and culture from scores of varying tongues and backgrounds."

The others who received degrees were: Rabbi David de Sola, spiritual leader of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagagues, Manhattan; Dr. Abraham A. Neuman, president of Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia; and Rabbi Leo Jung, president of the Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 4, 1955]

CALLS IGNORANCE SEEDBED OF BIAS

Ignorance of others' beliefs must be wiped out if the American goal of equality for all is to be achieved, Kings County Surrogate Maximilion Moss declared Sunday at an NYU observance of the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in the United States.

"In a democracy thriving in a community with such diverse national origins, almost a 'local one-world,'" he declared, "we must teach an appreciation of each other's culture. America fears no enemy more than ignorance. Dispel ignorance through education and we will go a long way toward assuring a peaceful and harmonious society; for our practical democratic creed, on close analysis, will turn out to be merely an appreciation of all our faiths."

Moss, who received an honorary doctor of humane letters degree, said further:

"There are more persons of Irish heritage in New York than in Belfast, more of Russian origin than in Kiev, Minsk, Odessa, Stalingrad, or Vladivostok. We have here more persons of Italian heritage than reside in Genoa, Naples, or Venice. We have in this city more people of Polish extraction than live in Warsaw."

And he pointed out that children of all groups, playing side by side, pick up the fundamentals of democracy in action.

Among others honored were Israeli Ambassador Abba S. Eban; Rabbi David de Sola Pool, of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue; Dr. Abraham A. Neuman, president, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, and Rabbi Leo Jung, president, Jewish Academy of Arts and Sciences, and professor of ethics at Yeshiva University.

A Tribute to the Late William S. Jacobsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the late William S. Jacobsen, of Clinton, Iowa, former Congressman from Iowa's Second District. As a constituent of his for 6 years, I came to know and respect the fine example of leadership my Congressman upheld in the Halls of Congress.

Iowa and the Nation suffered a great loss in the death, on Sunday a week ago, of William S. Jacobsen, of Clinton, Iowa. Davenport and Scott County will always remember with gratitude the faithful services rendered by Representative Jacobsen, for 6 years, from 1937 through 1942. Scott County during that period was included in the old second district of Iowa, and William S. Jacobsen gave wholehearted and capable service to all his constituents, following the splendid example set by his father, Bernhard Martin Jacobsen, who had represented the same district from 1931 to his sudden death in 1936. These were Democrats, both with the large and with the small "d." In national affairs, and in local affairs, they held to the tradition of rising above party interests, in the spirit of the nobel saying of Rutherford Hayes: "He serves his party best who serves the country best."

The Jacobsen family stands for one of the proudest traditions of Americanism—the tradition of the immigrant boy who made good, who served his neighborhood as a storekeeper, his city as a banker and postmaster, and his country as legislator. Bernhard Martin Jacobsen came to this country from Germany as a boy of 14, ignorant of our language, accompanying his immigrant parents. He worked in a sawmill, then in a brickyard, then in a general store, learning English from his fellow workers, then resuming his education as his earnings freed him to devote some time to studies. It is an inspiring story and is good to think that this great tradition established by Bernhard Jacobsen was most worthily carried on by his son William, and that others of this fine Jacobsen family survive to carry on the tradition of patriotism and friendly service. The Jacobsen Building, in Clinton, stands as a monument to the accomplishments of the family, and their motto, "Keep right on smiling," is enshrined in the name of the Jacobsen radio station, KROS–AM and KROS–FM, which, up to now, has been operated by William Jacobsen with his younger brother, Marvin J. Jacobsen.

William Jacobsen has left behind him two sons, Bernhard J. Jacobsen and Maenard W. Jacobsen, who are carrying on the tradition of this outstanding family, a fine example of the contribution of German immigration to the development of Iowa and America.

The Argentine Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 15, 1955:

THE ARGENTINE PICTURE

Since Juan D. Perón is now rounding out 10 years of domination in Argentina an inquiry into his role in that nation and the nation's role in the world was apt. The Times has now presented the results of such an inquiry by Herbert Matthews.

Mr. Matthews' principal conclusions are that Peronismo cannot last, and that it is likely to give way to democracy after an interval of military rule; that Perón has made Argentina a land without justice; that its economy is weak; and that the pro-Perón policy of the United States has irked thousands of opponents of Perón, among whom many still have—as one of them remarked—"everything but freedom."

Peronismo cannot last because it is a one-man show. When time eliminates the man the show is over. Few observers will doubt that the army will succeed the Strong Man. As our correspondent noted, the next danger "would come from the right." For not all the foes of Perón, in terms of their social and economic orientation, can be regarded as true disciples of "democracy."

This year American firms interested in building a steel mill for Argentina have been delighted by a new export-import credit of $60 million to the Government-controlled mixed company that is handling the project for Perón. While the position of these firms is understandable, so must also be the sense of disquiet, protest and even outrage among some other Americans—from Washington to Buenos Aires—at what amounts to economic aid to the Perón regime. Washington has never been able to steer a happy course between those who want this country to underwrite their business with Perón and those who want to shun him as an unprincipled dictator.

The existence of this dilemma cannot be emphasized too often. The survey just concluded has brought it up to date.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Soft Fibre Manufacturers' Institute of New York City, which has members in my district, recently submitted to the Ways and Means Committee a comprehensive statement on H. R. 1, the reciprocal trade bill.

This material was submitted by my good friend, George F. Quimby, secretary and treasurer of the institute, and, under unanimous consent, I present the statement, to be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

SOFT FIBRE MANUFACTURERS' INSTITUTE,
New York, N. Y., February 10, 1955.

The Honorable JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOPER: The Soft Fibre Manufacturers' Institute, through its tariff committee, submits this statement in opposition to H. R. 1, and respectfully requests that it be included in the printed proceedings of the hearings on this bill.

The Soft Fibre Manufacturers' Institute is an unincorporated trade association of 13 companies that manufacture textile products from bast or leaf fibers on what is known as soft-fiber machinery. There is appended to this statement a list of the members of the institute, with the locations of their factories and principal sales offices. These manufacturing companies, with locations involving 12 States, employ 5,500 people and have an annual payroll of $17 million.

The products manufactured by these soft-fiber manufacturers are included in schedule 10 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Tariff protection is essential to the continued existence of the soft-fiber manufacturing industry, because it is in direct competition with foreign manufacturers who use the same raw materials and the same machinery, and pay their workers wages that are only a fraction of those received by operators in this country. Furthermore, the survival of this industry in the United States is important because of its essentiality for national defense—a fact abundantly demonstrated in World War II.

The soft-fiber industry has operated in the United States for well over a century, or for the greater part of the industrial life of the country. Although one of the smaller industries, it provides the principal economic base for several communities. It converts natural products, not grown in the United States, over specialized machinery also imported, with the labor of operatives to whom it pays wages at the American standard. Obviously, survival of an industry so placed, even though demonstrably more efficient than its foreign rivals, must depend on tariff protection.

The products of the soft-fiber industry—which are yarns, roves, twines, and threads of jute, hemp, and flax and woven linen towels and toweling—are for the most part primary materials of operating supplies for other industries, and they enjoy a very wide distribution, of which twines furnish the most obvious example.

The essentiality of the industry for national defense is based, however, not so much on its regular products as on the established fact that it can furnish, in an emergency, the only possible substitute for those vital rope and cordage items made from the so-called hard fibers. Hard fibers are, without exception, imported. When the imports suffer curtailment from enemy action and at the same time the demands from the armed services increase substantially, as they did in World War II, the only way of bridging the gap is to draw upon the soft fiber industry for rope and similar products (marlines, for example) made either from jute, as long as that fiber is obtainable, or from American hemp. American hemp is the only fiber in either the hard fiber or the soft fiber group which can be produced in the continental United States in quantities sufficient for a war emergency. The soft fiber industry is the only industry which can make full use of this American hemp to produce the items needed for war purposes.[1]

Although there is some production of fiber flax in this country, it is by no means sufficient for the requirements of the soft-fiber manufacturing industry, and a substantial amount of fiber is imported. The entire supply of jute is imported from Pakistan. The very existence of the domestic soft fiber industry automatically results, therefore, in substantial foreign trade in these two fibers.

Domestic manufacturers have no natural advantage over their foreign competitors in the procurement of raw material. Furthermore, because the working of these fibers requires specialized types of machinery which are not produced in the United States, this machinery must be imported; and the capital investment includes, therefore, a certain item of cost which represents the tariff charge on the machinery.

The most important consideration, however, is the great disparity in the wage rates paid to the American operatives and those who work for foreign competing manufacturers. India, prior to the partition in 1947, produced practically the entire world supply of jute. This advantage, coupled with her abundant supply of cheap labor, fostered the development in that country of a very large jute manufacturing industry, which is the foremost competitor of the United States soft fiber industry. At the present time, the average hourly earnings for spinners in India are reported to be 6.7 cents. In November 1954, average hourly earnings for jute spinners in the United States were reported as $1.40, not including fringe benefits. The ratio of United States to Indian wages for typical occupations in jute manufacture is, therefore, 20 to 1; and even if it is assumed that the American operative is as much as 50 percent more efficient than his Indian counterpart, this disparity in wages means that the labor cost in this country bears to the Indian labor cost a ratio of 14 to 1.

Footnote at end of speech.

When it is remembered that this ratio, speaking generally, applies to the entire range of manufacturing operations, from the raw fiber to the finished product, it is very evident that the United States industry, using the same material and the same machinery as its foreign competitors, can only maintain itself with the aid of some tariff protection. It is equally evident that this tariff protection is directed toward its most legitimate objective, the maintenance of the American standard of living for workers in a long-established and efficient industry, and the perpetuation of enterprises whose plant and technical knowledge are essential to the defense of the country.

In that section of the industry that uses flax as its raw material, the situation is similar. Flax manufactures are produced both in Great Britain and in many of the countries of continental Europe and, in every case, the wages paid in this country are considerably greater than those received by foreign operatives of comparable skill. In the case of Great Britain, for example, which is one of the leading manufacturers of flax products, recent comparisons show that United States wages are four times those paid in the British industry. Tariff protection is vital, therefore, for the domestic spinners and weavers of flax.

Tariff rates affecting the products of the industry are on both specific and ad valorem bases. Many of them have already suffered substantial reductions in agreements negotiated under the Trade Agreements Act. Even where some specific rates have not been reduced, however, it is clear that their effectiveness has been impaired by the substantial rise in prices, wages, and costs during the inflation of the last dozen years. The soft-fiber industry thus finds itself in intensified competition with foreign manufacturers.

The soft-fiber manufacturing industry has already suffered the complete loss of the domestic jute webbing market to Calcutta because of inadequate tariff, and the great disparity between wages paid here and in India. When this institute was organized in 1933, there were six concerns manufacturing jute webbing in the United States. Now there are none.

Concessions which have been granted in agreements negotiated under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act have left the domestic flax spinning industry with very inadequate tariff protection. Mr. Theodore Dahlstrom, sales manager of the Linen Theard Co., Inc., a member of this institute, in his able testimony before your committee on February 1, cited the large share of the domestic market on linen threads and yarns already captured by foreign producers—and the peril which this invasion already holds for the continuance of flax enterprises and employment in this country.

It should be remembered that the domestic flax business was considered by our Government to be essential during the last war, and various flax items are at present specified by the United States Armed Forces. The supply of these items can only be assured in times of emergency if the domestic flax manufacturing industry is maintained in a healthy condition.

In summary, therefore:

1. The soft-fiber industry has proved its vital importance to the defense of the United States during the last war.

2. It has existed as an American industry for over 100 years.

3. It is the principal source of income in several small communities.

4. It uses raw materials of which the bulk supply is grown abroad.

5. It pays wage rates 20 times those paid to workers producing jute goods in India.

6. It pays wage rates 4 times those paid to workers in the United Kingdom.

7. Tariff protection for the soft-fiber industry is essential to maintain a vital defense facility and to preserve the wages of its workers at the American standard.

It is hoped that this description of the soft-fiber manufacturing industry; its place in the domestic economy; its contribution to foreign trade and its essentiality in national security will serve to establish in the minds of your committee the justification for our position on tariff protection.

A litle over a year ago, the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, was reported in the press as saying:

"I am willing for American industry to face the competition of any industry with respect to all save the labor factor. I am not, however, willing to have American industry compete at the expense of the standard of living of American labor. America has learned that a higher wage policy results in a mass market and enables us to rise to ever higher standards of living. We cannot afford to sacrifice this high wage policy. I therefore suggest that the Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy consider whether our tariff legislation should not be gradually replaced by a policy which would bring about fair competition in respect to this labor factor as between the United States and other foreign countries."

The Ways and Means Committee could make a lasting contribution to the stability and strength of American industry were it to establish a national policy which would bring about fair competition in respect to this labor factor as between the United States and foreign countries.

The New York Times of February 6, 1955, announces that "top military and industrial leaders in the New York area will join in a national resources conference this coming May. Emphasis this year will be upon a strong national economy as the best preparation for possible war."

And Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, retired, is quoted as saying:

"The industrial capacity of a nation is the most important factor in war today. It is absolutely essential that our industrial leaders understand military requirements and that military leaders understand the capacity of our industrial machine."

In connection with the industrial mobilization program of the Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, is presently surveying the potential spinning capacity of the soft fiber manufacturing industry "in determining available production in the event of a national emergency."

It would seem that the Ways and Means Committee could, and should, devise criteria and the means of their application which would relieve industries essential to our national economy and defense from the periodic jeopardy and uncertainties implicit in international trade treaty negotiations authorized under trade agreements acts.

Furthermore, Congress itself should determine the amount of protection required for the products of domestic industries to insure a strong national economy and never permit such vital decisions to be made at Geneva or elsewhere abroad in international conferences. A revitalized United States Tariff Commission could serve the Congress in reaching these determinations—and should be instructed to report its findings to Congress rather than to the President.

H. R. 1, in our belief, represents a more complete abdication by Congress of its constitutional responsibilities than it has heretofore yielded to the Executive during the 21 years since the first Trade Agreements Act was enacted.

H. R. 1 means delegation run riot. It would place the power of making decisions vital to our national economy and defense entirely beyond the control of Congress and our elected representatives.

We commend to your earnest attention the legislative recommendations in the January 24, 1955, letter to your committee from Mr. John Chupka, general secretary-treasurer, Textile Workers Union, CIO.

The Soft Fibre Manufacturers' Institute respectfully urges that your committee postpone all action on H. R. 1, or on any measure which would extend Executive authority to negotiate trade agreements, until after the decisions of the current GATT negotiations with Japan and other countries at Geneva are promulgated—and become available for the consideration of your committee and the Congress.[1]

In urging your committee to delay action, we believe that ample opportunity will be afforded to explore the merits of the following bills, which deserve careful consideration:

H. R. 2807, by Representative BAILEY, Democrat, of West Virginia.

H. R. 864, by Representative VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE F. QUIMBY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

[1] Refer to testimony of War Production officials, Department of Agriculture experts and others before the Gillette committee in 1944, Hearings Before Subcommittee of Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee on S. Res. 80, Utilization of Farm Crops—Fiber, 78th Cong., 2d sess., pt. 9, April and May 1944.

Rules for American Investors in Good Neighbor Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 14, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, our country is fortunate indeed in having many ambassadors of good will whose relationships with the citizens of foreign nations have such an important bearing upon the establishment of favorable international ties. No better qualified or more outstanding American in this category than Mr. J. Peter Grace, Jr., president of W. R. Grace & Co., is to be found. Not only is Mr. Grace an intelligent student of this important subject matter, but his fresh viewpoint and farsighted vision combine to make his an authoritative voice in suggesting the most desirable course of our affairs.

In the New York Times of Sunday, March 27, there appeared an editorial entitled "Rules for Good Neighbors." Because of its clear-cut expression of important news, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES FOR GOOD NEIGHBORS

A businessman with wide interests in Latin America has set down three rules for American investors in the good neighbor lands. He is J. Peter Grace, Jr., president of W. R. Grace & Co., and his rules are: Stay out of local politics, employ a national of the host country as manager and have the management, particularly the norteamericanos in it, "closely identify themselves with local community life and become part of the countries in which they live."

These are sound rules. But there is another which is in effect the core of all three. The United States businessman abroad should never forget that he is a guest of a foreign nation, and that although it invites and expects him to operate at a profit, his equity in the natural wealth of the country is bound to be less than that of its own people.

This would appear elementary. But many of those who make up the local "American Club" in the great Latin-American capitals still talk and think as if they failed to recognize it. And it is their outmoded attitude that in the past has prepared the climate first for resentment and then for confiscatory and expropriatory acts.

What Mr. Grace had to say was all to the good. Businessmen abroad are envoys of this country no less than diplomats and tourists. Their responsibilities—and their rewards—are great. If they live up to the first, they will deserve the second.

Louisiana Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed some very fine editorials appearing in the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., regarding the tidelands off the coast of Louisiana. Mr. George W. Healy, Jr., a very able newspaperman, is editor of this great newspaper and has given the matter of tideland boundaries his most careful study for a long period of time. The editorials are set forth in a series of four editorials, and I am taking the opportunity of presenting each editorial separately in the RECORD.

I would like to take the time to comment individually on these editorials but I feel they are so carefully thought out, so well worded, and so capably expressed that they in effect present the problem of the State of Louisiana to the Congress most effectively. Mr. Speaker, the first one of the editorials I reproduce below and it is entitled "All Want Minerals Money: Flow Should Be Increased":

ALL WANT MINERALS MONEY; FLOW SHOULD BE INCREASED

Three recent developments in the situation affecting revenues received by the State of Louisiana from offshore minerals, it seems to us, merit extended comment.

First of these was the repeated statement by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay that Louisiana's tidelands claim is one based on a 3-league, rather than a 3-mile, limit. Although, after prompting, the Secretary said that he had intended to testify before the House Appropriations Committee that the Federal Government claims title to submerged lands beyond a line 3 miles from the Louisiana coast, his actual testimony to the

contrary appears to us to have been significant.

The second of the developments was the issuance of a statement by Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general of Louisiana, that the State will go to court "relatively soon" to sustain Louisiana's boundaries. It is and should be the State's contention, in our opinion, that the Louisiana boundary is 3 leagues, slightly more than 10 miles, beyond the coastline.

Third of the developments was a continuing action by State and city agencies to find ways to spend the money which Louisiana is receiving from offshore minerals. Most recent of the spending suggestions was a recommendation by city officials of New Orleans that tidelands oil revenues be used to pay part of the cost of a new incinerator here.

For many months this newspaper has contended that first call on money received through the sale of the State's mineral wealth should be conceded to elimination or reduction of the staggering State debt.

To exhaust the mineral resources of Louisiana without reducing the debt of Louisiana, we submit, would be worse than folly.

The joint committee of the Louisiana Legislature, which is headed by Senator W. M. Rainach, has accepted suggestions that tidelands money be used to retire the public debt, with amendments.

This committee believes that the money should be used three ways: One-third to retire the State debt, one-third to improve the State school system, and one-third to build and maintain highways.

A firm dedication of the minerals revenue to the purposes recommended by this committee, it seems to us, would be wise. Certainly, it would prevent dissipation of the windfall which won't last forever to pay inflated current expenses.

In the first quarter of 1955 royalties, bonuses, and rentals received by the State from its mineral lands aggregated $33,908,707. These figures were obtained from the office of Mrs. Ellen Bryan Moore, register of the State land office.

Of this income, slightly more than $14,800,000 was from offshore minerals and more than $19 million was from inshore royalties, bonuses, and rentals.

If the rate of the first quarter is continued throughout 1955, the State's income from its minerals—exclusive of severance taxes—will exceed $130 million.

This income, of course, is tremendous; but in the opinion of students of the situation, Louisiana still is not receiving its just returns from minerals being severed from submerged lands off its shores.

One of these students, Leander H. Perez, is convinced that a positive stand by the State to protect its claim to all lands within its historic boundaries should substantially increase the revenue realized by the State from its minerals.

An elaboration of this thesis will be presented in succeeding editorials in this series.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to the Colonial Daughters of the 17th Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered on yesterday afternoon to the Colonial Daughters of the 17th Century.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply grateful for the high honor and the privilege of addressing this most distinguished group.

You represent all that is best in loyalty and patriotism. You believe in 100 percent Americanism.

You keep alive the traditions and the spirit of those whose courage, sacrifice, and love of liberty built the greatness of our country.

You serve America by your example of devotion to the principles upon which our Republic was established.

You defend America by your watchful, steadfast, and vigorous support of our sacred heritage of liberty and independence.

The early settlers of the American Colonies differed in their form of worship and their ideals of government. But they had one firm belief on which they could all agree—that freedom of the individual is God's greatest gift to mankind—more precious than life itself.

The development of the United States, from an uncharted, savage wilderness, to the greatest Nation in all history, was founded upon that priceless element of our national strength—freedom of the individual.

Yes, my fellow Americans, freedom of the individual, sustained by faith in God, made possible our marvelous industrial development, our great transportation systems, and our rich agricultural production.

It expanded the employment of our workers and encouraged the establishment of many thousands of large and small businesses.

It built our great cities and beautiful towns. It gave us our great colleges and universities, our centers of art and music, our splendid churches of every denomination.

It gave America the highest living standards and the highest cultural and spiritual level ever attained by any nation in the world.

We can point with pride to all that has been achieved in the comparatively short span of years since the first settlers reached our shores. But we must never forget that we did not gain the proud position we occupy today without struggle, hardship, toil, and sacrifice.

All that we have is ours to enjoy because heroes and patriots in every generation were willing to shed their blood and give their lives in defense of their God-given freedom.

The troubled times in which we live call upon every one of us to take up the cause they so nobly served. The dangers we face today call for renewed dedication to our country and our flag. They call for deeper devotion to the ideals of liberty and independence, for new strength and courage in defense of freedom.

America faces a desperate challenge.

It is a challenge hurled by the forces of evil that would destroy our system of free government and would wipe out the principles of individual freedom.

Let us consider briefly the situation confronting the United States today.

The course of history has placed upon the American people the responsibility for peace and progress in the world.

The United States stands as the one strong barrier against the Communist conspiracy to dominate and enslave the entire world.

The jet-propelled plane, the atomic weapons, and the hydrogen bomb have changed the whole picture of offensive and defensive war. They have revolutionized the whole concept of military science. They give tragic emphasis to the fundamental truth that the world must live in peace or bring about its own destruction.

We know, however, that enduring peace cannot be achieved by force alone. It can be realized through truth, honor, justice, and devotion to high moral and spiritual standards.

But until these ideals are accepted by the whole world, including the Communists, we must face facts that connot be ignored.

To save the world from the total disaster of war, America must be strong—not in arms alone—but strong in the spirit of our forefathers, strong in patriotism, ready and willing to do our full duty in peace and in war.

Unfortunately there are too many misguided Americans who do not understand and do not appreciate the real meaning of America.

They do not seem to realize that our system of free government places upon each citizen an equal share of responsibility for our security and our progress.

Good citizenship is the basis of patriotism. That is why I am constantly urging every individual to take a more active, intelligent, patriotic part in government.

We will not attain our full strength as a Nation until every American has a clear understanding of his individual responsibility for the future of the United States.

I think it is the duty of every American to make his voice heard on the question of loyalty.

There is no room under the American flag for those who would tear down our free institutions or undermine our system of government.

We must teach young and old that America means freedom under God, while communism means slavery under the iron rule of godless tyrants.

We must tell over and over again the glorious story of our country's rise to greatness among the nations of the earth.

We must tell and retell the story of our sturdy, courageous pioneers and the heroic exploits of those who extended our frontiers over the mountains and across the western plains.

We must point with pride to the patriots and statesmen who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor that "these united colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states."

I make this appeal to you because you are qualified by patriotic service for leadership in civic responsibility.

Let us go forward once more, armed and equipped, to fight for our country.

Let us take our places in the front line of the battle to keep America free, strong, prosperous, and at peace.

Asian Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have had brought to my attention an editorial entitled "Asian Aid Shaping Up," published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 18, 1955. This is a very important contribution to an understanding of the Asian situation, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIAN AID SHAPING UP

Indian Prime Minister Nehru's calling of an 11-nation Asian conference at New Delhi to work out plans for using western economic

aid highlights recent hopeful developments in this field. The Nehru move comes in time to help keep Asian perspectives realistic. It will remind Asians that they can get help from the West on terms consistent with their own self-respect and freedom.

This should help to offset impressions which Communists may wish to create at another Asian conference now getting underway at Bandung—that Asian peoples can best achieve their hopes by keeping clear of western ties even at the risk of being dominated by the Asian branch of international communism.

The near coincidence of the two conferences has meanings, however, not only for Asians but for westerners. One of these has been spelled out by Canada's Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Lester B. Pearson. In a speech at Princeton University, Mr. Pearson has warned that we must offer more than plumbing in exchange for philosophy and not try to substitute Coco-Cola for Confucius in dealing with our Asian friends.

Western leadership may well note that the Bandung conference is being organized around political and philosophical concepts Asians share. If economic aid to Asia is to give maximum help to free-world understanding it must avoid emphasizing material aims to the exclusion of other values.

This is one reason why some of America's allies with long experience in the Far East have hoped that new Asian aid can be launched without too much fanfare; that it will not seek the spectacular and swift results of the Marshall plan in Europe, which in any case are probably unattainable by underdeveloped nations.

Main dangers of divergence on the approach to Asian aid appear to have been surmounted already. The New Delhi conference is in line with Washington's desires that Asians should determine how the aid should be spread among their nations.

This conference, like the announcement of plans for a 56-nation International Finance Corporation to aid private investment in underdeveloped areas, reflects much careful cooperation within the western community as well as between it and the Asian community. In asking Congress for funds for this work the President will be asking only adequate support of a moderate, down-to-earth approach to Asian aid.

Oil Slicks Killing Raritan Bay Ducks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Paterson Evening News, of Paterson, N. J., on February 25, 1955. In the article, the writer pointed out that hundreds of ducks were being killed by oil slicks resulting from the reckless dumping of waste oil by ships in the eastern area.

I hope the appropriate authorities will take note of this violation of the law, and will take proper steps to stop the practice. Incidents of this type are far too frequent along our eastern coast.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL SLICK KILLING RARITAN BAY DUCKS

TRENTON—Dr. A. Heaton Underhill, director of New Jersey's Fish and Game Division, said today oil slicks were causing some deaths among thousands of ducks that winter in Raritan Bay.

Underhill said an oil tanker sprang a leak last week off Raritan Bay and New York's harbormaster was investigating to determine if the accident resulted from a normal hazard of the sea.

The fish and game director said as many as 100,000 ducks from the upper reaches of Canada and from Alaska use Raritan Bay and its shoal areas as winter quarters from October through April. He said the ducks fed on mussels in the shoals.

Underhill said he had a report that about 1,000 ducks died since the oil slicks appeared in the bay, but that he didn't believe that many had been affected.

The Fish and Game Division has experimented with detergents in breaking up oil slicks which appear in the bay periodically, Underhill said.

He said the New York harbormaster and the American Petroleum Institute have cooperated with his division in efforts to prosecute officers of oil tankers who pump out their bilges in the vicinity of New York Harbor.

Underhill said the slicks should drift to shore and that the division hopes a wind will spring up to blow off the slicks quickly. He said the slicks had lessened in the past few days and should be gone by the weekend.

Construction of Atomic Energy Plants by Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on April 12, there appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital a most important editorial dealing with private enterprise, as opposed to public power, in connection with the new development which is occurring by authorizing private companies to participate in the atomic energy field. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOW TO SOCIALISTS

The eagerness of private enterprise to build at its own expense the four plants needed to develop atomic-energy plants must have shocked the advocates of public power. The private companies propose to spend 80 to 90 percent of the $150 million the plants will cost. They ask only the encouragement and support of the Government in fringe areas, such as adequate insurance if private insurers back away from this new type of industrial plants.

The furore raised last year by the public power advocates when the Atomic Energy Commission contracted with Dixon-Yates for a generating plant at Memphis had little effect upon the Eisenhower administration. The program of getting the Government out of the power business so far as possible is going ahead, even though the critics of private enterprise still are protesting.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, which has cost the Nation's taxpayers billions of dollars, does not stand very high in the estimation of Congress. Appropriations are being reduced to the point where TVA is resorting to issuance of revenue bonds to take up the slack between costs and receipts. The free spenders are finding that President Eisenhower meant what he said: "Government should not engage in business that can best be carried out by private enterprise."

The New Look in the Government's attitude toward private business is a red flag to the advocates of public power at no matter what the cost to the taxpayers. The Eisenhower administration's effort to balance the budget by reducing expenditures is cutting under the Socialists who hate private enterprise. Private companies are willing to spend billions for development of new sources of hydroelectric power, and pay normal taxes for the privilege. The TVA and its sister public power enterprises pay little or no taxes, but drain billions from the taxpayers.

Dedication to an Immigrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation today mourns the loss of one of its outstanding citizens, Dr. Albert Einstein, whose tremendous contributions to the world and to this Nation have literally changed the course of this century in which we live.

Many honors have been showered upon Dr. Einstein during the course of his life and many more will be dedicated to his memory. But I can think of no greater tribute which this Congress could pay to him, and certainly none that would be more fitting, than that the House reexamine the immigration laws of our country in order that future Dr. Einsteins, whether potential or recognized, shall not be barred from our shores because of our preoccupation with unworthy fears, mistrust, and discrimination against the stranger who knocks at our gates.

Surely no finer monument could be erected to the great heart and great mind of Dr. Einstein than for this House to put life and meaning into the Refugee Relief Act. Need I remind any Member of the House that this act was passed by the 83d Congress for the humanitarian purpose of admitting to this country 214,000 of those who seek escape from tyranny and oppression, from hardship and suffering in their mother lands to reach America, where liberty was cradled and independence nurtured. Yet today this legislation stands a bar instead of a door to freedom.

In memory of Dr. Einstein then let us engrave upon our hearts as well as upon stone those famous words of the poet, Emma Lazarus:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest tost, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The Fight Against Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has had reason to rejoice in recent days at the announcement that a vaccine has proven effective in checking the ravages of poliomyelitis. The discovery marked a victory for scientific teamwork, supported by the will and the money of the American people. It is an accomplishment that has been welcomed generously by the people of all nations who have learned of it. Polio has never let frontiers or boundaries stand in its way.

The fight against polio was a long and an expensive one. It could never have been carried on without the cooperation of the people and the organizations who sought the funds, the administrators who encouraged the research projects, and the scientists and their assistants who worked long and patient hours in the laboratories. To Dr. Jonas E. Salk, who rightfully deserves the credit for the final achievement, must go the thanks of every parent. Let the thanks go also to his team of associates in the University of Pittsburgh, drawn from as far away as Australia and Germany, for the research that made this discovery possible.

They would, I am sure, be the first to concede that their final discoveries would not have been possible without the research and guideposts that were left for them by hundreds who worked on other phases of this problem. The discovery of three distinct types of polio virus, in an experiment that cost $1,370,000, and was carried on in four major universities for 3 solid years, and the discovery that the virus circulates in the blood stream before the onset of the disease are examples of the knowledge that had to be learned.

It is a source of particular pride to me and to the people of my district that the first major scientific breakthrough in the battle against polio was made by a distinguished Harvard scientist whose parents still live in West Hartford, and whose ancestral roots are deep in Connecticut soil. I refer, of course, to Dr. John F. Enders.

It was Dr. Enders and two associates, Drs. Thomas H. Weller and Frederick C. Robbins, who proved in 1949 that the polio virus could be grown in human and ape tissues in sufficient numbers to produce a vaccine. Their discovery made it possible to produce a safe vaccine that does not carry the risk of brain damage.

For their work, they received the Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology in 1954. Two other awards also came the way of Dr. Enders—the Albert Lasker Award of the American Public Health Association in October 1954 and the Passano Foundation Award in June 1953 for distinguished medical research, the latter an award of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Enders is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John O. Enders, of 17 Highland Street, West Hartford. He is the brother of Ostrom Enders, of Avon, president of the Hartford National Bank & Trust Co., the fifth oldest national bank in the United States.

Dr. Enders was born in west Hartford on February 10, 1897. He was graduated from Yale in 1920, after service as a Marine flier in World War I. He received a master of arts from Harvard in 1922 and a doctor of philosophy in bacteriology and immunology in 1930. A former president of the American Association of Immunologists, and editor of the Journal of Immunology, he is associate professor of bacteriology and immunology at Harvard and director of the research division of infectious diseases at Children's Medical Center, Boston.

I feel it proper that the Congress should take note of these contributions to the drive against polio, and I therefore introduce the following resolution:

Whereas the Congress has learned of the success of American medical science in developing a safe vaccine to use against polio; and

Whereas it is recognized that into the final discovery went years of work, countless observations, and the painstaking efforts of thousands of people; and

Whereas the first successful breakthrough in the fight to conquer polio came as a result of the discoveries of Drs. John F. Enders, Thomas H. Weller, and Frederick C. Robbins at Harvard Medical School in 1949 of a way to grow the virus in human and ape tissues in sufficient numbers to produce a vaccine: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress and the American people hereby express their gratitude and appreciation for the achievements of Dr. John F. Enders, Dr. Thomas H. Weller, and Dr. Frederick C. Robbins in making the final discovery of a way to halt poliomyelitis possible.

Postmaster at Maysville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an affidavit dated March 23, 1955, by Hon. D. Bernard Coughlin, attorney at law, Maysville, Ky., to supplement his affidavit of December 29, 1954, which appears in the March 1, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, concerning the charges against the postmaster at Maysville, Ky.:

AFFIDAVIT IN BEHALF OF NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER AT MAYSVILLE, KY., ON HIS APPEAL UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED—NEWELL M. HARGETT, POSTMASTER AT MAYSVILLE, KY., APPELLANT, *v.* ADDITIONAL BRIEF FOR APPELLANT, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington 25, D. C.:

To further supplement my affidavit of December 29, 1954, concerning the alleged political conspiracy of William B. Mathews and the Republican Committee to remove Newell M. Hargett as postmaster at Maysville, Ky., and replace him by said William B. Mathews, I wish to state that said William B. Mathews has been contacting the members of the Republican committee in Mason County, Ky., for their endorsement and support to assist him to get the postmastership at the Maysville post office although the present incumbent's appeal is pending before you and same is a part of the political conspiracy involved and proved in this case.

_____.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this March 23, 1955.

_____,
Notary Public, Mason County, Ky.
My commission expires April 4, 1958.

H. R. 5659

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5659 to provide a refund on gasoline used or resold for the operation of motorized equipment for agricultural purposes.

I am cognizant of the fact that Congress originally enacted the Federal gasoline tax in 1932 for general revenue purposes. However, I am convinced beyond all reasonable doubt that the Federal gasoline tax should be levied and earmarked for highway purposes, thereby imposing a tax upon all motor vehicles propelled upon public highways to pay the tax levied by the respective State and the Federal Government.

My home State of Michigan has a constitutional provision which provides that all monies collected from the tax on motor fuel consumed by motor vehicles using public highways shall be dedicated and used exclusively for highway purposes and the tax on gasoline consumed for all other purposes shall be refunded to the user. I believe this method to be basically sound and in the best interest of the general public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe you are aware of the debate on the floor of the House a year ago when the Congress passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954. It was brought out numerous times that the full amount of money derived from the gasoline tax should be appropriated for highway construction, beside the fact that the tax levied on gasoline used for other purposes than highway construction is highly discriminatory. I am convinced that the American farmer is willing to pay his fair share of the cost of building highways, and this should be developed only by the use of the highways and not through a medium of a flat tax on gasoline for purposes other than highway use. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I introduce H. R. 5659 to provide for the exemption of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes from the Federal gasoline tax. I request that the Committee on Ways and Means, who is handling this legislation, give fair and impartial consideration to the bill I have introduced.

Snagged Refugee Relief Program Needs "Shot in the Arm"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Corsi controversy, I have received hundreds of protests from constituents of Italian origin urging my intercession with the President to speed up the refugee relief program in order that their relatives and loved ones may be permitted to join them in America.

This "entire mess," as it has been called, merely serves again to expose the ineptitude and inability of the Republican administration in matters of human welfare.

Approximately 340,000 persons entered the United States under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act administered humanely and expeditiously under the Democratic administration of President Truman. This in itself proves that our party, as always, has the interests of the little people at heart and again shows that the Republican Party still stands behind big business.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert herewith my letter to President Eisenhower wherein I urged him to appoint an independent agency to handle this program in order to bring it to a successful conclusion by December 31, 1956:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters from the many Americans of Italian origin residing in my congressional district protesting the dismissal of Mr. Edward J. Corsi as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Problems.

I think we would find ourselves in agreement that we should not lose sight of the main point, which is, the efficient and effective operation of this program.

The records of your office will show that on three occasions since its inauguration I warned against delays and procedural snarls in the administration of this program designed by Congress to aid the refugees and to bring the relatives of Italian citizens to the United States for permanent residence.

As you yourself said when signing the law on August 7, 1953, this legislation was conceived as "a significant humanitarian act and an important contribution toward greater understanding and cooperation among the free nations of the world."

The latest official semiannual report made by the Administrator to you and the Congress, under date of February 8, said only 17,000 visas had been issued to the first of this year—toward the program goal of 209,000.

The report is significantly silent as to the number of persons who had actually been admitted to the United States under this program 16 months after you signed the bill. That figure is about 800.

Thus, the rate of admission was approximately 50 a month. If the same rate continues it would take 4,180 months, or 340 years, to complete the program. Under the law no visas are to be issued under the act after December 31, 1956.

The Administrator's report itself admits the average time for processing a single case up to the issuance of a visa is 126 working days—61 of which are used for investigative purposes. Explanations for this are wordy and illustrated by elaborate charts and statistical tables.

In the matter we are not dealing with statistics, but with human beings to whom we are presumably extending a helping hand; human beings who have been uprooted from their homes, whose lives were wrecked on the tides of war or conquest by subversion.

What can be done about it?

The Congress can and should revise the law to make its terms more liberal from the standpoint of technical procedural requirements. Although I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which handles immigration legislation, I am exerting every effort upon my colleagues to make a thorough investigation of this program and to enact appropriate legislation to remedy the situation as it exists today.

Secondly, a responsibility rests upon you as President to immediately remove from the Department of State to another independent agency under you the authority to make the investigations and reports of the applicants for admission.

This you have the power to do under the act which provides no visas shall be issued except after a thorough investigation and by such investigative agency as the President may designate.

By Executive order dated September 16, 1953, you designated the authority to the Department of State, which authority in turn was delegated to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

Mr. President, in all fairness to the citizens of the United States who are in the process of gaining admission to our country for their relatives and friends under the Refugee Relief Act, may I respectfully request that the authority to administer this program be taken out of the hands of the Department of State and delegated to another agency?

To prove that we are sincere in our wish to have the peoples of the world come to America to live, I appeal to you to use your authority to speed up this program and permit the admission of the remaining 209,000 immigrants before the act expires on December 31, 1956.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT, M. C.

Time for Stocktaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, many of my constitutents have expressed to me their deep concern regarding the drift of our far-eastern policy. The recent speech of Mr. Adlai Stevenson gave expression to the fears that many people feel regarding this situation and proposed a path that might lead us out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves. Under unanimous consent, I insert an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 17, which admirably summarizes both the problems we face and a possible new way of facing them:

TIME FOR STOCKTAKING

This is a good day on which to do some needed stocktaking of world affairs. There have been several notable developments in this country and in Europe in the fortnight immediately behind us. The wholly unprecedently Asian-African conference, representing approximately three-fifths of the world's population, opens tomorrow in Bandung, Indonesia.

Unquestionably there is a better informed public opinion in the United States as to Quemoy and Matsu now than there was 2 weeks ago. American doubts that were beginning to arise over these coastal Chinese islands were clearly and cogently put into form by Adlai E. Stevenson's exceptionally able radio address on foreign affairs.

Not only did the former Illinois Governor counsel against risking the difficulty of trying to make "a rational, calculated decision under fire" as to what to do about these islands, which are historically, legally, and geographically a part of mainland China. He proposed a positive course by which the United States and its indispensable allies would work for, among other things: first, an end of hostilities in the Strait of Formosa, after which Quemoy and Matsu would be of little if any value to Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist troops; second, peaceful settlement of the status of Formosa through international action.

In seeking these ends, Mr. Stevenson supported hopes that have been expressed by President Eisenhower.

The Stevenson address was an air-clearing message that set forth the folly of "go-it-aloneism" and called for correcting the distorted picture of the United States that has resulted from our Defense Department's seeming reliance on atomic weapons. It also urged Washington to be done with bluster and bluff since these tactics only "dismay our friends" and add to "the misgivings about America" over the world.

Some of the most thoughtful of commentators wrote along the same line last week. Walter Lippmann said the Eisenhower administration's lack of clear policy on Quemoy and Matsu is an invitation to Communist China to create as much confusion as possible "in this country, in Formosa, among our allies and in the uncommitted Asian countries."

Urging evacuation from the coastal islands, he wrote that whenever this country must fight a war, it is paramount that it be in "the legitimate and clearly defined interests of the United States—and not because we have become entangled and cannot muster the moral courage to disentangle ourselves."

A similar view was expressed by Joseph C. Harsch of the Christian Science Monitor who said that the net effect of Mr. Stevenson's "intervention" was to give Mr. Eisenhower "a powerful reason" for resisting the pressure of the element in Washington "that wants to fight over Quemoy and Matsu."

But will the United States not lose face in the Orient if there is no fight to hold Quemoy and Matsu, as Chiang demands? Will this country not then become a paper tiger?

The answer of Prime Minister Nehru is on the preceding page, in an interview with Donald Grant, of the Post-Dispatch staff, now in Bandung. Says the Asian statesman who is the leader of millions of uncommitted peoples:

"The United States would not lose prestige. Everyone knows that the United States is a great and powerful nation and such an act would not make anyone believe the United States was weak."

Admitting that Chiang might lose prestige if he were required to evacuate Quemoy and Matsu as he did the Tachen Islands, Nehru said: "Anything the United States would do to help reduce tensions would be

appreciated in Asia as a contribution to peace—and a peaceful solution is most desirable, no matter how long it takes."

The Knowlands and the Bridgeses and their cohorts in the GOP's anti-Eisenhower wing are only too ready to risk war over these postage-stamp coastal islands. But the vast rank and file of the American people, to say nothing of their friends overseas, would oppose entering Chiang's civil war over territory so unimportant.

Informed opinion, so we believe, holds to the view that it would be wicked, if not criminal, to bring on an atomic war that might engulf the whole world for no better reason than to prop up Chiang's fading prestige.

It is easy to throw the word appeasement around, as some of Mr. Stevenson's critics did after his distinguished address. But epithets or no, the United States cannot afford to let itself appear less pacific in intent than, for example, Communist Russia, which only this past week agreed to restore the unity and integrity of Austria—a course this country has favored almost since the end of World War II.

The precise route for the United States may not be clear, but there can be little doubt about its general direction. It is the way of conference and negotiation, of conciliation and adjustment, of international action and agreement. We cannot yet let our guard down, but while we keep it up we can do many things through economic aid, scientific and technical assistance, and the lowering of trade barriers that will be far more effective than armaments in the winning of friends to the side of freedom.

In a little more than a month Britain will hold its general election, following the departure of Sir Winston Churchill and the installation of Prime Minister Eden. Our cue is plain: work with might and main for a meeting of the big powers this summer, as Premier Faure in France, and Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in this country have proposed.

Meantime, get out of Quemoy and Matsu. The risk is too great at a time when the prospects for peace are brighter elsewhere in the world.

Start at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Punxsutawney (Pa.) Spirit, of March 29, 1955:

START AT HOME

Some time ago Dean Clarence E. Manion made a radio address which stirred and has held national attention. In it he blasted the idea that socialized electric power is honestly low-cost power. He said, "By the same theory and practice involved in government made and merchandized power, the Government could go into the milk business, the coal business, the lumber business, or what have you, and undersell every private businessman in the country. The milk, coal, and lumber user would like it at first, because he understands his milk, coal, and lumber bill, while he knows next to nothing about the taxes that he is paying to subsidize the price of every commodity that the Government makes and sells, including electricity. In the same way that such Government-operated business drove its private competitors out of the Tennessee Valley, so also will extended and continued Government operation drive every private business out of the entire United States."

In Dean Manion's view, any attempt at coexistence with what he terms "galloping" rather than "creeping" socialism is futile. But he offers an alternative. It is to sell the TVA and all kindred Government-operated enterprises to private investors. If all were sold, he adds, we would reduce the public debt by more than $30 billion and save some $900 million in annual interest which we, the taxpayers, are now paying on money advanced for these socialistic ventures. And, in addition, huge new tax revenues to Government would result when private enterprise took over.

Still more important, this would show that we mean it when we talk about freedom. As Dean Manion said, "If we are really determined about our worldwide fight against socialistic slavery, the first place to underscore that determination is at home."

Has Our Foreign Service Gone Completely To Pot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years we have received many disquieting reports about the conditions prevailing within our Foreign Service. I spoke about those reports on other occasions. They indicated that the morale of our Foreign Service was at a very low ebb—that officials occupying responsible positions were apparently afraid to properly discharge their responsibilities.

Currently, attention has been called to a report of Mr. Hans J. Morgenthau, director of the Institute for the Study of American Foreign Policy at the University of Chicago, and a former State Department consultant. Mr. Morgenthau reports that the conditions in our Foreign Service have been deteriorating drastically, that the personnel has declined in quantity and quality, and that the reports of our Foreign Service officers are tending to become worthless because these men appear to be more concerned about not becoming controversial than in reporting facts as they see them.

If our Foreign Service, as Mr. Morgenthau alleges, "has ceased to be the eyes, ears, and brains of the foreign policy of the United States," then what usefl purpose does it serve at this critical juncture of history?

I should like to commend the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 19, which deals with this matter, to the earnest consideration of the Members of this body:

HAS OUR FOREIGN SERVICE GONE COMPLETELY TO POT?

A year ago last January five distinguished former diplomats issued a public letter charging a lamentable breakdown in the morale and the competence of the State Department and the Foreign Service.

The names of these five men gave weight and substance to their comments. They were Norman Armour, Joseph C. Grew, Robert Woods Bliss, William Phillips, and G. Howland Shaw. Three had been Assistant Secretaries of State and two had been Under Secretaries. Four had been Ambassadors. Their careers reached back to the early part of the century.

They charged, among other things, that "a Foreign Service officer who reports on persons and events to the very best of his ability and who makes recommendations which at the time he conscientiously believes to be in the interest of the United States may subsequently find his loyalty and integrity challenged and may even be forced out of the service and discredited forever as a private citizen after many years of distinguished service."

They charged that weakening of morale and capability of the State Department was a threat to national security. And they added that "it is relevant to inquire whether we are not laying the foundations of a foreign service competent to serve a totalitarian government rather than the Government of the United States as we have heretofore known it."

The letter of the five career diplomats caused a stir—and raised the hope that in the face of such damaging criticism the administration would act to restore to the State Department its traditional standards of competence, morale, and integrity.

Hans J. Morgenthau, Director of the Institute for the Study of American Foreign Policy at the University of Chicago and a former State Department consultant, has taken a close look at the Department 16 months after the letter cited above. In a recent issue of the New Republic, Morgenthau writes: "As presently constituted, it is hardly competent to serve any government, totalitarian or otherwise. Not only the morale but also the professional competence and capacity for teamwork of its members have drastically declined.

"The Department of State which the present administration inherited was, to say the least, a useful instrument of foreign policy. Its obvious administrative weaknesses were compensated for by the intellectual ability, technical competence, and devotion of most of its top and middle layer officials. Many of those officials have either been dismissed or have voluntarily resigned. Of the officials of this type with whom our High Commission in Germany was staffed 2 years ago, not a single one is said to be left today."

The present Department, says Morgenthau, "gives a golden opportunity for advancement to the incompetent, the time server, and the informer, who has never uttered a wrong thought and who has never been associated with the wrong person. A system which not only does not require professional competence but actually suspects it cannot help but use standards of selection congenial to it."

The personnel of the Department of State "has drastically declined in quantity and quality," says Morgenthau. Reports of our diplomats abroad have, for the most part, become worthless, for they too often pay less attention to the facts than to what they think superiors in Washington want to hear. State Department personnel fears to become controversial by reporting facts or giving opinions that are not popular.

Summing up his analysis of the Department, Morgenthau says: "The Department of State has ceased to be the eyes, ears, and brains of the foreign policy of the United States."

Here is a most disquieting indictment by an expert. It buttresses what the five distinguished diplomats said a year ago—and, unfortunately, indicates that things have grown worse in spite of their warning.

The Late John E. Nelson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Daily Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, of April 13, 1955]

Former Congressman John E. Nelson was one of those liberal Republicans who anticipated the need for drastic social changes in our American way of life long before the Democratic Party implemented them.

Two years before Franklin D. Roosevelt took office he won national attention by pointing out that "economic justice," not strict controls, was needed to reduce the threat of radicalism and communism in this country. Succeeding events proved his point.

Maine and his home city of Augusta are indebted to him for many things. Groundwork for modernization of the Togus Veterans' Administration Center, and the Cadillac Mountain Road in Arcadia National Park are two examples.

His neighbors knew him as the head of a fine American family of old-fashioned proportions. One son followed in his footsteps, and is carrying on his father's liberal tradition in Congress today.

His resourcefulness in adjusting his ideas to the times marked John E. Nelson as an outstanding American.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of April 14, 1955]

Men in public life are frequently remembered—or forgotten—in accordance with the durability of their words.

Former Representative John E. Nelson, who died in Augusta Monday, will be remembered for different things by different people, but his most durable claim to fame rests in words he wrote as a dissenting member of a special committee to study communism.

The committee was headed by a Republican of extreme ideas, Representative Hamilton Fish of New York. Its recommendations included abolition of the Communist Party and the deportation of Communists. In an opinion that took courage to express in 1931, Maine's Congressman John Nelson summarized his ideas on combating communism as follows:

"The solution of this problem lies in the wisdom of our legislators and in the unselfishness of our industrialists. In proportion as we work out economic justice here in America and so order our social system that labor shall share in the economic life of the Nation as fully and fairly as it now shares in its social and political life, in just that proportion will radicalism fail of its own inanition and the threat of communism cease to disturb us."

The astute Congressman spoke prophetic words. Even before most of the country knew much about communism John Nelson was advising his countrymen that superficial remedies weren't enough, that an effort should be made to seek out the cause. It is not given to every Congressman to have his words stand the test of time so well.

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel of April 14, 1955]

Elder Waterville residents who were in Waterville High School when he was its principal remember John E. Nelson with affection. They regard him highly both as a teacher and a friend and paid him homage whenever they got together at a class reunion.

Nelson's field of activity broadened considerably after he left Waterville and he went on to become a Member of Congress where he served for many years until the great Democratic upsurge of the depression days unseated him.

He lived to see his son occupy the seat he once held, and though he was ill for many years his courage and strength enabled him to keep that illness in check until he died this week at the age of 80.

John Nelson was a figure of national importance in Congress and when he left the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee declared: "There was no abler man in Congress or on my committee."

Those Waterville High School students of many years ago who are still living have reason to be proud of the years of service given his State and his Nation by their teacher.

[From the Courier-Gazette, Rockland, Maine, of April 14, 1955]

In the death of John E. Nelson of Augusta, Maine lost the last of its colorful political leaders of the old school. One thought of John Nelson in the same breath as Senators Frye and Hale, and our own dynamic Congressman, Charles E. Littlefield.

Mr. Nelson, Representative to Congress from the old Third Maine District, was in Washington from 1922 to 1932, and it took a Rockland man, former Congressman E. Carl Moran, to unseat him in the Roosevelt Democratic landslide of 1932.

Congressman Nelson, a lawyer, was a big man in every sense of the word, a Republican through and through, and he wielded a great influence during his decade in Washington.

He was the father of the present representative from this district, CHARLES P. NELSON of Augusta.

[From the Daily Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, of April 15, 1955]

To the EDITOR:

Just before commencing my duties in 1933 as a Member of Congress, I was invited by my predecessor, whom I had defeated for reelection, to share his office and "learn the ropes." His cordiality and kindness to me were unlimited; his introduction of me to his friends in Congress resulted in some lifetime friendships. He left for my use his thousands of files, which aided me immeasurable in completing such cases as veteran's claims in process at the time he left office.

The man who did all that for his political opponent was John E. Nelson.

At this time of his passing, I want the people of Maine to know how he placed their interest far above partisan consideration; he was a real public servant.

He was one of the first men in public life who, while recognizing the danger of communism, recognized the greater danger to our American way of life if we sank to police-state methods to root out communism. His famous minority report to Congress entitled "The Individual Views of John E. Nelson" is just as true gospel today as it was when he wrote it, and could be read to advantage by every American, particularly these superpatriots who would tear down the Bill of Rights in their effort (for their own political advantage) to stamp out communism in America.

John E. Nelson was a statesman, and far ahead of his time in his thinking. I join with his relatives and many friends in mourning his passing.

EDWARD C. MORAN, Jr.,
Ex-Congressman, 73d and 74th Congresses.

DEAR CHARLIE: Dorothy joins in deepest sympathy to you in the passing of your father—a great man and a great father—one whose virtues were his handicap in a world not ready for the truth he spoke but recognized in the tributes of those who knew him best.

He was the most able and the most fearless of the public men of Maine of his generation and one worthy to rank with the galaxy of Maine greats of all time.

You have much to remember with pride and gratitude.

Sincerely,

OWEN BREWSTER.

APRIL 19, 1955.

The Case of H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal]

THE CASE OF H. R. 12

Farmers have every right to resent the way farm matters are being kicked around in Washington like a political football. It seems quite obvious that nobody really expects any change to be made in the farm law this year. Yet Chairman COOLEY'S House Agriculture Committee has brought out a bill, H. R. 12, which would reverse the trend of thinking on farm programs again and return rigid supports of 90 percent of parity on basic crops. He is using this bill as an excuse for heckling and harassing the administration on farm matters at every turn.

It is a little difficult to see why, if not for political advantage, the House committee would bring out this bill. Everyone conceded it would pass the House only with great difficulty, and the Senate not at all. Furthermore, it was conceded that even if it should by some miracle clear the Congress, a presidential veto awaited it.

While it is disconcerting to see such an important matter as farm supports bouncing around in the political arena, perhaps it is just as well the bill is out, to be considered by the House after the Easter recess. Now Congress can weigh it coolly, without the heat and pressure which might be generated in any consideration of it in 1956, a general election year. In rejecting the rigid supports idea, as Congress will surely do, perhaps it will be demonstrated to the whole Nation that the political appeal of rigid supports has completely faded.

That this is true seems obvious. Congress showed that it realized the truth about rigid supports when it voted last year to turn to the flexible support plan favored by the administration. Then farmers backed up this action by their votes in last November's elections. They showed they were aware of what rigid supports had done and were continuing to do to their markets and that they favored a change to a more realistic peacetime plan. Now they must be looking on in amazement at the actions of Chairman COOLEY in heading right back in the same old track.

H. R. 12 appears to be a doomed bill. Already its backers have delayed bringing it to the House floor while they seek more support for it. They have even engaged in a

deal of logrolling with Walter Reuther for CIO support of it in an attempt to gain the necessary help. But even with this, predictions are that it will not make the grade. Perhaps it is just as well that this effort is being expended, though. Maybe the issue will, when finally settled, rest in peace.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of March 26, 1955]

GIVE FLEXIBLE FARM SUPPORTS A FAIR TRIAL

A showdown is due next month in the House of Representatives on a bill to supplant the administration's sliding-scale farm price-support program with rigid supports at 90 percent of parity. The farm bloc claims strong labor support for the first time in the House, but the administration is counting on the Senate to kill the bill even if it clears the House.

Speaking in Salt Lake City recently, Agriculture Secretary Benson effectively answered backers of high, fixed supports who claim the administration program is wrecking farm prices. Actually, the flexible supports do not take effect until this year's harvests. Not a bale of cotton or bushel of grain or peanuts yet has come under the new price-support plan.

Even so, the farm program is considered good political fuel and we will hear much about it. The main differences on policy are illustrated by the viewpoints of the National Farmers Union as expressed recently by presidents of the opposing organizations.

James G. Patton, Farmers Union president, declared recently in Salt Lake City that high price supports must be restored in order to maintain high-level farm income. He denied that high supports had led to burdensome surpluses and in fact defended stockpiling of food as essential to American security, as much so as the stockpiling of metals.

Charles B. Shuman, president of the federation, speaking before the House Agriculture Committee, argued that high price supports fixed by Government without adequate regard to supply and demand result in lower, not, as Mr. Patton contended, higher farm incomes.

Mr. Shuman cited the record of more than 25 years of experience with various types of farm price-support and production-adjustment programs. During 12 of those years, he agreed, farm prices averaged well above parity. But this, he contended, was due to "extraordinary demand associated with war and the conditions that grow out of war," and not to mandatory high price supports.

The Tribune has long held a similar view. High supports are only effective when postwar artificial demand has distorted the picture. Once conditions return to normal or near normal, the high price supports lead to surpluses and a host of attendant evils.

One of those evils is the encouragement of overproduction. We have today in the Nation a wheat carryover of 975 million bushels, representing a United States investment of $2½ billion. This is more than enough wheat to supply our needs, plus export demand, for a whole year.

Moreover, high United States farm price supports make export sales difficult, and then, while we reduce our wheat lands by 17 million acres, the rest of the world increases its output by 73 million acres.

Mr. Patton spoke of the monthly income of the average farmer declining to $150 in 1954. But averages can be very deceptive. Mr. Shuman, in his testimony, noted that farm statistics include residential and part-time farmers whose gross income from sale of farm products may vary from a few dollars up to $2,000 a year. These people, who make up 31 percent of all farms reported by the census, are not primarily dependent upon their farms for their livelihood. Inclusion of this group in farm statistics, he said, confuses the uninformed and makes it appear that commercial farmers are worse off than they are. In the year 1949, when total farm income was well below the postwar peak, the some-three-million commercial farms producing 95.2 percent of all farm products sold had averaged gross incomes of about $7,000 a year.

Americans have heeded the advocates of high price supports for a good many years with no solution to that problem. Surely it is time to give flexible supports a fair trial.

Indonesia in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Leader of March 28, 1955:

INDONESIA IN PERIL

(By Sal Tas)

Indonesia today is in the position of Czechoslovakia 6 months before Jan Masaryk's suicide. Preparations for a Communist coup are gathering momentum. And both the anti-Communist leaders and Western diplomats in Djakarta are standing by virtually paralyzed.

For 3 centuries, Indonesia was a Dutch colony. Occupied by the Japanese during World War II, it refused to submit to Dutch rule again after V-J Day. A guerrilla war ended in victory for the nationalists; Indonesia won her sovereignty.

The Indonesian people in 1945 were 90 percent illiterate. There was a pathetically small intelligentsia, for education had been quite neglected under Dutch rule. The young State needed administrative, commercial, and technical help. The Netherlands was the logical source of such help, but the war had left bitter anti-Dutch sentiment. Young, ambitious, often half-educated Indonesians, anxious to corner the key jobs for themselves, exploited the situation and fostered xenophobia.

The civil war had undermined Indonesian society. It had left a terrible legacy of banditry which the young State was too weak to destroy. Holland did everything it could to restore its reputation in Indonesia. A Dutch military mission, invited by the government, went to Djakarta and did an excellent job building up the Indonesian Army. But meanwhile living standards sank to 60 percent of prewar, poverty spread, parts of the country rebelled.

After the explusion of the Dutch the Nationalist leaders had named a temporary parliament; it was not the time for real elections. But, as the state sank further and further into trouble, many members of parliament began to concentrate on one goal: enriching themselves. As corruption increased, the parliament increasingly lost contact with the masses. That the state has survived has been due to the efforts of a handful of genuine idealists who have worked themselves to death.

Amid this chaos, all that remains is the prestige of a few outstanding names. One of them is Soekarno, Indonesia's president, a Nationalist leader and agitator since his youth, a "martyr" who had been repeatedly jailed by the Dutch. Soekarno is a sort of oriental Aneurin Bevan, a gifted orator, very vain, rather unscrupulous, with a strong will to power. One capable observer calls Soekarno a "gambler," but the fact is that his theatrical personality has overshadowed that of a far more realistic and able leader, Vice President Hatta. Soekarno has also overshadowed the Socialist leader Sjahrir, who refused to collaborate with the Japanese after they freed him from the Dutch and who led the Indonesian revolutionaries to their first political victories. Sjahrir became discouraged early, and stood aside when Soekarno took the spotlight.

Indonesian Communists played an important role right from the start. But they revolted prematurely and suffered a considerable defeat. Unfortunately, the Indonesian Nationalist chiefs did not follow up this victory with energetic measures. Both the Communist Party and the Communist parliamentary group continued undisturbed. Soon Communist power began to revive. The party waged a successful campaign against the Socialists in the labor movement and succeeded in capturing the trade unions. Since then, they have been concentrating their energies on parliament.

Elections have been promised to the Indonesian people for several years, but the present parliament has constantly delayed such elections. The Communists took the fore in postponing elections, because they knew that the Moslem Party, the Masjumi, would undoubtedly emerge as the strongest single bloc. In fact, it is probable that the Masjumi and the Socialists would be able to form a stable majority if free elections were held. In opposing elections now, the Communists have an ally in President Soekarno, who fears losing power after an election.

The present Indonesian Government, headed by Ali Sastroamidjojo, is based on a parliamentary majority in which the Communists form the most dynamic component. As a result, their influence has been felt in many ways. The Dutch military mission was dismissed after much intrigue. Undercover maneuvering forced the dismissal of the Sultan of Djokga, the energetic Minister of War who had made a serious effort to destroy the Communist guerrillas; he was succeeded as Minister of War by a fellow-traveler. Communists and fellow-travelers have infiltrated the army and police. Finally, a new special secret police has been organized, modeled on the gestapo and GPU. This "state police" is not responsible to the Department of Justice; it is responsible only to a Communist state official who, in turn, is responsible to no other minister. With this apparatus in hand, the Communists can prepare "safe" elections.

Meanwhile, the Communists are using the few remaining Dutchmen in Indonesia in a vast, complicated propaganda offensive. Most of these Dutchmen work in enterprises which remain Dutch property, and are regulated under the Dutch-Indonesian Treaty. These enterprises have suffered Indonesian persecution for some time. They are attacked and plundered by bandits, forced to pay exorbitant sums which no Indonesian firms face, harried by extravagant wage demands.

In the last few weeks, several Dutchmen have been arrested by the new state police. Some of these prisoners have signed confessions which say that they are plotting with the parliamentary opposition to overthrow the government. The Dutch High Commissioner in Djakarta has established that these confessions were extracted under torture by the Indonesian GPU. Many confessions were retracted as soon as the torture ceased; some of the prisoners refused to sign confessions even after the worst torture. When the case came to public trial, the defense lawyer was able to prove that the confessions were pure nonsense and were dictated by agents provocateurs. The poor

victims were forced to give the names of their accomplices (at state-police dictation), and a few of these turned out to be unbelievably ludicrous. A certain Colonel Thompson was not even in Indonesia at the time of his alleged subversion; there were other such false details, reminiscent of the Moscow trials.

A group of Indonesians and Chinese were also forced to confess that they had collaborated with the Dutch subversives. They confessed that they were members of the Netherlands Indies Guerrilla Organization—nonexistent. One man named Smit was tortured in the place of another suspect of the same name—who, it later developed, had been in Europe at the time of his alleged crimes.

One Dutchman had to be sent to a mental institution after his interrogation; others have become invalids. The defense lawyer was practically powerless. When he sought documents on his client from the department of justice, he was told that the secret police refused to deliver them. (The justice department thus acknowledged the supremacy of the secret police.) Witnesses for the defense have disappeared; the tortured prisoners have been deprived of their passports and otherwise intimidated. The police even tried to eliminate the defense lawyer, Mr. Bouman, by accusing him of bribing witnesses, but they had to retract this charge. The police terror in Djakarta is so powerful that not a single member of Parliament has dared interpolate the government about the secret police. The press is silent because editors fear destruction of their property and arrest of their staffs.

What is behind this campaign? First, the Government wants to discredit Dutch business firms, so that it can expropriate their properties without compensation in violation of the treaties. At the same time, leaders of the opposition are being involved in the alleged "conspiracy." The Government's next step will be to turn the Dutch "confessions" against Hatta, Sjahrir and their friends. If their parties are broken up and deprived of leadership, the Government can then start to organize "free elections." The current proceeding against Dutch businessmen is therefore something like the Reichstag fire trial, which Goering used to paralyze the anti-Nazi forces, and the Shakhty trial in Moscow, when British engineers were used to produce "confessions" of sabotage which laid the groundwork for the Soviet purges of 1936–38.

Both the American and British embassies have been implicated in the trials of the Dutchmen. The prisoners had to confess that arms for the alleged Dutch guerrilla warfare had been supplied by Britain and America. Despite this, both embassies continue to produce favorable reports on the Indonesian situation.

Next month, Indonesia will play host to the Afro-Asian conference in Bandung. The present Indonesian regime aims to lead the Asian peoples, through neutralism, in stages into the Communist camp. But, because this conference represents an intermediary stage, the Indonesian fellow-travelers must keep the Communist conspiracy secret during the Bandung sessions. Obviously, the Indonesian Communists are highly vulnerable in the next few weeks; an aroused world public opinion can lend valuable support to freedom-loving Indonesians and encourage resistance to the police terror. Some time ago, the secret police arrested two Chinese journalists, both Indonesian citizens, who had criticized the Peking regime; it planned to deport them to China—a barely disguised form of murder—but pressure from public opinion abroad stopped them. Now the stakes are much higher; the very freedom of Indonesia's millions hangs in the balance.

Man's Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we can come across a piece of literature—no matter in what form—which seems to strike the right chord in the inner man. It is when a piece of writing seems to reach out of the pale of the ordinary and commonplace that this happens. I felt this way when I read the editorial which apeared in the U. S. News & World Report on April 22, 1955, by David Lawrence entitled "Man's Miracle?".

In this age of materialism, it is well to reflect, even if momentarily, on something beyond all of this. When we do I am sure that like David Lawrence, we will find that "God may be merciful if men will only act toward one another in a manner which will deserve His blessings."

The article follows:

MAN'S MIRACLE?

(By David Lawrence)

Again science has come forward to save man from a dread disease.

Generations have suffered from it amid hopes that some day a miracle would be achieved.

The miracle has come. All honor to the scientists, Dr. Jonas Salk and the others, who have brought to mankind the relief so long and desperately sought as countless children have succumbed yearly to the ravages of poliomyelitis.

It is an historic coincidence that announcement of the discovery came on the 10th anniversary of the death of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. His valiant fight against polio, which struck him at the age of 39, helped to dramatize in later years the public drives that won so much financial support from the people of America for the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

What great hope one man's struggle instilled in the minds of other victims. To what heights could they aspire—since, indeed, one whose physical movements were restricted by the paralysis of his legs could nevertheless campaign actively and become President of the United States. It was an example that conveyed a message of encouragement to millions of persons with a frustrated outlook on what the future held for them.

Today the parents of children who might otherwise be potential victims of polio can rejoice that a vaccine has been found which in nearly all cases will prove effective. While research is yet to be completed, especially as to certain strains of the disease found abroad, the door has at least been opened. Science has conquered another enemy of man—adding to victories attained heretofore over typhiod and yellow fever and tuberculosis.

It is naturally hoped that the intense study concentrated in recent years by medical experts everywhere on another disease—cancer—may in the not-far-distant future also bring a preventive. In the laboratories day and night technicians are striving for that momentous result. The prayers of mankind are directed toward what may be the next great discovery of our times in the field of medicine.

We are inclined to credit man with all such achievements. Do we forget perhaps that behind man is the guidance of the Master?

The mysteries of man's successes and defeats are not unfolded to our finite minds. For even as man makes great discoveries in science and by his inventions changes the life of the world, nature often exhibits a power greater than any that man himself can generate.

The force of a tornado or of a hurricane can be stronger than that of a hydrogen bomb.

No invention as yet has conquered the most violent storms to assure the safety of all vessels at sea.

The sun is still a puzzling antagonist, as well as a great benefactor.

When we seek mastery over the elements, however, it is not in defiance but in self-protection against the dangers they may suddenly bring.

But, even as we manage to conquer a terrible disease, we are concerned because there are in the world today governments which threaten to use germs as an instrument of war. Our own experimentation in this field is carried on solely to teach us how to deal with such a scourge if an unmoral government some day decides to use germ warfare. The mere existence of such lethal weapons, however, is in itself a sad commentary on the deterioration of the human spirit in Moscow and Peiping, where such plots are hatched.

Of what avail it it to conquer the germs of disease that spread themselves naturally if we are to encounter the germs of man-made plagues, too?

We are reminded, moreover, that the worst epidemic of all—war itself—knows as yet no vaccine.

We have not yet found the way by which governments can be inoculated against the making of arbitrary decisions to kill innocent men, women, and children. We have in our lifetime seen it happen twice. This seemed impossible, but it happened.

Can it be said that the satanic instinct in many is still battling for supremacy against the divine spirit?

When we learn of the amazing discovery of a vaccine to ward off polio, we are encouraged to believe that it is not the hand of man but of a divine providence which guides us toward new accomplishments in the field of human welfare.

Perhaps our generations have been remiss as we have glorified the achievements of man in a world of materialism. Perhaps our shortcoming has been an inability to perceive through the years of suffering that another way is open to us. Perhaps this new respite—prolongation of life through such medical discoveries—points a moral in human history. Perhaps it tells us that God may be merciful if men will only act toward one another in a manner which will deserve His blessings.

Let's Quit Flirting With Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from The Derrick of Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., of March 30, 1955:

LET'S QUIT FLIRTING WITH SOCIALISM

Do you favor governmental action which poses a direct threat to the American system of free competitive enterprise under which this Nation has grown great and attained the highest living standard in the history of the world?

That, in effect, is the question posed today by a situation prevailing in the natural gas industry.

It results from a Supreme Court ruling of last June which held that under existing law the Federal Power Commission has authority to fix rates at the well head on natural gas destined for interstate distribution.

As a result of this ruling some 5,000 gas producers—big, medium, and independent small operators—were brought under Federal control. The Government is calling the turn. Price fixing is the order.

This carries a sinister portent not only for the gas industry, but for all industry. If gas production is to be subject to Government control and price fixing, might the next move not be regulation of oil, coal, and all other natural resources?

This is socialism. It is the very antithesis of the American way. Once affirmed as a national policy it could mean the end of the type of economy which has enabled this Nation to prosper and grow strong.

Every citizen has a stake in the fight against this sinister power of gas field regulation and control. Aside from the all-important long-range effect of regulation upon the tried and proven competitive enterprise system, there is the near prospect of higher prices to the consumer.

If the growing gas market is to be supplied, additional gas reserves must be found. This involves great risk of loss of capital. It is obvious, therefore, that there must be real incentive to encourage exploration by individuals and corporations. But producers will not risk the huge sums necessary for finding new gas reserves if the price they are to receive is to be determined by a bureau in Washington. Incentive will be destroyed, a lessening of supply undoubtedly will result, and this can only mean higher prices to the consumer.

Yes, the stakes are high in this fight to remove the field price of gas from Government regulation and restore it to the same category with other commodities.

The need for action is urgent. You can help. Let your representatives in Congress know you want the Harris-Hinshaw bill passed to free natural gas producers from control of the price of their product at the well head.

Let's quit flirting with socialism and stand firmly by the American system of free competitive enterprise.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for curtailment of the veterans' benefit program would, if carried out, cause serious hardships to many veterans and their dependents or heirs. I ask unanimous consent to insert a resolution introduced by Councilman Harry Hook in the Municipal Council of the City of Rahway, N. J., and adopted by the council, which states the need for continuance of the veterans' benefit program:

RESOLUTION BY COUNCILMAN HOOK

Whereas the veterans' central committee of the city of Rahway has requested the Municipal Council of the City of Rahway to lend its assistance in the prevention of the enactment of national legislation which would have the effect of penalizing disabled veterans and their dependents and heirs; and

Whereas it appears that the veterans' benefit program is to be made the subject of an executive investigation, and that precedent and prior experience reveal that such investigations result to the detriment of disabled veterans and their dependents with little or no corresponding financial savings in the cost of government; and

Whereas the cost to the taxpayers of veterans benefits has been grossly misrepresented as appears by the following statistics as represented to this municipal council:

(a) That in the past 15 years United States taxpayers have paid over $80 billion in foreign-aid program while the total cost of pensions and compensations to veterans and their dependents during the entire history of the United States is less than $35 billion.

(b) United States taxpayers are spending less today in proportion to national income, for pensions and compensation, than they were spending some 60 years ago when the veteran population represented less than 3 percent of the total compared to over 13 percent today.

(c) That it is the popular impression, in mentioning the 3 million World War I veterans who are reaching the age of 65 years and qualifying for pensions, that World War I veterans are automatically eligible for a pension at the age of 65, whereas the truth is that in order to qualify for a pension a World War I veteran must be rated permanently and totally disabled, unemployed, with income of not more than $1,400 per annum with no dependents, and $2,700 per annum with dependents.

(d) That if such World War I veterans can meet all the foregoing requirements, they may, when they reach the age 65, apply for a pension which is presently $78.75 per month. If under 65 years of age they may apply for a pension which is now $66.17 per month: Be it, and it is, hereby

Resolved, That the Municipal Council of the City of Rahway, while approving of legitimate savings in the cost of National Government, do hereby memorialize the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions to perform the duties involved in a manner which will not cause hardship or heartache to those who fought our country's wars or the dependents or heirs of our veterans; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to foward certified copies of this resolution to Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE, Senator from the State of New Jersey, and Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Congressman from the Sixth Congressional District.

I, Robert W. Schrof, city clerk of the city of Rahway, N. J., do hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Municipal Council of the City of Rahway, N. J., duly called and held at council chambers, 1470 Campbell Street, Rahway, N. J., on Wednesday evening, March 23, 1955.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the said city of Rahway, N. J., this 24th day of March 1955.

ROBERT W. SCHROF,
City Clerk.

Fired Postal Workers Unaware of Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Monday, April 18, 1955, by Charles E. Benson, a staff writer, entitled "Fired Postal Workers Unaware of Charges."

The article is as follows:

Manipulation of civil service hearing under the Veterans' Preference Act is making a mockery of civil service protection for Federal employees, Joseph Robbie, Jr., Minneapolis attorney, charged Sunday.

Robbie, former director of the office of price stabilization (OPS) in Minneapolis, represents a group of Minneapolis postal supervisors accused of political activity, and Henry A. C. Saggau, postmaster of Ceylon, Minn., whose replacement order is being contested.

Robbie said one of the key Minneapolis employees under fire, Ambrose Johnston, has been found innocent because the Civil Service Commission learned that one of the informers against him had lied.

The other Minneapolis employees involved are Odin Rude, Lee Saunders, Allen P. Roberts, Walter Hogan, John J. Brennan, Earl Woolery, and Clifford A. Carlson, whose Federal service averages 30 years.

Robbie said that he has asked that no suspensions be carried out until the matter has been heard in court (probably in the United States district court in Washington).

In the meantime he has asked that the Civil Service Commission explain the alleged violation. He said that he finds it difficult to answer the charges when they are not stated.

(Reportedly the Minneapolis employees are accused of selling tickets to a dinner sponsored by the Democratic Party.)

Robbie said the Minneapolis investigation was instigated by "disgruntled post-office employees who were seeking political preferment to be promoted to the jobs which they hoped would be vacated if they could cause supervisory employees to be dislodged from their positions."

The employees, he said, originally were accused of violating civil-service rules, under which the Government is required to detail its charges because of the veterans' status of the employees.

The charges later were shifted to the Hatch Act (which provides criminal prosecution of Federal employees who engage in political activity) because veterans' status is not recognized under this law, Robbie said. He added that he believes the Veterans' Act applies, regardless of procedure.

Robbie said that in asking for a review of the cases, and in planning court action if necessary, he has raised these points:

That the Government produced no evidence, but merely examined defense witnesses.

That postal inspectors who did the investigating refused to appear for questioning.

That the hearing examiner refused to permit testimony by persons making the charges.

That the hearing examiner refused to let the employees know who their accusers are,

or to know the nature of material in "secret files."

"It is impossible for a man to defend himself when he does not even know the identity of those whose affidavits are being used to convict him, or the contents of those affidavits.

"We offered to show that certain of the informers had used political contacts to seek to gain promotion to the positions they hoped would be vacated. This offer was refused," Robbie said.

In the case of Saggau, Robbie said that he had been postmaster of Ceylon for 18 years and that his ratings had been continuously satisfactory until November 1953.

"He was visited by a postal inspector on November 7 and 8 and received notice that he would be dismissed for inefficiency on November 12—only 4 days after the visit was completed," Robbie said.

"The inspector went up and down the streets of Ceylon visiting local businessmen in considering whether or not Saggau should be replaced, which is a new and unique method of handling a merit system in protecting the tenure of classified civil-service employees."

Robbie quoted a witness at the hearing on Saggau's appeal under the Veterans' Preference Act as saying that "someone heard the inspector ask if Saggau should not be replaced because he was a Democrat."

Robbie said the inspector was present at the hearing and did not deny the statement.

"The commission was at least sufficiently impressed by this testimony so that it conducted a new investigation at Ceylon without giving the defendent any chance to cross-examine any of the witnesses that it subsequently interviewed," Robbie said.

The regional civil service commission at St. Louis, Mo., upheld the removal decision of the Post Office Department. Robbie said an appeal has been filed with the Civil Service Commission in Washington.

Robbie charged that the postal inspectors "have become the political arm of the Postmaster General to destroy any semblance of civil service protection within the Post Office Department," and that "if these men can be found guilty on this kind of evidence, at this kind of hearing, then there is no merit system and no Federal employee is safe."

Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I hope President Eisenhower will not attempt to thwart the overwhelming will of Congress by vetoing a fair pay increase for postal employees.

The 8.2-percent increase voted by the House is less than adequate, but under the circumstances, was the best could be had. I have favored and still favor a 10-percent raise and am hopeful that the final conference agreement will be closer to 10 percent as voted by the Senate, than the 8.2 percent voted by the House. Either figure is small enough when measured by increased costs of living which have sharply reduced the purchasing power of postal workers.

We would be inconsistent, indeed, if we did not insist on making the increase retroactive to March 1. After all, the 50-percent salary boost Congress has voted for itself was made effective as of March 1. An additional safeguard provided in the House bill will prevent abuse of the reclassification program by requiring the Postmaster General to report his actions to Congress. If these reports indicate that the reclassification procedure is being abused, or being used for partisan political purposes, Congress will have an opportunity to change the program.

Confused Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the confusion and contradictions of administration foreign policy statements, to which former President Harry S. Truman and Adlai E. Stevenson have alluded in recent major addresses, has never been so well illustrated as by remarks made by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles during the last few days.

The radio commentator, Edward P. Morgan, discusses the confusion which has been compounded by the contradictory remarks of Mr. Dulles in an article published in Labor's Daily for April 21. I include that article as a part of my remarks:

As reported earlier, the promising Austrian situation makes things look better. In Europe maybe they don't look real cool yet, but they're encouraging.

In Asia, though, the situation is as sticky as tropical heat. If you are getting the picture clearly through the sweat of confusion it's more than a lot of reporters have been able to do in Washington.

I'm afraid Secretary Dulles hasn't been of much help to us, although I'm sure he tried. Either the Chinese Communists have stepped up their buildup of airpower in Formosa Strait, or they have not. Sunday the Secretary said they had. Today he was uncertain.

Either the buildup, if it's stepped up, has freshly grave implications, as the Secretary gravely said Sunday, was the case, or it has implications of the same gravity the Formosa situation has had for weeks.

Now Secretary Dulles is too busy a man to be expected to trot out of his office every time he gets a piece of news and tell the rest of us about it, so when he does put his privy to a bit of intelligence you'd like to think it was the latest, freshest thing available, clear as a bell pealing the facts or tolling them, depending on whether the news was good or bad.

Indeed when the Secretary read his communique after seeking the President in Augusta Sunday afternoon, he indicated it was thanks to better, swifter intelligence methods that he was able to reveal the ominous story that he did, which so conveniently caught the headlines in the usually lean Monday papers.

Now it's the informed and virtually undisputed opinion in Washington that the buildup Dulles spoke of on Sunday is nothing new. It has been going on steadily for weeks and was, in fact, one of the circumstances on which Admiral Carney supported his now no longer off-the-record judgment that the Communists could be ready to attack one of the offshore island groups by mid-April, if they wanted to.

After the speedup in the intelligence reports, it turns out now that they were too slow to begin with. Much of what there is to be found out about what the Communists are up to, what airfields they're building, and what planes they're stacking on these fields.

Much of this data comes from air reconnaissance by Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist pilots. These photographs and reports simply weren't being evaluated and turned over with dispatch, according to reliable information in Washington.

Now, this process has been quickened a little, so what the Secretary revealed Sunday with such a splash was seemingly little more than an accumulation of reports. He tried to put the matter in a perspective slightly less blurred when he was questioned about it by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Secretary said he didn't have full information, reported Senator GEORGE, the chairman, after the Secretary had appeared. He said, Senator GEORGE went on, that perhaps we were only getting more and better information about the Chinese Communists' activities than we had been getting in the past.

Somebody might say a mild amen to that. It is suggested charitably that the Sunday announcement, in any event, had the purpose of impressing the conferees at Bandung that while Chou En-lai was talking of peace, he was making belligerent preparations in Formosa Strait.

Now, if the limit of our ingenuity in trying to impress the Bandung Conference is represented by what some people would have to believe would be classified as a stale news story, framed with grave implications, in the Secretary's words, grave implications that confuse the American public in the bargain, maybe it's even more urgent to reexamine our policies than Adlai Stevenson said it was.

Measure of a True Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of humility I rise to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, a true patriot. The measure of a person's devotion to ideals can be put to no greater test than when that person will submit his wife and family to the possible scorn of his neighbors and friends. Mr. Ray C. Moorhead, of Cashion, Ariz., was asked by the FBI in 1947 to join the Communist Party. For 8 years he underwent the many trials and tribulations that go with being a known Communist. Last week Mr. Moorhead testified in the Government's behalf in its case against 5 men and 2 women accused of advocating the violent overthrow of the Federal Government. Mr. Moorhead is a dairy farmer and the father of 4 children. Since testifying, he may be in more danger than when he actually was working with the Reds, but his comment to this has been, "When the FBI asked me to work for them, they gave me 3 days to talk it over with my wife. She told me communism was

against God and I decided that I owed it to my country and to Him. After all, somebody has to do the job." I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial written in the Phoenix Gazette on Saturday, April 16, 1955, entitled "Measure of a True Patriot." I am sure that every American is grateful to Roy C. Moorhead for his sacrifice for his country.

MEASURE OF A TRUE PATRIOT

The 8-year ordeal of Ray Moorhead, a Cashion farmer who served the FBI as an unpaid anti-Communist undercover agent, is not new. Many Americans have endured the loss of friends, community distrust, and mental anguish that such assignments bring. One of them, Herbert Philbrick, described the impact of these hazards on a typical American family in his book, I Led Three Lives.

Thus Ray Moorhead is not the first loyal American to endure the ordeal in the service of his country, and he will not be the last. But he is the first known Arizonan to engage in the risky job of catching Communist subversives by pretending to join with them in activities aimed at the overthrow of our democratic form of government. Unlike Philbrick and others whose undercover activities were carried on in large cities, Moorhead performed his valuable work in small farming communities west and south of Phoenix.

Where everybody knows his neighbors by their first names, it takes rare courage to pose as an active Communist for 8 long years. It means cold glances from former friends that say more than words. It means hardship for self and family. It means a man's children must be permitted to believe that their father is disloyal. It means embarrassment, worry, and tensions for a wife who knows the secret but cannot tell.

All these things and more are the price Ray Moorhead has paid to serve his country while protecting it from its enemies. That, we submit, is the measure of a true patriot.

Jay A. Robinson, President of the National Society of Public Accountants, Honored by Texas State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Texas State Legislature bestowed an unusual honor on the Honorable Jay A. Robinson, C. P. A., president of the National Society of Public Accountants, of which I am a member, by inviting him to address their distinguished body in joint session on Tuesday, April 19, 1955. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the address which Mr. Robinson presented:

ADDRESS OF JAY A. ROBINSON, CPA., PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS, BEFORE JOINT SESSION, TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, members of the house and senate, ladies and gentlemen, I do not believe there is any man to whom this great privilege and honor was extended that would not stand before this august body in deep humility. There were many things going through my mind as I prepared to come to your great State, and there were many thoughts whirling around as I sat at my typewriter preparing the details for these remarks.

I considered that all of the public accountants in the United States were being honored and that I, their president and representative, was merely the symbol of this great honor. I pay tribute to the State of Texas having this privilege so near April 21, which is the commemoration of the Battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836, when independence came to your great State. I salute you on this occasion.

I am deeply grateful to my colleague and dear friend, Representative Louis H. Anderson, whose resolution made this memorable appearance possible. He and I, over the years, have worked together in the interests of the public accountants, and he has served in many responsible elective and appointive positions in the National Society of Public Accountants. He is a great servant of the profession and he has brought the profession great honor by his election to this house of representatives, and I am certain he will be a loyal and devoted servant to the people of his great State of Texas as well.

No man in the accounting profession could come to the State of Texas without paying his personal respects to one of the most renowned and revered members of our profession, Mr. J. A. Phillips, of Houston, a certified public accountant and a past president of the American Institute of Accountants, the national professional society of certified public accountants. He has been and is an understanding man in our profession who is dedicated, as I am, to the unification of the accounting profession not only in your State but throughout the width and breadth of this land. The accounting profession is deeply indebted to Mr. Phillips for the great service he has rendered the profession, his community, and this great State.

I have had occasion in the past 2 years to have met and known Mr. L. E. Tennison and Mr. Hagans who are members of your State board of accountancy, but during the year of my administration the national society has been extremely fortunate to have as one of its elective officials from your State, Mr. John A. Thomason, who is a newly appointed member of your State board of accountancy. He is also an official of the Texas Association of Public Accountants and is presently serving in the elective office of State director for the State of Texas for the National Society of Public Accountants. He is for our society and the accounting profession generally rendering yeoman service in the building of the standards and the ethics of the profession and making known to all the public accountants of your State their great responsibility.

Let me briefly tell you something about our society. The society was founded in 1945 and its founders were a small group of courageous public accountants—it was founded as a protest against discrimination, exclusion, and prejudice—its objectives were recognition of the public accountant by legislation and the preservation of his rights to practice in the future and to secure enrollment for admission to practice before the Treasury Department—its philosophy was militancy, hate and conflict—10 years later with the advent of professional maturity—the protest still prevails where discrimination, exclusion, and prejudice still exist—its objectives are the same—its philosophy with maturity has changed to conciliation, cooperation and understanding—intelligent planning, constructive programing, higher standards of practice adherence to a code of ethics and rules of professional conduct—educational programs to prepare and qualify to take examinations to practice public accounting and be enrolled for admission to practice before the Treasury Department and public relations to inform the public of its program of service through its members, to the American community—and now for a few of the important details of our society.

The National Society of Public Accountants is composed of practicing public accountants and those interested in accounting from all of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories of Puerto Rico and Hawaii. There are State societies of public accountants in all States except approximately 4 or 5. Regulatory legislation prevails in 28 of these States and the remainder are on a permissive basis. The administration of the National Society of Public Accountants is vested in a board of governors, and the officers consist of a president, a vice president selected from the States east of the Mississippi, a vice president selected from the States west of the Mississippi, and a secretary-treasurer. The national society has its executive offices in Washington, D. C., at 1012 14th Street NW., and maintains an executive director and a full executive and administrative staff.

The National Society of Public Accountants has two publications—the National Public Accountant, which is our technical publication, and its subscribers consist of our members and other persons who are interested in its publications, and it is published monthly. The other publication is a house organ intended solely for our membership. It is entitled the PA and it is also published monthly. The operating and programmatic organization of the society is divided into 10 districts, each headed by a district governor, and each State within each district has an elective director representing the National Society of Public Accountants in his State. In the State of Texas, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. John A Thomason is our director, and the State of Texas is part of district 8 of the national society, which this year is headed by district governor C. W. McAllister, of Tulsa, Okla. The State of Texas and the entire district 8 have performed most admirably in the program of the society during this year in all of its programmatic phases, and your State is leading in the forefront in society activity. The national society has a code of ethics and rules of professional conduct of the same standard and intensity as those under which all other accountants practice, and our committee on ethics and practice maintains vigilance over every possible violator and shows no mercy for the member who fails to adhere to the code of ethics and rules of professional conduct. The society has established and maintains a department of education which has now promulgated a correspondence course for our members which will ultimately qualify them for an examination for admission to practice before the Treasury Department of the United States, and when enrolled will represent taxpayers in their differences or disagreements with the Treasury Department at the administrative level or conference level.

The members of this society do not expect to be granted anything for which they do not prepare, nor for which they do not qualify, but they believe that if they do prepare and take this course which will prepare them adequately for an examination for admission to practice, the examination that they have to take should be prepared, given, graded and under the complete jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, and that no material should be used from any private source whatsoever, including the National Society of Public Accountants. The society believes that only through the medium of continued education will it be performing its organizational obligations to the citizens of all the communities which our members serve. The society maintains a public relations department and through that department is presenting to the public its story of the public accountant and his fine record

of service to the public these many years. The society in this presentation attempts to inform the public of the qualification of the practicing public accountant in the United States. It also believes in this presentation that the right and prerogative of the citizen of this country should be maintained and preserved in the selection of the person or persons whom he desires to serve him. The American community should be made fully aware by the respective professions of the abilities and the qualifications of the members of the same but should advocate that the citizen should have the right to select the person he desires to serve him, and that the decision should not be in the form of restrictive legislation which could be classified as discriminatory or exclusionary. The National Society of Public Accountants pledges its support to every State board of accountancy in this country to uproot any unethical practitioner and will give any and all assistance to see that the profession is maintained at the highest possible level of conduct for the protection of the public, but it cannot help but feel that if the public is made aware, then we should permit the public to make its decision.

The society is dedicated to the proposition that the standards of the accounting profession shall be maintained at the highest possible levels and that the future of the profession shall be determined only through the process of educational preparation and meeting the standards by passage of an examination. It is well to consider in this regard the incidence of service and the level of service in the American economic community. Should the man who serves John Smith, the blacksmith, be required to be the same type of technician as the man who serves the Texas Oil Co.? We place this question before the legislative bodies of the American community.

I agree that there may be different levels of academic knowledge and different levels in professional techniques. However, I do not believe that there can be two levels of honesty and integrity, and is it not an established fact that a professional practitioner is selected by his client not merely for his academic knowledge or technical skill in his particular field, but more particularly because the client knows him to be an honest practitioner and has confidence in him as well as his ability?

The society is against no class either within or without the accounting profession. It is for the preservation of the rights of the public accountant to practice his profession and to continue to render service to his community.

The society would like very much to see standardization of legislative enactments relating to public accounting practice so that reciprocity will be provided for licensed public accountants from State to State as it is now provided for a certified public accountant.

We urge a general study of the entire legislative enactments relating to the regulations of public accounting so that inequities which may now exist may be corrected and refinements made of existing law where required.

Leadership must continually observe the trend of events and the desires of their constituency, and perhaps it would be well for leadership to look to the grassroots for a sign of the times.

In my home State of California, of which I am very proud, during my year as president of the Society of California Accountants we sponsored and had enacted by the legislature, in cooperation with the California Society of Certified Public Accountants, legislation which forbid discrimination against the public accountant by any agency of the State government, or any of its political subdivisions, for example, counties, cities, school districts, etc. The national society equally is energetically engaged in the program of eliminating discrimination against the qualified practicing public accountant by any government or State agency as soon as the discrimination comes to its attention.

It has been the idea for some years that when a man passed the examination and became a certified public accountant, or when a man was privileged by legislation to secure a permit to practice as a public accountant that he had reached the end of the line. I think that we can do a major job or perform a major undertaking if we were to send out the clarion call that this is by no means the end of the line—but quite the reverse, it is only the beginning of what is a great responsibility because here begins service to the public, the application of all of the academic knowledge, professional skill, ethics, and standards which had been taught, and this together with a display of honesty and integrity will spell success in the future. The only way, in my considered opinion, that the public accountant can be faithful to his trust is to continue with the process of education so that he may be familiar with the new techniques and skills in this ever-changing political, social, and economic world in which we live.

Let me for a moment discuss with you the present situation as it relates to the licensing of certified public accountants and public accountants and the renewal privileges. I should like to make particular reference to the use of the funds from such licensing and renewal privileges. It is my opinion and the opinion of many that the funds which State boards of accountancy receive from the licensing privileges and renewals should remain under the exclusive jurisdiction of the various State boards of accountancy and earmarked or allocated for the specific use of such boards of accountancy. And it is my opinion that although the State boards of accountancy are the policing and enforcement agencies for the protection of the public to see that high standards are maintained and that their rules of professional conduct are abided by, there is an equally important function for State boards of accountancy, and I suggest to you most respectfully that you consider that the funds from the licensing privileges and renewals should be used for the dissemination of educational material to the public accountant and certified public accountant to continue to keep them alert to the techniques, changes, rules, and responsibilities which may be thrust upon them in the future. No more beneficial use of this money, in my opinion, could be made in the public interest.

The public accountant of your State or any State assumes a tremendous responsibility, and it is not a surface one, by any means. It is a responsibility of great depth. It reaches much further than most people imagine. Most people think of the public accountant as one who comes into his place of business and makes little red marks in his books and then prepares a statement or a report which ultimately reflects a profit or loss of that business.

It is a responsibility which reaches much deeper than that. It is a responsibility to the people behind the books. The lives of many people, the futures of many families may hinge upon the ability of the public accountant to perform satisfactorily and adequately in his chosen field. His responsibility reaches far beyond his client. It reaches the third-party interest—the bank, the credit grantor, the taxing authorities, at all political levels from the municipality to the Federal Government, who rely upon the statements and the tax returns which the public accountant prepares and files in behalf of his client.

The public accountant owes a responsibility and an allegiance to the State in which he is privileged to practice and he owes his loyalty and devotion to his country, protected by the Constitution and its memorable Bill of Rights.

The public accountant is not only a fine, qualified, ethical, upstanding practitioner, he is a loyal citizen ready to render service to his community in welfare and in charity, for which there is no reward, only the satisfaction that he had served. The public accountant is dedicated to the program of continued education, the broadening of the accounting profession, living in peace with all the other professions, and discharging his responsibility at all levels of service as men of great honor, dignity, and integrity.

All of the great academic accomplishments of the profession and all of the great service rendered over the years notwithstanding, no one in this profession or any other profession could fully discharge his responsibility unless he had first discharged his responsibility to God, and I pledge to you men of this august legislative body of this great State of Texas and you kind ladies and gentlemen who have assembled for this occasion that the public accountant who is a member of the National Society of Public Accountants and its affiliated State societies, such as the Texas Association of Public Accountants, will discharge his responsibility as a highly qualified and ethical practitioner faithful to the rules and ethics of our profession and as a true and loyal citizen of a great State and country, and seek the divine guidance and the spiritual assistance in order that he may fully discharge this responsibility to both God and man.

As to Rural Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Parsons (Kans.) Sun of March 22 entitled "As to Rural Power":

AS TO RURAL POWER

Rural electric cooperatives are stirred up, and properly so, over a Hoover Commission recommendation that the REA rely on private financing instead of loans from Government sources in the future.

By making such a recomendation, the Commission shows a failure to understand the nature of the rural electrification program or prefers to ignore it. The position it assumes is unrealistic, completely so.

If extension of electric powerlines could have been accomplished by private financing, it would have been done long ago. But not until the Government entered the picture with the Rural Electrification Administration was electricity taken to the farms in quantities that counted. Private companies refused to take the risk.

By following the Hoover Commission's recommendation to its logical conclusion, one gets the idea it would have preferred no rural electrification to having it done with Government assistance. Most citizens would disagree with that premise.

One of the really big domestic developments of the past two decades has been the spread of rural electrification. It has revolutionized life on the farm, and brought conveniences to rural residents which their city cousins long had enjoyed. It has created a vast new market for American industry at the same time.

Rural electrification proponents have overstepped bounds in their zeal to promote the cause. Their job primarily is one of distribution of power to farms. But to suggest that the Government step out of the picture at this time and leave rural electrification at the mercy of those who were not in sympathy with it before is to commit just as big an offense in the opposite extreme.

Private enterprise had its opportunity to deliver electric power to the farms of the country. It chose not to do so and while the wisdom of its decision may be open to question, certainly the right to make it goes unchallenged. But because it did choose to go the way it did is no reason why the job should not have been done in the first place or finished now that it has been started.

The Late Albert Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert editorials from the Elizabeth Daily Journal and the Christian Science Monitor, on the death of Albert Einstein. If any one man can be said to have shaped the destiny of our times, he was that man. I believe all Members of the Congress will join with me in feeling that the finest eulogy that could be given him would be to make the most creative and constructive use of the intellectual legacy left us by this great man of science and of peace.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Elizabeth Daily Journal of April 19, 1955]

GIFTED MAN OF SCIENCE DIES

Dr. Albert Einstein, world-famous scientist, died yesterday at Princeton Hospital at the age of 76. His was a genius that must stand forth whenever in the ages to come historians seek to group the greatest scientists. Dr. Einstein's theory of relativity drew attention to him from all over the globe, long before racial conditions in his native Germany drove him to the New World—and the world spotlight followed him to the famous Mercer campus where the noted thinker found the quiet and the privacy he cherished.

No one ever abhored publicity more. Glory came to him without seeking. He was truly an unpretentious wizard at mathematics and physics and was numbered among the world's most outstanding scholars—one whose fame will endure through the ages.

Dr. Einstein's thinking was too intricate for many to comprehend. As Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton, said: "His contributions to man's understanding of nature are beyond assessment in our day. Only future generations will be competent to grasp their full significance."

It is equally significant to note Governor Meyner's estimate of him. "It is one of the cosmic ironies that out of Dr. Einstein's intellect," he said, "were produced the postulates which led to the creation of the atomic bomb. It is a cosmic irony because Albert Einstein was a man of peace, a man who abhorred violence. In the years to come, his work and his memory will be suitably honored if the atomic power which produces bombs is diverted to the myriad uses by which it can benefit humanity."

The death of Dr. Einstein is a tremendous loss to his field of science. There is in truth no one to take his place.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 19, 1955]

BREAKER OF BARRIERS

"I never believed an axiom." That was Albert Einstein's own answer when asked to explain how he came to formulate the theory of relativity. He refused to accept the supposed fact that light moves in a straight line; he saw reasons to believe it could be bent, and proved it.

He constantly rejected limitations; he insisted on looking beyond the apparent. His "holy curiosity of inquiry" could not be satisfied with claims that the behavior of electrons was inexplicable; by reason or intuition he arrived at provable explanations in the quantum theory.

"I cannot believe God plays dice with the cosmos." Unwilling to believe the universe was not ruled by law, he persisted in seeking to reconcile the relativity and quantum theories. Finally he came up with the unified field theory. The whole effect of this is not yet evident, but once more he had opened new worlds of thought—worlds as far beyond limited material concepts as are the millions of milky ways in the astronomers' "expanding universe."

Aside from his great work in showing that motion, mass, energy, and time could not always be dealt with as fixed quantities. Einstein contributed in another way to progress. He helped give respectability to the method of deduction—the "inspired hypothesis" often producing results which might not be reached by centuries of goalless induction.

It has been said that when physicists accepted a mathematical description of nature (with Einstein as chief describer) they were forced to abandon the world of sense perception. In many respects this is true, but it does not always mean they are ready to accept the view that all real causation is spiritual.

Einstein described his own humble religious sense in moving words:

"That deeply emotional conviction of the presence, of a superior reasoning power, which is revealed in the incomprehensible universe, forms my idea of God."

Like other physicists, he continued to seek explanations of reality in physical phenomena. But his greatest contributions in making the universe comprehensible were achieved when he broke the barriers of conventional thought patterns and rode the wings of insight.

No. 1 Lung Cancer Cause Is Smog, Study Indicates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Star of April 20:

NO. 1 LUNG CANCER CAUSE IS SMOG, STUDY INDICATES

PASADENA, April 20.—Smog is the greatest single cause of lung cancer, says a top research scientist in the field of air pollution and its relation to public health.

"Atmospheric pollution holds the answer to lung cancer more than any other single agent," Dr. Paul Kotin, University of Southern California pathologist, told the third national air pollution symposium yesterday.

His connecting smog with lung cancer climaxes more than 4 years of experiments with thousands of animals under a United States Public Health Service grant. Dr. Kotin, 38, and his research team conducted the experiments at the U. S. C. Medical School and the Los Angeles County General Hospital.

CITES ACCUMULATIVE EFFECT

The scientist said the study showed that smog "has a prolonged accumulative effect" as a tumor inducer.

"We have no concept of the dosage of smog required," he added. "But I feel that the amount encountered during an ordinary siege in many cities may be too much."

His experiments have all been with animals subjected to artificially created smog.

The pollutant which is the irritant causing the cancer, he explained, is at least one type of hydrocarbon in the oxidized state. Hydrocarbons are found in auto exhausts, industrial emissions and in gasoline vapors.

NEW TESTS PLANNED

His conclusions will be the basis for new experiments aimed at detecting which hydrocarbon is guilty, and what chemical state it is in when it does the damage, he said.

"We did find the tumor yield—both benign and malignant—to be significant" among animals breathing smoggy atmosphere created from gasoline and diesel engines and gasoline vapors, he said. In some of the tests the yield was very high.

With the exception of cancer, Dr. Kotin said he and his research team found smog had no permanent ill effects on the health of test animals. This contradicts the opinions of some scientists that smog damages the respiratory system.

"There were no consistent biological changes in animals subjected to up to 10 times the maximum known concentration of smog," he declared. Even the animals with impaired respiratory systems showed no ill effects from such heavy doses, he added.

Law Urged To Bar Job Bias for Age—Aid Asked for Those Over 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of April 17, 1955, entitled "Law Urged To Bar Job Bias For Age":

LAW URGED TO BAR JOB BIAS FOR AGE—AID ASKED FOR THOSE OVER 40

Demands are arising for Federal legislation to bar discrimination because of age, now that laws bar discrimination for race, creed, or color. These demands are based on the increasing difficulty persons over 40 have in finding employment. Meanwhile, the population of the United States is getting older.

The argument is that age is relative. What should be taken into account is biological age, not calendar age. A person of 30 may be old mentally and in his reactions, whereas many older persons make brilliant executives, mellowed by experience.

Rejection of those in the 40 age bracket seeking employment often is based on pension plans. Overloading of older persons requires higher payments by employers, but both banking and insurance quarters assert that most pensions, either insurance-underwritten or bank-trusteed, are flexible enough to absorb older persons and let in the young, too. It averages out.

COUNCIL FINDINGS

The social change which is taking place in United States age brackets is indicated by a bulletin of the New York Adult Education Council. It reports that among users of the council's consultation service in September and October 1954, about 18 percent were between 45 and 54 and 12 percent were 55 or older.

Five years previously, in these months of 1949, those who told their ages to the service were tabulated as 11 percent between 45 and 54 and four-tenths percent over 55. The unemployment factor is in there somewhere, but it cannot be proved.

Employment managers say that, except for a relatively few enlightened managements, there is considerable difficulty to get a front-office approval for hiring both handicapped persons and those above 40 because of unproved fears that both groups are bad health and insurance risks. The statement that pension plans make it financially impossible to hire older persons, is merely an excuse, not reality, they say.

PLUS 40 CLUB AIDS

The drive to maintain middle and older age groups of both sexes as useful units of the American production team is spearheaded by the Plus Forty Club. It is run almost exclusively by volunteers who have been unable to get work. Several of these clubs have sprung up throughout the country since the first one was established here 16 years ago.

As the Catholic Digest pointed out, "40 plussers have proved so dependable that some employers, regrettably few it is true, rely almost exclusively upon the club to fill their vacancies. At times concerns have tried all other sources without success and turn to the club for help."

That calendar health is a myth and biological health a reality also has been discovered by the airlines. There are many pilots over 40 and many in their fifties who are assigned to the most important runs. The pilot who flies the Queen of England is pushing 60.

Another aspect is that those who cannot find employment because of "advanced" age at 40 or more are not eligible for social security—merely for temporary State unemployment insurance.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell pointed out that, if business and industry is not going to do anything about freer employment of older persons by 1975, the United States may well have a pressure group of more than 60 million persons over 45.

President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped is to be held May 23 and 24. Because I am one of the sponsors of legislation which created this committee, it gives me an especial pleasure to extend a personal invitation to my colleagues to join me in attending this meeting.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an informative article about this committee. The article appears in the current issue of Performance, the Story of the Handicapped, and should be of much interest to all:

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE TO HOLD ANNUAL MEETING MAY 23–24

How governors' and community committees on employment of the physically handicapped can meet the increased need for job placement of the physically impaired will be the principal subject of discussion at the annual meeting of the President's committee on May 23 and 24. The meeting will be held in Washington, D. C., at the Departmental Auditorium and the Washington Hotel.

The need for a stepup in providing work opportunities for the handicapped is expected to grow out of the passage of Public Law 565, the vocational rehabilitation amendments of 1954. Under this law, the number of handicapped rehabilitated and made ready for jobs is expected to triple by the end of 1959. A panel on "How To Make Public Law 565 Work" will be a feature of the second-day morning session. Elmer Walker, general vice president of the International Association of Machinists, will act as moderator, with Arthur W. Motley, Assistant Director, Bureau of Employment Security, and Miss Mary E. Switzer, Director, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, participating in the discussion, along with a chairman of one of the governors' committees.

The annual meeting will convene Monday, May 23, at 9:30 a. m., with Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, chairman of the President's committee, presiding. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., will deliver the invocation. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell will greet the delegates.

President Eisenhower will make the presentation of the President's trophy to the "Handicapped Man of the Year"—Judge Sam M. Cathey, of Asheville, N. C., a municipal court judge there and one of the founders of the North Carolina State Association for the Blind.

The President will also present the prizes to the winners of the national essay contest conducted annually by the committee.

A panel on how employers can help increase job opportunities for the handicapped will be chaired by Arde M. Bulova, chairman of the Bulova Watch Co. and chairman of the employer committee of the President's committee. Panel members include Edward L. Cushman, director of industrial relations, American Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Henry Viscardi, Jr., president of Abilities, Inc., West Hempstead, N. Y.; and G. R. Fugal, manager, employment practices, General Electric Co., New York City.

The Monday afternoon session will be devoted to a general discussion of State and community problems, with representatives of governors' and community committees participating in a discussion conducted jointly by General Maas and Mr. Bunting.

The first day's session will conclude with a showing of The Eternal Sea, new Republic Pictures feature film. Immediately following the film, a reception for delegates and friends will be held at the Washington Hotel.

Earl Bunting, vice chairman of the President's committee, will preside at the Tuesday sessions. A speech by Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois, will open the morning meeting. Following the Governor's talk will be a speech by John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston and vice president of the United States Conference of Mayors. The panel on Public Law 565 will follow.

Gen. Nathan Twining, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, will be the principal speaker at the noon luncheon on Tuesday. Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, rear admiral (Ch. C.), U. S. N. R., will deliver the invocation. A medical panel on "Cardiacs: Employment and Placement" will follow General Twining's address. Cochairmen for the panel are E. A. Irvin, M. D., medical director, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn Mich., and Carl M. Peterson, M. D., executive secretary, Council on Industrial Health, American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill. Panel members are Frederick J. Whitehouse, Ed. D., rehabilitation consultant, American Heart Association, New York City, and S. Charles Franco, M. D., Consolidated Edison Company of New York, New York City. A prominent employer will also be on this panel. A demonstration will then be given by the Washington, D. C., Cardiac Work Classification Unit under the direction of A. G. Prandoni, M. D., rehabilitation committee chairman, Washington Heart Association.

Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4644) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to close debate in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Before the chart was carried out, I noticed on it that the regular clerks and carriers were credited with a 6.9 percent raise. I think it has been conveniently forgotten that 20 percent of the postal field service, 120,000 substitutes and temporaries, were not included on that chart. If they were, the average raise would have been 7.2 percent.

Mr. HALLECK. At that point, and with particular reference to that chart, I think this point should be made, and everybody ought to be fair enough to understand it. In recent years we have had what we call across-the-board raises of $400 and $450. Obviously everyone recognized that this profits in greater proportion the men in the lower grades as against the higher grades. That is what is meant by the reclassification, to bring some sort of equalization in pay to the more responsible positions. So, certainly, this proposal of the committee should not be attacked on that ground.

I am for this bill and against this amendment for two reasons: First, be-

cause the committee has brought in a good bill, that is fair and equitable; and second, there is no question about it in my mind that it is the only bill that can become law.

Reference was made to the fact that even if we go this far, the 8.2 is risky. It is more than risky, because if you stop to consider, this is the fact: Already this bill recognizes a tremendous amount of compromise from the original administration proposal. I know something about it because I worked very diligently trying to bring about an arrangement by which we could get fair treatment for the postal employees and have a bill which would be passed. So the original 5 percent was raised to 6 percent. Other adjustments also were made. A total of $30 million has been added to the cost of the bill by the action of the committee as against the original administration proposal. Now let us take another look at it. I realize it is always easy to want to be openhanded. I have had people working for me and I would like to pay them more, but the question is how much can I afford. That is one of the things involved here. The total cost of the committee bill was $160 million a year. You may say, "Well, to add $12 million more—how does that make it bad?" I just want to say to you the committee bill has gone about as far as we can go. It has gone as far as we can go. Not only will we add on more expense every year, but in addition it will wreck the whole reclassification proposal, which is most important.

Bear in mind another thing. We ought to be responsible in respect to affairs of government. The Post Office Department is operating at a deficit right now of $400 million a year. You are going to add another $160 million a year in expenditures. How many of you who want to raise that amount are ready to stand up here and vote for a rate increase to balance it out? What you are doing is saddling the taxpayers of the country with additional burdens.

I say this bill is fair. Since 1945, the increases for the postal employees have totaled 96 percent and in that time the cost of living has increased only 48 percent. The gentleman from California referred to the increases in our own salaries. I have received some rather critical letters and communications. They said, "Well, you voted yourself 50 percent and now you will not give us 10 percent." But they overlook the fact that since our salary was set at $15,000 a year, we increased it 50 percent while in that time the postal employees have received a 60-percent increase in their pay and here is an additional 7.6 percent. This bill is fair treatment for them. If the average pay for the postal employee is $2 an hour, and that is about what it is, then this 7.6-percent rate is equivalent to 15 cents an hour increase in their pay. Is that not comparable to what you have heard has been done generally in industry in that time? If you go back to 1951, when the last pay adjustment was had for the postal employees, the cost of living has increased 3.8 percent and here is proposed a 7.6-percent increase in their pay.

Finally, as I say, we have a responsibility and I think we ought to meet it. I do not think we ought to touch off another inflationary wage spiral and price inflation. Reference has been made to the increased cost of living. We all know how that has affected us. Fortunately, in recent years the cost of living has balanced out. I do not want to be responsible for starting that inflationary action all over again.

Michigan State University Mission to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to inform the Congress that Michigan State University, my former employer and a great educational institution, is undertaking an important and dramatic step in the fight against world communism. The political science department of Michigan State has just concluded a contract with the Foreign Operations Administration of the United States Government to conduct a technical-assistance mission to the troubled State of Vietnam. This practical approach to problems of government is in keeping with the great down-to-earth tradition of our land-grant colleges. It is unique, however, in that it undertakes to apply our educational and technical skills on an international scale.

The main objective of the Michigan State mission to Vietnam is to help stabilize the Government and the economy of that country by training native Vietnamese in the skills of modern public administration. Experts are being sent to help train the workers in this new democracy in the fields of public administration, police work, government finance, and field administration. Later, Vietnamese will be brought to the United States for further training in each of these fields.

Michigan State is undertaking this project with clear motives. Believing that democracy can only flourish when the machinery of government is effective, honest, and technically proficient, the members of the mission are dedicated to their task of helping build a sound governmental structure.

With the withdrawal of the French and the refusal of the United States to engage in colonial control of this brave but threatened country, the hopes of keeping the country from falling to the Communists would seem slim indeed. But if we act quickly to help the Vietnamese people in their efforts to make democracy work, Vietnam can still be saved. Small islands off the coast of China are of little importance, indeed, relative to this country which stands between the Chinese Communists and the rich lands of Burma, Thailand, and Malaya.

Prof. Wesley Fishel deserves great credit for developing this technical-assistance program for Vietnam. Mr. Fishel has spent the last several months working with the Premier of Vietnam—Ngo Din Diem. His knowlelge of Vietnam, his sympathy for its people, and his determination that free government shall flourish in Vietnam have made the project a reality. Prof. Edward Weidner has also worked tirelessly to bring the know-how of American public administration to this troubled spot in the Far East. We wish them and their colleagues Godspeed in their endeavors.

What Freedom in America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include, for thoughtful reading, the following statement made by Miss Jeannette Mudgett, a second-year high-school student in my district, on the all-important subject, What Freedom in America Means to Me:

What does freedom in America mean to me? Right now I'm sitting in a desk in a public school. In front of me sits the daughter of the president of the bank. Across the aisle to my right, a boy, whose father owns and manages his own store, is sitting. My dad is a machinist in a factory. Yet all of us go to the same school. We sit side by side in class; we play together; we worship together. That is freedom.

I came into this classroom a few minutes ago, and my teacher assigned this theme to be written. She did not tell me what to say. Nor has anyone above her told her what to say. I am writing only my ideas. That is freedom.

I am the officer of a club. We have a sponsor, but we, as officers, direct the activities of the club; she serves to give us advice as we need and ask it. This club is a religious organization, but no one has told us we must attend its meeting or accept its beliefs. In fact, this is a nondenominational club and there are no restrictions as to color or creed of those who attend. That is freedom.

My father and mother own our home. The car is paid for. We have conveniences and even luxuries. Certainly my parents pay taxes, but they have the privilege of voting and thereby choosing the legislators who tax them. They themselves may hold public office. That is freedom.

I think now of a little Russian girl. I do not know her name, but maybe she today is in school just as I am. She is fortunate that she can attend school. She is one who passed a test that made her eligible for high school. Even then, only those of her own social class are around her. This is communism.

Perhaps she too is writing a theme. However, her teacher has been told what to tell her class. Her class must write on What Freedom in Russia Means to Me, not as the students or teacher sees it but as Moscow directs. That is communism.

Tonight our little Russian girl must attend a political rally. She is required to be in attendance. She has to accept the propaganda fed to her there. She has nothing

to say about the way in which activities of this sort are directed. That is communism.

In a little while, she will be going home. Her parents have saved and scraped to afford this little cottage. Her family walk every place they go, as they have no car. She wonders about this wonderful television she has heard of, but never seen. Taxes are high but what can her parents do about it? They cannot vote as they wish. That is communism.

I, as an American, living in a country where I enjoy so much freedom, find it hard to comprehend a life such as our little Russion girl must live. She is a slave compared to me. I am free. I am an American.

Look What Is Happening in Pennsylvania Under the New Democratic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the following statement by Miles Horst, chairman of the Pennsylvania State Republican Committee, Harrisburg, Pa., is confirmed by the editorial that follows, which appeared in the April 20, 1955, issue of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa.:

CHAIRMAN'S MESSAGE

The Democratic Party won the last election by promising, first, to abolish the general sales tax, and second, to so manage the State's affairs as to make a substitute tax unnecessary.

Before election, the Democratic State Chairman said:

"The Democratic Party is convinced that the State budget, with proper economic reforms, can be balanced without reenacting the controversial sales tax next year and we intend to show that it can be done. We're not going to be stampeded by Republican demands to name a substitute tax when we do not believe a substitute is necessary."

At the very same time, the Democratic candidate for governor declared:

"Republican leaders, in an attempt to put me on the spot, have asked what I would substitute for the sales tax. I do not plan to substitute anything. I am not convinced at this time, * * * that a substitute is necessary."

The people believed these words of the Democrats and elected the Democratic candidate to the highest office in the gift of the voters. Certainly they have every right to expect the Democrats to live up to their promises.

However, from his first day in office, the Governor has been slowly but surely preparing the public for repudiation of his repeated promises to operate the State government without the sales tax or a substitute.

Although he has received, at his request, the broadest power ever given a Chief Executive to reorganize, he has made no discernible effort to reduce the cost of operating our State government as he is pledged to do.

On the contrary, the Democratic State Chairman has said in effect that all promises made before January 18 no longer count, while every sign indicates the next budget will surpass any this Commonwealth has had previously.

The governor and the Democratic Party received a mandate to cut government costs which they cannot escape except by practicing the rankest kind of political fraud and chicanery.

The people will not accept astronomical demands for new taxes until the Democratic administration makes a real and sincere attempt to put into effect some of the savings they so glibly promised last year to get votes.

Unless this is done, the Democrats will be branded for all time as complete political fakers whose promises are not worth a plugged nickel.

MILES HORST, *Chairman.*

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of April 20, 1955]

LETTING THE PEOPLE DOWN

Governor Leader's record-breaking State budget and tax program are an amazing denouement to the months of controversy and speculation concerning the new administration's plans for handling Pennsylvania's financial troubles.

Well authenticated reports in the last week, of course, have indicated the governor would ask for some form of an income tax, but the full extent of his breath-taking budget and tax demands were not revealed until Tuesday afternoon.

Governor Leader's program is a disappointing one. It is more than that. Although we have been favorably impressed by Governor Leader, and have commented with some satisfaction upon his government reorganization plans and other ideas, we must say that Tuesday, he let the people of this State down!

There is not other way we could put it!

In this column, we opposed the Republican sales tax. We remarked at that time that the people of this Commonwealth were looking for economies in State government. We predicted the sales tax would be unpopular, and it is.

But, in all frankness, we must say, too, that it is as nothing compared to the broad program of heavy taxation suggested by Governor Leader Tuesday.

Last fall, Governor Leader denounced the sales tax. He refused then to say what he would do about replacing it. But, he spoke strongly about effecting State economies, cutting costs, adopting a little Hoover commission type of government bureau reorganization in order to eliminate duplication and needless work and costs.

Governor Leader, it is our conviction, was elected because the people of this Commonwealth expected him to cut the budget, and cut taxes—not raise both!

So far, almost every department of State government is showing an increase in costs.

Tuesday, the governor asked for $620 million in new taxes; the Republicans went to their political doom asking for some $425 million.

Even the highway department, normally one of the strongest financially in the State, apparently is slated for a slice of the new revenue program, for the governor calls for a 1-cent increase in gasoline taxes, and a $5 hike in passenger auto licenses.

Never before in Pennsylvania history has such a tax program been laid before a General Assembly.

The Governor asks for 1 percent on incomes, exempting the first $1,000. He asks 2 percent on professions or unincorporated business. He asks 4 percent on rents, interests, royalties; 5 percent on income from dividends; 6 percent from long-term capital gains. He raises the corporate net income tax, already the highest in the Union, from 5 to 6 percent. He increases the 14-mill tax on utilities to 24 mills. He includes natural gas under the new utility taxes. He would require banks to pay the corporate net income while repealing the tax on bank shares, and would extend the corporate tax to include savings and loan and building and loan associations and cooperative banks.

Under this program, Altoonans would pay four separate taxes on their wages or income: City, school, State, and Federal.

The Governor proposed an industrial development fund some time ago. Although it was called self-liquidating, and $20 million was asked for it, this program received favorable reaction.

But, of what effect could such a program be to bring new industry to Pennsylvania in the face of such an all-inclusive new tax program as proposed Tuesday?

In this day of record Federal taxation, business and industry are looking for States with a tax program which will permit their survival not facilitate their demise.

We had expected, and we believe the people of this State also had expected, that economy would be the dominant area of activity in the new State administration.

So far in this administration, there has been little if any evidence of a real desire to effect economies in the State government.

It may be admitted that the Leader administration has a heavy deficit to face. It may be admitted also that it is not responsible for incurring this deficit.

It is, however, responsible for telling the people this problem could be met without the annoying sales tax and for not telling them a far more annoying tax program would be substituted for it.

It is most unusual for a governor to draft a tax program and present it to a legislature. That duty customarily falls upon the lawmaking body.

It is unfortunate Governor Leader did not relinquish this tax to the legislature.

But, it is entirely probably, the legislature will not pass the program presented Tuesday.

Duck-Stamp Funds for Acquisition of Waterfowl Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter I have received from Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, and to one of the resolutions adopted by the delegates to the 19th annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation at Montreal, Canada, on March 11 to 13.

Last year, Congressman LEE METCALF and I spoke out very vehemently against the cut in the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. I voted for the amendment introduced by Congressman METCALF to restore the funds for the waterfowl program. The amendment did not pass and the reduction in funds meant that the Fish and Wildlife Service could not expand the program of acquiring new wildlife refuges, but would have to spend the monies received from the sale of duck stamps for maintaining the refuge, research, enforcement of waterfowl regulations, printing of the duck stamps, and other administrative costs.

Since Congress intended that the extra dollar assessed for the purchase of duck stamps by conservationists be used for the acquisition of wildlife refuges, I and other conservation-minded Congressmen felt that the Department of the Interior should use the additional money for this purpose.

Therefore, on January 13 of this year, I introduced H. R. 2142, one of the bills to which Mr. Callison refers in his letter of April 14. Mr. Callison's letter reads as follows:

APRIL 14, 1955.

The Honorable LESTER R. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LESTER: We appreciate your continued interest in the proposed legislation to guarantee that a fair share of the duck stamp money will be used for acquisition of waterfowl areas as originally intended.

Bills similar to your H. R. 2142, earmarking 40 percent of the receipts for acquisition, have been introduced in the House by the following: H. R. 37, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE (California); H. R. 597, CLIFTON YOUNG (Nevada); H. R. 4448, JOHN E. MOSS (California); and H. R. 5140, HENRY S. REUSS (Wisconsin).

Anything you can do to secure action on this important legislation will be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.

Resolution No. 2 adopted at the 19th annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation is as follows:

DUCK STAMP FUNDS FOR ACQUISITION OF WATERFOWL AREAS

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior has estimated some 4 million additional acres of lands suitable for waterfowl management and refuge purposes is urgently needed to complete the Federal refuge system and to assure the perpetuation of continental waterfowl resources; and

Whereas the acquisition of desirable wetlands for this purpose is lagging and the resource is gravely endangered by drainage and by other destructive factors; and

Whereas the receipts under the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act have been used largely for maintenance and operation expenses rather than for land acquisition as originally intended: Therefore be it

Resolved by the National Wildlife Federation in convention at Montreal, March 11–13, 1955, That the Members of Congress be urged to enact H. R. 37 or similar legislation to earmark at least 40 percent of the duck stamp receipts for acquisition of waterfowl areas; be it further

Resolved, That the Federation study the advisability of increasing the migratory bird hunting license (duck stamp) fee as the only practical means of securing adequate funds to complete the minimum and essential acquisition of suitable waterfowl areas.

Ship Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the costs of ship construction subsidies and ship operating subsidies payable with respect to American-flag ships in our merchant marine have been mounting so rapidly as to cause widespread concern. That concern relates both to the basis for determining the payments and the amounts of the payments.

It is generally conceded, and I firmly believe, that we must have a strong, privately owned and operated merchant marine under the American flag. Apparently, that result cannot be secured without the payment of subsidies. It is high time that we reviewed all phases of that problem and I am, therefore, glad that Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, has introduced a bill which will require that committee to make such a study.

Record Still Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Coffeyville (Kans.) Journal of April 18 entitled "Record Still Bad":

RECORD STILL BAD

While 1954 saw a slight decrease in the Nation's automobile accident toll, nearly 2 million casualties were reported.

Even with the slight improvement over the more than 2 million reported in 1953, the results are staggering.

A report shows 35,500 perosns killed and 1,960,000 injured in 1954. Excessive speed was the most dangerous driving mistake in 1954. Speed killed 12,380 people and injured more than 659,000.

Weekend crashes accounted for 13,980 killed and 678,000 hurt during 1954. Thirty-nine percent of the deaths and 35 percent of the injuries occurred on Saturdays and Sundays last year.

Three out of four auto accidents happened to passenger cars driving in clear weather on dry roads, and 78 percent of vehicles involved in fatal accidents were traveling straight ahead.

These are grim statistics. The above figures point out that accidents are heavy, even though State and community authorities have spent millions of dollars in an effort to provide safer and better roads and saner driving.

Insurance companies and other private firms are spending millions for safety education. State, county, local, and parkway police are constantly patrolling streets and highways. More and better engineered throughways are coming off the drawing boards. It appears to us that almost everyone is concerned with this needless slaughter and its accompanying waste of human and property values.

Almost everyone, that is, but the drivers.

Traffic regulations were set up as a proper guide for the handling of traffic, and need the cooperation of all drivers. The problem starts and could ideally end with the drivers. Who are the drivers?

Each one of us knows the answer to that question. It is sincerely hoped that by continually reminding drivers of safe driving through newspaper messages, television, radio, and literature that traffic accidents will be reduced in the coming years. It can be done. We are the drivers and it is up to us to see that it will be done.

Let's Keep Liberty Solvent—An Address by George E. Stringfellow, President of New Jersey Taxpayers Association, Before the Annual Conference, State DAR, at Trenton, N. J., on March 18, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of the American Revolution is an organization that has always been alert to guarding our Nation from any type of weakness. Time and again it has called for adequate military strength to protect us from the assaults of the enemy from without and vigilance against those influences from within that weaken the foundations upon which we have built.

One of these weakening influences that too often our people overlook is that which relates to our fiscal policies. Waste, extravagance, and prodigal use of our financial resources can undermine our strength and bring disaster. It was therefore appropriate that one of the character and standing of George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association and senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., should bring to the annual State conference, State Society, the Daughters of the American Revolution, at the State House Assembly Chamber, Trenton, N. J., on March 18, 1955, a message under the title "Let's Keep Liberty Solvent," which emphasizes the importance of maintaining the financial stability of our Nation.

This timely address, delivered by Mr. Stringfellow on the above occasion, is entitled to the consideration and attention of all of our citizens. It reads as follows:

LET'S KEEP LIBERTY SOLVENT

(Address by George E. Springfellow, president, New Jersey Taxpayers Association and senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the annual State conference, State society, the Daughters of the American Revolution, at the State house assembly chamber, Trenton, N. J., March 18, 1955)

Recognizing the important part which the Daughters of the American Revolution has played in defending the principles upon which our Government is founded, I consider it an honor to address you this morning.

Your organization has been in the forefront in defending the best interests of our Nation.

You have demonstrated your belief that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

With the passage of time, the requirements of vigilance have changed. In the earliest days of our Nation's history, vigilance meant that—in the manner of minute-men—we should be ready to assemble on the village green when the call to battle was sounded. Later it took us to sea to defend our Nation's commercial interests. Subsequently, we fought to preserve our Nation against inter-

nal division, and then, in two world wars, we fought for a way of life—that men might not be trammeled under the heel if dictatorship.

And now, today, we find ourselves in a great conflict of ideas. In addition to guns, the opposing forces now use the printing press, radio, and television to capture men's minds. Two philosophies are in a life and death struggle. One would make government the servant of man. The other would make man the servant of government.

If we are to emerge victorious in this titanic struggle, we must do more than claim that our system is best. We must continue to prove it. May I paraphrase the scriptural text, to say that, in the final test, it is by our works that we shall be known.

One hundred and eighty years ago, when our people were in peril, Paul Revere mounted his horse, in the dead of night and galloped, from house to house, sounding the alarm to which the minute men responded. Today we face more subtle dangers. Against these, one Paul Revere will not suffice; we must have many. They must reach us in our homes, alerting us to the dangers which our Nation faces.

In this great contest, the Kremlin is well aware of the importance to us of a strong national economy.

If our Nation spends its way to destruction,
If it saddles itself hopelessly with debt,
If it destroys incentive with taxes,
the main citadel of free government will fall easy prey to the authoritarian forces which already hold in their grip a large portion of the land surface of the globe.

This morning, I want to talk with you about the cost of government. You feel the impact of this cost in the form of taxes, for taxes are the price tag of government.

This, I believe, is a particularly appropriate subject to discuss before this audience because women control a substantial portion of the Nation's wealth. They are large stockholders in industry. At the same time, they direct the expenditure of more than 60 percent of the domestic dollar. Of necessity they have developed a strong sense of economy. The taxpayer is coming to realize that government is beset by the same forces that control costs in his own household or business. Increasingly, too, the taxpayer is coming to realize that in government, as in private affairs, ways must be found to make a dollar buy more in goods and services. A wise Frenchman has said:

"There are some sciences so lofty and serene that they leave in peace those who are not concerned with them, but finance is not one of these; it has a way of taking a terrible revenge upon nations and upon individuals who neglect or despise it."

Let us look at local government, since this is closest to us. Unless we happen to live in a large city, it is quite likely that we are personally acquainted with many of the officials. Because of this close acquaintance, we are able to subject the local official to a high degree of direct accountability. At the same time, we can assume a high degree of individual participation in government affairs. This close relationship is one of the most effective safeguards against waste and inefficiency if we will but exercise it.

Like the home, the municipality is confronted with rising costs. While this results in part from our increasing population and its dispersion outward from urban centers, it is also profoundly affected by modern invention.

Reflecting New Jersey's dynamic growth and the increasing complexities of government, operating expenditures between the close of World War II and 1954—a span of 8 years—rose approximately 124 percent for our State, 115 percent for our schools, 92 percent for our counties, and 87 percent for our municipalities.

Under this stress, there has too often developed a tendency to look to the State for financial aid. While at times this may seem justified—it is a disturbing fact that it is invariably accompanied by a deterioration of the sense of local responsibility. Why question a certain expenditure, the State is paying a large part of the load. So the argument runs. And it is a potent argument with the unthinking. But apathy and imprudent expenditure are its consequences.

It is necessary that we recognize that the State, too, has great fiscal difficulties. I call to your mind that as recently as 1946, New Jersey's State appropriations totaled $78 million. In contrast, the Governor's proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning next July indicates expenditures totaling $287 million—an increase of $209 million or 268 percent. The new budget level is more than 3½ times the 1946 appropriations.

Efforts to obtain aid from a higher level of government rarely stop at the State level. They eventuate in demands for Federal aid. Let's look at the Federal Government. Last year this greatest of all enterprises again operated at a loss. It spent $67.8 billion, which is 10 times the assessed value of all taxable property in New Jersey. While consuming approximately 22 percent of the national income in its operations, the Federal Government still turned in an astronomical $3 billion deficit. This year it will again operate at a loss. Today we hear of an increasing number of proposals for so-called Federal aid to our States and local governments—to deal with housing, highways, health and welfare, schools, libraries, air pollution, water supply—almost everything in varying amounts—totaling billions of dollars.

Let us examine the Federal Government's capacity to supply this aid. To begin with, the only place the Federal Government can get money, with which to extend Federal aid, is from you, me, and the other taxpayers. The disturbing fact is that Uncle Sam is already spending more than he is taking in—billions more—and borrowing to make up the difference. It is quite clear, that the only way he can obtain the necessary funds with which to extend more aid is to borrow. And where shall he borrow? From the people. And how shall he repay the borrowing? With money which he collects from the people—in more taxes paid by you and me and the other taxpayers throughout the Nation.

I emphasize this debt particularly because New Jersey's share is nearly 50 percent greater than the assessed value of all taxable property in the State—all of our factories, our farms, our commercial establishments, and all of our other taxable real estate. This debt is a part of the heritage of every new born babe in New Jersey.

Meantime, Uncle Sam must pay interest on his huge debt amounting to $6.5 billions annually. This year New Jersey's share of this interest is $242 million—or $164 million more than the budget of our State government in 1946 and only $45 million less than the governor's proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

For every dollar our State and local governments receive in Federal aid, we pay the Federal Government $2.19 in taxes.[1] These figures do not include the cost of Federal administration and debt service. It would also be observed that monies easily procured from the Federal Government usually result in more extravagance at the local and State levels, than would be true of monies raised and spent locally.

Once a Federal-aid program is established, it is more difficult to terminate than to expand. It grows by easy stages. As Federal grants are made, Federal controls are extended far beyond the limits intended by the framers of our Constitution.

May I suggest that we will never have better State or Federal Government than that at local levels. If we tolerate extravagance and corrupt local government, it will breed and multiply many times at higher levels.

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association, of which I have the honor to be president, supports efficiency in the collection and expenditure of public funds. It urges the "delegation of governmental functions to the lowest levels capable of fulfilling them efficiently and economically, thus insuring maximum responsiveness to the will of the people."

In the last quarter century the Federal Government has spent $258 billions more than it has taken in and, during that time, taxes have been increased in many instances to a confiscatory rate. Yet Government has either been unwilling or incompetent to bring disbursements within income. In only 3 of the last 26 years, said the senior United States Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, has the Government lived within its income.

May I quote an Americanized version of Charles Dickens' philosophy expressed more than a hundred years ago. In effect, he said that if one's annual income is $5,000 and his annual expenditures are $4,500, the result is happiness; if one's annual income is $5,000 and his annual expenditures are $5,500, the result is misery.

That continued deficit spending will produce misery for every American should be self-evident, even to the unthinking.

History bears mute testimony to the fact that liberty cannot exist in a bankrupt State. I submit that continued deficit spending will produce a bankrupt State and a bankrupt State will produce a dictator in America, as it has elsewhere. We must keep our country solvent if we are to keep liberty alive in America. Fellow citizens, lift your voices against confiscatory taxes and deficit spending, and thus strike another blow for the preservation of liberty in America.

[1] Based upon computation by the Tax Foundation, national research organization.

Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution regarding Constitution Day officially adopted by the 64th continental congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution assembled in Washington:

Whereas the changing of the name Constitution Day to Citizenship Day in the matter of observance of September 17 as the date of the signing of our Constitution minimizes the importance of this all-important document in the minds of the American people and emphasizes the citizenship idea which tends to fall into the world citizen plan of propaganda, and in order to preserve, support, and appreciate our Federal Constitution, it is essential to understand its provisions and principles: Be it

Resolved, That the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the United States Congress to restore the designation Constitution Day to the date of September 17 in order that all Americans on this anniversary may rededicate them-

selves to the basic principles of this great document; and

Resolved, That the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in every locality study and publicize the Constitution during its 168th anniversary week of September 17–23, 1955; request their mayors and governors to proclaim Constitution Week; and sponsor chapter, school, and public programs on the Constitution, especially emphasizing the primary purposes of good government as set forth in the preamble to the Constitution and the duty of citizens in our Republic to protect the Constitution and the freedoms as set forth in its Bill of Rights, so that it may continue to protect us and our posterity in "this Nation under God."

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, an informed, inteligent, and alert public has been the foundation of America's greatness. Secret governmental plans and secret international agreements have always created suspicion and, in most instances, eventual sorrow.

Wider knowledge today of the functions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the purposes of the new Organization for Trade Cooperation is most important.

The League of Women Voters has recently published two outstanding bulletins containing concise descriptions of these two international trade media. By so doing, these ladies have again rendered a valuable public service.

The international relations of the United States and our conduct in foreign trade and economic assistance matters are of paramount importance in the struggle with international communism. Extension of the Trade Agreements Act, expanded international trade, and United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation are vital parts of this effort.

I include here the following two statements by the League of Women Voters:

THE GATT AND THE OTC

Congressional interest in trade policy turned abruptly last week from H. R. 1, the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, to the proposed international Organization for Trade Cooperation. The proposal is an outgrowth of a conference recently concluded in Geneva, Switzerland, in which the United States and 33 [1] other countries participated to renegotiate the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Senator BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said he believed the committee should not act on H. R. 1 until it had a better understanding of the proposed OTC.

The functions of the OTC will be (1) to sponsor international trade negotiations and (2) to act as an intergovernmental forum for the discussion and solution of trade disputes and other problems related to international trade.

Since 1947 these functions have been carried on through a limited and temporary agreement by most of the main trading countries. This agreement is called the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

As a result of the renegotiation in Geneva, organizational features of the General Agreement have been modified and incorporated in the OTC. Remaining in the General Agreement are mainly (a) a listing of all tariff rates negotiated by the member countries and (b) a set of fair trade rules. The OTC, if approved by the United States Congress and the legislative bodies of other nations, will administer the General Agreement.

WORK OF THE GENERAL AGREEMENT

The need for a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and therefore an OTC, is based on the premise that the foreign commerce of each nation has international implications and that through international cooperation trade can be conducted on a more orderly basis than if each nation were left to make its own rules.

United States participation in the tariff negotiations under the general agreement has been based on the authority Congress delegated to the President in the Trade Agreements Act. These tariff negotiations, conducted in 1947, 1949 and 1950–51, have resulted in the stabilization of over 58,000 separate tariff rates of the participating countries. This figure represents well over 50 percent of all foreign trade in the world. The 34 countries represent 80 percent of world trade. The results of a round of negotiations are formally binding for only 3 years at most. At the end of a 3-year period, nations are free to renegotiate any tariff concessions given. The last review was in early 1955 and the negotiated tariff rates were extended until December 31, 1957. Indeed, since the first negotiation in 1947 the tariff reductions have been extended by the member countries without substantial modification.

The general agreement also specifies a set of fair-trade practices to which each member should adhere. One prohibits trade discrimination among nations. When one nation agrees to reduce a tariff or not to raise an existing tariff, this "concession" applies to all nations. This is called the "most-favored nation" principle. The general agreement has succeeded in obtaining general acceptance of this principle because when many countries negotiate at one time, each can see the value to itself of obtaining the results of concessions granted by other nations. More reductions in trade barriers also result.

An example of this was the desire of the United States to obtain from Canada a reduction in the latter's tariff on plate glass. Canada would not give the United States such a concession in an agreement between the two nations because Belgium supplied Canada with even more glass than did the United States, and if Canada gave the United States a concession, her bargaining power with respect to Belgium would be weakened. But when Canada, Belgium, and the United States negotiated at the same time, both the United States and Belgium obtained from Canada a tariff reduction on plate glass.

Another fair-trade practice recommends that nations prohibit the use of quotas because quotas constitute an absolute barrier to trade. Once the quota for the year has been filled, no additional imports are allowed. The use of quotas can undermine the reduction of tariffs gained through negotiation.

A third fair-trade practice advises against the use of government subsidies on exports in order to gain a competitive advantage in world markets. If one country uses subsidies then all other countries are placed at a disadvantage and may, in turn, also resort to subsidies, thus beginning a vicious circle.

EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULES

The general agreement makes provision for exceptions to the fair-trade rules and also allows member nations a means of settling disputes when one country has a complaint against another.

One exception permits a nation to increase tariffs when a domestic industry is seriously injured by competitive imports. The United States has made the greatest use of this exception.

A second exception permits nations to place quotas on imports when its means of payment for those imports is threatened. Of the 34 countries in the general agreement, 21 are taking advantage of this exception though the number of products affected by quotas has been drastically decreased in the last 2 years.

A third exception is that a nation in the early stage of economic development may place quotas on imports in order to establish needed industries.

Although each nation in the general agreement is pledged to nondiscrimination in trade policy, some nations have close political ties with others which involve giving them preferential treatment in trade matters. Great Britain and other members of the British Commonwealth have such a preference system. The United States and Cuba, the French Union, the Benelux Customs Union, Uruguay and Paraguay are other examples of preference systems. The general agreement has succeeded in preventing an increase in the preferential treatment received by countries in these preference systems.

Occasionally the deterioration of political relations between countries results in one's wishing to discriminate against the other in trade. In 1951, Congress called for the withdrawal of all United States trade concessions to the Soviet bloc, including Czechoslovakia, which is the only Soviet bloc country belonging to the general agreement. Since this action would have been contrary to the agreement, the United States requested and obtained a waiver of its obligations. Such a waiver requires a two-thirds vote of the member countries assembled.

Another waiver obtained by the United States just recently is one permitting the United States to place quotas or special fees on imports of agricultural commodities which the Secretary of Agriculture deems to be interfering with our price support system.

RESOLVING DISPUTES

Opinions different as to whether the General Agreement should allow so many exceptions to the rules. The general agreement, however, contains procedures for resolving complaints of one country against another. The first step is for a country to enter a complaint on the agenda of the annual meeting. An example was a United States complaint registered in October 1954 against Belgium import restrictions of United States coal. The United States and Belgium con-

[1] Members of the GATT and the OTC: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Italy, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay; also Japan on a provisional basis pending the outcome of tariff negotiations now going on in Geneva between Japan and member countries.

sulted at Geneva and the result was favorable to the United States—most of the restrictions were removed.

If the consultations do not resolve the dispute, the complaining country asks that the member countries, by a majority vote, approve retaliatory action. Such a case occurred when the United States placed quotas on imports of dairy products and The Netherlands complained that the action denied benefits to it resulting from United States concessions given under GATT negotiations. Since the quotas were placed by Congress, there was nothing the United States negotiators could do about removing the restrictions. Therefore, the member countries approved the proposed retaliatory import restrictions by the Dutch against United States wheat flour.

The working of the general agreement described above was not altered substantially at the Geneva Conference. The most important changes tightened up the exceptions on the use of quotas for balance of payments, reasons, and for economic development. Under the new agreement, any country using quotas for the above reasons must periodically justify their use and indicate that their use will be temporary.

Another significant change is that member countries must not increase the use of export subsidies on manufactured goods between now and December 31, 1957. At that time consultations will take place on the extent to which existing subsidies can be removed. On primary products (agricultural and other raw materials) the subsidy provision should not permit a country using subsidies to gain more than its fair share of the market.

The general agreement and the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation are designed to expand world trade on an orderly basis. In a few weeks a measure will be introduced into Congress authorizing United States membership in the OTC.

PROPOSAL FOR WORLD TRADE COOPERATION

The Organization for Trade Cooperation is a new proposal to enable nations to work together on problems of world trade. The OTC's main function will be to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a basic and comprehensive trade agreement among the United States and 33 other countries.

The OTC was formulated in Geneva, Switzerland, at a conference ending in March 1955, in which the United States and the 33 other nations participated. The OTC would come into being upon approval by those (of the 34) nations which account for 85 percent of the foreign trade of the GATT nations.

The OTC is made up of an assembly, an executive committee, and a secretariat.

The assembly would meet once a year and each of the 34 nations would have 1 vote.

The executive committee would be made up of representatives from 17 nations. The 5 nations of chief economic importance would be included automatically among the 17; the United States would obviously be 1 of the 5. In addition, the composition of the executive committee would include nations from different geographic areas and in different degrees of economic development. The executive committee would operate according to powers and duties assigned to it by the assembly, and decisions would be made by a majority of two-thirds of the votes cast.

The secretariat would be headed by a director general appointed by the assembly. He would have the power to appoint the staff and determine their duties and conditions of service in accordance with regulations approved by the assembly.

MODEST COST

The OTC would operate on a moderate budget. It would not be substantially greater than the budget which has enabled members of the GATT to meet annually and conduct their business. Each nation's share of the budget would be determined, basically, in proportion to that nation's share of the foreign trade of the nations in the GATT. At the present time the United States contributes 17 percent of the budget of GATT or about $60,000. This is a slightly lower percentage than the United States share in the world trade of the GATT nations.

The purpose of the OTC would be to provide a forum for the business of the member nations in the GATT. Functions would include discussion of trade disputes among nations, sponsoring trade negotiations, and reviewing various proposals by which the trade barriers of individual nations might be reduced.

The proposed international organization would have no authority to veto the acts of individual governments or to impose new obligations on them without their consent. It would have authority only to consider problems, to recommend courses of action, and to determine whether individual countries had been hurt by the action of others in trade matters. Functions and authority of the OTC would be substantially unchanged from the manner in which the GATT has been carried out since its beginning in 1947. The main difference would be a greater degree of coordination and continuity in the work of the general agreement.

Any nation which is a member of GATT would become a member of the OTC. A nation may be admitted to the GATT by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the member nations. The new nation would also be required to enter into trade negotiations with other GATT nations.

The OTC, once established, may "by an agreement approved by the Assembly, be brought into relationship with the United Nations, as one of the specialized agencies * * *." Such an agreement would require the approval of the U. N. General Assembly.

President Eisenhower is expected to ask Congress to approve United States membership in the OTC. A bill to this effect will soon be introduced in the Congress. Rather than either accepting or rejecting the OTC as proposed, the Congress may place certain conditions on United States membership. If these conditions basically alter the character of the OTC, the proposal would then have to be renegotiated. If other countries were unwilling to accept the United States conditions, then the new organization would not come into being.

As stated above, approval by nations accounting for 85 percent of the foreign trade of the GATT nations is necessary if the OTC is to be accepted. The United States accounts for 20 percent of this foreign trade. United States participation, therefore, is vital.

The Public Interest Is Not Served by Secrecy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat of March 29, 1955, on the subject of secrecy in Government.

The editorial points out the repercussions following publication of the Yalta papers. The proceedings at Yalta were kept secret. Historic decisions were made, many of them responsible for the tension existing in parts of the world today.

It was President Wilson who advocated open covenants openly arrived at. We should adhere to that philosophy. The records of meetings should be opened to public view within a reasonable length of time. If mistakes were made the people should know what they were and who was responsible in order to be able to reconsider before it is too late.

At a time when this issue is generating considerable controversy I respectfully call your attention to the following expression of interest by a newspaper serving an important area of the First Congressional District of California:

AT YALTA OR SANTA ROSA, SECRECY HURTS PUBLIC

This may be reaching pretty high to prove a point, but your Press Democrat would like to call your attention to the worldwide uproar resulting from publication of the American version of what went on at the Yalta Conference between Joseph Stalin, Winston Churchill, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

This secret meeting probably was one of the most fateful things that has happened to date in the troubled history of this world. Three individuals, speaking for three great world powers, met for the purpose of deciding how to carve up and redistribute vast portions of the civilized world. The United States, Great Britain, and Russia at the time were allies in a major war involving the Big Three and some minor allies on one side, and Germany and Italy on the other side.

Two of the Big Three, Britain and the United States, were allied with Australia, New Zealand and some minor powers in another major war with Japan. In both wars, some of the allies were minor only because the enemy had already conquered them. France, a major power, was occupied by the German forces. The Philippines were occupied by Japan.

Meeting in secrecy, with only their handpicked advisers present, Mr. Stalin, Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Churchill proceeded to reshuffle the world.

The official American version, just released, is that Mr. Roosevelt promised to give Russia lands held by Japan and China in return for Russia eventually declaring war on Japan. At the time, Mr. Roosevelt knew that the atomic bomb was nearly perfected and Russian help was not essential to the defeat of Japan.

There was tentative agreement to split Germany into 5 or 6 unimportant small countries. There was discussion of freezing France out of any important postwar settlement.

At least, that's what the American notes, now made public, claim.

Mr. Churchill, the only surviving member of the Big Three, has not given details but he says that the American version is not correct.

Now, what we would like you to consider is this:

Using hindsight, the decisions reached are now known to have been very good for Russia and very poor for the United States. Some of them were modified later at another secret meeting which still remains a secret. But the things Russia obtained in the Orient now threaten the safety of the United States.

Was it better that the Yalta meeting was held in secret, or would America have been in less danger today if it had been public, so that the public could learn of, and object to, the historic mistakes that were made?

And how about Churchill's claim that the American version is incorrect?

Is what we are now being told the shocking truth, or is the true picture something different?

Our point is that secrecy in Government, whether it be in a local school board or at the highest international level, is not in the public interest.

The World Challenges American Educators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address delivered by Mrs. Dorothy Houghton, Deputy Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, before the spring conference of the Education Association of the District of Columbia on Saturday, March 10, 1955.

Mrs. Houghton's address was eloquent, inspiring, and informative. I take this opportunity to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress:

THE WORLD CHALLENGES AMERICAN EDUCATORS

(Address by Mrs. Dorothy Houghton before the spring conferenee of the Education Association of the District of Columbia, Saturday, March 10, 1955)

Technical cooperation with the less well-developed nations of the world is a major phase of United States foreign policy, as an expression of the humanitarian interest and good will of the American people, and because the ultimate benefits to this country justify United States assistanee on the basis of its contribution to our national interest and security. Our programs of technical assistance are designed to help build and stabilize within the world the kind of nations and peoples with whom we can live in peace and who in time of need will place their human and natural resources on our side. Through these programs we are waging a relentless war against ignorance, poverty, hunger, and disease.

Technical cooperation has many facets, such as the improvement of health, agriculture, industry, or education, but all of them to be fully effective involve educational processes. Only by helping the less-developed nations to increase their own ability to do the job for themselves and by themselves can any lasting improvements be made. In this, education has a key role to play.

American education and technical skill have become a major export item amounting to more than a hundred million dollars a year. This is fast becoming an influential factor in American foreign policy. The Foreign Operations Administration alone has more than 1,700 United States educators and technicians at work in nearly 60 countries to help foreign peoples better their economic conditions and way of life. Forty-three American universities have contracted with foreign universities and governments, with the help of FOA, to bring American skills, methods, and techniques into the educational systems of 29 countries, and already have members of their staffs overseas conducting advisory and extension services under 61 contracts.

Never before has such an opportunity and challenge come to any nation. Never have so many nations come to any nation and pleaded "come over and help us. Send us your greatest scholars and your most skilled scientists and share your knowledge and skills with us. Train our teachers and our doctors, our agriculturists and our administrators in your methods and techniques. We will open to you our schools and all our other facilities. We will pay our share of the costs in our own currencies whether it is double or treble your dollar costs. Don't delay. Time is running against us."

That is the challenge that FOA has accepted on behalf of our people. The challenge is a fitting tribute to you as educators and to your predecessors who in years past have labored at scant pay and often with slight public recognition to develop a system of education to meet the everyday needs of our people. Today in countries where once the professor taught only the sons of the elite your American colleagues are striving to establish a functional concept of education geared to meet the needs of people who have burst the shackles of economic serfdom to gain their rightful place as free citizens of the modern world.

The problems of the developing nations of the world today are so immense that the efforts of the United Nations and FOA can contribute only a fraction of what is required in their solution. Needed also is the understanding and selfless work of private groups, such as yours.

You perhaps know of the increasing use being made of American universities in providing technical assistance to foreign institutions and governments. Individual faculty members have been borrowed from universities, and have served as staff members of FOA missions overseas. During the past year, FOA has been emphasizing an entirely new approach whereby United States educational institutions undertake major projects overseas, sending their faculty members abroad, while faculty and administration on the home campus provide technical and administrative supporting functions.

The provision of United States assistance in raising the teaching, research, and extension standards of a foreign university can usually be done best by an education institution in this country, which has take generations to reach its present level of efficiency in just those fields. The American school can attack the problem as a well-integrated team, with faculty on the home campus rendering much-needed professional advice, as well as undertaking the training of selected members of the staff of the foreign partner. Outstanding members of university faculties are often willing to serve their own university overseas, when they might not be interested in taking leave from their universities to serve as direct Government employees.

Technical-assistance programs are not giveaway programs. They are not imposed upon any country or people, nor are they designed to create an unhealthy dependence upon us. These are cooperative programs requested by the other governments and their people. In support of these programs the 39 independent countries and 20 dependent territories with which we carry out cooperative programs of technical assistance are spending the equivalent of at least $2 to every $1 we spend.

In the past, improvements were imposed by conquerors and built with slave labor or were given as a largesse from a ruler to his subject people. The people themselves had no real part or cooperative interest in the improvements. The American technician in the field is well aware of this, and knows that what he imposes upon his neighbor won't last. He knows, too, that giving these people something beyond their ability to maintain and operate is equally foolish. The guiding principle of all the technical-cooperation programs is aided-self-help. Nothing will remain unless the country participates of its own free will and accord; unless its people invest their time, their own effort, and their money in the projects, too.

The basic philosophy in which we are engaged and which we pray may be extended even beyond the present free areas, even beyond the Iron Curtain, was expressed by the President in his address to the American Association of Newspaper Publishers. The philosophy that was expressed in that address is the basic philosophy which we are carrying on. He said, in part: "We are prepared to reaffirm, with the most concrete evidence, our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous. This Government," he continued, "is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom. The monuments to this new kind of war would be these: roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health. We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of the world."

In the free world—those nations specifically alined by treaty or agreement between ourselves or our immediate allies—there are approximately 550 million people. In the Communist orbit there are 850 million people, comprising one-third of the world's population in one-fourth of the world's land surface. In between there are approximately 1 billion neutrals.

The fellah of the Middle East, the peon of Latin America, the coolie of the Far East are gradually awakening to the fact that things can be different. There are nearly 1 billion people in these areas of the world, a great proportion of them poor and continually hungry. Eight out of ten never learn to read or write. Two out of three are chronically sick with preventable diseases that sap their strength and productive power. The fellah, the peon, and the coolie now know that this does not have to remain true.

We cannot ignore the fact that these billion people in underdeveloped regions are important to us for a variety of reasons. For example, they produce all of the natural rubber we need. They produce 85 percent of our manganese, 77 percent of our tin, and 80 percent of our antimony. Out of the total volume of strategic materials we need, 73 percent comes from the product of their labor.

It may be too easy for us in the United States to blame the turmoil in the Middle East and South Asia solely upon the menacing expansion of Communist totalitarianism. It would be unrealistic to ignore the Communist part in magnifying the trouble in Iran, Indochina, Indonesia, and elsewhere. We must recognize, however, that the problem is not just a creation of Communist totalitarianism but is exploited by it. Communism directs a major portion of its effort toward the underdeveloped countries. Today these countries realize that they must modernize. The question is how—by taking the Communist path, or by modernizing with western aid and friendship. The choice these peoples make will probably determine whether Communist totalitarianism or the democratic way of life eventually acquires throughout the world a preponderance of economic, political, and defensive power.

Should communism succeed in bringing most of the underdeveloped countries under its yoke, the effect upon the free world will be disastrous. Political freedom, individual dignity, and liberty will suffer a staggering blow. Our concern, therefore, for economic and social progress in the underdeveloped areas of the world is also a concern that the distinctive human values of the United States and western civilization shall remain alive in the world.

The primary purpose of such a program is to teach those who, in turn, will teach others new and better methods of instruction, to develop curriculum and materials for classroom use, and to advise ministries of education in the broad principles of educational administration. Special emphasis has been given to literacy campaigns and community development so as to lift the economic, health, educational, and social structure at the village of grassroots level.

For example, the social and economic ferment in Iran has required a coordinated attack on ignorance, ill health, disease, and poverty. The FOA mission in Iran has mobilized its technical and economic aid resources to assist the Government to provide types of services and institutions needed in this crisis, training personnel to carry them on, and stimulating local communities and private enterprise to use their own resources in meeting the problems of the country. The FOA education program has resulted in adoption of a revised and more practical curriculum for the entire educational system of Iran and an extraordinary expansion and improvement of the schooling available in the rural villages where 80 percent of the people live. The training of teachers for agriculture, trade and vocations, homemaking, recreation, and health is carried out with FOA help. Approximately 8,000 rural and urban teachers from every part of the country have already been trained, including 3,748 from villages and remote tribes who came by donkey, camel, boat, and bus to regional training centers set up by FOA for inservice summer sessions taught by selected village teachers trained at Teheran the previous summer. Major emphasis is placed on gearing the educational program to the needs of the pupils in each particular village, and stimulating the teachers to create their own teaching materials out of what might be found in the village.

One of the most dramatic and unique phases of the FOA education program in Iran is its pioneering development of schooling for the approximately 200,000 people still living in nomadic tribes. There are now over 100 schools operating among these tribes, with an enrollment of more than 1,000 boys and girls. One hundred and five teachers, selected (and paid) by the tribal leaders, were given intensive training under FOA auspices at Shiraz in the summer of 1953, and the program was inaugurated last winter. By March, 73 schools had been supplied with a school tent, portable lap desks, a few books, and simple equipment such as easel blackboards; 44 more were to receive their tents and supplies and begin operation by last June.

In Khorassan, one of the most isolated provinces of Iran, an adaptation of the American Chautauqua idea has been utilized to bring fundamental education to thousands of people during the past 6 months. Moving from one remote village to another, a team of FOA-trained Iranians equipped with motion pictures, slide projectors, and simple demonstration equipment, presented a 6-day course for adults including some rudiments of education in health, sanitation, and agriculture, drawing an attendance of up to 1,000 persons a day. Men and women walked many miles to attend the sessions. In some of these classes, turbaned Turkomen from the high steppes patiently learned infant care, so that they could take the information back to their wives and daughters.

One thousand five hundred and sixty Iranian students, teachers, principals, and supervisors have participated directly in arts and crafts lessons given by the FOA specialist and her Iranian counterpart during recent months. A film strip on arts and crafts is being produced by the Syracuse Film Group, using photographs and drawings made by Iranian students and the FOA arts and crafts specialists. She also prepared Iran's first textbook in the field, a "Creative Art Teaching Manual," designed to assist teachers and students to think creatively.

In Lebanon, one of the educational activities of FOA has stimulated production of a series of health-education pamphlets of great value to the entire Arab world. During the summer vacation in 1953, Lebanese public and private schoolteachers from all over the country attended a special seminar and workshop on school health, whose objective was to instruct the Lebanese teachers in this field and to develop teaching materials in the Arabic language. Up to this time, the subject of health had never been introduced into the Lebanese curriculum, nor in the entire Near East were there any teaching materials available on this subject.

The conference was eminently successful. The materials produced by the teachers during the summer were utilized by the Lebanese staff who conducted the workshop in turning out a series of school health pamphlets for the use of children and teachers. These 50 teachers have, in turn, provided training in the same field for the other teachers in Lebanon. As a result of this workshop, the subject of school health was recognized in Lebanon for the first time, and a professor was employed at the National Teacher Training College to teach this subject.

Last fall at the opening of school the Lebanese workshop staff and some of the teachers trained in the workshop conducted a series of 2-day institutes and workshops on the subject of school health for the teachers in each small area. To provide intensive and more individual instruction, each workshop was kept small, and an average of almost one conference a week on the subject of school health was held during the winter months. The reaction to these conferences was heartening. For most of the Lebanese teachers, it was the first opportunity to get together on a professional basis to discuss their common problems and to cooperate in developing their teaching methods and techniques is a particular field.

Lebanon has no natural resources in terms of agriculture or minerals; her greatest resource is her people. If Lebanon is to make full use of this resource, the education staff of the Lebanon mission and the mission's public health staff, together with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health, must cooperate as they have done in creating a recognition of the importance of health and in developing proper health habits and attitudes through adult education and the school system. This project illustrates a fundamental approach to a basic problem in which the United States and the Lebanon Government have worked together to provide the basic training required to develop a healthy and productive country.

In Ethiopia, there is a critical shortage of trained teachers. There are only about 1,200 teachers in the entire country—less than 1 for every 12,000 persons. Of these, 800 had less than 4 years of formal education and only 17 had completed high school. The problem is further complicated by the large number of spoken languages and a scarcity of reading material in these different tongues.

Under joint programs with the United States, substantial progress has been made in Ethiopia's educational system. All Ethiopian teachers attend intensive teacher-training courses designed to accomplish in one summer the equivalent of a year's regular study, thus raising the educational level of the teaching staff and the quality of teaching throughout the country. New curricula and techniques have been installed to solve the language problem. Instruction in English has been improved and expanded and new materials are being developed in Amharic. Teacher salaries have been standardized, teacher training expanded, and a system of orderly promotions established.

Today there are 5 high schools in Ethiopia, operated under the guidance of Oklahoma A. & M. College on an FOA contract. United States specialists in education have been working with Ethiopian representatives on plans to establish 8 additional secondary schools within the next year. The number graduating from high school each year has been tripled as a direct result of the FOA program.

Probably the most distinctive contribution of the FOA program to Ethiopian education is the preparation of the first school textbook ever devoted to the geography of Ethiopia. Written for use at third grade level by a FOA geography adviser, it was accepted by the ministry of education and distributed to 100 schools during the last week of May 1954. This preliminary edition is in 4 parts, a text in Amharic for use by the students, the same text in English, and guides to the text in Amharic and in English for the teachers. After an initial period of trial in the 150 schools, and possible revision based on that experience, the book is to be printed by the Ministry of Education.

In the war-devastated areas of Korea our own GI's have not waited for their Government to act but, with their own hands and money, have begun to rebuild the village schools. These sons of ours have made contributions of several million dollars. Senator THYE reported to Congress that he saw them on a blustery December day laying up the stone masonry of new school buildings. It was their own peaceful contribution to a free world—of greater importance over the course of the years than the winning of a battle in war.

To finance these programs costs each citizen of the United States less than 8 cents a year. The expenditures of the other countries amount, in many instances, to much more than twice the United States contribution. In the fiscal year 1954 only 2 percent of FOA's appropriation was spent on programs of technical assistance. This year 5 percent or approximately $116,500,000 is going into those programs.

As you are well aware, technical assistance is only one of the ways in which we are meeting our international problems. The mutual defense assistance program is another phase of the FOA program. While we are not in the business of arming the whole world, we do supply friendly nations those weapons, equipment, and other items which they need to meet an agreed level of effective defense, but which they are unable to make, buy, or otherwise obtain for themselves. In most cases the other countries do most of the work; we supply the missing links.

Another way of protecting our interests and of attaining our foreign policy objectives is by means of our programs of economic aid for defense, for development, and to meet emergency situations. Such aid was used, for instance, a year ago to keep Iran from going bankrupt and possibly into Communist hands. Considering the strategic location and oil reserves of Iran, such an investment of United States funds can well be considered a good bargain. More recently such aid has been used in Bolivia, in Guatemala, and now in Indochina, especially in connection with the resettlement of half a

million refugees from communism in North Vietnam.

The concept of the mutual-security program changes somewhat from year to year, reflecting changed conditions in world affairs. For instance, massive economic aid to Europe now appears to be a thing of the past. In our program this year no such aid was requested or will be allocated to Europe except for a few special cases, such as Spain, Yugoslavia, and Greece, and in these instances only to enable those countries to support a defense level which would be beyond their normal capacities. Total appropriations of new funds for the mutual-security program are down from $6 billion in fiscal year 1953 to $2.8 billion for fiscal year 1955. This reduction is the result of (a) an enormously improved economic position worldwide; (b) the substantial completion of the initial period of vast and rapid military buildup; and (c) the establishment of a pace in international military affairs which can, if necessary, be sustained for years.

We cannot, nor do we seek to buy the minds of men, but we are firmly convinced that through the Foreign Operations Administration's programs we can develop the understanding and promote the economic development which will permit the underdeveloped nations of the world to move forward and take their place as true partners and friends in the world community.

It is not enough to share our knowledge and our skills; it is not enough to teach others how to use new machines and industrial methods. As educators, you will understand that we must share ourselves—our ideals, our beliefs—recognizing others as our equals and cherishing them as our friends. Whenever an American goes overseas under an FOA-sponsored program, he will be working with a local national counterpart. The American will stay for a very brief 2 years, but he must leave within the person of his counterpart and all whom he may reach that spirit which is the dynamic for all he attempts. It is an exacting test to apply, but unless he has left a trusted and trusting friend he has failed in his mission. Not all can meet such a challenge. Perhaps the world is asking too much of us, but the opportunity is ours to build new frontiers of understanding and peace.

Willow Run Not Proper Base for Jet Plane Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of April 18, 1955:

WILLOW RUN NOT PROPER BASE FOR JET PLANE OPERATIONS

If the Air Force stands by its tentative decision to move jet planes to Willow Run, the action will indicate a great disregard for a few economic fundamentals and for the pocketbooks of taxpayers in general. How Air Force officials ever arrived at the decision to send the jets is rather mysterious in view of the very strong arguments that can be marshaled against it.

No doubt they have had to provide themselves with mental blinders in most discussions of jet operations. Nobody anywhere seems to want a jet base nearby. And seldom was a greater squawk raised than that over setting up a jet base in northern Michigan last fall. But there are certain salient facts about the Willow Run operations that they seem unwilling to face.

Their intended action first became known when they turned down a University of Michigan request for use of a hangar which they owned at Willow Run. The university is carrying on an extensive secret research program for the Government and needs room for expansion. The Air Force didn't reply for some months, and only recently refused the request on the grounds of the jets' coming in July.

Since then, in face of growing protests from Washtenaw County officials and citizens, the Air Force has stood its ground. While no definite decision has been reached on the matter, say Air Force officials, the planes will be based at Willow Run as announced earlier, unless more factors are brought into the picture.

In selecting Willow Run as a jet base, they passed over nearby Wayne Major Airport which is already equipped to handle military aircraft—to the tune of $3 million in installations, in fact. The Michigan Air National Guard and two commercial airlines are the lonely users of the Wayne field now, while Willow Run's 9 commercial airlines handle a busy schedule of 320 regular flights per day.

But Wayne Major doesn't want the jets either. Leroy C. Smith, Wayne County road commissioner, wants Willow Run's nine commercial airlines, instead. He has made overtures to the separate airlines, and has called a May meeting to discuss the switch. Navy and Marine aircraft, pressed for space at Grosse Ile, were recently denied the use of Wayne Major facilities by Smith on the grounds that there would be no room for them when the airlines moved from Willow Run.

Wayne's blandishments have found a cold reception among the nine airlines. The negligible differential in driving time to the Wayne terminal from Detroit is not sufficient to offset the huge costs the move would incur. Representative GEORGE MEADER, of Ann Arbor, Second District Republican Congressman, on the floor of the House of Representatives this week estimated that the cost of preparing the Wayne Major Airport would be $20 million to $30 million, a sum that would have to be provided by Wayne County taxpayers and the Federal Government.

Willow Run, on the other hand, handles the sixth largest passenger volume among the Nation's airports at a negligible cost to the taxpayer.

While the airlines would not ordinarily be receptive to Wayne County's invitation, they are apprehensive about the jets. Jet operations constitute a hazard for ordinary air traffic, and they would hesitate to jeopardize their passengers' safety.

The disastrous effects of basing jets at Willow Run would probably not end with a mass migration of the airlines, if they decided to move. Observers also feel that the operations could hamper development of the proposed 1,100-home West Willow subdivision immediately west of the airport, as well as the multi-million-dollar redevelopment project planned for Willow Run proper. The two Government financing agencies, the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, have definite restrictions covering housing loans on land near jet and military aircraft installations.

All of these reverberating results can be forestalled if the Air Force follows the logical procedure of basing its plans at an airport that can easily accommodate them—Wayne Major.

For the Air Force to sabotage an extremely satisfactory arrangement between the university and the airlines at Willow Run, at great cost to the citizens of Michigan, would be economic folly. Surely they will be too sensible to let such a thing happen.

UNESCO and American Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the fight against illiteracy, ignorance, and intolerance, which has been one of the driving forces of American history, is today being carried forward throughout the world by UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. What UNESCO's activities mean to Americans is outlined in an article by Mr. John D. Connors, director of education for the AFL, which I include under unanimous consent:

UNESCO AND AMERICAN WORKERS

(By John D. Connors, director of education, A. F. of L.)

Of vital importance to American citizens—and particularly to American workers—is UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. UNESCO, one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, works to carry out the primary purposes of the parent body, the establishment and the protection of world peace.

UNESCO works toward this goal by promoting cooperation among the nations through education, science, and culture. Its purpose, thus, is of importance to all peace-loving people. Because it works to promote peace—and does this through fighting illiteracy, ignorance, and intolerance—UNESCO is particularly important to American workers who have fought these enemies for decades through the American Federation of Labor.

By encouraging education in reading and writing, in scientific and in vocational skills, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is helping to raise the living standards of all people. This necessarily will tend to raise the standards of living of American workers as well as of all other segments of our national community.

One of the greatest contributions of UNESCO, through education, is the blows that it deals the international Communist conspiracy. In some parts of Asia and Africa, Soviet agents and local Communists carry on, with some success, campaigns of propaganda based on lies, half-truths and distortions. Facts, through education, stop this Red technique in its tracks. Facts about the free way of life, its culture, its ideals, and its material progress provide the Asian and the African with a valid basis of judgment. Perhaps this explains why Communist Russia boycotted UNESCO for so long and forbade its satellites to become or to remain members.

Only at the recent general conference of UNESCO held at Montevideo, Uruguay, where this writer had the honor to serve as labor adviser to the United States delegation upon recommendation of President Meany, did Communist Russia exercise its right to UNESCO membership as a member of the United Nations. This late coming was, of course, merely a part of the friendly face which the Communists use from time to time when they hope to serve their own

purposes thereby. This action fits in with their current peace crusade, which is fraudulent and designed to lull the free world into inaction.

At Montevideo the Soviets led their usual drive to force the seating of Chinese Communists as the representatives of China. This move was defeated, 41 to 6. Similar attempts to admit the Soviet puppet governments of Rumania and Bulgaria were likewise defeated.

Underlining the democratic nature of UNESCO, the Montevideo conference amended the UNESCO constitution, 49 to 9, to prohibit the executive board from initiating activities beyond policy directives passed by the general conference itself. Policy authority was thus kept firmly in the hands of the general representatives.

One of the most important activities of UNESCO is its battle against illiteracy. The American concepts of liberty, due process, freedom of speech, protection against involuntary servitude, democracy and the like have little meaning for a man who cannot read. Self-government, so important to us, has little reality for a person who has neither experienced nor studied about it. Therefore, in its basic aim, mass education, UNESCO is contributing to the cause of freedom.

UNESCO by its constitution is an international agency. It does not operate as a supra-national organization. Rather it acts by, through and for sovereign independent nations. Its facilities and aid are extended only on request of a national state, and then only as that state requests. UNESCO's constitution provides as follows:

"With a view to promoting the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the member nations, the organization is prohibited from interfering in matters which are essentially within a nation's jurisdiction."

That this proscription is honored by the director-general and the 200-person secretariat of UNESCO gives the lie to the isolationists' charge that UNESCO is attempting to dominate the American or any other school system.

Since its establishment in November 1945 at a meeting of allied ministers of education in London, UNESCO has grown in membership and activities. As one of the founding nations, the United States has given UNESCO close support. There are now 73 member states. These determine policy questions and approve the program and budget at general conferences every 2 years.

Between conferences this world educational organization is governed by an executive board meeting several times each year. Day-to-day operations are carried on, from UNESCO's Paris headquarters and in the field, by the permanent staff (the secretariat) under the direction of a director-general. The present director-general is an American, Luther Evans, the former head of the Library of Congress.

The United States National Commission for UNESCO was established by Congress in 1946. Sixty of the 100 members, all appointed by the Secretary of State, are nominated by national voluntary organizations. As one of these organizations, the American Federation of Labor has been represented on the national commission from its inception. The writer is the present representative and is a member of the executive committee.

The United States national commission was set up, as were similar national commissions in other member countries, to advise the Government on the kinds of projects it believes that UNESCO should undertake, to cooperate with UNESCO's activities and to provide information to our citizens about this important agency of the United Nations.

This support of UNESCO by our Government and the A. F. of L. is based not only on the high aims of UNESCO but also on its solid achievements and its proposed future program.

Primary among the UNESCO activities in which the American labor movement is interested is the holding of international seminars for specialists in labor education, such as those held in recent years at the Chateau de la Breviere, not far from Paris. Here during one summer session, for example, some dozen American trade unionists met with their counterparts from other countries to exchange ideas, techniques, and information.

In the UNESCO exchange-of-persons program last summer, a group of American trade unionists toured Europe studying labor organizations, working conditions, etc., in several countries. Plans are now underway for the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees to charter a plane to take a group of its members on a similar 4-week study tour of 6 countries this year.

These activities serve a double purpose: first, to enable workers in other countries to learn firsthand from Americans about our economic life; and, second, to enable our own workers in turn to learn from trade unionists of other countries more about their ways of life and work. This mutual give-and-take is of vast benefit in pointing up the economic problems faced by all workers and how they are solved through free, democratic trade unions.

America's labor movement also supports the UNESCO clearinghouse for educational, scientific, and cultural information; the seminars of experts on the problems of education for women, evaluation of textbooks and television, and the special problems of arid zones; the missions of specialists assisting member states, who request it, in the improvement of their educational systems; the efforts to establish free public libraries more widely; and the many other widespread activities of UNESCO. Among the more important projects is the positive encouragement of the free exchange of information among the nations of the world.

Its accomplishments, too numerous to detail here, have won for UNESCO the praise of American labor and our Government. Warm endorsement has come, also, from the leaders of all major religious groups in the United States.

If the past achievements of UNESCO are noteworthy, its current program is also impressive. The 1955–56 program, adopted in Montevideo, includes an expanded program of technical assistance in the form of exchange among nations of those skills, techniques, and factual information which will assist mutual economic development.

Scientific and technical document centers will be completed in Mexico, Egypt, India, and Yugoslavia. Primary and secondary education programs will be carried on in 19 countries. With the direct aim of teaching skills required for a higher living standard, fundamental education programs will be conducted in 9 countries, while 8 will receive help in technical education projects.

As in the past, the training of adults and children, the education of teachers, the attack on illiteracy, the training of scientists, the support of research, the reproduction and the translation of the great literature of all countries, of the great works of art—all of these and other projects will continue.

What does all this cost us, as taxpayers? About 3 cents per person per year. Even from the standpoint of self-interest alone, the benefits to Americans in terms of increased world productivity, accelerated international trade, and increased understanding make this a very good investment in peace and security.

It is to be hoped that, as literacy increases, the workers in the economically underdeveloped nations will learn how far superior the lot of the workers in the democratic countries is to their own.

This could well lead to the organization of strong and free trade unions which would advance labor's economic well-being and thus expand the economies of their countries.

As President George Meany stated in his New Year's message in summarizing the program of 1955 for American labor:

"Our first concern must be for the preservation of peace. That goal can be accomplished by strengthening our national defense, by reinforcing our alliance with the free nations of the world, by participating with them in effective programs for broadening international trade and economic growth and by joint resistance against any further appeasement of the Soviet conspiracy."

There can be no doubt that the programs of UNESCO will serve to assist the free world in accomplishing its goal of preserving the peace.

Since much of the bad feeling, suspicion and distrust between peoples is based on ignorance, which evil leaders can turn to their selfish advantage, the work of international education can make a concrete contribution to peace. As the people of the earth learn more generally, they will learn more about the Soviet slave empire and be able to see through its disguise as a reform movement. They will learn—particularly those in Asia and Africa who have had little if any experience in democracy—that the oppressed have the most to gain through freedom; that they would lose even the little they now have through Communist tyranny.

The United Nations and its educational, scientific, and cultural organization, UNESCO, are in the forefront of the international struggle for freedom and peace. UNESCO is helping the workers in many countries in their struggle for bread and peace.

In the preamble to the constitution of UNESCO is a phrase which is almost an axiom:

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

Editorial Comment on the Tariff Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the April 5 issue of the Eureka (Calif.) Humboldt Standard.

I, personally, am very appreciative of the comments in this editorial on the problem of tariffs and trade. Such a constructive analysis is heartening, especially in view of the constant published criticism which would infer that Congress is opposed to world trade.

I know it is not the intent of Congress to restrict trade. We are fully aware that trade between nations of the world is good for all concerned. But certain checks are necessary or else the high standard of living attained by the American people—through their own efforts and enterprise—would surely be

jeopardized if America were made a dumping ground for surplus foreign production.

The wide variance between American workers' standards and those of other countries should never be lost sight of in formulating trade agreements. Too often this has been ignored, or minimized, by those who would substitute international politics for sound economic reasoning in negotiating tariff concessions.

Congress should have the right of veto over proposed tariff negotiations, in a like manner accorded Presidential reorganization plans.

I am pleased to include the views on this subject expressed, as follows, by one of the leading newspapers in the First Congressional District of California:

SCUDDER ON TARIFF RATES

In the news from Congress these days there is a good deal of comment relative to GATT, a term which is somewhat reminiscent of the alphabetical maze associated with the advent and course of the New Deal, which coined so many such references to identify the myriad agencies that sprang up during that period.

GATT, by way of information, means General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The agency itself was set up about 7 years ago, representing an agreement among some 33 nations (including the United States) as a sort of temporary tariff truce, devised as a method of promoting exchange among these nations during the period of postwar readjustment. Recently, the State and foreign departments of the participating nations agreed at Geneva, Switzerland, to put the arrangement on a more permanent basis.

This new agreement, however, has had the result of stirring up a controversy between the administration and Congress over its provisions, its proposed duration and various other factors. Basically, what it boils down to is a battle over the question of whether Congress or the administration in power shall control tariff levies. The significance of the current controversy and the importance of the issue are indicated by the fact that, according to veteran observers, the debate now raging in Congress is the hottest since 1929, when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was adopted to set up a protective wall around depression-struck American industry.

Further reducing the dispute to its basic elements, the issue is that which has been debated for a great many years—protective tariff versus relatively free trade. And, for that matter, this is an issue which doubtless never will be finally settled, in view of the opposing political philosophies involved representing, largely, partisan views.

At any rate, however, Congressman HUBERT B. SCUDDER, representing our own First California Congressional District, voiced some significant and timely comment on the entire tariff situation, including GATT, in remarks made recently in the House of Representatives. Mr. SCUDDER prefaced his remarks by the declaration that tariff rate negotiations should not be made a pawn or bargaining point in international politics but, rather, should be based solely upon economic conditions existing in the countries involved and should be equitable from the standpoint of the importing country and our American economy. And this, certainly, is a point of view that makes extremely good sense.

Mr. SCUDDER pointed out, among other things, that the United States has been a consistent leader in reducing tariff rates to a point where, at the present time, our tariff rates are among the lowest in the world, 5.1 percent on the average. By contrast, 37 other countries maintain higher tariff rates. For example, the United Kingdom imposes a tariff schedule amounting to 25.6 percent on the average, including revenue duties and, in addition, imposes strict quotas, license requirements, dollar control and favors empire countries with low rates. France has an average tariff rate of 10.6 percent, Mexico 20.6 percent and Japan as high as 50 percent on some items.

Again, Mr. SCUDDER points out that the answer to the trade problem does not lie in the relatively simple approach of cutting American tariff rates. He insists, and rightly, that schedules must be considered from the standpoint of American industry, labor, and agriculture and that this Nation cannot afford to go along with the idea that we can absorb the surplus of our overseas friends with whom we do business.

On this latter score, he points out that as Americans we are justifiably proud of our high standard of living. For instance, American industrial workers receive an average of $1.83 per hour, compared to 19 cents in Japan, 46 cents in France, 47 cents in Britain, 44 cents in West Germany, and correspondingly low wages in other countries. Domestic producers, he points out, cannot compete with products from cheap-labor areas because, largely due to United States aid and assistance programs, other industrial nations now have machines as modern and efficient as our own, with equally skilled laborers. Without protective tariff regulations, he declares, the end result will be the tearing down of our hard-earned wage standards. Which, again, is a viewpoint that makes good sense.

Bringing the situation down to cases, Mr. SCUDDER notes that in our own district the price of crabmeat has been driven to such a low point by imports that it is almost financially imposible for local fishermen to operate, with several plants already closed down. Japan, in this instance, represents the threat to American industry, in view of the fact that 60 percent of the crabmeat consumed in this country is imported from that country. A similar situation is threatening the plywood industry, due largely to the fact that hardboard has been erroneously classified as a paper product under the existing tariff rules.

In summing up his stand, Mr. SCUDDER declares:

"Tariff rates should be based wholly on the findings of a bipartisan Tariff Commission, after receiving testimony from representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture * * * based on economic conditions as they exist. Those findings should be final, and if they are to be varied in any manner, it should not be done without congressional approval. In this way the constitutional responsibility of Congress in determining trade policies would be maintained, and adequate protection should thereby be accorded our economy."

And again it is apparent that anyone concerned with American industry and our American standard of living (a concern which, unfortunately, seems to have been lost sight of by some of our high-pressure foreign aid "do-gooders") must concur with Mr. SCUDDER's comments.

New Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit (Mich.) News of April 18, 1955:

NEW HORIZONS

Apparently Governor Williams has accepted the Democratic showing in this month's election as a mandate to see the world. He left New York's Idlewild yesterday with bow ties to last him through England, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Greece, and France.

His tour will consume 3 weeks and end in New York and Washington, where he will be exposed to reporters and TV interviewers, drawing him out on the world's troubles.

Others before him—Adlai Stevenson and the late Wendell Willkie and Tom Dewey—had made their grand tours when their box appeal had already wilted. It may be then that Governor Williams sees some point in staging his hegira at this point, against the background of 1956, when his aspirations to the Presidency come to full flower.

This is the seventh time this year the governor has left the formalities of office to Lieutenant Governor Hart. He has been absent on chores as far afield as telling Californians they should have honest elections.

For 6 years the governor has won considerable sympathy with his complaint that he couldn't get the cooperation of the legislature. In most of that time the legislature was in no mood to cooperate with itself. In the present year, with the legislature moving into the climactic weeks of debate on his program, he is beguiled by the prospect of being heard over an international radio hookup from Tel Aviv.

Only the unreflective will wonder why the governor can afford to be absent at so critical a juncture in our public affairs. Actually, his absence changes little. As long as government remains under the watchful eye of Michigan's No. 1 Democrat, Walter Reuther, the governor in good conscience feels he can leave Lansing to campaign, even in Istanbul.

Food: Not Less, but More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Newsweek, under the heading of "Food: Not Less, but More," carries a most interesting article on the subject of agricultural research.

The article makes reference to the work of the Council for Agricultural and Chemurgic Research, formerly known as the National Farm Chemurgic Council. This organization which for many years has sponsored and encouraged the development of industrial uses for agricultural products is now broadening its activities. Under the able leadership of its president, Henry T. McKnight, it has enlisted the support and assistance of all of the general nationwide farm organizations. Its board of directors includes representatives of farm groups as well as officials of many business organizations dealing with agriculture. I am told that five major foundations are now contributing members of the organization.

The council, of course, works with land-grant colleges, the Department of Agriculture and other Government agencies as well as private research organizations.

The Newsweek article, which I am submitting herewith as a part of my remarks, is a challenging discussion, not only of recent research achievements in agriculture, but of the many problems which lie ahead in that field:

FOOD: NOT LESS, BUT MORE

Behind each mouthful we eat, behind the farmer, the food processor, and the supermarket, stands a little-publicized but critically important line of endeavor—agricultural research. Within a generation, the men of this quietly phenomenal science have put a meaty abundance on the American dinner table envied by all the world.

But with miracles come huge problems. From a glance at the current United States farm surplus, one might conclude that science and mechanization have lured the farmer into overproduction. The truth is far from this. The embarrassing pileup of wheat, corn, butter, etc., is destined to vanish soon.

One good drought could do it. In any case, it will soon be eaten away as the population boom adds 2.5 million mouths a year to the national stomach. If these mouths are to be fed, farmers must become much more scientific than even the best of them are today.

In the following special report, based on talks with top authorities in the field, Newsweek Science Editor Richard K. Winslow tells of the marvels already achieved by agricultural research and of the knotty problems still to be solved:

"Last week a canny Iowa farm manager, an old hand at 'selling' research, put his finger on the changed mood that has revolutionized American farming.

"Before the war, the county agent needed several seasons to put across a proven point on soil care or insect control. Most farmers would wait for the fellow down the road to try it first. Today, it's the other way around. A farmer snoops around an experiment station, then rushes back to try some discovery that the scientists haven't half tested."

For the 1955 season, this science-minded farmer has a bumper crop of fresh wonders to keep his eye on.

A Midwest experiment station is about to release a strain of corn with husks so tough a bird can't peck through. It will also fend off its old enemy, the borer.

Since January, American cattlemen have been slipping a female sex hormone, stilbestrol, to 2 million steers to make them bigger quicker on less feed (an operation, scientists say, that will not affect a steak-lover's manhood).

Breeders also are talking seriously of impregnating 200,000 cows with the frozen semen of a single prize bull.

In New York City, a chemist is taking the last kinks out of an edible sugar-based detergent made from cane and beet sugar. Soap and soap powders containing it do not leave rings around the bathtub, do not sting the eyes—and wash spinach thoroughly.

More, more: To some experts—the ones who can see beyond the misleading mountains of today's surpluses—such advances are deceptive. They are not nearly enough to assure that United States agriculture will continue to get its job done.

One of these men, Dr. Byron T. Shaw, farm research chief of the United States Department of Agriculture, estimates that, if the average American is to continue to have as much meat to eat as he did last year, all acreage that is currently idle will have to be back at work by 1960. By 1975, even if all marginal lands are used, there might be a deficit of more than 100 million acres. To meet this, livestock production alone will have to be nearly doubled on the land at hand.

But the output of the hard-pressed hen, for example, has already been pushed from an average 100 eggs a year to 180. Broilers have 70 percent more meat on them. For further big increases, the hen and her rations—already nutritional dynamite—will have to undergo some serious redesigning.

Big push: To improve and broaden agricultural research, the National Farm Chemurgic Council—a group of influential farm, industrry, scientific, and Government leaders—is launching a concerted campaign on many fronts this month. This is the group which has long pioneered in promoting industrial uses for such items as corncobs, soybeans, peanuts, and other farm products. They have made such a dramatic success of this that these products now account for 8 percent of the $30 billion total farm sales. However the chances for further expansion along these lines look dim in view of the mounting competition from petroleum derivatives. So the council is currently broadening its scope to embrace all aspects of agricultural study, from the test tube to the consumer's palate. (To emphasize this, it is changing its name to the Council for Agricultural and Chemurgic Research.)

The council's president, Henry T. McKnight, a Virginia cattle raiser, is alarmed by the not too surprising fact that industry's investment in research is five times that of agriculture. "It seems pretty shortsighted," McKnight says, "when you consider that the $15 million spent to develop hybrid corn now brings in more than $1 billion a year."

To keep the United States diet as rich as now in protein, McKnight figures that the $300 million spent last year for farm research must be doubled within 5 years. (Half of the annual bill is paid by the government, Federal and State, and half by food processors and farm suppliers.)

Antibiotics: Whether or not the council achieves its goal in that short time, farm research will continue to unfold excitingly. The big news story at the moment is what is being done with antibiotics, the wonderfully versatile wonder drugs which alone may prove a considerable antidote for the land shortage. They are performing startling feats in making an animal transform more of what it eats into good lean meat.

Antibiotics were initially used on animals to knock out bacterial infections. Soon, scientists found that in smaller doses, they also made the animals grow faster. First fed to chickens and pigs, they have been supercharging cattle and sheep to a profit-doubling extent in the last 2 years. Even mink and beagles are thriving on them. In Terre Haute, Ind., the Pfizer Research and Development Farm, which feeds and weighs experimental cattle like rats, now serves a special antibiotic-and-hormone cocktail that is setting fantastic new records for induced growth.

Antibiotics may have even greater potential for plants. Fresh on the market are streptomycin sprays that knock out costly bacterial blights on fruit trees, tobacco, peppers, tomatoes, and potatoes. After treatment, the plants show big crop gains, leading to speculation that antibiotics not only control plant diseases but may, as was found with animals, somehow stimulate plant growth.

Experimentally, these potent substances are also controlling fungus attacks, responsible for a major part of the Nation's $5 billion-a-year crop loss from pests. They are being screened as insecticides. Dramatically, they are being studied as a means of altering and improving the very chemical characteristics of plants, including tobacco and cabbage, as they grow to maturity.

A present obstacle to their widespread use for all this is an economic one. Antibiotics are pretty expensive for repeated sprayings of low-price crops.

Closer at hand, probably, is the antibiotic preserving of meat, dairy products, and vegetables. This may soon compete with radiation sterilization of foods, which, apart from some use in preventing potato spoilage, is still some years away. Dr. F. E. Deatheridge, head of the Ohio State Biochemistry Department, embalms fresh-killed steers simply by pumping an antibiotic through their arteries. The meat then will keep through 3 hot summer days and acquires, in the process, a delicate aged flavor. Similarly, by pumping brine and smoke flavor into a slaughtered hog, Dr. Deatheridge thinks he can put ham and bacon on the table in 3 days instead of 3 weeks.

Future gaps: Supplementing the antibiotics, hormones, and other surprises on the brink of development, the enterprising farmer of the future will have an old standby to rely on: A choice of some 40,000 agricultural chemicals developed over years of research.

All these will help, but the farmer will still have other problems—pressing problems that demand immediate and thorough investigation if those 2.5 million new mouths a year are to be adequately fed. Some of them:

Mechanized as farming is, the farmer still spends an estimated 65 percent of his day shoveling, lifting, and toting. Needed: A variety of radical labor-saving devices—everything from fertilizer spread by the same vehicle that delivers it to the farm, to pipelines for milk from the udder to the vat.

Marketing is often a Stone Age process, capable of depressing many a farm item even when production has been modernized. Needed: Studies showing the dairyman how to sell his beverage, for instance, as fast as brewers do, and research to ease the way for more vertical organization in marketing.

Though botanists have cataloged 300,000 plants from all over the world, chemists have intensively analyzed no more than a dozen, notably corn and soybeans, for use by industry. Needed: A greatly stepped-up search of all plant life for new foods, pharmaceuticals, and chemical products.

By 1970 American industry will have doubled its already gargantuan thirst for water. With water already in tight supply over most of the Nation, crop irrigation is spreading fast over the eastern half of the country, for it enlarges the yields and helps insure against drought. Needed: Commonsense, stricter conservation, and above all, more research—on the development of crops and grasses thriving on less water, and on rounding out theories of the water cycle that can be applied to each locality.

This is perhaps the biggest and most ominous scientific lag of all. Without water, all agricultural research could quickly become so much theory.

REVOLUTION AT THE DINNER TABLE

In just 30 years there have been big changes in what Americans eat and the way it is produced on the farm. Some of the most startling shifts:

	1925	1955
Appetites increased:		
Beef per citizen per year ..pounds..	59	72
Oranges.....do....	20	58
Chicken.....do....	14	23
So did farm efficiency:		
A farm worker produced food for.....people..	8	19
Crop yields per acre ..units..	100	130
Farm tractors.....	246,000	4,600,000
Food production of farm animals.....units..	100	150
But—		
Production expenses ..units..	100	300
Average farm size..acres..	141.9	215.6
Farm population.....	31,200,000	21,000,000

Ijebu-Igbo Is Listening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Christian Science Monitor a letter to the editor from a resident of Ijebu-Igbo, Nigeria, Mr. Donald J. Eberly. Mr. Eberly wrote the editors of the Christian Science Monitor about the program of the United States Information Agency for Africa and also touched on some of the other types of news, information, and music which are available to the Nigerian listener. It is a very interesting summation of the situation in Nigeria and, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

IJEBU-IGBO IS LISTENING

To the Christian Science Monitor:

In your edition of December 18, which has only recently arrived by slow boat to Nigeria, there was an article about the discussion of policies and activities of the United States Information Agency at a Massachusetts Institute of Technology conference. This report reminded me of much less formal discussion about the same topic which occurred at MIT not many years ago.

While we had stimulating talks about this subject, we realized we could never do complete justice to the topic since we had not witnessed an information program in operation. Now that I have spent 18 months at a secondary school in a small Nigerian town, I should like to record a few impressions concerning the information program as it affects Ijebu-Igbo.

News of the United States reaches us through many and varied media. Our shortwave radio brings us such stations as Radio Pakistan, Radio Moscow, the BBC, the Voice of America, and WRUL, the privately sponsored American station. Local newspapers carry American news received from Reuters or the United States Information Service in Lagos. Occasionally, USIS may send a speaker or its portable cinema van. Here at Molusi College, we have received several hundred books from several American sources.

That is the extent of sources of American information available to the citizen of Ijebu-Igbo. The shortwave radio is not such a great luxury as one might guess; a good one run on a dry battery may be obtained for about $30. What do these various sources tell us about the United States?

Radio Pakistan often brings us encouraging reports on the progress of United States technical assistance projects in that young nation. Radio Moscow carries the customary vituperative attacks on America of which we read so much in our newspapers. What not all of us may realize, however, is that these diatribes are attractively arranged, somewhat like American commercials. Many listeners are content to put up with 5 minutes of rubbish if they can have 25 minutes of stirring Russian music.

BBC does not seem to be concerned with propaganda; it caters to a worldwide audience of British subjects who desire the same type of program they would receive in the British Isles.

The Voice of America is, in my opinion, not well designed for African listeners. It seems bent on showing the evils of communism and nothing else. It is the "nothing else" which worries me. I am convinced that this gap can be filled by a specific concern for Africa. On my way to class several weeks ago, I was stopped by one of my fellow teachers, a Nigerian.

"I heard your President give a speech on the radio last night," he related with a beaming face.

"That's nice," I said. "What did you think of him?"

"I like him very much. He mentioned the importance of Africa in his talk."

I am sure the mere mention of that three-syllable word, Africa, on the lips of President Eisenhower, did more to win the approval of my friend than the rest of the speech. What greater prestige could be won by America by a more concentrated and specific concern for Africa.

While casually turning my radio dial, I often find myself stopping at WRUL. Why? Because WRUL always fills 1 of my 2 criteria for radio listening—an intelligible voice or pleasant music. If Africans have the same criteria, would it not be advisable to woo their attention by a selection of African music?

United States Information officers in Nigeria do a consistently fine job in reporting news of special interest to the leading newspapers in Nigeria. For example, there was excellent coverage of the Supreme Court decision of last May on the school-segregation issue.

The one speaker from USIS who came to our school on invitation was well received. There are, of course, severe limitations on time and manpower in such a program of information. The two film shows that were brought here by USIS were received with rapt attention. One film was devoted to the need for and the consequent development of Boys' Clubs in Egypt. Just the familiar sight of palm trees helped to bring the lesson home to the viewers.

Film showing is a project which gives evidence of being worthy of great expansion. If the cost of one battleship were converted into cinema vans and the cost of operating them, every person in Nigeria could see a film show a month for several years. In more impressive terms, President Eisenhower surveyed the positive things that could be done for the cost of one modern heavy bomber in his memorable speech of April 16, 1953.

Many books have come to us through voluntary groups and friends in the United States. These have been the much-needed textbooks and biographies. Among the governmental agencies, the United States Book Exchange Service, in conjunction with the Library of Congress, has similar books plus magazines such as the National Geographic and Popular Science. The Department of State, under a program initiated by Chester Bowles while Ambassador to India, has sent a fine selection of pocket books. Included in this selection are works by Dwight Eisenhower, Albert Schweitzer, George Gamow, Alexis de Tocqueville, Robert Frost, and the Christian Science Monitor's own Edmund Stevens.

That is what I will tell my friends from MIT at our next bull-session. I hope our State Department will be listening.

DONALD J. EBERLY.

America's Perpetual Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address on the subject America's Perpetual Disease, delivered by Rev. Feltham S. James, department commander of the American Legion, Department of South Carolina.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S PERPETUAL DISEASE

(A speech on national security by Rev. Feltham S. James, department commander, the American Legion, Department of South Carolina)

The men of many wars lie silent. Victims of a terrible disease. Their names are etched on time-discolored tombstones, and are unforgettably engraved on the hearts of all posterity. The battles they fought made history, yet to many of them the glory of the victory was their's on history's pages only, for we have not stamped out the disease. In spite of the achievements of science, in spite of the development of the wonder drugs of our time, in spite of the discoveries that have rid mankind of deathly plagues, America is still infected with a disease that has claimed uncounted thousands. It is America's perpetual disease. The tragic results of that disease are visible in every cemetery where lie the remains of our soldier dead; in every hospital where the maimed and the sick are suffering from battle-caused inflictions; and even on our streets where the crippled and handicapped depict the casualties of war.

"America's perpetual disease" is the result of the failure of the supreme legislative bodies of our country to fulfill their obligation laid down in the Constitution. In the preamble of that cherished document we read: "We the people of the United States, in order * * * to provide for the common defense, * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." To provide for this common defense Congress is given power "to raise and support armies" and "to provide and maintain a Navy." Except in time of extreme emergencies Congress has not made provision for the protection of the Nation. Therein lies "America's perpetual disease"—failure to provide for the "common defense."

"America's perpetual disease" began in the time of George Washington when we fought the Revolutionary War without trained men. We did that after 10 years of warning that such a conflict was bound to come. Oh, we gained our independence, but the tragedies of our loss are buried up and down the countryside in marked and unmarked graves.

After the "shot heard around the world"—after Lexington and Concord—English General Howe shoved the colonists before him with the ease of a vessel ploughing the lanes of the sea. The untrained, undisciplined, poorly equipped Colonials ran pell-mell at the sight of the British Red Coats. In saying that, I am not trying to detract from the heroism of the soldiers of the Revolution. But it wasn't an army that George Washington had. It was a collection of fellows who hadn't been taught the first principles of armed conflict, did not understand discipline, who had a few togs, were poorly conditioned and scarcely knew how to line up. Nothing, you see, had been done in preparation. It was the first on-set of "America's perpetual disease." We can't blame them for running. We can't blame them for deserting by the thousands. They just didn't have a chance against well-drilled and well-trained opponents. George Washington's fighting of the whole war might be likened to a football coach who is given a new squad of men every Monday morning and is expected to win all the games on Saturday against well-coached teams.

We actually never won the Revolution by either our power or our skill. Because of our

failure to make preparation, we dragged through 8 years of death by exposure, disease, and the bullet. And yet we had material available in the colonies as fine in ruggedness, character, and marksmanship as anywhere in the world. Of course the men became discouraged by the wholesale when they realized that they had little chance against the well-trained British and when they saw themselves officered by persons as unskilled and unlettered as themselves.

But more surprising is what was done after the war. Here is the first evidence that America had become completely infected with the disease of unpreparedness. After the war we dismissed our entire staff of leaders and all the soldiers—except 80. These 80 simply worked around the quarters and received no practice or instruction. We had the idea that there would never be another war. Any attempt to set up an army was met by charges of professionalism—despotism and tyranny. Armies had been the plaything of kings and the people would have nothing that even suggested the tyrannical and despotic ways of royalty. George Washington did his dead-level best to show them how false was such a view. He begged and pleaded and advised, but to no avail. He wrote of the Revolution: "Had we formed a permanent army in the beginning, we should not have been the greatest part of the war inferior to the enemy." He also wrote: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Governor Harry Lee, of Virginia, about the same time, went even further and said, "Convinced as I am that a government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field uniformed and untaught, where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and discipline for battle, I cannot withhold my denunciation of its wickedness and folly."

Yes, we were warned against the tragic disease with which we had become infected—but we paid no heed. The people refused to look at the picture. They refused to take out preventatives or insurance against the disease. Even when the United States became a Nation and our Constitution was adopted, we had an army of the magnificent size of 595 men.

The Indian raids began to take their toll. We had no army to fight them. A thousand perished by tomahawk and arrow in Kentucky alone, with no army to protect them. A hastily recruited force of men was ambushed and annihilated in Ohio. And so goes the record of history with the Indians. Our weakness furnished the savage with new courage, and we cannot even estimate the thousands who died.

There was only one bright spot in this decade of terror. Washington had selected Anthony Wayne to lead troops against the Indians. Wayne trained his men for over a year before he took them into action. At the Battle of Fallen Timber, 11 years after the Revolution, he completely spanked the Indians, and they let the settlers rest in peace for a long time. Trained troops would have spared the lives of many, but we were infected with a disease.

War scares came one upon another. One with France 15 years after the Revolution. One with Spain 20 years after the Revolution. One with Great Britain 25 years after the Revolution. The only thing we did about any of them was to vote huge sums of money and call out thousands of men on paper. At no time did our Armed Forces, even poorly trained, number 4,000 men. The Army never rose in time, and it never stayed long enough afterward to have any effect. So we arrived at our second war with Great Britain, 29 years after the Revolution, weaker proportionately than when we faced that conflict.

The War of 1812 would be funny were it not so tragic. Our history books, in order to make us the perfect people of the world, omit much of it. Here again we find thousands of untrained men fleeing from the fields of combat, fleeing because they were unprepared to meet a well-trained enemy. We had no management or leadership and the fine manhood of our country, for want of previous training, was held up to ridicule, suffering, casualties, and disgrace. We called out over a half-million men and could not drive a maximum of 16,000 British soldiers from our shores. We spent nearly $200 million, not counting pensions, when a small percentage of that would have maintained an army of trained soldiers that could have met the situation. We sacrified 6,000 lives in camp and on the battlefield, when it should not have been much more than 100. We should thank God for Napoleon and European weariness, which called off the British.

After this narrow escape of 1812, we did not do as we had done after the revolution. We didn't do away with our preventative medicine. No, sir, we kept our Army in training—for 3 whole months. Then we reduced it to 10,000 men on paper. Five years later, in the face of protests by such men as John C. Calhoun, we cut it to 6,000 men. Then came the Seminoles, Creeks, Black Hawks, and others with their gentle art of taking scalps. Again we had no army to fight them. What army we had was scattered up and down the country in lonely forts. Oh, Congress got afraid once and hastily voted for our Army to be raised back to 10,000. But they could not be trained in time and the slaughter went on. General after general on the frontier, seeing the uselessness of his struggles, asked to be relieved of his command. One hundred and seventeen of our best officers, in 1 year, resigned from the Army rather than to be a party to American's perpetual disease.

By 1842 the Army was reduced to 8,613 men. A Congressman on the floor of the House stated that year: "We have no prospects of war. We have more reason to suppose that the world will grow wiser and that the humane and oft-repeated wish of the wise and good, that the sword and bayonet may be converted into scythe and ploughshare, will be realized." No prospects for war—but 4 years after that statement came the war with Mexico. It came like a bolt out of the sky. War has a way of sneaking upon us like a thug in the night.

The war with Mexico found our 17 million people with an Army of 5,300 men all told. Think of that. General Taylor had to fight with less than that. He had just 3,000 troops against a possible 50,000 Mexicans. And his command was the largest regular force we had assembled since the Revolution. His position was perilous as he went forth with his little band of trained soldiers. He won over superior numbers but it was a hard struggle and it cost dearly in lives. In the years just before this war, Congress twice tried to abolish West Point and once made no appropriation for it. The superintendent borrowed at his own risk $60,000 from a private individual to keep it going. That is a symptom of our perpetual disease.

But we didn't learn after three wars. After the Mexican conflict, we reduced our Army to 7,000 men. That is the same size it was after the War of 1812, 36 years before. We reduced it in spite of the fact that we had a population of 17 million and a territory of nearly a million square miles. In this vast territory our paltry 7,000 struggled against hundreds of thousands of Indians. By 1861, the entire Army numbered a little over 15,000 men.

Then came the Civil War. For 30 years the North had been trying to black the South's industrial eye, and the South had vigorously defied the threats. Oh, there were speeches—speeches that there would be no war; that brother would not fight against brother. Even when South Carolina seceded 4 months before the conflict, and six other States followed, we did nothing about it. Even when we saw the South call up 100,000 men for a year's service, we sat like spectators on the bleachers. We continued the practice of not being ready. In 1860 we even passed a bill to abolish the Navy. The North threw away 365,000 lives, not counting the thousands who died in the Southern forces. Here was the bloodiest conflict we ever fought and it could have been prevented by wisdom and foresight. "America's perpetual disease" took its toll. We fed our manhood like babies into the burning cauldron of Moloch, all because we were infected with the disease of unpreparedness.

After the Civil War—what happened? First, we trimmed the Army down to 38,000. The day before General Grant took office as President, we reduced it, against his urgent recommendations, by 28 regiments. By 1876 we had a scant 25,000 soldiers. And there it remained, for almost a quarter of a century, until the Spanish-American War. There it remained in spite of increased population and increased territory. There was a war party who wanted to keep peace and a peace party who wanted us to fall into war. A paltry 17,000 soldiers were scattered up and down the country in little groups to protect the advancing settlers against hundreds of thousands of Indians.

The American people, after 25 years of sleep, awoke one morning to find the battleship *Maine* at the bottom of Habana Harbor. And we were in war again. Amazed and confused we rushed this way and that. And yet, we knew it was coming. Just 2 years before the *Maine* a Congressman rose and said, "I do not take much stock in an early war with Spain or England." That same day Joe Cannon said, "I want to say that I do not believe we will have a war the coming year, nor the year after. I doubt if there will be any during this century or perhaps the early years of the next century."

When the Spanish-American War blew up in our face the Army was the same size it had been 22 years before. It was scattered in little groups all over the West and on the borders. The War Department was clogged with 30 years of cobwebs. We had not learned a single lesson from a hundred years of tragic disasters of our own making. Here was unpreparedness at its worst. Oh, we called up our volunteers but they did not have time to train. "On to Havana," the people cried. What matter to them the extravagance of human life. Congressmen who had taken delight in blocking legislation for preparedness were the loudest in crying for guns and vessels to protect their districts. But we lost 7,000 lives in 2 years.

After the Spanish-American War for the first time in history we strengthened the Army. We raised our Army to 100,000 for 75 million people. We set up other service schools and made it possible for our officers to have a good military education. We formed a general staff. For several years it looked as if our Army would be a going concern. Then we lagged. Then came the old wolf in sheep's clothing. Congressman DIES in the House of Representatives, stated in 1913: "God has placed us on this great, rich continent, separate and secure from the broils of Europe." Others propounded their propaganda of no more war. The people ate it up. They always have. It is something we like to hear. All Europe was arming but not us. By now our trained mobile force was smaller than our trained force before the Spanish-American War.

We were magnificently unready when we jumped into war on April 6, 1917. Someone had fired another "shot heard around the world" at Sarajevo. Europe was on fire and we had done nothing to prevent the flames from reaching us. We needed 200,000 officers, but did not have 10,000 trained to in-

struct them and at the same time to lead our forces. We had a few out-of-date airplanes, only enough artillery ammunition for a 2-day battle, no automatic rifles, and comparatively few machine guns and ordinary rifles. What equipment we had was out of date. We did not have time to adequately train the men called up in the draft. We sent men into battle who couldn't even load a gun. The people were excited. Flags waved and bands played. But that did not save a single life of a soldier sent into battle untrained and poorly equipped. Out of 2 million sent to Europe, 50,000 were killed and 65,000 more died. And I am sure many thousands of these because they were untrained for battle.

Well, after World War I we raised our Army to 280,000. Finally we were going to do something about this business of preparedness—we were going to provide for the common defense. We were at last going to obey the Constitution. But the efforts were short-lived. Congress reduced the Army to 175,000 for 120 million people. We began to destroy our equipment. What we kept went from bad to worse with little effort on improvement. Until World War II the Army was never more than 119,000.

You know about World War II. It is the same old story over again. We had not yet learned our lesson. The same old disease had us down again. The only bright spot was Roosevelt's National Defense Act, but that was too little, too late. Again thousands died because of insufficient training. Again men were sent into battle who couldn't even hold a gun. I was at the port of embarkation when replacements were sent in for my antiaircraft regiment, replacements who had never even seen an antiaircraft gun and who had not fired the rifle.

After World War II it is the same old story. We reduced our Army. We destroyed our equipment. The boys just had to get back home. But then came Korea and it is just about the same thing over again. In spite of our warning we didn't even have a good map of Korea when the fighting started.

Call me a militarist, if you will, but I believe that economy which cripples our national defense is nothing short of extravagance. I believe with Benjamin Franklin that "the expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it."

Did you ever stop and ask how many wars we have had? "Oh, about 10," you say. That is indicative of our knowledge. Well, we have just finished fighting our 112th war. One hundred and twelve wars—great and small—an average of about one war every year and a half since we have been a nation. We have fought all told more than 900 battles. The truth is—through the years we have had no military and no peace.

Once more we are coming up with a plan to provide for the common defense. Once more we are going to attempt to cure America of its perpetual disease. The national security training program must come to pass. Our Nation's ability to protect itself is our best insurance. With George Washington we say, "If we desire to avoid insult we must be ready to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

As members of the American Legion we are interested in curing America of its perpetual disease. The American Legion from its birth has been the foremost champion of national security. Being veterans with battlefield experience we are conscious of America's need for a strong defense. Adequate training and adequate equipment have grim meanings for the men who have borne arms in the Nation's defense. They know from experience how important it is to go into combat with good and sufficient equipment and to know how to use modern arms and how to defend against them.

Since World War I the American Legion has kept the torch burning for peace through strength. It has been called militaristic by the pacifists and subversive elements of our country, but it has not faltered in its effort to provide for the common defense. We are proud that in all of our 36 years of championing an adequate protection for our country, we have never been wrong in any of our major recommendations. The march of events has always justified the rightness of our course. We have worked; we have pleaded; we have demanded that the common defense be provided for. We are now waiting for the Nation and for Congress to catch up with the American Legion's policy on national security. We are out in front and mean to stay there. We mean to cure America—to rid America of its perpetual disease. We mean to fight until Congress fulfills its constitutional obligation to provide for the common defense.

Ethics and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, recently former United States Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, delivered a speech before the Harvard Law School forum as part of a symposium on ethics and politics.

Because I believe that this speech will be of great interest to many people, I am today inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ETHICS AND POLITICS

As a part-time politician I thank Harvard for the chance to share this platform with two professionals. I also feel honored because politics is a noble calling, one of the noblest, and I am proud to be part of it, even part time.

Just 20 years ago I sold out my interest in my first creative business enterprise, the New York advertising agency of Benton & Bowles which I founded. I dedicated 6½ years of my life to Benton & Bowles, big full-time years when I thought only of business and of financial risks, uncertainties and profits; but of the 20 years since, I've devoted myself, in about equal parts, to three fields of action: first, to higher education, as an administrative officer of a university and as a college and university trustee; secondly, to the three businesses which I control and own, in publishing, motion pictures, and music; and thirdly, to politics, including service as Assistant Secretary of State, and later as a United States Senator.

Thus I've had an opportunity to compare the ethics of practitioners in three major fields. If we here tonight were to ask Dr. Gallup or Mr. Roper to get us a rating-scale of public opinion on the relative virtue, or perhaps the word is respectability, of the three groups, I'm sure the professors would come in first, almost with halos; the businessmen would rate second because, as President Coolidge said, "the business of America is business"; and the politicians would come last, and many would label them as mendacious and corrupt.

My own rating scale, based on my observations of the 20 years, and taking into account the pressures to which each group is subjected, would reverse that order. I would put the politicians first—and remember, please, I am speaking of ethics—and the professors last.

I hasten to assure you that my veneration for scholarship and the life of learning is not diminished by my discovery of its ethical deficiencies as ethics are understood by practitioners of business and politics. The professor does not apply his high code of scholarship to one significant facet in any code of ethics, the realm of private and personal relationships.

Early in 1949, after I had served in the State Department as a high administrative officer working closely with the Congress, but before I had any notion I'd ever serve in the United States Senate, I gave a talk to the Sales Executives Club of New York. I may have startled some of the members with this paragraph:

"The truth is that the Members of Congress—the five-hundred-odd Members of Congress—are the finest group of men that I have ever met anywhere; and on integrity, intelligence, hard work, they rank above any group of men with whom I've ever worked and, believe me, I know the business community well. I know the Board of Trustees of the Committee for Economic Development, and I am not without friends in the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. I would trust our United States destiny overwhelmingly to the Members of Congress, judged by intelligence, integrity, competence, and hard work, far ahead of trusting our country's future to the top business leaders as represented in these business associations. That is as great a tribute as I know how to pay to a group of men who are so frequently kicked around and abused, misunderstood and unappreciated."

Today I still hold with that view—and with far greater emphasis after my 3 years in the United States Senate—I hold with it even after 3 years exposure in the Senate to the condemned man from Wisconsin. The ethical practices of politicians are greatly underrated in contrast to other groups in our American community; and it is by such contrast that they must in part be judged.

The notion that all politics is dirty is one cause of the cynicism and apathy that keeps nearly half of all our eligible voters away from the polls, even in presidential years—a disgraceful record compared with the democracies of Europe. I pause here to pay high praise to my State of Connecticut where 93½ percent of the eligible voters went to the polls in 1952, the highest percentage ever achieved in any State in any election. I praise this percentage even though it was the Eisenhower vote which accounted for my own defeat.

This idea that politics is dirty is also one reason why otherwise estimable citizens avoid any personal involvement in politics. The truth is that only some politics is dirty. Mr. DeSapio and Mr. Javits can, if they will, tell you where the dirt is.

We are not here to minimize the ethical problems of politics. Many of these problems are very old indeed. From the Old Testament on, a high proportion of the great books of our Western World have debated the virtues that are required of political leaders, and the vices associated with political power and with the struggle for power. Plato and Aristotle had much to say about this: Plutarch very much. So did Machiavelli and later the 18th-century philosophers.

As my approach to the problem before us tonight, I shall seek to identify some major ethical problems of politics as they exhibit themselves in our day; and secondly, I shall discuss some steps we might consider in our effort to resolve them, at least in part, for our generation—more precisely, how we might pursue those steps which may reduce the powerful pressures toward mendacity and

corruption which our society inflicts on our politicians.

What are some of those pressures? And what are some of the easier things we can do to relieve them? In these two questions I pose a long series of discussions and debates before this forum. We cannot undertake tonight to develop a catalog. I shall only try to identify for you four major areas of acute ethical discomfort in politics, and briefly suggest approaches to relieving them.

I shall not invoke for you that great tried and true remedy of the orators and reformers, the only true, permanent, and sovereign cure, that of an ardent and informed citizenry. I shall not invoke it if only because from my efforts to sell encyclopedias and other books I know some of the difficulties in achieving this goal. This is a true goal, a great one, but it is very long range indeed.

Two of my four areas concern election campaigns. The other two concern the conduct of an officeholder, specifically a Member of Congress, once he has achieved election.

There are really three kinds of politicians. There's the candidate who's running and any good candidate must run hard. Then there's the same man after he's been elected, the officeholder. Finally, there's the man in the back room, the professional, the manipulator and compromiser whose power is often absolute and whose word must be better than other men's bond.

My comments tonight deal with the first two species of homo political and ignore the third who is often the most important of all.

As the first of my four areas, let's look at the financing of campaigns. This is the single most ticklish ethical question in the whole field of elective politics. Every candidate is now a panhandler, first among his friends, and then among people he hopes to make his friends. (Of course, I'm talking about Democratic candidates—we Democrats realize that a bottomless cornucopia flows automatically into the Republican coffers.)

The school of thought which holds that all politics is dirty of course believes that candidates and their campaigns are bought and paid for by the so-called vested interests. The truth is at least cousinly to this belief: it is that nearly every candidate, at least for Federal office, must violate the spirit if not the letter of corrupt practices legislation. The limitations set forth in the corrupt practices legislation are unrealistic for our day. Since these acts were passed, campaign costs have increased 400 percent to 500 percent and they will increase further with the greater use of television. The Congressional Quarterly records that candidates for Congress are now reporting a national total of $10 million in expenses per election, and the Congressional Quarterly adds: "The reported spending is actually far below what it cost to elect many candidates for contested seats." Ten millions is by no means an excessive total. The truth far exceeds this. Ten million is far too small to underwrite and pay for the campaigns which must be waged. All the professionals know this. Ask Mr. DeSapio. If you don't believe him, ask Mr. Javits.

Further, in defense of these higher and even higher expenditures, may I suggest that our political campaigns are our principal instrument for education in public issues, as our elections are our principal instrument for determining the public will. On that alleged $10 million rides the decisions we shall make about many tens of billions and, potentially, hundreds of thousands of lives. The 10 million, by current standards, is a pittance. It's the old nickel subway ride.

Unhappily for the morals of our generation, the present pattern of our corupt practices laws, Federal and State, is such a sieve that any Harvard undergraduate can drive a bulldozer through the holes. What is now needed is a realistic revision of existing corrupt practices laws, and then rigid enforcement of the new legislation.

Among reforms required is new legislation to provide high penalties on corporation officials who reimburse themselves, in one way or another, from their companies, for their campaign gifts. Another urgently needed reform is a greatly improved system of reporting campaign contributions. A contribution made in the open loses much of the sinister character of a hidden gift. I would insist also that this reporting take place not only immediately after the election but shortly before it, and again at stated intervals following the election, to disclose how a campaign deficit, if there is one—and there frequently is—is met. I think all of us should know about the NIXON funds, even before the recipient becomes a candidate for Vice President.

Fifty years ago Theodore Roosevelt felt so strongly about the ethical hazards in campaign financing that he recommended that Congress provide "an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties." I'm not sure I'd go quite as far, but I'm not sure I wouldn't. Here's a good study for some willing Ph. D. candidate. But before I embrace President Theodore Roosevelt, I'd like to examine possible ways to broaden the base of political giving. As a people we haven't yet learned to give for politics. Our political fund-raisers—and many of my best friends do it—are almost all of them part-time amateurs. Philanthropic money raising is developing as a science and an art. The political parties and partisans have yet to learn the techniques of the Red Cross, the Community Chest, the March of Dimes, the Harvard Alumni Association to which you are about to become abject subjects.

I'm merely opening the door into this first dark and murky area, that of the financing of political campaigns. I'm giving you a peek, but with little light. I haven't even touched the high spots.

I move hastily into my second area of danger—the character of the campaign itself.

I hasten to assure you I have no hope of overcoming the current excessive flamboyance of campaigns. I refer to the kind of exaggeration for which we Americans have developed a high tolerance.

But can we not concern ourselves with a moral peril point which is reached when a campaign becomes vilification and defamation, an attempt at political assassination? As a high example, I place in this category Governor Dewey's speech in Hartford, the capital of my State, when he told his audience that "Whenever anybody mentions the words 'Truman' and 'Democrat' to you, for the rest of your lives remember that these words are synonymous with Americans dying thousands of miles from home because they did not have the ammunition to defend themselves. Remember that the words 'Truman' and 'Democrat' mean bungling our country into war and the lack of courage or the capacity to win the war or to win a truce."

I take this as my example because this comes from no irresponsible political campaigner but from the 8-year titular head of one of our two great parties, a far more responsible role than that of any governor or United States Senator.

I take this as an example because I am here at the Harvard Law School talking to young men who could not be blamed if they wished to emulate Governor Dewey's present role, as a senior partner, in nomenclature at least, in a firm not unknown even in my community of Fairfield, Conn.

In this, my second area, I ask 2 questions, though I am not applying these 2 questions to my reference to Tom Dewey, who is perhaps an understandable idol for any young Harvard Law School student, even though a dubious one by the ethical standards which is our subject tonight. I ask these questions of those who seek to teach you. First, I ask whether our laws of libel and slander, applied to political campaigns, should be strengthened. In practice we have made it almost impossible for a complainant to recover damages for statements made about him in a political campaign. We have taken the position that "all's fair in love and politics." Perhaps a change is in the offing; a few weeks ago, a New York court assessed $25,000 damages against a candidate for Congress who described two of his opponent's workers as Communist fellow travelers. In my own second campaign, advertisements were run all over Connecticut attacking me in eight points as a Communist.

Is there not a question here of legitimate interest to your forum and to the Harvard Law School?

Even more valuable than strengthened libel and slander laws could be the creation of a permanent Citizens Elections Practices Commission, a national body which could serve as a model for similar State commissions. I urged the creation of such a commission when I served in the Senate. Such a nonpartisan commission of distinguished private citizens could be called upon, among other responsibilities, to issue reports each 2 years after elections, a kind of referee to report on low blows delivered during the heat of campaigns and to admonish against them, and then to recommend criteria of responsibility. Such a commission could sponsor an era of public enlightenment which our politics desperately needs.

My last two areas of moral hazard, for officeholders, are characteristically pitfalls of office as they are traps for campaigners. The first of these involves the familiar old dilemma of compromise. George Bernard Shaw once described a political situation as "smirched with compromise, rotted with opportunism, mildewed by expedience, stretched out of shape with wirepulling, and putrified with permeation." But politics has also been defined as the art of the possible. It has been defined even more precisely for the politician by T. V. Smith as "the art of compromising an issue without compromising yourself."

Compromise is necessary and inevitable in politics. But exactly where, in the necessary and inevitable compromising, exactly where lies the question of ethics? A good compromise is the best practicable solution of a problem, possible at a given time, in the interest of one's constituency, and of one's nation.

A bad compromise is a politician's decision to support the proposals of a special interest group, even though they may conflict with the general interest. A classical example is pork-barrel legislation. Personal financial gain is rarely the consideration of the politician in such compromises. What is at stake is votes the politician seeks to own or control. Rarely is outright cynicism involved, but rather what might be called gymnastic rationalization. That is why I prefer to speak of relieving pressure on the politicians, rather than of redeeming sinners.

The root of the pork-barrel problem, and by any other name it smells the same, is that the special pleaders control a bloc of votes—or successfully create the illusion that they do—and the politician is not convinced that he opposes the bloc, no matter how small it may be, he will gain an offsetting support in the general citizenry, by virtue of his opposition.

Here is the great potential role for the Voters' League, the Citizens' Council, the women who prefer politics to poetry. Here is the answer to the familiar question, "Does it do any good to write to your Congressman?"

Now let me move to my fourth area of acute ethical discomfort in the field of politics. This springs from the politician's need for publicity. Of all the crafts and professions, politics and the theater are the two for which publicity seems indispensable. This is no mere matter of ego satisfaction for the performers. A good press translates into tickets at the box office and into votes at the polls.

Applied to the politician, this urgent need for publicity is consistent with democratic theory. The ethical dilemma feeds upon the fact that what is interesting, what is newsworthy, has no necessary relation to what is important.

Congressman who knocks himself out trying to master tax measures, appropriations bills, tariff problems, water-resource issues, or any key problem may find his lazy colleague, or his opponent, grabbing the headlines with a quick denunciation of the latest shakeup in the Politbureau.

When I was a very junior Senator—in fact, No. 96 in seniority—a batch of Hoover Commission proposals, for the improvement and reorganization of the Federal Government, came before the Committee on Expenditures, of which I was the junior member. To my surprise, many of these worthy proposals had no Senate champion. Perhaps because of my business background, these proposals to save money and achieve efficiency appealed to me powerfully. I leaped into the breach, not, I like to believe, without some success. One columnist said of me he couldn't decide whether I was a Sir Galahad or just naive. I never was a Galahad; I happen to think my heart is reasonably pure, but it never gave me the strength of 10, or even 1½, in the Senate. But I was puzzled. The Senate has many able and dedicated men. Why had they not stepped forward?

Senator Wherry helped me gain understanding. After my speech in support of the Hoover Commission proposal to reorganize certain aspects of the Treasury Department's relationship to the banks, and I was the only Senator to speak for this proposal which was opposed by the banks and finally mustered only seven votes, Senator Wherry left his front row seat as Republican leader and walked back to my back row No. 96. We were friends from my State Department days. He said, "Bill, your speech reminds me of my first as a Senator; I prepared it carefully; as I spoke I saw the old and distinguished heads nodding in approval; I thought I was doing fine; but when the vote came, I wasn't there; I didn't have them; and I remember that as I walked off the floor Senator Reynolds came up to me and put a consoling arm around my shoulder."

At this point, Senator Wherry put his arm around me.

"'Kenny,' Senator Reynolds said to me, 'Kenny, we was with you as long as you was talkin'.'"

I learned that, older and wiser than I, the old hands of the Senate knew there was no political sex appeal in reorganization. There was little publicity, almost no incentive in terms of popular support, meaning votes in the next election, and there were some real and terrible penalties in terms of organized opposition of those who think they stand to lose, whether they be bankers or post-office workers.

In this my fourth year there is a great opportunity for creative ideas and I have one suggestion I'll give you tonight. Can we develop a system of recognition which is independent of newsworthiness? A month or so ago, when Harold Lasswell of the Yale Law School was visiting me, I suggested an idea to him. He is to be president of the American Political Science Association next year. I suggested that the association each year designate the 10 Members of Congress who had done the most valuable unpublicized work of the year. If no Member could be named twice in 5 years, that would mean that every 5 years 50 members would receive such recognition. I do not believe it would be difficult to make the selections. Such matters are common knowledge to the staffs on Capitol Hill. And I would not underestimate the value of such recognition even in a campaign. I believe Senator DOUGLAS would acknowledge other value to him in last fall's election in Illinois of the fact that he had been named "No. 1" Senator in a poll of Capital news correspondents.

My suggestion here is trivial, however, in contrast to the problem in this area. I give it to you because it's quick and easy. This problem well warrants a full evening by your forum.

Many of you young men here tonight in this historic hall will find yourselves within a few years deep in politics. I say, strength to your arms. The risks and hazards and pressures of politics are great. But the rewards outweigh them all. All your capabilities, all your experience will be called into play. And when other desires and ambitions have been satisfied, or blunted by the years, your desire to serve the public interest will sustain you.

I have outlined some of the pressure that operates against morality in politics. I have suggested a few possible ways of helping to relieve such pressures. But I have not mentioned the best solution of all. That solution is everywhere in this hall tonight. It is in yourselves, and in what you can and will and must do, for yourselves and for your country and for all of us, as you of the Harvard Law School move into politics. As your generation moves in and takes over American politics, in line with the great history of this hall and university, to which your presence here tonight shows you chose to conform, you will bring to politics all the truth and earnestness and honor that is in you. This is the best solution, the great solution, and to it I hope that some of you may dedicate yourselves here—in this hall—tonight.

Aid for the Koreans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, among many private agencies supplementing the United States Government in its worldwide fight against misery and want is the American-Korean Foundation. The Salt Lake Tribune in a recent editorial found its program worthy of special mention. The editorial follows:

AID FOR THE KOREANS

Attention has been focused lately on Formosa but meanwhile the enormous job of rehabilitating the war-ravaged Republic of Korea goes on.

The United States Government is contributing about $700 million this fiscal year, representing about half the value of South Korea's gross national product, but the program is geared to military necessity and expediency. A South Korean Army of 20 regular and 10 reserve divisions helps reinforce our security.

The damage caused by more than 3 years of fighting in the little country has affected every family, business, and institution in South Korea. Some industries were completely wiped out. The rural irrigation system was badly damaged. Cities, transport systems, and powerlines were wrecked.

The American-Korean Foundation, headed by Maj. Gen. Charles W. Christenberry, former deputy chief of staff of the famed Eighth Army, is taking the lead in helping the South Korean people rebuild their war-torn country. Stressing technical assistance rather than relief, the foundation is helping the Koreans to help themselves. It has spent more than $2 million in the fields of health, education, and social welfare. Schools, hospitals, and orphanages have been rebuilt; training has been given doctors, dentists, and nurses, and rehabilitation work carried out in other ways.

Patrons of the theaters in Salt Lake City, Utah, and neighboring States are being given an opportunity this week to contribute to the funds of the American-Korean Foundation. Money voluntarily donated by American people and business firms goes directly into the reconstruction program. Our investment in blood, money, and promises in South Korea is tremendous. And the job is only partly done.

The Late Walter White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that we learned of the death of a true American, Walter White. As executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he played a leading role in the endeavor to have the principles of the Constitution of the United States adhered to on all levels of American life. To have full recognition of the dignity of all men was his chief objective.

Born with fair skin, blue eyes, and Caucasian features in 1893 in Atlanta's Darktown, he chose to remain proudly a member of the Negro race. At the age of 13, when he witnessed his first mobbing of a Negro in the streets of Atlanta, he started to fight racial segregation and discrimination. Walter White was indeed one of the great national leaders of American Negroes, and his name now lives with those other great Americans of his race, with Booker T. Washington, and George Washington Carver.

As secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People from 1929 until his death, Mr. White fought against lynchings and led the fight for a Federal antilynching bill. A lecturer, author of books and magazine articles, stalwart investigator of lynchings, mediator and consultant on various National and United Nations committees, he was ever vigilant, stoutly militant, and showed no hesitancy in bucking public opinion when he thought he was right.

During his lifetime, 3,017 men and women were lynched in the United States, but for the 4 years prior to his death, there had been not a single lynching in this country. Racial bias and discrimination in labor, industry, and in the arts, was on the wane, and desegregation in education was being effected. Thus it was that in the final days of his

life he saw the definite trend toward the fruition of his objective, the full recognition of the dignity of all men. In closing, I want to add the tribute of Marjory Jackson, a member of my staff:

Hard the battle
Day had just begun
Fierce the fight
In heat of noontime sun
Peace with twilight
Brought the victory won.
Rest from labors now
Most valiant and illustrious son.

Let's Count Our Blessings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the following from the East Side News. Both of these articles deal with one of the most enlightened spirits that it has been my privilege to know, the Rev. Richard E. Evans, minister of the Presbyterian Labor Temple in my district. Eloquent as these tributes are to this distinguished religious leader, they cannot and do not do full justice to his extraordinary devotion to his fellow men and to his work as minister and pastor. It would take volumes to report fully on all that he has done for, and meant to, not only the East Side, in which he carries on his ministry, but for all America whom he seeks to serve.

The articles that follow are token tributes among the many that are his due:

LET'S COUNT OUR BLESSINGS

Living as we do in the shadow of the A-bomb and confronted each day with stories in the press of an alarming increase in crime and juvenile delinquency; of strife and impending war and disaster, we are prone to believe that all is evil and that virtue has abdicated.

It is therefore with pride, in this holy week of Easter and Passover, that we pause to pay homage to a man of God, our good neighbor, the Reverend Richard E. Evans, minister of the Presbyterian Labor Temple.

Under the dynamic administration of Dick Evans, who came to Labor Temple some 5 years ago, this oasis has become a true temple of all the people—a living, pulsating symbol of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

At Labor Temple kids do battle on the basketball court, on the premise that if boys play together they can live and work together. Here, too, at Labor Temple is home for Hebrew School and Quaker Seminary; Russian Christian Choir and Seventh Day Adventists; Christian fraternity and B'nai B'rith; the Brownies, Boy Scouts, Family Circle, and veteran groups; for civilian defense, mothers' clubs, Jewish Writers Union, and Greek societies.

At Labor Temple the friends of Spinoza lecture and Mizrachi chapter meet. Here the fellowship of all men is revered and the welcome mat is out for those of every race, creed, color, and national origin.

For this is America, this is democracy, a shining face to show to all the world. We feel that the world-famous author, Will Durant, summed it up when he recently said:

"It gladdens my heart to see that my alma mater, Labor Temple, is in the hands of so noble a lover of humanity as Dick Evans, and is bringing together, without any proselytizing, men and women of diverse Christian and Jewish denominations, and helping them to live together in friendship and concord. I owe much of my education to Labor Temple. It taught me that civilization is a cooperative product, the work of many people; and there I learned that clarity is a moral obligation of a teacher. I hope that this unique institution which does not merely preach interfaith fellowship but practices it every hour of the day, will be adequately supported to go on with its undiscourageable conviction that all men are brothers."

And when we pay tribute to Dick Evans and to Labor Temple, we hasten to include the gracious little lady, who not only has been the inspiration of his life but whose radiant spirit permeates every activity of this historic institution. In her own right she has lived a magnificent life of devotion to God and service to humanity. His foster-mother, Miss Sarah E. Dickson, the first woman elder in the history of the Presbyterian Church, is known affectionately far and wide as "The Chief."

We can think of no finer words to describe her than those used by Dr. Alexander Sharp of the National Board of the Presbyterian Church at a dinner given in her honor recently, when he said:

"'The Chief,' as she is known affectionately, belongs in the roster of unforgettable characters, once you have seen or met her. Her hair is gray but her heart is eternally young. Her body is slight, but her spirit is as vital and vibrant as a youth's. Her eyes take in the world—as it is, and as it can become. She loves people—sharing with them their fun; bearing with them their sorrow. Her mind grasps instantly the complex issues of this day; her heart resolves them in magnanimity. She is a personal radiation center of spiritual power who leaves us all stronger for having come within the radius of her spirit.

"Thank you for being yourself."

We say thank God for "The Chief," for Dick Evans, and for Labor Temple. Let's count our blessings.

ONE CLERIC'S FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Ernst Jacobi)

During the course of a recent trip through Europe and the Near East, the Reverend Richard E. Evans, of New York's Labor Temple, had dinner with Pastor Moss, rector of Heidelberg's Heiligengeist Kerche, and one of Germany's foremost Protestant clergymen. Dr. Evans told him about his work at the Labor Temple, explaining how members of nine different congregations and widely divergent racial and ethnic minorities were all worshiping harmoniously under one roof and in one chapel.

"This is madness," the German pastor exclaimed. "But it's divine madness," he added, after a moment's reflection.

Almost everything Dick Evans has done in his life had this tinge of divine madness. He has preached in Negro churches in the South, openly defying the Klan; challenged and broke the Bund during the height of his popularity in the heart land of its strength, in Milwaukee, Wis. An ordained Presbyterian minister, he has raised funds for Israel; made himself into one of the stanchest defenders and protectors of the predominantly Roman Catholic Puerto Rican minority group in New York; and advocated the return to the fundamental principles of the Judeo-Christian tradition within his own church. He has sided with the underdog and fought tyranny in whichever form it showed itself—communism, fascism, or bigotry.

Dick Evans was a lad of 18, working in the Chicago stockyards after the First World War, when he had his first brush with social injustice and intolerance during the terrible race riots of 1919. Ever since then he has devoted his life to fighting these evils.

It's a battle for which he's well equipped. He has the Welshman's gusto for a good fight and gift for fiery oratory, along with unflinching personal and moral courage. Attempting to silence Dick Evans when he's aroused is like trying to smother a volcano.

To take one day the helm of New York's Labor Temple, where many of his ideals were being translated into action had been one of Dick Evans' lifelong ambitions. But when the call finally came to him, in 1950, the famous 40-year-old institution had lost much of its former vitality and missionary spirit. There was talk of closing it unless Dick Evans could somehow revive it. In less than 5 years he has since raised its monthly attendance figure to over 20,000, making it into a shining example of what he calls symphonic democracy. Its doors are open to all denominations, creeds, and races; its forum at the disposal of all viewpoints, even the most intolerant ones, as long as its advocates are willing to stay and listen to discussion and rebuttal.

During his busy life, Dick Evans has acquired not wealth, but a great many friends and a great many enemies. He's equally proud of both.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

A Soldier for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the American Legion has been doing some special work in the effort to stimulate patriotic sentiments in our high-school boys and girls. One of the projects, which is working especially well, is the annual patriotic speech contest.

This year the contest was won in South Dakota by Gary Schulz, of Mitchell, S. Dak., whose oration was entitled "A Soldier for America." I feel that his speech contained many ideas and professed many ideals on which all of us could reflect. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have this thrilling and inspiring patriotic address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOLDIER FOR AMERICA

(By Gary Schulz)

In Arlington National Cemetery stands the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Upon the flawless white marble is the inscription: "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God." In the hallowed silence of the dead, a glowing sun casts radiant spendor over the tomb of a lone man, a man chosen to represent all those who have offered their lives for our country. The tribute paid in humble gratitude to this man is paid to every individual whose life and work have come to be part of the United States of America.

The body was placed there in 1921, immediately following the First World War, but many years after the death of the first American soldier, many years after men had begun to sacrifice their lives for our Nation.

Many years ago, upon the turbulent ocean, a frail ship sailed slowly forward toward a distant shore. A small group of weary people stood on the deck of that ship, their eyes gazing hopefully into the misty haze of an early morning. These people had deserted their homes, their families, had risked a lifetime of work and achievement for an ideal; within the hearts of these people was the realization that in the vast world there could be a place where man could love his God, where man could live with pride and dignity, where man could be free. It was upon the shore, seen only vaguely in the distance, that their eyes saw promise of a great nation, a nation tall and proud, a nation they would build. And from across the towering mountains and rolling prairies the new day's sun foretold their words that would live forever: "We, the people."

There followed behind many more ships and soon 13 tiny colonies sprang to life; 13 colonies worked and built and created until one day, when these people were no longer able to endure the injustice and mistreatment which came from across the ocean, they banded together, all in one accord, and sent back to that world living under the imprisoning bondage of only a few, separate individuals, the truth which so long had been repressed by autocracies, monarchies, and dictatorships. They said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And the yoke of time and fear was lifted from their lives.

The first step had then been taken and there could be no turning back. Filled with the inflaming desire to confirm and substantiate their words, they raised high the sword of justice and beneath it fell the greatest empire of the world. A newly created country took form, a country that needed law, law which would give these people their freedom, law which would also protect them from ever again being subversed in the hands which bring human subjection.

In 1787 the delegates of those colonies moved slowly, but deliberately into this lucubration, the creation of government that would protect the life, liberty, and property of its citizens and thus secure the happiness of individuals and the prosperity of the Nation. Their doctrine was to be the culmination of all men's aspirations from the beginning of life; it was to finally abolish the injustices, the iniquities, and the grievances to which man had been subjected; it was to confer and accord to mankind those sanctioned rights and privileges which had unlawfully been taken from him. Their manifestation was to be an affirmation of justice.

It was when the last delegate had signed his name that the impossible, the unthinkable had been accomplished. From that assemblage came the immortal Constitution of the United States.

Yet the most decisive step was still to come, for the law alone could not complete true government, especially since this government was rooted in its citizens. Their final judgment was to determine the fate of an ideal. Whether or not this novel and unprecedented form of representative democracy could succeed was to be decided by the reaction of the people; this law required their fullhearted cooperation and participation or it would fall into the annals of impossibilities. Could such a young country with its untried government survive; could it stand in a world long established and founded; could it unite and become strong? The crucial test was to come.

At last citizens of a nation were granted freedom of religion, and God was worshipped in the hearts of all; freedom of speech, and voices resounded in the void that was once silence; freedom of public assemblage, and common, everyday citizens became the power.

At last citizens of a nation were granted the right of trial by jury, and fear left the minds of men; the right of petition, and the people became the government; the right to vote, and the ballot became assurance; the right of equality, and men and women of all races and all creeds stood equal in the sight of justice.

Within 5 years, order and strength replaced the chaos and confusion of the Original Thirteen Separate Colonies. Round the globe every country came to respect and admire this miraculous achievement. In every corner of the world people heard and dreamed of living in this land of opportunity, this cradle of freedom. Every year brought more immigrants, every month brought more prosperity, every day brought strength to the Constitution.

And when, in 1861, there seemed suddenly chance of destruction, of disintegration, brother turned against brother in a war of sacrifice for that document. A great man spoke out in time of crisis, a man of wisdom, * * * "With malice toward none, with charity for all * * * " The wounds were healed and peace prevailed until 1917, when in distant lands an aggressor sought to trespass upon human beings, the first call for world leadership came from across the seas. The time had come for the American soldier to move beyond his native shore, to move into the world bearing testament of the ideal. That call was answered and the Stars and Stripes of freedom were unfurled to every man, woman, and child who before knew only the chains and shackles of slavery.

So it is that the Constitution, leader of the world, leader of all mankind, is still waging its crusade in the cause of justice and liberty. Today it stands steadfast and indestructible against every power that would destroy it.

In Arlington National Cemetery lies one man who offered the supreme sacrifice for this document, one of the multitude. He is the men and women who dared to leave their homes to seek out this land with only an ideal; he is those men who took arms against their mother country to make the ideal possible; he is a signer of the final written document which made the ideal a reality; he is a brother who walked to battle against brother to save that ideal; he is the men and women who have crossed the oceans and seas to universalize this ideal. And that soldier is the farmer who tills the prairies, he is the mother who keeps the home, he is the minister who teaches goodness and truth, he is the businessman, the lawyer, the carpenter, the laborer, the schoolboy. He is in every home, every church, every school. He is an American.

Ladies and gentlemen, each of you is an American citizen. Each of you is a soldier or an enemy of our Constitution. In order that this supreme law may continue, you must give it strength. What reason can there be for freedom of religion in a land where men and women have forgotten God, what purpose is the privilege of free speech when no one cares to speak of anything more than a bridge game or the latest movie, of what worth is the right to vote when a citizen casts his vote for a candidate he doesn't know, of what justice is equality when boys and girls are denied proper education because of the color of their skin?

In your hands have been placed the privileges and obligations of all ages. You have been given the task of making valid those sacrifices of American soldiers who have gone before you, and of continuing where they laid down to rest. A soldier is an American, but not an American filled with apathy, ignorance, and indifference; he is not an American whose acknowledgment of responsibility is indolence, nor a citizen whose response to his country ends with the thoughtless recitation of an allegiance to our flag. An American soldier is not the individual who refuses to accept the heritage of a great ideal, an ideal that took centuries of suffering and dying to fulfill, a heritage made sacred by the blood of young men at Concord and Bunker Hill, at Gettysburg, at Argonne, at Iwo Jima, at Heartbreak Ridge. The survival of our Nation, of our Constitution, and all that they died fighting for, is in your hands. You alone can take up their battle, you alone, as a soldier of America.

In the dusk of evening the image of a tall, thin man walks among the endless rows of white crosses. His voice echoes sadly from out of time passed, calling to the people whose Constitution is the crowning achievement of all time. He pauses silently to read the inscription of a marble tomb in Arlington National Cemetery and Abraham Lincoln speaks once more, to you, the living, "that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Recovery Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, herewith attached are two articles. One is an editorial from the New York Times of today. The other is by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, writing in the New York Herald Tribune on April 11, 1955. Both bear on the remarkable economic recovery of this country during the past few months, as well as on the prospects for the future:

[From the New York Times of April 25, 1955]

RECOVERY PICTURE

If there had been any lingering doubt that the recession of 1953–54 was now definitely behind us that doubt should be effectively resolved with the publication by the McGraw-Hill Economic Department of the capital investment plans of American business for 1955.

Six months ago a preliminary survey by this same organization indicated that capital spending by manufacturing industries would be some 7 percent lower in 1955 than in 1954. Now all but 3 of the industries covered in this category have revised their estimates upward. The revised outlook is for a 3-percent increase in the capital investment in manufacturing and 5 percent for business as a whole. Some of the specific revisions are little short of spectacular considering the length of the interval between the 2 reports. Last fall, for example, the iron and steel companies were planning to cut their spending on plant and equipment in 1955 by 3 percent; now they are planning to increase it by 29 percent. Machinery companies have shifted their sights from a 1-percent reduction to a 14-percent expansion, and paper companies, which only recently foresaw a drop of 6 percent, now are making plans for a 10-percent expansion.

This study, organized 8 years ago by Dexter Keezer, combines the advantage of sensitivity with the fact that it deals with the most vital driving force in the economy. In addition it now looks 3 years into the future. Plans become increasingly approximations, needless to say, the farther away the year covered. However, the preliminary estimates for future years have customarily been kept deliberately on the conservative side and have had to be adjusted upward later. With this fact in mind, it is particularly important to note that, although the figure now indicated for 1955, namely, $29.4 billions, would set a new record for capital spending, preliminary estimates for 1956 point to a decline in that year of only 3 percent. Should history repeat itself with respect to the pattern of revisions, this gap could not only be closed before another year has come around but transformed into a substantial increase.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 11, 1955]

WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

THE OVERLOOKED BIG STORY

WASHINGTON.—Nobody is yet leaking the biggest story in the United States today.

It isn't classified and it's staring us right in the face. The pessimists may hesitate to admit it and the optimists may fear they will not be believed. But there is full evidence to support it and there is no use delaying the news:

The 1954 recession is over.

Every significant business indicator is on the rise and has been on the rise for months.

At several points the economy is beginning to set new records. The upturn has now been so sustained and so steady that it is accurate to say that the recession which began in July 1953, reached its depth in March 1954, and began to saucer out in October 1954, is well in the past.

A new period of growth and stability is at hand.

Here are the most meaningful business indices which justify this report:

Industrial production has risen from a low of 123 on the Federal Reserve index in the March-August period last year to an estimated 135 in March this year.

The gross national product has grown from a low annual rate of $355 billion to about $369 billion during the last quarter—better than anybody anticipated.

Personal income, made up largely of wages and salaries, has risen from a 1954 low rate of $283.4 billion to an alltime high of $292 billion.

The average workweek has moved up from 39.3 hours to 40.7.

New plant and equipment spending has begun to increase, reversing a 2-year downtrend.

Industrial employment has risen steadily for 7 consecutive months and industrial unemployment has gone down consistently for 6 months and is now leveling off.

Total unemployment was down 548,000 this March from a year ago and total employment was up 400,000.

Some precisionists among the economists will want to throw in a layer of "ifs" and "buts." Throw them in and you still come up with the conclusion that, while there may be another recession some time, this one is over. It has been a remarkable experience—remarkable for these reasons:

Because it was one of the most short-lived and least severe slumps in American economic history.

Because it showed that, although there will continue to be wrinkles in the Nation's economy, man-made measures—both private and governmental—are capable of controlling the extremes of the business cycle.

Because it proves anew, and increases confidence in, the resiliency of the American enterprise economy.

It is impossible to measure which factor or which set of factors did most to shorten, to cushion and to reverse the 1953–54 recession. But there are discernible measures which each contributed to that end. They are:

1. The brilliantly timed and perceptive shift of the Federal Reserve System, in advance of the recession from a hard-money policy to an easy-money policy which relieved many pressures toward forced liquidation.

2. The deliberate and, from its standpoint, substantially unorthodox decision of the Eisenhower administration to carry through the scheduled lowering of income and excess profits taxes despite an unbalanced budget.

3. The fact that business stuck by its long-range investment and did not run to shelter at the first sign of trouble.

4. The visible impact of the built-in shock absorbers which Government has added in the past 20 years to the functioning of the economy—unemployment insurance, social security (both expanded in the past 2 years) plus the general leveling up of incomes.

The Federal Government resisted the pressures and the political temptation to launch a crash spending and reflation program at the onset of the recession. It was called blind and heedless by some. In retrospect its diagnosis proved accurate and its actions equal to the need.

Robinson-Patman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my remarks in the RECORD recently, the recommendations of the Attorney General's committee to study the antitrust laws are receiving wide attention.

Some of the recommendations strike at the very heart of the Robinson-Patman law. My service on the House Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over all monopoly and antitrust legislation, has afforded me an opportunity to keep in close touch with the operations of the Robinson-Patman law, the court decisions interpreting it, and the efforts constantly made to weaken it. This law was passed by Congress in the interest of the small independent businessman. It is intended to give the small man an opportunity to stay in business and it has demonstrated its usefulness over the years.

We frequently hear loose statements to the effect or at least implying that the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, requires the selling of commodities of like grade and quality at the same price, under all circumstances. This is simply not true. The act specifically permits the manufacturer on supplier to sell commodities of like grade and quality to different customers at different prices, where the difference is due to normal discount for cash, quantity buying, freight savings, and other varieties of customary and acceptable business practices. Cash discounts, savings in freight based on quantity buying, differentials which make due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from differing methods or quantities in which commodities are sold to the purchaser—all such advantages have always been available to operators. Such fair business practices were customary prior to the adoption of the Robinson-Patman Act and they have not been changed by that law.

What the act prohibits is purely arbitrary price discrimination, not remotely connected with economic reasons, so

that the discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly or to endanger, destroy or prevent competition. Such price discriminations mean that a manufacturer or supplier has two prices, a secret and very low price for a few favored customers such as chain stores, and a so-called public high price for the independent little-business man in the community, such as the corner-grocery store, hardware store, drug store, and filling station. It prohibits under-the-counter concessions to the favored few under such guises as excessive free goods, brokerage commissions, rebates, and so on.

One of the favored devices to crush the small-business man was the maintenance of so-called brokerage departments by large buyers. A majority of the Attorney General's committee proposes to amend the act so as to permit payment of brokerage to buyers to the extent of services rendered the seller by the buyer. Beware of this proposal. In that connection, I want to make a part of the RECORD the letter I received from California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp., dated April 21, 1955. It tells the story so very clearly that I cannot possibly improve on it, and I commend it to all the friends of the small-business man in Congress. The letter follows:

CALIFORNIA & HAWAIIAN
SUGAR REFINING CORP.,
San Francisco, Calif., April 21, 1955.

The Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIS: I am writing to state this company's strong opposition to the position of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws regarding the brokerage section of the Robinson-Patman Act.

As the law now stands, section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act forbids payment of brokerage to any person who is acting for or is under the control of a buyer. This provision was aimed at an abuse widely practiced before adoption of the act—the maintenance of so-called brokerage departments by large buyers. Such buyers were in the practice of demanding brokerage for these departments in amounts completely unrelated to the value of any services received by the seller. The brokerage was of course nothing but a price concession given color of validity by the brokerage department device.

A majority of the Attorney General's Committee proposes to amend section 2 (c) of the act so as to permit payment of brokerage to buyers to the extent of services rendered the seller by the buyer. In our opinion this seemingly innocent exception would make the section entirely unenforceable. It would make every complaint under the section depend on difficult questions of cost accounting. In practical effect, the section would be a dead letter.

The consequences would be extremely serious, both to sellers and all but the largest buyers. It is only relatively large buyers that are in a position to establish brokerage departments and take advantage of the loophole proposed by the Attorney General's Committee. In our judgment the committee's proposal is inconsistent with the basic purpose of the act, to preserve equality of economic opportunity.

The payment of brokerage to a buyer is a merchandising absurdity. A bona fide broker is the seller's sales representative; his functions is to give sales service. In the nature of things a "broker" employed by a buyer cannot and will not do this job. A more honest and descriptive name for a broker acting for a buyer is purchasing agent. His interests are essentially adverse to those of the seller, and no seller would ever voluntarily agree to pay him. This practical inability of such a broker to give any service of value to a seller justifies the present outright prohibition of brokerage in such a case. Any payment to such a broker is in practical effect a payment to a buyer's purchasing department and results in unfair discrimination as between competing buyers.

Please forgive the length of this letter. This company well remembers the brokerage practices that existed before the adoption of section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act. They were costly and unfair, and should never be permitted again.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD MACLEAN.

Forced Repatriation in Treaty Protested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called the attention of my colleagues to House Resolution 137, which I introduced on February 8, 1955, and which was referred to the Committee on Rules. This resolution, if passed, would set up a select committee to investigate the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47 and fix the responsibility for same.

At this time we are giving a good deal of attention to the Austrian State Treaty, and we should examine it thoroughly and make sure that we do not make the same mistake with regard to forced repatriation that we made following World War II. I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of my colleagues article 16 of the Austrian State Treaty.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by Mr. Julius Epstein to the New York Herald Tribune giving an excellent analysis of article 16, which appeared in the April 23, 1955, edition of said newspaper.

FORCED REPATRIATION IN TREATY PROTESTED

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The Austrian State Treaty which the Soviets and the Austrian Government just agreed to sign—pending the consent of the American, British, and French Governments—may well bring about one of the greatest tragedies in modern history.

The origin of this tragedy must be seen in the Soviet version of article 16 which deals with former Soviet citizens who are now living as displaced persons in Austria. There are now about 30,000.

Article 16 of the Austrian State Treaty, against which the American Government had fought for about 8 years, and which it suddenly accepted on February 13, 1954, at the Berlin conference, creates a similar situation as had existed in 1945, when Soviet missions visited our POW camps and when we forcibly repatriated millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians.

Article 16 provides:

"Austria undertakes * * * to take all necessary measures to complete the voluntary repatriation of displaced persons within its territory." Today, 10 years after the end of hostilities, there is, of course, not a single displaced person in Austria who, voluntarily, would want to be repatriated to the Soviets.

"Austria undertakes to render full assistance to the allied and associated powers [read to the Soviet Government] concerned in regard to the voluntary repatriation of their nationals and will enter into direct bilateral negotiations for this purpose." That means that a powerless Austrian Government would have to face the Soviet Government. Under these circumstances it is, of course, more than doubtful that the human rights of the anti-Communist displaced persons could ever be protected.

"Austria further undertakes:

"To permit the accredited representatives of any allied or associated power [read Soviet representative] * * * to visit freely such camps or centers for the purpose of conferring with its nationals." This provision can only mean the repetition of the horrible scenes of attempted coercion which the world had witnessed in the neutral zone in Korea.

"To prohibit in such camps or centers any propaganda hostile to the interest of the allied and associated powers [read of the Soviet Government] and any activities designed to induce such displaced persons not to return to the countries of which they are nationals." This stipulation gives the Soviets a complete monopoly of propaganda, coercion, and blackmail with no possibility to counteract the brainwashing to be expected in Austrian camps.

"To dissolve immediately any committee, center, and other similar organizations existing in those camps and assembly centers that may be found to be engaged in activities opposed to the interests of the allied and associated powers." Read the Bolshevist tyranny. This paragraph can only be interpreted as a deprivation of all organized aid and protection and an invitation to the Soviet agents in Austria to destroy the lives of the 30,000 vigorously anti-Communist displaced persons.

Paragraph 5 of article 16 provides:

"No relief shall be given by Austria to persons who refuse to return to their native countries. If these persons fought on the side of the enemies of the allied and associated powers, or voluntarily collaborated with the enemies of these powers, or are engaged in hostile activities against their countries of origin, as well as against any of the United Nations, or are members of organizations and groups which encourage displaced persons not to return to their countries of origin."

This paragraph is the most insidious clause of the Austrian State Treaty. It is the first time in history that a government will be forbidden by international law to give aid to the poor and destitute. It means a complete renouncing of the principles of western civilization.

If these provisions of the Austrian State Treaty should ever become valid, it would only mean a tremendous Soviet victory in the cold war of ideas and morals.

There can be no doubt that validation of the provisions mentioned above would put an end to the ideological war, would render utterly useless our anti-Soviet media as the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberation, and would certainly deprive us of the last vestiges of our reputation as defenders of liberty and human rights, especially in Asia and Europe.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK, *April 21, 1955.*

S. 923

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a petition and list of signers from Huntington, W. Va., in support of S. 923. These citizens protest the advertising of alcoholic beverages in magazines and newspapers and over the radio and television, and request that they so be recorded:

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We the undersigned citizens of Huntington, W. Va., urge you to use your influence in support of Langer bill S. 923. This bill if passed will prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the air:

Marion Fisher, Mrs. V. B. Gothard, Mrs. Vernon Johnson, D. L. Brumfield, E. M. Pridemore, Mrs. Edgar Pridemore, Mrs. Marion Fisher, Mrs. L. O. Adkins, Mrs. C. L. Cremeans, C. L. Cremeans, L. O. Adkins, Lorraine Pennywitt, Floyd H. Adams, Lloyd Y. Bayless, Maxine Bayless, Mr. and Mrs. P. J. Hutchinson, Jewell Brumfield, Mrs. N. E. Berry, Ruth Zimmerman, Patricia Zirkle, James Zirkle, Robert Zimmerman, James Allen Reed, Mrs. J. A. Reed, Mrs. Charles Bias, Wetzel G. Owens, J. D. Wilkes, Clive Ferguson, Mrs. Clive Ferguson, Joseph J. Patton, John J. Hedrick, Doris Hedrick, Mayme White, Mrs. Robert L. Hunt, Garland R. White, Howard A. Meadows, Mrs. H. A. Meadows, Mr. and Mrs. Herman Day, Mrs. George Coos, Mr. and Mrs. Carl I. Eves, Garland R. White, Claude L. Nelson.

Orland Hunt, Claude Shy, Rev. Ran H. Ball, Harry Patterson, Herbert Wysong, Taylor Allen, Juan Leap, E. G. Snyder, Henry M. Barbour, Thomas Eves, Even Eves, C. B. Childert, A. F. Hooker, Sheely Shurlock, Everett L. Zimmerman, Robert F. Hunt, Russell Bower, S. C. Newman, J. L. Cooke, E. W. Charlton, Earl Wheeler, W. M. Gill, E. F. Waedl, Archie Adkins, W. A. Roberts, C. A. Dillon, H. T. Pribble, M. H. Campbell, M. R. Shepard, H. B. Wheeler, A. W. Holley, Russell Jenkins, Kerzie Donahoe, Gene Berry, H. W. Edwards, Roscoe Childers, Dempsey W. Vickers.

J. E. Cregger, Mrs. Euna M. Cregger, Mike Chafin, Helen Weekley, Otto Dinger, Bernice Smith, Mabel Rumbaugh, Mrs. Otis Rusil, Sr., Mrs. Ollie Weeghan, J. W. Neumun, O. L. Bawyer, Mrs. Hosea R. Hodges, Ralph E. Fawlkes, Harry Davis, J. N. Bell, Mrs. Opal Barr, Byron I. Judy, Reva Mae Judy, Lura Hetchings, Dorothy Watts, Euna M. Cregger, C. V. Humphrey, Reba Davis, Dorothy Smith, John A. Busch, Delphia Johnson, Beatrice Hall, Nelle M. Campbell, Mrs. John Calvert, Evelyn Miller, Robert H. Miller, Vernard W. Griffin, Katherine Vasvary, Lorena Richardson, Agnes C. Sliger, H. E. Hill, Faye Shields, Walter A. Stvore, Louie Sanford, J. Richard Malcolm, Eloise F. Malcolm, Ludia Gibson, Kathleen Browning, S. Y. Dobbin, Mrs. R. E. Fawlkes, Lloyd J. Mullins.

Florence Ball, R. Cecil Ball, C. C. Hobost, Mabel Chinn, George Chinn, Virginia Worland, R. C. Worland, H. O. Morris, Helen Griffis, Ruth Johnson, Bessie Andrews, Wm. Paul McNee, Flora Hill, D. B. Shumaker, Grace V. Shumaker, Josephine Hoback, Kathryn A. Jones, Harold E. Ward, Kermit Shields, Mrs. I. L. Green, Mrs. A. H. Adamson, Mrs. Margaret Y. Matthews, Clara E. Richardson, Mrs. J. H. McComas, Mrs. I. F. Gillen, Mrs. J. H. Lenny, Mrs. D. B. Shumaker, Alice D. Crawford, Mrs. Edna E. Ferguson, Mrs. Mary B. Williamson, Mrs. W. F. Taylor, Verne Taylor, Mrs. J. H. Dawson, Mrs. Ethel Morrow, Mrs. E. G. Yost, Mrs. Ellis Watts, Mrs. Bertha Grogg, J. R. Morrow, Ruth Newman, Frank Hitchings.

Mrs. Luella Holley, Mrs. Lee Huff, Mrs. Namie Sullivan, Mrs. T. H. Lambert, Mrs. N. Johnson, Mrs. Mamie Ray, Mrs. Lizzie Earls, Mrs. Kerzie Donaho, Mrs. Anna Curtis, Mrs. R. H. Ball, Mabel Whitehead, Mrs. Edna Smith, Ada Eves, Mrs. C. A. Dillon, Pearl Fapping, Mrs. Opal Moreland, Mrs. Vesta Edwards, Mrs. R. A. Petit, Doris C. Miller, J. A. Arauslicent.

We, the undersigned residents of Huntington, W. Va., do petition the legislature to reject House Joint Resolution No. 5, which would in effect permit the sale of liquor by the drink, and we ask you to support House Bill No. 37, which provides for local option on beer, and also for your support of House Bill No. 207, to close beer establishments all day Sunday.

Tom Shepherd, Mrs. Evelyn Brilhart, Mrs. Millie Valentine, Mrs. Gordon Gore, Mrs. L. L. Sutton, Mrs. R. J. Haselip, June Baker, Mrs. Carl Sutton, Mrs. Ernest Rood, Katie Mae Sutton, Mrs. Willis Gilbert, Mrs. Georgia MacCalla, Mrs. Martha Greig, Mrs. M. J. Heller, W. H. Norton, Willis Gilbert, P. C. Vernatte, William L. Hartz, David Byers, Thelma McIlvain, W. E. McIlvain, M. D.; J. A. Meador, J. S. Hanshaw, James W. Stean, Robert Wamsley.

Richard Bosten, Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Carson, Mrs. Paul R. Robertson, Mrs. Milo F. Melrose, Jr., Milo F. Melrose, Jr., Mrs. P. E. Dundas, Mrs. Wm. Rice, Mrs. J. A. Meador, Mrs. Wm. Joseph, Mrs. Harper E. Williams, Mrs. Lillian Childers, Mrs. Marvin Lowe, Marilyn Wamsley, Phyllis Stanley, Kathryn Jenkins, Peggy Robertson, Georgia Wheeler, Doris Hylbert, Mattie Charlton, Mrs. H. C. Russell, Mrs. H. B. Wheeler, Mrs. Everett L. Zimmerman, Mrs. Ola Hooker, Mrs. John R. Moore, Mrs. W. L. Ringer, Mrs. Dana C. Ashley, Opal Floyd, Mrs. Archie Adkins, Mrs. W. R. Marks, Mrs. E. G. Snyder, Mrs. A. R. Roswall, Mrs. J. L. Cooke, Mrs. V. C. Becket, Mrs. Evan Eves, Mrs. M. H. Campbell, Mrs. Eril Leap, Mrs. O. C. Hunt, Mrs. B. W. Marcum, Miss Jessie L. Shy, Mrs. O. L. Zimmerman, Mrs. Austin Day, Mrs. John Ray, Mrs. Ruth Duke, Mrs. Josephine Atkins, Mrs. T. E. Dunkle, Mrs. S. C. Neuman, Mrs. Shelby Spurlock, Mrs. E. H. Parsons, Mrs. H. M. Barbour, Mrs. J. H. Barbour, Mrs. M. R. Shepard, T. E. Dunkle, H. H. Harless.

The Hells Canyon Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Capital Journal, of Portland, Oreg., on April 7, 1955:

THE HELLS CANYON HEARINGS

As a Boston paper once said of a better speech week, the congressional committee that held hearings in the Northwest on the bill for a high dam in Hells Canyon "has came and went," after hearings in Boise, Lewiston, Pasco, and Portland.

The visit was planned by pro-Hells Canyon solons, presumably as a political Roman holiday to grace Easter Week, for it was hardly conceivable that any important new facts would be developed after the Federal Power Commission had spent so many months hearing the experts air all the pros and cons:

They sought to bypass southern Idaho, locale of the bitterest opposition, but agreed to gave Boise half a day. There they really got a ground swell from the grassroots. Two hundred organizations, chambers of commerce, granges, irrigation districts, etc., a cross section of the region with the exception of the labor unions and the Democratic Party organization showed up to oppose the bill. Headed by Governor Smylie, who defeated a pro-Hells Canyon opponent last fall. Eight hundred persons crowded the auditorium, cheered the anti-Hells Canyoners, booed the pros till they were shut up by Senator MURRAY, a pro.

The committee was glad to leave that hotbed behind at noon Monday and fly to Lewiston which was supposedly in the other camp. There and at Pasco about the same number of witnesses were heard on each side, repeating the familiar arguments.

At Portland Wednesday both sides were heard in about equal volume. There the opposition was led by the Governors of Washington and Oregon and two former presidents of the National Reclamation Association. If the crowd showed any preference, it was for the opposition, though it appeared courteous to both sides.

What did the hearing show? That there is a lot of opposition to this project in three principal States of the Columbia Basin. Usually a proposal to dump half a billion of Federal money in a region evokes nothing but applause there. The objections come from taxpayers elsewhere. Here is a big Federal spending project strongly opposed in the Northwest States. The committee, which came out here expecting a very different reception must wish it had never come. The result is bound to weaken leftwing enthusiasm and strengthen the opposition that almost certainly includes a substantial majority in Congress.

Surplus Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the laws passed by Congress, including the most recent Public Law 480, in substance and essence constitute directives to the Department of Agriculture to find outlets for surplus farm commodities in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices.

I am willing to concede that these directives of necessity present administrative difficulties. On the other hand, many of us in Congress honestly feel that the program outlined by Congress has been pursued by the Secretary of Agriculture with something less than vigor and enthusiasm. This could be due to the fact that because of alleged international considerations the State Department has put a damper on or at least has been cool to the program. But whatever the reason for it the cold fact is that our surplus farm commodities have not moved in the channels of foreign trade, as contemplated and directed by Congress.

Rice is a typical case in point as brought out recently by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Representative E. C. GATHINGS, one of the farmer's best friends in Congress. Following a discussion with Mr. GATHINGS, I addressed the following telegram, dated April 12, 1955, to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State:

APRIL 12, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand that as conditions to the proposed transfer of 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice by our Government to Japan, the State Department is seeking to have Agriculture Department to agree first that in the future no rice will be offered on the world markets at less than current domestic prices and, second, that no rice will be exported into the southeast Asian markets. The first condition would, in my opinion, be in direct violation of the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 480 and the second would constitute a trade barrier which neither State nor Agriculture can impose. Further, such restrictions would no doubt result in further reduction of domestic rice acreage which has already been cut too deeply. I strongly protest any action of this nature and would appreciate your advising that these or any other similar restrictive conditions have been or will be removed and that program of disposal of rice will be pursued vigorously as contemplated by Congress.

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert in the RECORD the reply of the Department of State, dated April 18, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 18, 1955.

The Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILLIS: Reference is made to your telegram of April 12 concerning the question of rice sales in Asian markets.

We recognize the desirability of finding outlets for United States surplus rice in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices, as the Congress has stipulated. We support such an objective. We have not taken a position to embargo sales of rice in southeast Asia.

Your attention is called to the fact that title I, section 101 of Public Law 480 provides that in negotiating agreements "the President shall (a) take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that sales under this act will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities."

On September 9, 1954 the President issued an Executive order and a general policy statement for the implementation of Public Law 480, which outlined the basic problems as well as certain of the responsibilities in connection with the administration of this act. Two paragraphs of the policy statement are hereinafter quoted in full.

"Today, the magnitude of the United States' holdings of many commodities is such as to be capable of demoralizing world commodity markets should a policy of reckless selling abroad be pursued. This potential greatly alarms other countries despite the fact that past behavior of the United States has shown no intention of pursuing a harmful policy."

* * * * *

"The United States cannot be satisfied with the position of holding its own supplies off the market and accumulating surpluses while other countries dispose of their entire production. Accordingly, the United States will offer its products at competitive prices. At the same time, the United States will not use its agricultural surpluses to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices of agricultural commodites."

The State Department, from the very outset of the problem of surplus agricultural commodities, has been intent upon opening up possible permanent foreign markets for American commodities, and particularly in the areas where consumption may be increased. Our primary concern has been to widen the markets and to create a situation which will permit a continuation of sales abroad on an expanding basis. The Department has been concerned that we do not enter into potential price wars which can only harm the American farmers and defeat the basic foreign policy concept clearly set forth in the introduction of Public Law 480.

A decision to dispose of United States surplus rice stocks in Asian markets under Public Law 480 or at subsidized prices under existing uneasy political conditions in that area is one which should involve consideration of the important questions of foreign policy which are concernd. In particular, disposal in a manner which would have the effect either of depriving Burma and Thailand of their traditional markets or of depressing export prices, or of threatening to do so, may seriously jeopardize the enthusiasm of those countries to resist Communist overtures. Few actions on our part could be more suitable to Communist propaganda which is already pounding into Asian ears the charge that the United States surplus disposal program disregards the economic interests of Asian countries.

The specific question of rice disposals in Asia is now being considered at the highest levels of the administration to determine the manner in which our surplus disposal program and our critically important foreign policy intersts in Asia can be reconciled.

Sincerly yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. Speaker, I was, of course, very pleased with the second paragraph of the letter, which I repeat:

We recognize the desirability of finding outlets for United States surplus rice in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices, as the Congress has stipulated. We support such an objective. We have not taken a position to embargo sales of rice in southeast Asia.

And while the succeeding paragraphs in the letter were perhaps necessarily general, I was nevertheless pleased with the assurance of the last statement to the effect that "the specific question of rice disposals in Asia is now being considered at the highest levels of the administration," and so forth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, 3 days later, on April 21, 1955, I received the following letter from the Department of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 21, 1955.

Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIS: We have your telegram of April 12 to Secretary Benson regarding the proposed transfer of 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice by our Government to Japan.

The Department of Agriculture has been discussing this transfer thoroughly with the Department of State and other interested parties. We are now in the process of going ahead on negotiations for the transfer.

As you may know, the Department of State is properly interested in making sure that relations with friendly nations are not jeopardized by any transfer of foodstuffs involving substantial subsidy that might interfere with normal marketings by other friendly nations.

However, I am glad to inform you that in this case satisfactory arrangements were worked out to proceed with negotiations.

Assuring you of our desire to pursue every possible avenue to move rice into the export markets, I am

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, evidently the considerations at highest level of the administration referred to by the State Department bore fruit because in the letter of the Department of Agriculture I find this significant sentence:

I am glad to inform you that in this case satisfactory arrangements were worked out to proceed with negotiations.

I sincerely hope the negotiations, when completed, will continue to be satisfactory not only in this case but in connection with the general administration of the directives of Congress.

Opinion-Poll Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have been conducting an opinion poll among citizens of the Third Congressional District of Indiana on eight questions dealing with President Eisenhower's 1955 legislative program and other issues of vital concern to the Nation.

I have been conducting these polls among my constituents annually for the past 4 years with several objectives in view. My primary purpose has been to determine, in broad terms, for my own benefit, the attitudes and opinions of the people of northern Indiana on major legislative issues. These surveys, however, also serve to stimulate public discussion and interest in these issues, which is a healthy thing, and they enable me to present to Congress, as I am now doing, the views of an important segment of the voting population.

Questionnaires were mailed early in March to a substantial cross section of voters in the four urban and rural counties I represent: St. Joseph, South Bend; Elkhart, Elkhart and Goshen; La Porte, La Porte and Michigan City; and Marshall, Plymouth.

Ballots also were printed in several district newspapers and readers were asked to fill them out and send them to me with their answers.

The response this year, as in past years, was well above the average for similar mail polls. Approximately 18,000 questionnaires have been returned to date, and they are still coming in. This com-

pares with a response of approximately 12,000 in 1952, 15,000 in 1953, and 21,000 in 1954.

The results of my 1955 poll, as tabulated by the IBM service bureau, an impartial private concern, are listed below. Within the limitations of any survey of this nature, they reflect the current opinions of a substantial cross section of Indiana voters.

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you believe that Congress should:			
1. Continue to support the President in his determination to defend Formosa against attack by the Chinese Reds?	Percent 82	Percent 9	Percent 9
2. Reduce the minimum voting age below 21 years?	34	61	5
3. Approve a $25 billion increase in the national debt to finance an expanded highway program?	44	46	10
4. Grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska?	76	11	13
5. Approve construction of 35,000 public housing units per year for 2 more years?	39	46	15
6. Raise the Federal minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents per hour?	70	23	7
7. Approve the cuts in the Army Ground Forces proposed by President Eisenhower?	55	33	12
8. Make the Post Office Department self-supporting by increasing postal rates?	67	26	7

POLL OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

In order to stimulate interest in public affairs among future citizens of my District I again conducted a separate poll among high-school students. More than 3,000 students took part this year, voting on the issues in class under the supervision of instructors after a thorough discussion of the pros-and-cons. Here are the results of the 1955 high-school poll, based on returns from 25 high schools in northern Indiana:

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you believe that Congress should:			
1. Continue to support the President in his determination to defend Formosa against attack by the Chinese Reds?	Percent 84	Percent 7	Percent 9
2. Reduce the minimum voting age below 21 years?	50	43	7
3. Approve a $25 billion increase in the national debt to finance an expanded highway program?	41	39	20
4. Grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska?	73	15	12
5. Approve construction of 35,000 public housing units per year for 2 more years?	50	22	28
6. Raise the Federal minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents per hour?	65	22	13
7. Approve the cuts in the Army Ground Forces proposed by President Eisenhower?	34	44	22
8. Make the Post Office Department self-supporting by increasing postal rates?	54	28	18

National Federation of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following radio broadcast by Chet Huntley, ABC, March 18, 1955, where he commented on Federal employees and the National Federation of Federal Employees:

This reporter had a cup of coffee yesterday morning with a highly responsible and almost dedicated employee of the United States Government, a man from the Civil Service Commission.

The fact of the matter is that Uncle Sam has a problem, a real aggravating and accumulating problem.

The Government of the United States is woefully short of scientists and engineers and technicians and specialists of all sorts, everything from operators of complex accounting machines to bacteriologists and anthropologists and nuclear physicists.

True, the Government can't pay as much as private industry is paying. The loyalty program has driven off many a quality employee who just simply resents the prying into his private affairs and who has seen the most innocent act or association misconstrued and misinterpreted. But the fact remains that the Government of the United States needs people, trained people, and needs them badly. Our Government may not get these people until you and I stop the foolish and damaging business of regarding every Federal employee as a suspect or an enemy.

In this respect there is now under way a big recruiting program for the National Federation of Federal Employees, the oldest independent union of United States Government workers. In Los Angeles alone the National Federation of Federal Employees hopes to recruit some 50,000 workers and some 220,000 in the State of California.

The wages of Federal employees are lagging far behind those in private industry. That has to be corrected.

But probably most important the National Federation of Federal Employees understands that something has to be done about the security of the Government worker. The occasional individual who wraps himself in the protection of Civil Service and coasts along as though he owned the job and Government, has to be corrected or weeded out. On the other hand, something has to be done to secure the stability and economic security of the good public servant. This reporter would say, offhand, that 99⅘ percent of the Federal employees are dedicated, sincere, and deserving people who do not take their responsibilities lightly. Once in awhile you run into a bad apple who can destroy or damage the whole reputation of the more than 2 million Federal employees.

One thing the National Federation of Federal Employees realizes is that more care must be exercised in recruiting people into Government service. As badly as the Government needs people, particularly qualified technicians and scientists, it dares not lower its standards and take on all comers. Do we realize, for example, that it costs you and me about $600 to fire a worker and replace him? Just the process of turning over 1 Federal job costs the taxpayers of the Nation about $600. So we have an investment in these workers. It pays to hire good ones in the first place and after they're hired it pays us to see that they stay hired.

There are a number of things you and I can do in all of this. One, take a more kindly and understanding attitude toward your underpaid, patient and reliable public servant. Meet him halfway with your understanding and he'll meet you 75 percent of the way everytime.

Second, be aware of the National Federation of Federal Employees, and if, by chance, you are a Federal worker, find out about it and consider whether you might want to join in. You can find out about it at your nearest Federal building or Federal offices, or contact the nearest United States Civil Service Commission office.

And if you are a student or about to enter college, or if you are the parent of a student or a prospective student, give a thought to the possibilities of Government service. Government careers are not all bliss, to be sure, but it has a lot of compensations and there are many of us who insist that it's really a rather noble undertaking.

Sports Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Congress is well aware of my interest in our State Department's international, educational, and cultural exchange program. As a cosponsor of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, the Smith-Mundt Act, I have been gratified to note from time to time the effectiveness this program has had in winning friends abroad and gaining respect for our country.

While it is generally well known that this program includes an exchange of students, professors, teachers, and research scholars it is not so well known that the program has also been garnering much good will for our country through nonacademic exchange of persons. The interchange of leaders of national prominence between our country and some seventy countries around the world has been a very fruitful interchange in obtaining a better understanding of our life, our attitudes, and our peaceful intentions in today's world. Top level Government officials, mayors, civic leaders, and so forth from other lands have returned home to tell the American story with convincing credibility. The selected American leaders who have gone abroad on this program from as diverse fields as law, labor, management, the arts, and athletics have been equally effective in providing living refutation to Communist lies about our life and our people.

Surprisingly, to some observers, has been the tremendous success of the goodwill tours of our top athletes who have gone abroad on this program. On February 7, 1955, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable CARL HINSHAW, of California, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint of a newspaper article which appeared in the Pasadena Star-News which described the tremendous exploits and friend-winning activi-

ties abroad of our great two-time Olympic diving champion, Major Sammy Lee. I have been told of the voluminous reports which have come in from our Foreign Service posts describing the abundant goodwill won for our country by our four great Olympic champions, Sammy Lee, Mal Whitfield, Rob Richards, and Harrison Dillard. Bob Considine, outstanding American sports writer, recently quoted an on-the-spot observer from India as saying that Bob Richards, the Vaulting Vicar, reached and favorably impressed at least 3 million Indians while he was in India on this educational exchange program.

The Cleveland Press on February 16, 1955, carried an article on Harrison Dillard which displays so much admiration for their home-town product and which expresses so well the value of this kind of exchange that I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DILLARD WINS PRAISE AS UNITED STATES "AMBASSADOR"

(By Jack Clowser)

For a long time, I've felt it was impossible to be more proud of Harrison Dillard than the day I saw him ascend the victory stand at London and accept his first Olympic victory wreath.

For a close second, perhaps, it was the time his old coach, Eddie Finnigan, and I watched him enter Buckingham Palace—the only member of his race invited to a reception by the British King and Queen. I remember Eddie, his chest swelling with pride, muttering "What a long way to come—a kid from a poor East Side neighborhood, all the way to the Palace."

Now I'm not sure that either was Dillard's finest achievement. After reading letters that have been coming to Mayor Celebrezze and to Hank Greenberg, Harrison's boss, it seems the famous Cleveland track star has just turned in his most praiseworthy performance.

The letters are from the United States State Department, under whose auspices Dillard recently made a 3-month good-will tour of South and Central America. His selection was, in the first place, a high honor indicative of his type of citizenship.

In this global struggle for the minds of men, with democracy arrayed against communism, the State Department sought to impress our pan-American neighbors by sending them a young man who was representative of the highest type of sportsman. A gifted extemporaneous speaker and world-famous athlete, Dillard filled the bill so well that United States Embassies in the countries he visited have been deluging the State Department with praise for his work.

Here are some examples, as cited by the department in letters to Greenberg and the mayor:

From Haiti: "The Department is to be congratulated for its selection of Dillard. His effectiveness is not limited to demonstrations of sports techniques; in addition he represents his country, on all occasions, with poise, intelligence, cordiality, and a genuine interest in his hosts."

From Bolivia: "The story of Dillard's visit can be described by saying that in almost every instance when he was scheduled to make a speech, show a film, or attend a reception indoors, the demand to see him was such that we had to move outside. He was one of the most successful of American leaders who have visited here in years."

From Argentina: "His visit to Buenos Aires was a great success * * * his engaging personality, his modesty and sincerity made a highly favorable impression on all who met him. President Peron himself expressed his satisfaction at Dillard's visit, and his wish that the visit might have been longer."

From Cuba: "Just imagine what it means, in the affirmation of the principles of the good neighbor and democracy, to see this young Negro, of humble background but lifted to the pinnacle of success and admiration by his own efforts, widely honored, as he well deserves. Dillard has rendered Cuba a work worthy of gratitude."

From Panama: "Dillard's visit is considered by this Embassy to have been the most effective short-time exchange of persons project ever experienced in Panama."

In his reply to the State Department, Greenberg wrote, "We are proud of his association with the Cleveland Baseball Club, and delighted to learn that his appearances in Latin America provoked such complimentary responses."

It must give all good Americans a warm glow to know that the skinny little guy at East Tech High has grown up to represent his country, not only as a wonder athlete, but much more important, as an instrument for international good will.

After all, isn't that the logical sequence for the sterling sportsmanship he has unswervingly practiced?

The Effects of Atomic Radiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from editorials and articles which have appeared over recent months in the New York Times and the Washington Post and Times Herald and which relate to Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, introduced by me on April 13 and cosponsored by 24 other Senators, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of September 2, 1954]

DOOM OF MANKIND SEEN IN ATOM WAR

Dr. Edgar Douglas Adrian, Nobel prize winner and president of the Royal Society of Great Britain, in his presidential address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, said: "We must face the possibility that repeated atomic explosions will lead to a degree of general radioactivity which no one can tolerate or escape." Dr. Adrian is quoted as having said that the human race could not survive if more than a few thousand large atomic bombs were exploded, regardless of where they fell.

[From the New York Times of September 12, 1954]

GENETICIST WARNS ON RADIATION RISE

Reports on an article by Dr. A. H. Sturtevant, of the California Institute of Technology, in Science, in which Dr. Sturtevant is quoted as having said: "I regret that an official [Admiral Strauss] in a position of such responsibility should have stated that there is no biological hazard from low doses of high-energy radiation. * * * Every geneticist familiar with the facts knows that any level whatsoever is certain to be at least genetically harmful to human beings when it is applied to most or all the inhabitants of the earth."

[From the New York Times of November 3, 1954]

CHURCHILL SAYS RADIATION MAY LINGER 5,000 YEARS

Prime Minister Churchill is quoted as having told the House of Commons that an undue number of hydrogen bomb explosions might have serious effects on the earth's atmosphere for about 5,000 years.

[From the New York Times of December 9, 1954]

RADIATION CALLED HEALTH PROBLEM

The New York commissioner of health, Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, is quoted as having said at the annual conference of State and Territorial health officers: "Because the use of radiation in industry and in the community is gaining so rapidly a special problem faces the health officer who wishes to prepare now to meet what may well become one of our most significant environmental health problems of the future."

[From the New York Times of March 7, 1955]

UN URGED TO SIFT POISONING OF AIR BY ATOM BLASTS

The Federation of American Scientists, urging that the United Nations undertake a special study of the extent to which atomic and hydrogen bomb tests may be poisoning the world's atmosphere, is quoted as having said: "However, it should be clear that future accelerated H-bomb test programs by several atomic powers will ultimately reach a level which can be shown to be a serious threat to the genetic safety of all people of the world."

[From the New York Times of March 13, 1955]

UTAH IS WORRIED BY ATOMIC TESTS

Utah residents expressed uneasiness regarding the amount of fall-out registered in their State from Nevada tests by the Atomic Energy Commission. Reassurance was given by AEC monitoring teams and by the radiobiological laboratory of the University of Utah.

[From the New York Times of April 4, 1955]

STATE CODE CITES ATOMIC HAZARDS

Public hearings on projected regulations for the State of New York, designed to lessen the risk of working with radioactive materials, were announced for the near future. The rules were made public by Rear Adm. William S. Maxwell, retired, newly appointed chairman of the State Board of Standards and Appeals, and are designed to cover everything from shoe store fluoroscopes to the industrial use of isotopes. Even uranium mines will be covered, if any are discovered in the State.

[From the New York Times of April 8, 1955.]

EXPERTS TO STUDY RADIATION EFFECT ON ALL LIFE

The effects of radiations have been a subject of increasing controversy among scientists. Dr. Detlev Bronk, president of the National Academy of Science, said there is an urgent need for further intensive research since very little exact knowledge is now available. Prof. Linus Pauling, Nobel Prize chemist of the California Institute of Technology, is qouted as warning that radiation from atomic tests could be potentially fatal to persons whose resistance to cancer was low. Prof. Frederick Soddy, Nobel Laureate physi-

cist, is quoted as saying that hydrogen bomb explosions are "fouling the air with radioactivity" and that "it is nonsense to say it is harmless." Prof. Joseph Rotblat, an associate to the head of Britain's atomic bomb project, is quoted as saying that "future generations of all nations" might forever pay "through disease, malformation and mental disability for our folly unless effective curbs are placed on hydrogen weapons."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 18, 1955]

COLONIALISM INTRIGUES HIT AT BANDUNG

President Soekarno, of Indonesia, said of nuclear and thermonuclear explosions, "There is a force loose in the world whose potential for evil no man truly knows. The effects may be building up into something of an unknown horror."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

HOW BAD IS RADIATION?

The Post called our knowledge about the effects of radioactivity appallingly small. It praised the study initiated by the National Academy of Science and said only a a study by a United Nations Commission could speak with more standing and authority. It said that the public ought to know whether its mounting apprehension is justified. If it is not justified, the best way to dispel the fear is by getting all the facts.

Quemoy-Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD an article by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, April 11, 1955. Mr. Alsop in his article compares the present situation in Asia with conditions in Europe in 1939 immediately prior to Hitler's invasion of Poland.

The article follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

QUEMOY—POLAND

HONG KONG.

The visit to Saigon, from which this reporter has just returned, has inspired two pretty unhappy questions.

First, have we not reached almost the same state in Asia that was reached in Europe when Britain so desperately guaranteed Poland? And, second, does not this connect rather directly with the vital decision on Quemoy and the Matsu Islands?

Trying first to answer the first question, the crisis in Saigon still drags on, but the outcome will surely be bad. Whether there is more shooting or a lame compromise, the prevailing condition of nongovernment in southern Indochina is bound to get worse, not better. That means that the already heavy odds in favor of the Communists are being substantially increased.

If southern Indochina falls to the Communists, even the local consequences will be bitter indeed. We shall have an advance taste of them, no doubt, at the impending discussions with the French about the Indochinese future.

The French will ask, for example, a question we must answer: What does the American Government propose to do with the 700,000 tragic refugees from the Communist north, for whom the United States has a direct moral responsibility? Are these poor people to be left where they are, to swim for it or die, after being exploited as a kind of ghastly public-relations stunt by the authorities in Washington?

It is already high time to think about this problem, and about the many French problems, such as the 50,000 or so French citizens and passport holders in south Vietnam. Thinking of them may lead to some very unpalatable results, such as an eventual French request for American ground troops. But these essentially local problems fade into insignificance, when compared to the wider consequences of the new Communist victory that now seems to loom ahead.

These wider consequences of the loss of southern Indochina will first be felt, of course, in south Asia. And all the evidence suggests, unfortunately, that the position in south Asia has worsened a lot since the pompous Bangkok conference that was supposed to draw so many uncrossable lines.

In Laos, chaos reigns; and the Communist-led Pathet Lao are creeping nearer and nearer to a place in what passes for the Laotian Government.

In Cambodia, the doughty little king is out, leaving confusion behind. And the Cambodian democratic party, the only party having links with the all-important villages, now seems to be successfully infiltrated by crypto-Communists.

The party machinery has lately been taken over by a group of young Cambodians returned from studies in France. The French Communists have long maintained a special trapping system for such colonial students and there are good reasons to believe that the new Cambodian democratic party leaders are among those who were trapped.

In Thailand, finally, there is now hard evidence that the Communists have full scale, classical liberated areas in the Betong salient and elsewhere along the Malayan border. These Communist areas in the far south will usefully support the No. 1 Siamese Communist stooge, Pridi Phanamayong, whose personal base is also in southern Siam. Meanwhile, in the northeast, across the border from Laos, the No. 2 stooge, Tieng Sirikohond, is also organizing on an extensive scale.

In short, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand more than ever look like setups for the Communist walls-of-Jericho trick. By this trick, a country is made to fall by mere internal subversion and external threat, with no coarse border crossings to make the Manila pact inconveniently applicable. The fall of southern Indochina will be the first blast of the trumpets of the Communist Joshuas.

Laos and Cambodia are the keys to Thailand. Thailand is the key to Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma. Southeast Asia, in turn, is the key to India and Japan. And the loss of south Asia will surely produce grim repercussions further afield, in the Middle East, North Africa, and even Europe.

Such is the unending prospect of disaster that is beginning to open out. No one can be certain that these disasters will happen, since the future is never certain. But they are just about as foreseeable, let us say, as Hitler's progress was foreseeable after Munich, from the Sudeteniand to Prague to Danzig and to Poland. In other words, there are the best reasons to think that the progressive upset of the Asian balance of power has now reached exactly the stage that the same process reached in Europe post-Munich.

In these circumstances, it is no use saying that fighting for Quemoy and the Matsus is militarily illogical. The British guaranty to Poland was both militarily illogical and morally dubious. Britain could not contribute to Poland's defense and did not honor the guaranty, even in victory.

It is no use saying, either, that these dreary rocks in the Formosa Strait are poor pretext. We missed the best pretext to deal with the Asian problem in Korea and the next best at the time of Dien Bien Phu, just as the British missed five superior pretexts before taking a stand on Poland.

These arguments are not valid for the same reason that the arguments against the guaranty to Poland were not valid. Whatever its defects, the guaranty to Poland saved Britain on the naked edge of an abyss. It was Neville Chamberlain's last chance to take a stand. If he had waited even a little later, it would have been too late. All Europe would have been lost, and Britain would have had to beg for terms from Adolf Hitler.

In the present case, if all Asia is lost, we may not have to beg for terms. But if we do not beg, we shall surely have to fight a much worse war with infinitely heavier handicaps.

There are other good reasons, of course, for taking our stand on Quemoy and the Matsus. There is the strong possibility that Formosa itself can be lost on these little islands. There is the absolute certainty that the world Communist leadership will never again believe the American Government until the shooting actually starts. Why should they, if we once more repeat the Dien Bien Phu pattern of big talk followed by a quick backdown?

But those who oppose taking a stand on Quemoy and the Matsus must above all suggest practical means of holding south Asia or indicate how the free world is to survive after the loss of all of Asia. Otherwise their pleas for just one more backdown are like saying a man should wait to use his fists until his legs have been cut off, so that he can be quite sure his enemy really is his enemy.

The Sudeten German Case—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, to further his desire to bring before the American people the truth concerning the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, Dr. Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Landtag, of Munich, Germany, has written the following article, which I wish to insert in the RECORD in six installments:

THE SUDETEN GERMAN CASE—TRUTH VERSUS PROPAGANDA

I

On March 25, 1954, page A2284 and following, the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published a short outline of the Sudeten German case from my pen, picturing the Sudeten German history during many hundreds of years in the areas of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia (western part of Czechoslovakia) as well as the expulsion of those 3.3 million Sudeten Germans who had lived there together with those 4.4 million Czechs for centuries, from Czechoslovakia in and after 1945 by the Communist-led Czechoslovak (Czech) Government of the National Front—the expulsion during which nearly 300,000 Sudeten Germans lost their lives as a result of starvation, tortures, rape, exposure, and other cruelties to which the National Front Government had incited.

On August 5, 1954, page A5796 and following, three of the top men of this Government of the National Front, who had functioned under the Communist Prime Ministers Fierlinger and Gottwald from 1945 to 1948—the same government which claims the deportation as its achievement—gave their reply to the Sudenten German case calling their re-

ply Propaganda versus Truth. They signed by their full former titles as Dr. Hubert Ripka, former member of the Czechoslovak Parliament and of the government, Dr. Peter Zenkl, former member of the Czechoslovak Parliament, mayor of the city of Prague, vice premier and chairman of the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party, Dr. Josef Lettrich, former chairman of the Slovak Democratic Party, president of the Slovak National Council (national assembly), member of the Czechoslovak Parliament.

The reply of these three National Front men, who fled in 1948—or as some put it, were sent—to the West and are now living in the United States, deserves to be read by the distinguished Members of Congress. It shows clearly the way in which it was possible to communize Czechoslovakia from within, while men as Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich were working and holding power there, and also reveals the form in which these men are now working in the West.

Since these men are leading members of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and the official organ of thmt organization took over their statements, their reply represents also the opinion of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, which is nothing but the continuation of the National Front Government in exile (without the full Communists who are governing Czechoslovakia), financed by the Free Europe Committee and the Crusade for Freedom.

Facts which can easily be verified

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich declared most decidedly: "We shall answer Dr. Walter Becher's propaganda by facts which can easily be verified. First we shall point out the fallacy of his historical interpretation and then we shall proceed to show how the policies of the Sudeten Germans have led as a direct consequence to their transfer from Czechoslovakia to Germany."

The three men start with the history and with the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. They say: "The fact that the medieval Kingdom of Bohemia, like other non-German countries, had been a part of the Holy Roman Empire has been used by the pan-German imperialists of the modern age to lay claim to Bohemia (i. e. Czechoslovakia) [sic] as well as to Austria, Alsatia, and other countries. This pretense, conflicting sharply with historical facts, is indicative of the lust of pan-German expansionism."

When I read through my article published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find that I nowhere laid claim to the entire Czechoslovakia or to the entire Bohemia (being merely the western part of Czechoslovakia, not as Ripka puts it falsely). On the contrary, it is a matter of record that I asked for the right for self-determination not only for the Sudeten Germans, but also for the Czechs. I also never stated that the Holy Roman Empire was a nationalist state. But it was—the official full name—the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Its kaisers were Germans. And it is also a matter of fact that the Bohemian kings, with the exception of a few, were of German blood. It is also a fact that the famous Bohemian king (whom the Czechs wrongly call a "Czech" king), Charles IV, of whom the Czechs are so proud and whom they call "Father of the County," was a German. Even before becoming part of the Roman Empire of the German Nation, Bohemia had dukes of German blood—the last Premyslides. These are the facts.

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich continue: "We must protest against the one-sided interpretation of modern German nationalists, who in their conceited role of Kulturtraeger pretend that the Germans are solely responsible for the higher cultural level achieved by the Czechs. Bohemians (the Czechs) [sic] came under the influence of the Italians, the French and later the English, not only the Germans."

Ripka gives no example of the English, French, and Italian influence, nor of their proportion of strength to the German influence on the Czechs, neither does he mention that the aforementioned influences reached the Czechs just through the Germans.

In rereading my article, I find nowhere mentioning, indicating in general that the Germans were solely responsible for the higher cultural level achieved by the Czechs. On the contrary, I stressed the achievements of the Czechs during their coexistence with the Sudeten Germans. In general, I was guided by no will to prove that the Germans were better than the Czechs. But with regard to the fact that the Benes-Czechs systematically translated "Bohemians" falsely as "Czechs" and "Bohemia" falsely as "Czechia" (Czech territory), claiming her fully for themselves instead of claiming it for both Bohemian nations—that is the Czechs (7.4 million) and the Sudeten Germans (3.3 million)—and due to the fact that the Benes-Czechs expelled the Sudeten Germans from Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, where they constituted one-third of the population, I felt it my duty to point out the reality about Bohemia-Moravia and the Sudeten Germans, and their real influence there, in their common homeland.

I stated facts: that, e. g., all towns in Bohemia and Moravia, with the exception of the Hussite (early-Communist) town Tabor, were founded by the Germans. Ripka wanted facts. Now, these are the facts.

I stated facts: that, e. g., all towns in the Czechoslovak industry (50 to 100 percent of individual branches) were in reality Sudeten German and that many Czechoslovak export products, known from 1918 to 1938 under the trade mark "Made in Czechoslovakia" were in reality Sudeten German products. Or: I also, stated that the "Bohemian" city and world-known spa of Carlsbad, to whose citizens I have the honor to belong, was a purely Sudeten German city.

Of course, I still failed to quote a number of other facts concerning history or recent times. For example, I did not say that the Prague University, founded on April 7, 1348, by Emperor Charles IV was the first German university with four faculties. It then incorporated four nations—the Bavarian, the Saxonian, the Polish, and the Bohemian. Three of them were German (the Polish were the Germans from Silesia) and one-half German, i. e., Bohemian, that means mixed German-Czech.

I failed also to quote, for instance, the list of artists and architects of the Baroque period, who built up Prague and the rest of the Bohemian cities, presenting the picture they all are showing now. A. Leithner, Christoph and Ignaz Dientzenhofer, Santin-Aichel, Ignaz Bayer, Peter Brandel, Reiner, Mathias Braun, Hartmann, B. Neumann, F. Dietz, Fischer von Erlach, Lukas von Hildebrandt, Anton Zimmer, J. M. Lassler, Ferd. Max Brokoff, Johann Brokoff—all these were Germans. Franz M. Kanka, Jakob Blaschejowsky and Skreta were Czechs. In addition, there were about 6 Italian and 1 French architects.

And so on. These are the facts and there are even more of them.

In fact, during the entire history, the Benes-Czechs have always tried to nationalize the Sudeten German history in the same way as they did in 1945 with the Sudeten German property.

The Hussite period

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich then proceeded to proclaim: "Dr. Becher's enmity toward the Czechs stands out most glaringly whenever he mentions the Hussite period."

I fully and absolutely resent and reject and slightest accusation of enmity toward the Czechs. In my first article I expressly used the word Benes-Czechs. I have deep esteem for the real Czechs, the majority of Czechs, persecuted in the same way by Gottwald, Ripka, Zapotocky, Zenkl, and Lettrich, as my own people were persecuted. Actually, the Czechs are so strongly intermingled with the Sudeten Germans, that nearly one-third of the Czechs have German family names. Curiously enough, the names of Zenkl and Lettrich, too, are German names.

It seems, indeed, necessary for Ripka to defend the Hussite period in order to defend his own activities which were so parallel to it. Our stand against Hussitism has nothing to do with religion or the priest Hus. It was the political followers of Jan Hus—Zizka and the others—who robbed, murdered, and expelled many Sudeten Germans and the better-off Czechs in the 15th century. The same did Ripka and his followers in 1945 and after. It was the same primitive Communist greediness for the property of others during Zizka's and Ripka's time. As to the way in which Communist measures are defended by Ripka and Zenkl and Lettrich, please let me quote their own words from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 5, 1954: "In the Hussite period, the great majority of Germans opposed religious and social reformation as sought by the Czechs and also the Slovaks, in the last war, Hitler, supported by the great majority of Germans, especially the Sudeten Germans, tried to destroy the democracy, the modern form of social reform, as advanced and defended by the Czechs and Slovaks."

Here is what Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich reached in 1945: Prohibition of all Czech and Slovak political parties of the center and the right (constituting the majority of the Prague Parliament before the war), expropriation and nationalization of industry and trade by various decrees, establishment of people's courts against all reactionaries, abolishment of the freedom of press and free speech, establishment of the national committees as the local Soviets (Soviet committees) and of the rigid national front under Communist leadership, deportation and murders committed on Sudeten Germans and Hungarians, and imprisonment or execution of the Czech leaders of the Czech Agrarian, Artisan, and National Democratic Parties. (See Special Report No. 8 of December 31, 1954 (Communist Takeover and Occupation of Czechoslovakia) of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives under the chairmanship of Representative Charles J. Kersten, pp. 13 and 15.)

This is the "democracy, the modern form of social reform, as advanced and defended by the Czechs," which Ripka, Benes, Lettrich, Zapotocky, Gottwald, and Zenkl carried out from 1945 to 1948.

False propaganda operating with flagrant distortions of facts and downright falsehoods

These are the words of Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich concerning my presentation of our case. They are hard words. They, however, seem to represent well the anger of men who, until now, have held a full monopoly in informing the West and America about Czechoslovakia. Yet in their reply these men failed to prove any single distortion. On the contrary, they volunteered a series of downright falsehoods themselves.

Ripka stated that the regions of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, known as the Sudetenland, were settled by newcomers not earlier than in the 17th and 18th century, after the Battle of the White Mountain. The truth could easily be proved and presented in uor Sudeten German Atlas, Munich, 1953, showing the fact that those regions previously uninhabited in which the Czechs had not resided before, are known as already settled by the Sudeten Germans during the 12th

and 13th century under the Premyslides, long before the Hussite Wars. If, in the following centuries, more land within the Sudeten German area was cultivated and occupied, then it is also true that more territory was cultivated and occupied by the Czechs within the Czech territory, in inner Bohemia and Moravia. As far as the taking over of territory is concerned, the truth is that the Czechs have pushed, out of the central position, the Sudeten Germans from their land, in the course of history, among other things Czechizing all the towns and cities in inner Bohemia and Moravia up to the final infamous Agrarian Reform of October 15, 1919, by which about one-third of the Sudeten German territory in the Sudetenland was given to the Czechs, and to the full expropriation and expulsion of the Sudeten Germans in 1945.

What may be called a flagrant distortion of facts is also the interpretation of the Battle of the White Mountain, as given by Ripka. He is presenting nothing but the nationalist interpretation of the Pan-Slav historians who maintain that the Battle of the White Mountain was a battle between Germans and Czechs, in which the Czechs were defeated. In reality, the Battle of the White Mountain was the battle between Catholics and Protestants, just as the Thirty Years War, which took place on the entire territory of the German Empire. The leaders of both parties were Germans: the leader of the Catholic League was Duke Maximilian of Bayern (Bavaria), the leader of the Protestant Union was Kurfuerst Duke Friedrich V von der Pfalz (Palatine).

Indeed, in the battle of the White Mountain, the military commander of the Bohemian (falsely "Czech") Protestants was a German, Duke Christian von Anhalt, while the commanders of the allegedly German Catholics were no Germans at all—they were Count Tilly, a Belgian, Count Boucquoy, a Spaniard. The Catholics won, and the first of the defeated Bohemian Protestants to be executed after the battle of the White Mountain, was the German Count Schlick. During the following years, German and Czech Protestants in Bohemia were persecuted alike and German as well as Czech Catholics had the same advantages. The same happened in other countries, e. g., in Austria, where the Protestants were also persecuted by Duke Ferdinand of Tyrol.

As soon as the Protestants of Bohemia assumed the Catholic religion, the persecutions were brought to a standstill. Today the majority of Czechs are Catholics. And, as a matter of fact, Catholic Czech historians, as Josef Pekar, do not see in the period after the White Mountain battle a "black" period—as do the Ripka-Hussites and the Communists. On the contrary, the former rather consider as a black period the time of Hussite communism.

The Sudeten German Case—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the second installment of the article by Dr. Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Landtag, of Munich, Germany, follows:

II

It is also an unchangeable fact that the ideas of the romantic enlightened nationalism, preached by the German Johann Gottlieb Herder called forth the awakening of Czech nationalism; Herder was the real father of Czech nationalism, which, of course, later assumed the Pan-Slav direction.

The Hapsburg Empire was centralized, but in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia, both the German and the Czech language were used. In 1784 Emperor Josef II, residing in Vienna, decreed that the German language be the official language in all countries of the empire, including also Belgium, Italy, etc. This was only part of his other centralization measures which, however, called forth a strong opposition and could not be upheld for a long time. As far as the language problem is concerned, in 1880 an order by Stremayer and later by Badeni decreed that both languages, Czech and German, became the official languages in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia. However, during all the time the Czechs had their representatives, their deputies, in Vienna and were not hindered to use their language, to build up their institutions, schools, etc. There was, of course, no suppression of the Czech language and absolutely no such rude suppression of use of their own language as during the Hussite period and as Ripka practiced it in 1945 and after, when German speaking was forbidden in the streets and when the Germans had to wear white badges in the Sudetenland.

In any case, I did not object to the right of the Czechs to disrupt the Hapsburg Empire and to seek full self-determination.

There was no privileged Sudeten German "Herrenvolk," as Ripka stated. It is true, however, that at times certain Czechs had inferiority complexes and projected their worse stand in life-standard and lower working energy as caused by the viciousness of those who were richer—of both the Sudeten Germans and the richer Czechs. This has been, however, the general sign of the proletarian Communist and collectivist world philosophy since ever and is known among other nations, too. It ends by taking property from the rich, by communizing it, as Benes and Ripka did to the Sudeten German property, as well as to the property of the Czech upper and middle classes after 1945. This inferiority complex was sufficiently proved by the Ripkamen in the same way as by the Bolshevists in Russia.

This is the general collectivist dogma, unfortunately preached by Ripka even today, when Ripka is teaching at American universities, and also spread through America by means of the publications of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. It seems quite possible that the time may come when Ripka will start to preach also in America that the property of the "privileged" American classes, of the master classes, should be taken away from these and collectivized, in the same spirit as he did in Czechoslovakia and as it is being manifested behind the Iron Curtain by the Communists day by day.

In contrast to this behavior of the Zizka- and Ripka-Czechs, the Sudeten Germans, when expelled and robbed of their property and driven to Germany, started their new life with bare hands, not demanding the property of others, but working hard in private enterprise, thus building up many of their former factories and workshops in a free competition economy, even though it has been so immeasurably hard. The same philosophy was manifested by most of the non-Ripka Czech refugees and by nearly all the Slovaks who fled from their communized country from 1945 to 1948 until today.

Why were the Sudeten Germans not given the right for self-determination in 1918?

Austria-Hungary was allegedly dismembered on the basis of the right for self-determination for her nations. But the very same right for self-determination was not given, in 1918, to the Sudeten Germans, the Hungarians, and Slovaks—who together constituted 50 percent of the inhabitants of the then created Czechoslovakia, and who had to remain as second-class nations in the new, constructed country.

The very same Czechs who were radical democrats before 1918, promptly changed into imperialists. Those who maintained that the economic advantages and intermingled nationalities of Austria-Hungary do not justify the centralization role of Vienna, suddenly felt that the idea of Czechoslovakia justified the Czech imperialism over the majority of inhabitants of Czechoslovakia. Here is what Ripka said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to explain why the Sudeten Germans were given no right for self-determination in 1918: "At the Paris Conference the Allies, after a thorough study by experts—Mr. Allen Dulles was one of them—realized that Bohemia and Moravia form an integral part and organic whole which cannot be disrupted according to nationalities, inasmuch as these are so very intermingled. Therefore the Allies sanctioned the old historic boundaries between the Czech [sic] state and Germany, boundaries which have existed uninterruptedly even since ancient times."

I had said in my article that Benes presented to the experts of the Paris Conference deliberately falsified maps, reducing areas of Sudeten German settlement in Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia—again a historic fact which Ripka cannot refute. We possess these falsified maps and reproduced them on page 250 of our Documents on the Expulsion of the Sudeten Germans.

Why the Sudeten Germans were not permitted to secede from the Czech regions and why—moreover—they were not given a federative status of equal partners in Czechoslovakia, but had to remain as a mere subjected minority in the Czech state, can be understood, as I had pointed out, from the unchangeable reality that after 1918 Czechoslovakia was established as a wall against defeated Germany—the wall of France and England and, since 1935 when Genes so eagerly sought and obtained an alliance with Soviet Russia, also the wall of the eastern Communist motherland.

They admitted: Czechoslovakia was no other Switzerland

The following is what Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich said: "Dr. Becher repeats the accusation that the promise given the Allies by Masaryk and Benes in 1918 that Czechoslovakia would be a state after the manner of Switzerland were not carried out; he likewise repeats the well-known charges of German propaganda that Czechoslovakia treated the Germans as second-class citizens, only as a minority. Had it been possible to preserve peace in Europe for 50 or 60 years after World War I, Czechoslovakia, as to the nationalities, would undoubtedly have become a state such as Switzerland. Masaryk, Benes, and other Czechoslovak leaders in political life tried faithfully to achieve this goal.

Ripka admits what I had stated before: Czechoslovakia was never a second Switzerland, though Masaryk and Benes had promised to the Allies at Paris to establish such a body politic in 1918—not in 60 years. The constitution of the Republic—again a historic fact—was made by the Czechs alone, no Sudeten German was invited to take part in elaborating it. During all the years before Hitler came to power in Germany, Benes rejected all efforts of the Sudeten Germans to achieve equal rights as nationality in their territory. After Hitler came to power in Germany, Benes rejected this goal even more decisively. Neither in good, nor in bad, was he willing to give the Sudeten Germans their rights. Had Czechoslovakia lasted for 50 or 60 years, or even for 200 years, the Sudeten Germans would have had to remain always subjects to the anti-German Czech state nationality, in the same way as the Slovaks, the Hungarians, and the Ruthenians.

Ripka's, Zenkl's, and Lettrich's records—the records of three Czechoslovak Democrats

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich further declared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 5, 1954, against my article: "It is not necessary to defend against the charges of alleged chauvinistic communism such men as Benes, Ripka, and others of the Masaryk school of thought, who tried to live with the Germans in friendship in the period between the two World Wars and who have always openly rejected not only communism but Marxism as well."

In reality, the alleged open rejection of communism and Marxism by Benes, Ripka, Zenkel, and Lettrich looked exactly as follows:

Upon the strong urging of Ripka, the Czechoslovak exile Government in London under President Benes concluded in 1943 a Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship treaty in Moscow. In 1944–45, Benes and his exile government returned to Czechoslovakia via Moscow and declared at Kosice on April 4, 1945, the so-called Kosice program, by which a Government of the National Front, involving only Communist and pro-Communist parties, was established under the lead of Prime Minister Communist Fierlinger and later of Gottwald. All Czech parties of the center and the right, as well as all Slovak parties whih, before World War II, had constituted the majority of Czech and Slovak deputies in the Prague Parliament, were dissolved, the parties of the National Front got new, Communist-chosen leaders. Freedom of election, of speech, press were abolished. The press of the National Front only was permitted, people's courts were established in order to punish all traitors and reactionaries, the industry forecfully nationalized and collectivized, local Soviets established under the name of National Committees, and the Sudeten Germans and Hungarians expropriated and expelled. Dr. Hubert Ripka became Minister of Foreign Trade, Dr. Peter Zenkl, Deputy Prime Minister to the Communist Prime Ministers Fierlinger and Gottwald, and Dr. Josef Lettrich became the leader of a new, artificial Slovak Democratic Party as well as the leader of the National Front in Slovakia.

III

The case of Dr. Hubert Ripka

(The quotations given in this chapter are available.)

The story of Dr. Hubert Ripka is a simple one. Member of Benes' National Socialist Party, he was a journalist before World War II. In 1935 he conducted a group of Czech newsmen in the Soviet Union. Up to 1938 he was assistant editor of the magazine Praha-Moskva, devoted to Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship.

In 1939 Ripka went to Paris where he became a spokesman of the former President Benes. His personal secretary was the known Communist Mrs. Hilda Matouskova. One of his chief assistants was the Communist agent Otto Katz-Suchy, alias Andre Simon. Having joined Benes in London in 1940, Ripka became Minister of Information of the Czechoslovak Government in exile. He often spoke over the EBC, the Czechoslovak section of which was headed by the Slovak Communist Vavro Hajdu, another member being the Communist spy Otto Biheler, later expelled from the United States.

On November 7, 1942, Ripka said over BBC:

"The Russian revolution not only increased the strength of the Russian Soviet state, but also raised to greater heights than ever before the standard of civilization, culture, and living of the wide masses of the Soviet peoples. * * *

"Bolshevism is a supernational ideal, an eternal ideal, a human ideal, an ideal which has kindled the minds of the noblest of men from the time of Plato and through the Christian era, through the French Revolution and until today. * * * Just as the French Revolution strove to realize the ideal of freedom, so did the Russian revolution try to realize the ideal of equality."

In London, Ripka was also Deputy Foreign Minister and under Jan Masaryk, who ran the Ministry with a notoriously loose hand, Ripka—in reality—managed his Ministry. As to the Czechoslovak-Soviet Treaty of December 14, 1944, he said over BBC: "The Czechoslovak-Soviety Treaty is the foundation of our country's external security and is a fundamental contribution to the unification of national forces * * * Thanks to the treaty, Czechoslovakia's interests are receiving effective support."

In his book East and West, London 1944, Ripka wrote: "The Bolshevism of Lenin and Stalin represents a creative synthesis of specifically Russian and certain Western elements" (p. 13). "We the Czechoslovaks make no secret of our satisfaction that Soviet Russia is beginning to participate in European and world politics as a strong world power" (p. 58). On the past policies in 1939–41, Ripka wrote in the same book: "Since, in the new situation, it was impossible to collaborate officially with the Soviet Union, we * * * did nothing which might prejudice or prevent the renewal of cooperation at the earliest possible moment; I need only recall how strongly our attitude contrasted with that of many others during the Soviet-Finnish war. Moreover, even in that period, there was no interruption of the personal contacts and exchanges of information between ourselves and important Soviet representatives in London, Paris, Washington and elsewhere" (p. 34).

In his recent book Czechoslovakia Enslaved, London, 1950, Ripka admits authorship of the plan to expel the Sudeten Germans: "I myself * * * had proposed a detailed plan for the transfer of the Germans" (p. 26). The details were worked out in London by a secret section of Ripka's foreign office, run by Wolfgang von Putlitz, friend of the vanished British diplomats Burgess and McLean as well as of Dr. Otto John who during World War II lived in London. Putlitz later turned up as political adviser in the East German Communist regime.

Ripka's signatures are on the Kosice Statute and on the decrees concerning nationalization and retribution. Under the latter decree any appeal concerning the decision of a people's court was impossible. A death sentence when pronounced was to be executed within 2 hours. As an act of grace, 1 additional hour could be granted.

The New York Times of April 15, 1945, reports: "London—Dr. Hubert Ripka, Czechoslovakia Minister of Foreign Trade, told a farewell press conference here today that he did not consider the Western Allies' apprehensions that his country might become a vassal of the Soviet Union were grounded. He said it was natural that Czechoslovakia should seek her security primarily in friendship with the Soviet Union."

In his book, Cskoslovensko v nove Evrope, London 1945, page 87, Ripka wrote: "All anti-Soviet elements must necessarily be eliminated from our schools, educational institutions, and literature."

One of Ripka's first transactions as Minister of Foreign Trade was to turn over to the Soviet Union, free of charge, the uranium mines of Joachimsthal (Jachymov) in the Sudetenland, now one of the principal sources from which the Soviets are extracting atomic material to bomb the United States.

In the bulletin of the Czechoslovak Chamber of Commerce, London, 1947, Ripka wrote: "Closer trade relations with the Soviet Union were not dictated by the Communist Party. The strengthening of these relations was in the interest of the Czechoslovak economy and part of our own policy. Alliance with the Soviet Union has been the most important factor in this country's foreign policy."

In 1948, after the Communist take-over, Ripka started his flight to the West in the company of two ministers of the National Front, both Catholic priests. All of them were surprised by the Communist police near Rakovnik in Bohemia. The Communist police arrested the two priests but allowed Ripka to flee.

After arriving at Paris, Ripka organized the "Benes' Czechoslovak Foreign Institute." This institute issued a directive summarizing its poliitcal aims: "The transfer of the means of production into the hands of the workers is the only way leading to the increase of well-being and prosperity among the largest classes." The Institute has operating groups and their members have to remain unknown. The organizatorial directive explains: 'The Czechoslovak Foreign Institute is to create a group within groups. The anonymity of its members is to constitute its great strength, because it is not possible to defeat an invisible power." A group of members of the Institute lived in Switzerland, where they sold ball bearings, cadmium, and other strategic materials to the states in the Soviet orbit.

The list of Communists and agents with whom Ripka has been associated now in exile is a long one and includes names such as Bohumil Lausman, Frantisek Kubal, Bohumil Cerny, Vladimir Bruza and Milos Vanek.

In the book Czechoslovakia Enslaved, London, 1950, Ripka advocates the policy of coexistence in the following terms: "Today more than ever I persist in believing that a free and independent Czechoslovakia cannot exist except in a balanced Europe in which the Western Powers and Russia are trying to live on good terms. Even the events of February 1948 have not been able to shake this conviction, which remains the keystone of my whole conception of our foreign policy" (p. 74). "We are not naive enough to believe that our country can be governed without the Communists" (p. 183).

In the United States Ripka became Foreign Secretary of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. In 1953, the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security investigated Ripka; and his American employers, the Free Europe Committee, dropped him from this position. He remained, however, member of the Plenum and the first ideologist of the "Counsil." He is also professor with the New School of Social Reserch in New York, teaching his ideas to the American youth.

(Material to this chapter from Overseas Research, Inc., 4914 44th Street NW., Washington, D. C.)

The Sudeten German Case—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the third installment of the article by Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Landtag, of Munich, Germany, follows:

The case of Dr. Petr Zenkl

(The quotations given in this chapter are available.)

A parallel case is that of Dr. Petr Zenkl, Member of Benes' National Socalist Party, before World War II mayor of Prague, during World War II as pro-Communist in a concen-

tration camp, after the war Deputy Prime Minister of the National Front under the Communist Prime Minister Fierlinger and Gottwald. It was on Zenkl's initiative that the Communist Party, the Social Democratic and Benes' Socialist Parties of the National Front formed, on June 25, 1945, the National Bloc of the Working People or the Socialist Bloc, working in accord with respect to the fourth party of the National Front, the People's Party (this party, too, had been deprived of its former leaders and was led by pro-Communist men installed by the Communist Party, even though some leaders were Catholic priests).

In July 1947, after under his presidency the Czechoslovak Government had rejected the Marshall plan for Czechoslovakia, Zenkl declared: "Never shall we forget the huge help, offered to Czechoslovakia by the Soviet people, its army and personally, Comrade Stalin. The socialist ideas have opened also to our nation the gate to better future. With the feeling of sincere love and faithfulness toward the Soviets, it is necessary to immediately start building socialism in Czechoslovakia and thus prepare for future." On November 14, 1945, Dr. Peter Zenkl uttered in the Provisional National Assembly at Prague: "The great Marshal Stalin had said on the 6th of November 1943 concerning the aims of this war * * * the war is ended. It will be necessary to win the peace in the spirit of this clear declaration of Stalin. The gratitude to the liberators is not the privilege of one class or one party of our people [thunderous applause of the parliament]—this gratitude is a permanent ornament to the whole of our people which happily lived in order to see the fulfillment of the great dream of its forefathers, of a free and powerful Slavism."

At the same session of the Provisional National Assembly at Prague Zenkl also declared: "It is obvious that these policies (of the national front, the Kosice program) do not arise from emotions only, but they also result from rational thinking. * * * It is self-evident that the feelings of Slav solidarity, the deep gratitude and admiration for the Soviet Union, for the heroism of the Red Army and for the great achievements of the Soviet Union, are sincerely shared by the entire Czechoslovak people, irrespective of their political or other differences. It would be a mistake and would not agree with the truth, if somebody would maintain that this is not a common standpoint of our people." "All Czechs and Slovaks should agree that cooperation with the Soviet Union is essential to our town and to the national interests. Never without the Soviet Union, never against the Soviet Union, but always with her, side by side" (p. 20 of the shorthand record).

Dr. Peter Zenkl, in "Svobodne Slovo" of January 1, 1946: "We are a God-chosen generation, to which it was granted to fulfill a unique historic task: to rid our homeland of the Germans, of this otherwise eternal danger for peace, for our land and for Europe * * * What was carried out and established by laws, that is the embarking on a road which the nation has chosen and on which the evolution will go. On this road there is no return, even if someone would wish it. But we, of course, do not wish it. We began an enormous task, which has to succeed, we all are responsible for it, facing future generations * * *."

On May 7, 1946, at a session of the Provisional National Assembly in Prague, Dr. Peter Zenkl said: "The faithfulness to the alliance with the U. S. S. R. and the brotherly love for the peoples of great Russia are for us, Czechs and Slovaks, sincere ties which are valid for our whole nation. Therein lies the symbol and duty for all those who lead or want to lead the policies of this nation. The feeling of a faithful duty with regard to Czechoslovakia's alliance with the U. S. S. R. is given by our position in the world and in Europe as well as by the spontaneous will of the Czechoslovak people who has to be considered as the only carrier of the executive power in Czechoslovakia and next to whom nobody can be taken into consideration" (p. 6 of shorthand report).

In a letter of November 23, 1946, Dr. Zenkl wrote: "Gottwald is the chairman of the Communist Party. He organized it and gave the best years of his life to it, he fought for its program and was put in jail for it. * * * I wish him that his political party, after 10 years of opposition and persecution would play the leading role in the reconstruction of our state, the leading role which our people would confirm at the elections * * * and that it should always be the actual creative element of every Czechoslovak government."

After his flight to the West in 1948, Zenkl became president of the executive committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. A friend of Dr. Zenkl in exile was the Communist spy Bohumil Cerny who went back to Czechoslovakia and is at present the chief of the Communist intelligence service at Brno. Cerny lived, in 1948 and 1949, in Germany and was known as a representative of Dr. Zenkl, organizing the committees of the Czech National Socialist Party. For this and other services he was paid by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

Zenkl was investigated in 1953 by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and dropped from his position as president of the council to a mere member of the plenum, but remained an important person behind the 2 or 3 weak National Socialist frontmen who now figure by name on the list of the executive committee of the council.

IV

The Case of Dr. Josef Lettrich

(The quotations given in this chapter are available)

The case of Dr. Josef Lettrich is quite similar to that of Dr. Zenkl. During World War II in freedom in Slovakia, he began a close cooperation with the Communists in Slovakia on Christmas 1943 and in 1944 coorganized the Communist Putsch at Banska Bystrica with its mass graves. In the National Front government between 1945 and 1948 he became chairman of the artificial Slovak Democratic Party. He is responsible for the suppression of all Slovak political parties with the exception of the Communists, and for the persecution of the Slovak people who in their majority are anti-Communist. He was head of the National Front regime for Slovakia.

He calls himself a Slovak, but in reality has no right to speak for the Slovaks. He sold the autonomy to the Prague Communist government by means of the agreement of June 27, 1946, for the Slovaks proved to be much more anti-Communist than the Czechs in the 1946 election and thus, following the Communist wish, had to be subordinated to the Czech pro-Communist majority. This was stated by the special report No. 8 of the Kersten committee of December 31, 1954, page 20. The report said:

"By this agreement, signed by J. Lettrich, chairman of the Democratic Party, Slovakia lost her legislative and executive autonomy."

Cas, the official daily of the Slovak Democratic Party, reported on January 21, 1948: "In the very heart of Moscow and the Soviet Union the founder of the Soviet State enjoys eternal sleep. He was the founder of a new, liberated, and joyful life for the suppressed nations. Soviet science preserved his image for future generations, so that at any time people could look into the face of the man, to whom they are indebted by deep gratitude for their happiness."

Cas, on November 7, 1947: "It is the unfalsified, unselfish, and pure feeling of friendship and sympathy that we have for this great, for us so intimate and neighborly a country. It is the pure joy about the success and the progress of the U. S. S. R., it is the unbreakable hope that Slavism, in its new form, will safeguard itself. * * * From our soul we greet the jubileeing U. S. S. R. * * * We wish that she keep on prospering, flourishing and growing mighty into her own greatness, but also to the welfare of all mankind."

Cas, Bratislava, June 19, 1954, issued on page 1 a speech of Dr. Josef Lettrich: "Already in the underground movement, during the resistance fight, the revolutionary leaders in Slovakia agreed that they would follow the democratic political order, but that, however, we will, within this democratic order, create only two political parties: the Democratic Party and the Communist Party, a party for the democratic citizens' elements and a party for the working class. These two parties are now governing together, and since they are governing together, they are respsonsible for Slovakia's fate." (Please not here what Dr. Lettrich understands under democratic order. The same Dr. Lettrich used the word "democratic" also several times in his recent congressional insertion.)

"It was decided that the Czechoslovak Republic will be a national state of Czechs and Slovaks. We will not tolerate minorities of such nations which have been undermining the foundations of the state and its democratic regime. Therefore, the Hungarians and the Germans must leave our country. In the next days, the President of the Republic [Benes] will issue a decree by which all Germans and Hungarians will be deprived of their citizenship. They will go there where their heart is drawing them."

Dr. Lettrich in Cas, on June 3, 1945: "Were we not to find a final solution of this problem of Hungarians and Germans, we would have to look forward to the future with misgivings. * * * It must be our aim to drive, without mercy, these people from our land."

Again in Cas, June 19, 1945: "We will not permit that religious organizations interfere in the political life; that the religion will be used as a means to cover political aims."

Why did Dr. Lettrich and company suppress all political parties except those pro-Communist? Here is his own explanation, given on June 19, 1945, in Cas: "We have not restored the old political parties because we consider their programs outmoded." Or in his speech on October 30, 1945, in the Provisional National Assembly: "Political parties which have outlived themselves, which are politically unacceptable or blamed, may not be revived in our country nor renewed in any form."

Again in Cas, June 19, 1945: "We fought purposefully for the resurrection of the Czechoslovak Republic. It has been clear to us that the Czechoslovak Republic must have a people's democratic regime and that she will have to avoid the political errors and mistakes of the past. In our Republic only the will of the people will decide."

Lettrich fought not only the Sudeten Germans and Hungarians but all anti-Communists. In Cas, No. 130, 1946: "Diverging forces shall be jailed. Diverging forces are today either eradicated or liquidated. Today only the Communists and members of other political parties (of the National Front) bear the responsibility for determining which forces shall control Slovakia and in which direction Slovakia shall go."

Dr. Lettrich equally persecuted the anti-Communist Ukrainians who in 1947 fled from Russia to the West via Slovakia. His hatred against all anti-Communists was unconditional. At a manifestation of the Democratic Party in Bratislava, November 16, 1947, he said: "It is with joy and satisfaction that we Democrats take cognizance of the fact that our security organs have saved us not only from the danger of the Bandera hordes but also from that of an antistate plot. We are fully aware of their difficult tasks and responsible work and we wish to

be of assistance to them in this meritorious undertaking."

On January 25, 1948, 1 month before the Communist takeover, Dr. Lettrich said at the session of the Democratic Party at Bratislava: "The alliance with the U. S. S. R. is the starting point of our new foreign policy and of our security system. It represents a mighty bulwark against a future possible danger from the part of German imperialism. In the spirit of these principles, the Democratic Party was acting stanchly at all forums. It put all its weight behind this conception. This orientation is to be considered as the invariable device for our future political life."

Lettrich foresaw the future evolution of people's democracies. In Cas, No. 262, 1946: "The national committees which have been created as a self-governing entity by our people's democracy after the liberation and reconstruction of our state, as well as their various organs, are the culmination of a stage of democratic evolution in our existence."

Lettrich had already once been sent to the United States of America by the Communists; in January 1947 he made a propaganda trip to the United States, assuring the American Czechs and Slovaks that there is real democracy and freedom in Czechoslovakia. At a conference in January 1947, ending his American trip, he said: "It has to be declared that, to a large degree, the success of my trip to the United States of America was only made possible by Slovak Communists, mainly the functionaries of the Slovak Workers Society."

In Cas, No. 153, Bratislava, 1947: "All our political parties (of the Natinoal Front) absolutely decline the smearing and lying campaign of certain foreign newspapers tending to create the impression that some forcible changes in the present Czechoslovak political regime are being prepared. Democratic Czechoslovakia solves and will continue to solve her own problems and difficulties by proper individual Czechoslovak methods and by cooperation with the parties of the National Front. It shall never happen that Czechoslovakia, proud of her independence, becomes a stage for international intrigues whatsoever, nor that she enters foreign disruptive entanglements with circles reactionary to her own interests. The parties of the National Front call upon all the citizens of our land not to allow themselves to be stirred up by false and fictitious "information" from abroad." (Here again we find talk about 'democratic' Czechoslovakia and 'reactionaries').

When the Communists were in full prepration of their February 1948 takeover, they had the full support and protection of Dr. Lettrich, see Declaration in the name of the Democratic Party, 1947: "It is our own interest to have this web of plotting torn to shreds." (These words concern an alleged plot against the Communists, which, they maintained, had been organized against them). In "Cas," on January 10, 1948: "The members of the National Security Corps (the Communist police) are given full recognition by the leaders of the Democratic Party for their arduous and responsible work."

Again in the Declaration, in the name of the Democratic Party, on June 10, 1948, 1½ months before the Communists took over: "The leaders of the Democratic Party wish to state that they will give full support to the Commissioner of the Interior in all matters pertaining to the obstruction of antistate activities whatsoever. • • • We emphasize that we are in accord with a thorough purge • • • of antistate elements."

When Lettrich came to the United States of America for the second time, in 1949, he became vice president of the executive committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. When investigated by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Lettrich was dropped by his employers from the vice presidency, but remained member of the committee, probably because there are so very few Slovaks who are willing to act as Slovak frontmen for the otherwise Czech council.

The Sudeten German Case—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the fourth instalment of the article by Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Landtag, of Munich, Germany, follows:

The present work of the Czechoslovak "Democrats" in the West

The activities of the ministers of the National Front led to the full communization of Czechoslovakia. After the full Communist takev-over in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, the same men were guarded in their homes, but curiously enough one after the other succeeded in escaping to the West. Only two Catholic priests were arrested when trying to flee. The other National Fronters were not hindered.

After they had arrived in America, Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich were picked up by the Free Europe Committee and installed in positions of leadership in the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and Radio Free Europe. These institutions are today fully dominated by their followers and Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich are still the most important persons there, while, since 1953, when the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee made its investigations, other well-paid persons are acting as front-men for them—Stefan Osusky, Jan Papanek, Juraj Slavik, Arnost Heydrich, Vaclav Hlavaty, Hodza, Fusek, Nemec, Rasin, and others.

Other such allegedly unpolitical organizations as the Czech Czechoslovak National Council in America, the American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., the National Union of Czechoslovak Students in Exile, and the Sokol are fully infiltrated and dominated by Ripka men.

The Czechoslovak Democrats are today a much tougher case than the Lattimores and Jessups. They reckon with the fact that Czechoslovakia is far from America and that the Americans do not know the real facts. They never admit any guilt or fault and are thus still holding the first line in the battle against anticommunism. They even call their activities between 1945 and 1948 in the following terms (congressional insertion on August 5, 1954): "The Czechoslovak Democrats fought communism the day the war ended and they were increasingly successful in the struggle."

They do not repent one single iota of their former activities, they continue to preach their crypto-Communist philosophy by means of Radio Free Europe and thus paralyze completely any anti-Communist spiritual resistance in the East.

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER wrote to the spokesman of the Sudeten German Landsmannschaft, Dr. Rudolf Lodgman, on Whitsunday 1954: "The Communists also needed non-Russian allies whose pro-Communist nationals could be sent to Western Europe and the United States, to infiltrate our anti-Communist agencies here and abroad and reduce American psychological warfare to impotence."

The Czechoslovak National Fronters fulfill completely this task by fighting all real anti-Communist Czechs and Slovaks, by occupying all positions, by preventing all real anti-Communists from any work, excluding all these from any cooperation in the allegedly anti-Communist agencies. They are working now in the same sense as they had worked in Czechoslovakia before.

V

The Sudeten Germans during World War II

In their elaborate of August 5, 1954, Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich uttered several words about the nazism of the Sudeten Germans during World War II and they mentioned the names of Konrad Henlein and Karl Hermann Frank.

The fact is that during World War II, the Sudetenland and the Czech parts of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia were separated by state borders from each other and that the population of the Sudetenland had nothing to do with the Czechs. Henlein was head of a part of the Sudetenland. It is also a fact that in inner Bohemia and Moravia the National Socialist regime was headed by Germans from Germany as Reichs protectors. This regime suppressed the Communist and pro-Communist parts of the Czech nation. Frank was a second man in this regime, but the Benes men, in their antipathy against everything Sudeten German and in their belief that it would be politically expedient they shifted all their hatred against him.

The fact is that in and after 1945 Ripka, Benes, and Gottwald liquidated by means of their People's Courts, in mock trials, not only all the German functionaries in Czech Bohemia and Moravia, but also in the Sudetenland, to which they most eagerly forged their way and which they reoccupied and resubjected. And they did not only liquidate the Nazis, but a few hundreds of thousands of innocent Sudeten Germans, too. As to the other Sudeten Germans, they were robbed of all property and driven out of the Sudetenland and out Czechoslovakia.

In any case, Frank and Henlein and with them many more are dead. But Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich who committed far greater crimes than the so-called Nazis and who, moreover, brought communism to Czechoslovakia, are not dead and not punished. Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich are still in full power today, upholding their genocide on the Sudeten Germans and their communization measures in Ccechslovakia, financed by private American institutions and teaching their morale at American universities.

Attacks on Dr. Rudolf Lodgman

Since 1918, the Czechs became accustomed to consider Czechoslovakia as a sacred thing and each effort of the Sudeten Germans, the Slovaks, and the Hungarians to reach their right for self-determination as a fight against democracy, as Nazism, high treason, and crime. There has never been a tougher imperialism than that of the Benes-Czechs.

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich also declared in August 1954: "Such German nationalists as Dr. R. von Lodgman, the present leader of the Sudeten Germans in Germany, never reconciled themselves to the Republic of Czechoslovakia."

Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen is today the spokesman and president of the Sudeten German Landsmannschaft. He was the man who tried to make out of Austria-Hungary a federation of nations. He was the man who tried to establish an independent Sudetenland in 1918, which effort was broken by arms by the Czechs. He remained in opposition to the Czech regime during the first Czechoslovak Republic and also against the German regime during World War II. He was expelled—like all the other Sudeten Germans—after 1945. When the expellee organizations were founded in Germany, he became the head of the Sudeten Germans as well as the first president of all German ex-

pellee unions. He and two cochairmen of the Association for the Protection of Sudeten German Interests, Hans Shütz and Richard Reitzner, both members of the Federal Bundestag at Bonn, signed an agreement in 1950 with the Czech National Committee in London formulating the right for self-determination for both the Czech and Sudeten Germans. Dr. Lodgman has always been a strong adherent of freedom and the right for self-determination for every nation, never wavering in his attitude; he remained true to his principles under and during all regimes in his country.

Attacks on Wenzel Jaksh

In the chapter the Transfer—A Direct Result of Sudeten German Policy, Ripka says: "The Sudeten German policy of avid servitude to pan-German imperialism, exposed ever since 1848 and flagrantly supported and carried out in the Nazi era, inevitably brought on their transfer to Germany after World War II.

"Unfortunately, even many Sudeten German Democrats, for instance Wenzel Jaksch, who until Munich had stood on the side of the Czechoslovak Democrats in brave opposition to Henlein, switched during the war in London to the pan-German policy of expansion and domination. When the British Government revoked the Munich agreement in 1942 as no longer binding, Jaksch went so far as to protest against the British decision in an attempt to save for the Sudeten Germans the gains seized by Hitler in 1938–39. This would have meant total subjugation of the Czechs and Slovaks. In the case of Jaksch and other Socialists and Democrats, pan-German nationalism eventually drowned out their democratic ideas.

"In view of these conditions, through the fault of the Sudeten Germans, there was no longer any reason to believe in any possible peaceful coexistence between Germans and Czechs and Slovaks in Czechslovakia. No other alternative remained but the drastic transfer. Since the organic entity of Czech [sic] lands must not be upset, it remained to separate the Germans from the Czechs by removing them to Germany."

So far Ripka, Zenkl and Lettrich. The fact that Wenzel Jaksch and Richard Reitzner, both now members of the German Federal Bundestag, who spent war in London in exile, have nevertheless adhered to the right for self-determination for their people, wanting that the Sudeten Germans could live free and not under the Czech rule in the future, this fact is called by Ripka—in his jargon—"During the war in London, they switched to the Pan-German policy of expansion and domination and Pan-German nationalism eventually drowned out their democratic ideals." Their adherence, moreover, to the right for self-determination was, according to Ripka, Zenkl and Lettrich, the reason for "removing" the Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia "since the organic entity of Czech [sic] lands must not be upset."

Ripka says: aspiring, rapacious and aggressive pan-Germanism

While the expelled Sudeten German people, whom Ripka, Zenkl and Lettrich drove out from their centuries-old homeland with nothing but bare hands, are clinging to their right for their country and the return to it, if once communism should be defeated, Ripka calls it:

"In reality, the Sudeten Germans are not basing their plans on the justice of the American people; rather they are hoping that Americans * * * will help them realize German ambitions entertained under Hitler."

While I have made my position clear on the Sudeten German wish for the right for self-determination for all nations in my Congressional insertion of March 25, 1954, here is what Ripka, Zenkl and Lettrich called it: "The Sudeten Germans * * * in reality * * * are addicted more than ever to aspiring, rapacious, and aggressive pan-Germanism."

The same opinions can be heard from Radio Moscow and Radio Prague.

Ripka says: The West was the first to agree to the transfer

Ripka's thesis is that the British and United States Governments first reached an agreement with Benes on the deportation of the Sudeten Germans and that the Soviet Union hesitated and gave its approval only when it became known that America had already approved the idea of the German transfer.

On page 17 of the Documents on the Expulsion of the Sudeten Germans Dr. Wilhelm Turnwald pictures the way in which the expulsion was agreed upon: "Dr. Benes showed himself not very particular about the means he used. In a conference with President Roosevelt on May 12, 1943, he mentioned that the Russians would agree to the transfer of the Sudeten Germans. Seventeen days later, May 29, Dr. Ripka explained to the Soviet Ambassador Bogomolow in London that the Americans had already agreed to the transfer and that in these circumstances the Czech Government in exile expected the official Russian consent. On June 6, Dr. Ripka telephoned Dr. Benes, who was in the United States, that the Russian consent just arrived—the same consent with which Dr. Benes had operated in his conversation with President Roosevelt on May 12."

There is still the fact that the transfer of the Eastern Germans decided by the Potsdam agreement and the entire transfer of the Communist border to the west was the aim of international communism. In addition, Dr. Benes and Dr. Ripka, in their blind hatred against the Sudeten Germans acted as mediators between the Eastern and Western partners and were trying to get the agreement from both sides by maintaining that the opposite side had already agreed and had asked for the deportation at a time when this was not so. They lied to both, the United States as well as the Soviets. The friendly protection for their plans by international communism safely covered those lies.

Ripka declares that the Soviet Government hesitated since it wanted to use the Sudeten Germans against the liberal and democratic Czechs. The government of the national front which had communized Czechoslovakia from within was established only by Communists and the so-called liberals. The nonliberal, conservative Czechs were excluded from it, because they were anti-Communists. For the same reason, the Sudeten Germans and Hungarians were expelled. The Volga-Germans, the Baltic nations and all those other nations which have been expelled and deported in recent history by the Soviets, were deported because they were hard anti-Communists, not because they were liberal. Had the Sudeten Germans been liberal in Ripka's sense of the word, they would not have been expelled. They would have become members of the government like Ripka himself.

The Kersten committee in contradiction to liberals Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich

The Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives under the chairmanship of Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN stated in its special report No. 8 of December 31, 1954 (Communist takeover and occupation of Czechoslovakia):

"Fateful for the people (especially in Bohemia and Moravia) (i. e. for the Czechs and not the Slovaks—author's remark) was the fact that they were misinformed by many fellow traveling intellectuals by means of newspapers, books, and through all the media of communication as to the real nature of communism, cleverly described for years even prior to World War II as undergoing an evolution toward a democratic, humanitarian ideology" (p. 18).

"It should be pointed out that the Communist advance in Czechoslovakia was greatly facilitated by the behavior of the non-Communist parties and their leaders.

"The signing of the Soviet-Czechslovak agreement on December 12, 1943, and especially the proclamation of the Kosic program of April 5, 1945, opened the door for an unobstructed drive on the part of the Communists to seize full power in the country (p. 17).

Ripka says that the Czechs were no less hard working and no less dedicated to free enterprise than the Germans. This statement is true for the decent part of the Czechs, for whom to speak Ripka has no right whatsoever. On the one hand, it is a fact that in 1946, under Ripka's rule, there were 40 percent Communists among the Czechs and, together with the Marxist Czech Social Democrats, there were 56 percent Marxists among the Czech people and, with Ripka's and Benes' Party, 80 percent Socialists. On the other hand, it is also the truth that the Sudeten Germans showed the following figures in the elections: In 1929, 31 percent Socialists (Social Democrats), in 1935, 16 percent Socialists (out of 66 Sudeten German Deputies in the Czechoslovak Parliament in Prague there were 11 Socialists—Social Democrats). In addition to it, there was absolutely no parallel, no relation, no similarity between the Sudeten German Social Democrats (who rather acted like the Social Democrats in Switzerland, Sweden, and the other northern countries) and the Marxist pro-Moscow Czech Socialists and Social Democrats. Before 1938 the Sudeten Germans had only 4 percent elected Communists (also elected by Czech votes) and from 1938 to 1945 no Communists and Marxists whatsoever. Today they can be considered as, may be, the strongest anti-Communists in Germany at all.

Disregarding and distorting these facts, Ripka says: "Had the Sudeten Germans remained in Czechoslovakia, in all likelihood, the Communist Party would have found strong support among the Sudeten Germans."

In fact, the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans was carried out at a time when only and exclusively communization measures were executed in Czechoslovakia by the promoters of communism, including Ripka. Ripka's pushing of the expulsion was only a part of his overall activities on behalf of communism.

It was the Communist agent Wolfgang Putlitz who, in Ripka's office in London, elaborated the details of the deportation of the Sudeten Germans during World War II. It was Josef Stalin, who in an interview given to the Prague Communist daily Rude Pravo, in September 1945, said: "Get rid of the Germans and expel them."

And it was the Communist Zdenek Fierlinger, at that time Czechoslovak Prime Minister, who said on November 8, 1945, in a speech at Prague: "We redress the defeat at the White Mountain (again this false interpretation common to Ripka and the Communists) by a state act, by the expulsion of all Germans from our country; this happened with the consent of our Government. We never would have been able to purge our country from the ill weeds, were there not the prominent assistance of the brotherly Soviet Union and the great Generalissimo Stalin."

Although Ripka was Minister of the National Front government which carried out the expulsion, the Prime Minister of this government was a Communist. There are plenty of press clippings of Czechoslovak Communist papers in our possession which prove that its main promoters were the Czechoslovak Communists, who bought most

of the adherents by distributing and collectivizing the Sudeten German property. They were, of course, most eagerly followed by the politicians and papers of the Benes' party. The kind of promoting the deportation of the Sudeten Germans was analogical to other communization efforts: Communists like Zapotocky and Gottwald led, but were closely followed by men such as Ripka, Benes, Zenkl, and Lettrich.

Ripka's objection that 3.3 million Sudeten Germans could not have prevented the communization of Czechoslovakia when 18 million Eastern Germans did not prevent the communization of the Soviet Zone of Germany is invalid. In the Soviet Zone there have been Russian Armies, but Czechoslovakia was the only country, besides Russia herself, which has been communized from within. There has been no Red Army in Czechoslovakia since the end of 1945.

Besides this, I did not state that merely the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans caused the communization of Czechoslovakia. The expulsion was only a part—probably the most important one—of the communization measures. Another part, e. g., was the full suppression of all anti-Communists among the Czech Nation itself, the abolishment of all Czech and Slovak Parties of the center and the right and the abolishment of freedom of press, also executed by Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich. The pro-Communist activities of these men were without any interruption. They did a full job.

They did not suppress the anti-Communist Sudeten Germans alone. They suppressed also all anti-Communist Czechs. Or would Ripka—analogically—say today: "Had we not forbidden the Agrarian, the Artisan and National Democratic Parties, the Communists would have in all likelihood found strong support among them"?

The Sudeten German Case—Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the fifth installment of the article by Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Landtag, of Munich, Germany, follows:

VI

Ripka's false logic

The above-quoted opinions of Ripka, Zenkl and Lettrich represent fine examples of false logic.

The Communists and crypto-Communists have a logic which normal men consider a perverted one. We cannot discern in every individual case, whether they deliberately pervert the truth or whether they are doing so unconsciously, simply thinking in a perverted way. Both ways are inborn to them. But whether consciously lying or unconsciously thinking in a perverted way, they—in any case—do always help the cause of communism.

Ripka, above all, has a false logic. It is also this logic, by means of which he calls the collaboration of Benes and himself with the Communists as follows (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertion): "Finally it must be underlined that President Benes and the Czechoslovak democratic parties never stopped fighting the Communists until the day of the brutal liquidation of Czechoslovak democracy in February 1948."

The kind of fight against the Communists by the National Front—Ripka calls it Czechoslovak democratic parties—was already pictured. After all, the Czechoslovak democracy, or better people's democracy was brutally liquidated in 1948 in the following way, namely that President Benes himself signed the new Gottwald government and remained president of a fully Communist Czechoslovakia. This was only the last step of this communizator of Czechoslovakia.

Ripka understands under anti-communism a full cooperation with the Communists in all measures and acts of policy, but quarreling with them for Government positions. If prohibition of political parties of the center and the right, if nationalization and expropriation of the industry and trade, if establishment of people's courts, abolishment of freedom of press and word, if establishment of the national committees and the people's democracy, if suppression, killing and deportation of all anti-Communists, if cooperation with the Communists and the U. S. S. R. and praise for them, well, if all this is anti-communism, than Ripka was an anti-Communist. He remained until today. Even today he is teaching and advocating this kind of anti-communism.

When Ripka says: "Czechoslovakia was Communist not because of the Sudeten German transfer but because she, together with the other countries of East Central Europe, had been placed in the Soviet sphere" then I can add: The placing of Czechoslovakia in the Soviet sphere was effected by the fact that this country was placed under the rule of Soviet agents, such as Ripka, Zenkl, Lettrich and Benes in 1945.

The two opinions

In any case there are two viewpoints, two testimonies on the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans.

Communist collaborators Hubert Ripka, Petr Zenkl and Josef Lettrich maintain that the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans did not further the communization of Czechoslovakia. This is the first viewpoint.

The second is that of United States Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, who, on the occasion of the Sudeten German Day in Munich, Whitsunday 1954, on which 500,000 Sudeten German expellees took part, wrote to Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen, the spokesman of the Sudeten German Landsmannschaft, extending his greetings:

"Why did the Soviet leaders know that you must be driven from your homes, if the Soviet design for the post-war world was to prevail? The Soviet leaders knew that you belonged among those who opposed communism completely and clearly, with the full energies of your minds and your hearts.

"The Communists are not afraid of people with lukewarm ideas about goodness and freedom or welfare. People with lukewarm ideas are putty in their hands. How clever the Communists are to encourage and make use of the soft-headed, while they fight incessantly to destroy those who hold an unbreakable conviction of devotion to what is right.

"The Soviet leaders set up their schemes for the post-war world long before the war in Europe was ended. They needed to push the Soviet borders as far westward as possible. They needed to set up weak or docile or confused governments in a wide area about their own borders.

"One precept guided all their tactics—kill or drive out the hard core of anti-Communists in Central Europe and we shall have no trouble taking over the rest. The brutal determination with which after the war the Communist leaders insisted refugees from the Soviet Union must be sent back as deserters, was cut from the same cloth as the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans. They know if they could drive out the men of firm principle, the soft-headed and the ambitious would do their work for them.

"You were driven from your homes, but your spirit was not quenched. Even in exile, you formed your own fighting organization. You made yourself a force for anticommunism even when you had no homeland. And you helped all Europe and the United States by your brave refusal to permit Communist agents and their hirelings to get a foothold among the refugees."

The Potsdam agreement and the decent deportation of the Sudeten Germans

Here are Ripka's, Lettrich's, and Zenkl's words:

"Following the decision of the Potsdam Conference on the German transfer from Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary, the transfer of the Sudeten Germans was carried out in an orderly manner. When the transfer was completed, the American occupational headquarters sent the Czechoslovak Government a note acknowledging Czechoslovakia's strict observance of regulations and decency."

During this orderly and decent deportation from their homeland about 300,000 Sudeten Germans lost their lives.

The losses

The number of losses of the Sudeten Germans which they suffered by the deportation can be substantiated by extensive and exact material we have prepared. They amount to nearly 300,000 dead, not counting those tortured, raped, and beaten. The Sudeten German property stolen by the National Front is estimated at $19.44 billion. Our Documents on the Expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, Munich 1953, are already today available as part of evidence.

On the other hand, the losses among the Czech Communists during World War II and the economic losses, given by Ripka, are unprovable. There has been no expropriation of millions of Czechs or their forceful transfer—things 3.3 million Sudeten Germans had to undergo. The losses of the Czechoslovak industry, e. g., were the results of war under the same conditions as in entire Germany and entire Europe. They were, of course, caused mostly by the unbelievably plundering Red Army at the end of war, which afflicted all German, Czech, and Slovak property. The hirelings of Moscow, such as Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich, can naturally never attribute these losses to their idol, the Red Army, and they never and nowhere mentioned it.

Without the Red Army, the Czech parts of Bohemia, being in the geographical center of Germany, would have been almost completely saved from economic losses caused by the war. As a matter of fact, Bohemia and Moravia were a kind of storing place for the Germany Army and a great quantity of supplies stored there fell, in 1945, into Czech and Russian hands.

It happens that the amateur author of the false numbers given by Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich is one Radomir Luza. Luza's father, General Luza, did not die in the hands of the Nazis for the cause of liberty as Ripka states. He was a partisan leader, one of those who, in civilian clothes, shot their enemies in the back, as was being done by Communist partisans also in Korea, Malaya, and elsewhere. General Luza and two comrades were in a country inn near Yglau in Bohemia, where three Czech—not German—gendarmes entered the building. Luza and the other men, believing being recognized, drew their pistols and attacked the gendarmes. The gendarmes did the same and in self-defense shot General Luza dead. Several days later, at night, the young Luza and a gang of Communist partisans surrounded the Czech gendarmerie station, took all the Czech gendarmes present, supporters of families, to the cellar and, without any hearing, shot them dead. It hap-

pened that the men who really shot Luza's father were on leave and not among those liquidated. Those killed were all innocent. This case is sufficiently known in Czechoslovakia.

Radomir Luza was wrong when he collectively liquidated Czech gendarmes, in the same way as in putting up false numbers. As to his person, Luza was never a good mathematician, but a member of the Czech Social Democratic Party and a personal and political friend of Blazej Vilim, former secretary general of that party, who signed the "Marxist block," binding the Czech Social Democrats to an especially close cooperation with the Communist Party in September 1947, a few months before the Communist takeover, and a friend of the Communist agent, Bohumil Lausmann (first in exile), like Luza and working for Radio Free Europe, now back in Prague), chairman of Luza's party before and in 1948.

VII

Ripka's, Zenkl's, and Lettrich's attacks on the Slovaks

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich declared in their CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertion of August 5, 1954:

"The Sudeten Germans took an active part in preparing and carrying out the occupation of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 not only in the Czech (sic) lands but also in Slovakia (where they exerted such great pressure that the Nazis succeeded in bringing about Slovakia's secession."

The Kersten report of the House of Representatives stated on December 31, 1954:

"Even though the Slovak state was largely the result of a tense international situation, it nevertheless corresponded to the aspirations of the Slovak people for freedom and the principle of self-determination and self-government." (P. 12.)

On August 5, 1954, Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich asked: "Who are these very able allies of the Sudeten Germans? The freedom-loving Slovak people Dr. Becher has in mind are the former Slovak collaborators with the Nazis who served them blindly during the war and link their fate today not to a German democracy but to radical German nationalists."

Here are the facts: On May 30, 1918, the first President of the then created Czechoslovak Republic, Thomas G. Masaryk, signed the so-called Pittsburgh agreement in the United States of America with the Slovak League of America—the top organization of Americans of Slovak descent in the United States of America. In this way, on the basis of this Czecho-Slovak agreement, the first Czechoslovakia was created. At that time, the American Slovaks were obviously able allies of Masaryk and Benes.

When, however, the Slovaks learned that they were treated as a mere minority in Czechoslovakia, when they noted that the Pittsburgh agreement was never kept and that the Czechs wanted to keep the Slovaks under their centralized rule, when the Slovaks and the Slovak League of America started to ask for a free Slovak state and especially when the Slovaks started to reveal the Communist background of the Benes Czechs, then they suddenly became the Slovak collaborators with the Nazis for the very same Czechs with whom they once had founded the Czechoslovak Republic.

It is true that once the Slovaks wished to have a common state with the Czechs, but it is equally true that, after their experiences with Benes, Ripka, Gottwald, and Zapotocky, the absolute majority of the Slovak people, at home and in exile, rejected fully and compromiselessly such a political solution. It is also the truth that the Slovaks have shown an absolutely different behavior toward communism than the Czechs, educated by Benes and Ripka. In 1946, when there were 56 percent of Marxist and 80 percent of Socialist votes among the Czechs, there were only 30 percent of it among the Slovaks.

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich recognize as democratic Slovaks merely the small Slovak minority who have favored communism and Czechoslovakism and who hate all other Slovaks including their former partners with whose agreement they once had established Czechoslovakia.

On August 5, 1954, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a group of Communist collaborators and political adventurers, such as Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich, slandered the Slovak League of America, an organization of American citizens who have fought in World War II for America and have donated several ships to the United States merchant marine. The son of Mr. Philip Hrobak, the president of the league, has fought in Korea and is still there.

But the American Slovaks and the Slovak exiles in the West organized in two big exile organizations, the Slovak National Council in Exile and the Slovak Liberation Committee speak for themselves.

On May 21, 1953, Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum of the 33d congress of the Slovak League of America. This memorandum says among other things:

"As Americans we sincerely believe that every nation, large or small, had the inherent God-given right to freedom and independence, the right to its own nationhood and statehood. We believe, too, that liberty cannot be exercised by proxy and that all nations are entitled to a voice in the determination of their own destinies. We knew then, just as we know now, that Dr. Benes * * * could never have returned to Czechoslovakia again as President, if he had not betrayed the peoples of that hapless country to the Stalin men of Moscow.

"In 1948, after the so-called Communist putsch in Czechoslovakia, we strongly protested to the administration of the American Government against the admission into the United States of former members of the Communist-dominated national front government of Czechoslovakia who had collaborated with the Communists in government and with the Kremlin until February 1948. We still insist that these so-called Czechoslovaks, now organized in the United States of America as the Council of Free Czechslovakia, are in a large measure responsible for the present terrible plight of the Czech and the Slovak nations. They have, in fact, compromised the good name of America, as well as the prestige of the Czechs and the Slovaks, the majority of whom are anti-Communist. The Slovaks were through with the Czechoslovak political monstrosity in 1939 and want no more of it; they are not willing to be subservient to and exploited by the Czechs and their Communist allies."

Hon. Edward J. Bonin inserted in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1954, two statements of Mr. Philip A. Hrobak, the president of the Slovak League of America. Mr. Hrobak said: "By an agreement that Edward Benes concluded with Klement Gottwald at the beginning of 1945 in Moscow, four political parties of Slovakia were suppressed: the Slovak People's Party, the Agrarian Party, the Slovak National Party and the Artisan Party. They had 33 deputies—19, 12, 1, 1, respectively—that is the majority of the 56 deputies that Slovakia had in the Prague Parliament before World War II. The principal leaders of the Slovak Democratic Party, created only in 1945, approved this undemocratic decision. In spite of this fact those politicians who have mostly joined the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, are considered as speakers for Slovakia, while the conservative forces constituting a great majority of the Slovak emigration are without any representation in the Free Europe Committee. These Slovak refugees can hardly understand why the leftwing of the Slovak political emigration should enjoy a greater favor of the American agencies than its more conservative and decidedly more anti-Communist center."

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, inserted in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 1, 1951, a memorandum of the executive committee of the Slovak League of America: "The Slovak nation has had its fill of the political system represented by Czechoslovakia and, presently, by the Czech National Socialists, other Czech groups, and the so-called Czechoslovaks in exile. The Slovak nation has had enough of Zenkl and Papanek, Ripka, and Lettrich and their ilk, who reminds it so much of Gottwald and his followers. They are the so-styled Czechoslovaks, the pseudo-democrats, who have used and abused—and are still using and abusing—American democracy for their own interests and are comprising the good name of the United States. We strongly urge the resolution of the Czechoslovak question for once and for all time. American interests and the interests of the democratic world at large are ill-served by supporting bankrupt Czech politicians and former Red collaborators who propagate the fiction of a united Czechoslovak nation."

Representative WALTER M. MUMMA, of Pennsylvania, inserted in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on June 2, 1954, a speech by Mr. Philip A. Hrobak before the National Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent in the Washington Hotel, held on May 24, 1954, at which 5 United States Senators and 26 United States Representatives took part. Mr. Hrobak said: "We were mistaken, badly mistaken. We did not see the job through; Czechoslovakia was not setup as a federation. It soon became evidence that the Prague government, headed by T. G. Masaryk and Dr. Edward Benes, did not regard the Slovaks as equal partners, but only as a colony to be exploited by the Czechs. The Slovaks soon realized that Czechoslovakia simply meant * * * to be placed under the Czech despot, who also sought to destroy them eventually as a nation." Mr. Hrobak then spoke about the imprisonment of the Slovak leader Monsignor Hlinka by the Czech Government and said: "The Slovaks, however, outlived the tyranny of the past and today are determined to outlive the present scourge of Czecho-Communist terror and violence and to continue in their march to complete political freedom and independence."

"And in the struggle against communism, the Slovaks want to be united with all free nations and not especially with and only with the Czech nation. They want it clearly understood, that they are not fighting communism for the sake of a free or any other kind of Czechoslovakia. They are definitively through with the political monstrosity known as Czechoslovakia in 1939, when the assembly of autonomous Slovakia declared the independence of the Slovak nation." These are words, as I may again underline, of the same Slovak League of America which once formed, in 1918, the first Czechoslovakia with Masaryk and Benes.

On the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, Mr. Hrobak said: "The Slovaks do not want or request the Czechs to represent them in any field of human endeavor, whether cultural, political, or spiritual. And, of course, the Slovaks do not want to be credited with the criminal acts committed by the Communist-dominated National Front Government of Dr. Edward Benes and Clement Gottwald. The Slovak nation had nothing to do with the criminal expulsion of Germans and Magyars from Czechoslovakia, or the brutal persecution and supression of religion and of all anti-Communist opposition in that hapless country. For the betrayal of Czechoslovakia—the Czechs and the Slovak na-

tions—to the Communists and the Soviet Union, the Slovaks give full credit to Edward Benes and his Socialist followers, who consistently promoted pro-Soviet policy. Slovak political, cultural, and religious leaders did not betray the Czechs, but the Benez Czechs betrayed not only the Slovaks, but the entire Czech nation as well.

"Today, in America and elsewhere, the Benez Czechs and their Slovak hirelings—the apostles of Czechoslovak democracy—are organized in various Czech and Czechoslovak organizations, the American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., and the Council of Free Czechoslovakia among them, which profess to be organizations of anti-Communist, democratic exiles from Czechoslovakia. In fact, however, they are controlled by the Benez Czechs, the Czech National Socialists, and former members of the Communist-dominated National Front Government of Dr. Edward Benes and Clement Gottwald, which collaborated closely with the Soviet Union and outlawed all anti-Socialist and anti-Communist parties in Czechoslovakia in 1945. These National Fronters who claim they control the employees of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America, never did and never will represent the political will of the Slovak nation, and therefore have no authority to speak for the Slovaks anywhere. Furthermore, they do not represent the anti-Socialistic and anti-Communistic Czechs. They should be recognized for what they really were in their homeland—promoters of the pro-Soviet policy of the Czech Socialists and Communists. And they should be treated accordingly. Under their leadership, the so-called Czechoslovak democracy had practically no trouble at all in converting to a people's democracy after World War II. Americans of Slovak descent consider it their sacred duty to unmask and embarass all such pseudodemocratic elements and to disarm them completely, because the enemies of Slovak freedom and independence are, in fact, the enemies of the American democratic way of life itself."

The Sudeten German Case—Part 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the sixth installment of the article by Walter Becher, member of the Bavarian Landtag of Munich, Germany, follows:

VIII

Ripka's, Zenkl's, and Lettrich's affronts to their own people, to the Czechs

The enmity toward the decent men even among their own nation manifests itself clearly in what Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich said further on about those Czechs whom I did call the Sudeten German allies. They said: "The decent anti-Communist Czech politicians are a handful of adventurers, Fascists and deracines, who hope to be given high positions in Czechoslovakia for services now rendered, although the Czech people barely know them."

The Sudeten German Association signed an agreement, in 1950, with the Czech General of the Army, Lev Prchala, chairman of the Czech National Committee in London. Before World War II Prchala was supreme commander of the Czechoslovak armies in eastern Czechoslovakia. Before the beginning of World War II, he went with his army to Poland and placed his soldiers at the disposal of the Polish Government to fight against the German and the Soviet armies. When Poland was defeated, he escaped to England and spent World War II in London. In London there was also the Benes exile government. General Prchala opposed strongly Benes' pro-Soviet policies in exile and especially the Soviet-Czechoslovak alliance treaty Benes, under Ripka's urging, had signed in 1943 in Moscow.

When in 1945 Benes returned to Czechoslovakia via Moscow, General Prchala did not return to his country and remained in London, rejecting the policies of Dr. Benes and any cooperation with the Communists. His line has never changed: he opposed both nazism and communism and the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans. There is no other Czech who has this political record and there is no other Czech who would be more known in Czechoslovakia.

Another prominent Czech politician opposing the Council of Free Czechoslovakia is Dr. Helena Kozeluhova-Prochazkova. She is the niece of the Czech writer Karel Capek and wife of the former National Front Minister Dr. Adolf Prochazka (who is now a member of the executive committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia). Separated from her husband with whom she had disagreed politically already in Czechoslovakia, she is now living in Germany. Dr. Kozeluhova was a member of the Czechoslovak Parliament in Prague and a nationally known journalist, columnist of the big daily of the People's Party. Because of her brave anti-Communist stand—after personal attempts of the Communist Prime Minister Gottwald to win her over for a softer stand had failed—she was expelled in 1946 from the Parliament. Later the National Front forbade her to write in any paper in Czechoslovakia and the Communists spent about 3 million crowns to supervise her. Only the fact that she was the wife of a government-member saved her from full liquidation.

When both, Dr. Prochazha and Dr. Kozeluhova-Prochazkova were flying to the West in 1948, Dr. Prochazka was not hindered by the Communist border guard to pass, while his wife was arrested. She outwitted, however, the Communist police and escaped too. In 1954 she worked for Radio Free Europe in Munich, but the Ripka-men there forbade her to write political programs—in the same way as Ripka and the Communists had done it in Czechoslovakia before. When in summer 1954 she appeared voluntarily before the members of the Kersten committee in Munich and testified about and against Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich, Radio Free Europe fired her from any further cooperation.

Dr. Kozeluhova—called Helenka by the broad masses of the Czech people—is a symbol of anticommunism among the Czech people in the east. She alone dared to be anti-Communist under the National Front regime and even in Radio Free Europe.

Another man with a great Czech name—maybe the greatest Czech name at all—opposing the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, is Dr. h. c. Jan A. Bata, now in Brazil and the United States of America, who in 1945 was falsely accused and sentenced in absentia by Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich and the Communists, so that they could steal (nationalize) his huge shoe factories in Zlin and elsewhere.

A common future line seems to be possible between Sudeten Germans and all those Czech political parties which were forbidden by Benes, Ripka, and the Communists in 1945, that is the Republican Agrarian Party, the Artisan Party, the National Democratic Party, and the Christian Democrats which together used to represent the majority of the Czech nation in the Parliament before World War II. The leaders of these parties were either executed or imprisoned in 1945 by the Communists, by Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich, but many members are nevertheless in exile. The paid fronting for the Council of Free Czechoslovakia is being done only by a few of them—mostly because of existence reasons—who are, however, not recognized as leaders by their own parties. Most of the members of these parties are real anti-Communists and some of them were already attacked by Dr. Zenkl as McCarthyites.

At a time when all support of private political societies in the United States of America is given to men like Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich, these anti-Commuist Czechs have to lead a hard fight for their existence and, while the National Fronters live in luxury, they lack the most primitive means for political activities and for life itself. And yet they represent the real Czechs, the majority of Czechs, and they are the real hope for their nation and for all those neighbors who want to cooperate with the Czech people in the future.

Another example of the famous logic of Czechoslovak Democrats

It is difficult to live together with men of abnormal logic, and the more difficult to live under their rule. And yet this was exactly the fate of the Sudeten German people who had to live under the rule of the Benes men in Czechoslovakia. The famous logic of these men, which caused them to call themselves anti-Communists, while they were helping communism, and Democrats, while they were semi-Communists or worse, manifests itself clearly in the chapter: Removing the German Minority a Precondition for Friendly Relations Between Germany and Czechoslovakia.

Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich said there: "For the very reason that we, the Czechoslovak Democrats, earnestly desire friendly relations with our neighbor, the German Reich, we are firmly convinced * * * that such cooperation calls for, as a fundamental prerequisite, the removal of friction caused in the past by the presence of a strong German minority in Czechoslovakia.

"We believe the moving out of the Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia to Germany was the only practical, fair solution of the centuries-old problem. It was the only way how to save the Czech and Slovak nations and how to achieve friendly coexistence with Germany."

This logic, as I may point out, is shared neither by the Sudeten German people nor by the German Federal Government.

In this statement, however, the real character of these men is also clearly shown, who so softly spoke about another Switzerland in 50 or 60 years. Here they bluntly say that they believe that the moving out of the Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia, the deportation causing the death of hundreds of thousands, was the only practical, fair solution of the centuries-old problem.

Europe needs no Czechoslovakia, but freedom and self-determination for every nation

In the name of Czechoslovakia, in 1918, the Sudeten Germans, the Hungarians, the Slovaks and the Ruthenians were held subjugated to the Czech state nation. Again in 1945 the Slovaks were subjugated anew by the Czech Communist regime, and the Sudeten Germans and the Hungarians were expelled and killed. (There was only one exception to the idea of Czechoslovakia: the Subcarpathian Ruthenia was traded over to the Soviet Union. However, Benes and Ripka made this exception only because it served the Soviet policy, just as the entire old and new Czechoslovakia had served U. S. S. R. policies.)

Ripka, Zenkl and Lettrich dare to declare today: "They (the Sudeten Germans) know fully well that could they but return to their Sudetenland, with the help of the Americans, they could seize powerful key positions enabling them to wreck the reestab-

lishment of Czechoslovakia. Upon their return to their homeland they would immediately demand annexation to the Reich and, together with the Hungarian nationalities, would provoke the secession of Slovakia from Bohemia and, it goes without saying, of Subcarpathian Ruthenia."

Czechoslovakia is no sacred thing. Since 1935 a bastion of Soviet Russia, and since 1945–48 a Communist country herself, was she only sacred to those who loved communism or hated Germany. The only sacred things are freedom and self-determination for all nations, the Slovaks, the Sudeten Germans, the Hungarians, the Ruthenians and also the Czech people. By granting support to Sudeten German Pan-Germanism—as Ripka calls the striving of the Sudeten Germans, Slovaks and Hungarians for their self-determination—America would not undermine the anti-Communist resistance of Czechs and Slovaks. On the contrary, by supporting the right for self-determination, America could encourage the Slovak people, win the Hungarians and the Germans and also the decent half of the Czech nation itself.

The situation is as the president of the Slovaka League formulated it: "The recognition of the inherent and God-given right of the Slovak nation to freedom and independence and will give aid and comfort and hope to the oppressed millions behind the Iron Curtain in Slovakia and added initiative to thousands of her patriotic sons in exile." The same is true about the Hungarians, the Sudeten Germans and of most of the Czechs who thus would finally find their way back to their better side of character.

IX

The Czechoslovak "Democrats"—Mass murderers and Communists

While it has been usual for repenting Communists (who changed their mind) to reject their past deeds and to join those who have always fought communism, in order to support them in their fight, it is the true present characteristic of Zenkl, Ripka, and Lettrich that they fully uphold and protect and excuse their entire work done in the national front between 1945 and 1948. Let me make it clear: They are still considering as just and right not only the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, but also all other pro-Communist activities, without any exception, they had developed in Czechoslovakia before 1948. Most probably, they are being encouraged to do so by those who use and finance them now and are being used and financed (while the other Czechs are excluded) because they are acting that way.

Among other things, they fully adhere to the genocide against the Sudeten Germans. They are nonrepenting mass murderers.

In their own terms they call their adherence to the genocide and to their communization measures in Czechoslovakia as follows: "Czechoslovak democracy remained steadfast notwithstanding and fought for the ideals of the western democracies to the very last moment. It has never given up these basic political ideas" (August 5, 1954).

On August 5, 1954, they gave to the free world a clear picture of what these basic political ideas and the praised and propagated Czechoslovak democracy consisted. Before 1938, they called it Czechoslovak democracy. In 1945 till 1948 they called it Czechoslovak democracy and Czechoslovak people's democracy. Now in the west, they prefer to call it simply, once more, Czechoslovak democracy. But it has remained the same.

Hatred against every anti-Communist among their own people, hatred against the Slovaks, the Hungarians, and the Sudeten German people on the one side, and blind, dull, unintelligent subservience to the intenational Communist conspiracy on the other.

We are grateful to the honorable gentleman from Arizona who inserted the statements of Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich on August 5, 1954, in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We are grateful that they could express themselves in their own terms and that it was shown what kind of men had deported the Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia and misused the word "democracy" and deceived the American people for 40 years, and what kind of men are now members of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

The two programs

It seems, however, that the monopoly the Benes Czechs have held in informing America on Czechoslovakia will be broken and that the white-black picturing of the Benes Czechs as the fighters for democracy and the Sudeten Germans in Bohemia and Moravia as villains will successively be recognized as falsification possible only because Benes men have been supported by the great majority of the opinion-molding machine in the United States as well as by rich private institutions there. Thanks to it, the Benes-Ripka men have upheld a false picture for decades.

And yet it must be finally recognized that there have been two interpretations of history in Bohemia and Moravia and, analogically, that there must be 2 programs for the future, 2 programs quite opposite to each other.

The one program presented by the Communist collaborators Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich calls for the upholding of Czechoslovakia, of the Czech rule over the Slovaks, the perpetuation of the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans and Hungarians, of the socialization and the full or partial abolition of political freedom by the National Front and the Communists, even after an eventual removal of the direct Communist rule over Czechoslovakia. A program, at the best, calling for the substitution of full communism by half communism, but in reality—since half communism can never defeat communism—calling for an eternal rule of communism in the East.

The other program is a program which, indeed, is common to the Slovaks, the Hungarians, the Sudeten Germans and also to many Czechs: the program which says that nothing can be upheld which the Communist National Front had committed, that all Communist wrongdoings must be abolished, that property must be returned to its Czech and Slovak proprietors and that the Sudeten Germans and the Hungarians must get the right to return as well as to be given back their possessions; that freedom and justice, private property, and free enterprise must be reestablished in this country communized by Gottwald, Ripka, Zenkl, and Lettrich. A program which says that freedom and the right for self-determination must be applied to all nations and also to all nations of former Czechovakia, regardless of whether these nations will remain in a federation or whether the Czech imperialist state, known as Czechoslovakia, will disrupt fully.

In the months and years ahead, the struggle between these two programs will have to be fought. There is no possibility for either the Czechoslovak democrats on the one hand, nor for the Sudeten Germans, Slovaks, Hungarians, and decent Czechs on the other, to enforce their program. In view of the present international situation as well as of the future one, the final judge will be the American people. The final word in this struggle, the decision which program will win, will lay in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

DR. WALTER BECHER,
Member of the Bavarian Landtag, Munich.
MUNICH, GERMANY, *April 5, 1955.*

Senate Haste Makes Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times under date of April 22, 1953.

The editorial points out the haste with which the Upper Colorado Basin bill was handled and the estimated cost of the project as outlined:

SENATE HASTE MAKES WASTE

Approval by a 58-23 vote in the United States Senate of an upper Colorado River project initially calling for an appropriation of $1,600,000,000 and threatening the country's taxpayers eventually with a cost of $4 billion, was obtained by logrolling methods and in such haste as to prevent serious consideration of its merits and demerits.

MORE TIME IN HOUSE

Fortunately consideration by the House of Representatives not only will allow more time in which to receive competent testimony on the project, but will afford opportunity for opponents of the wasteful adventure to alert the country to its dangers.

In view of known engineering doubts concerning certain aspects of the project, including the unlikelihood of a safe foundation for a proposed dam in Echo Park in the Dinosaur National Monument, the inclusion of this questionable feature of the project was an affront both to conservationists who oppose it as a needless destruction of natural beauty and to those who object to it on sound engineering and economic grounds.

MEASURE OPPOSED

The haste with which the bill was rushed through the Senate undoubtedly is explained by the project backers' determination to get it as far along as possible before a pending report on the entire undertaking by the Hoover Commission can be completed and submitted to Congress.

The Commission's tentative findings are understood to be strongly unfavorable to the reclamation program, as set forth in the Senate-approved measure. Inasmuch as the Hoover group is an official instrument of Congress duly authorized to study the problem and submit recommendations, only a successful stampede of the House Membership can prevent consideration of the experts' conclusions before the House acts.

Both of California's Senators opposed the measure, viewing it in its present scope as a definite menace to California's rights in the waters of the Colorado, and also presenting their objections to its costly and wasteful potentials.

Senator KUCHEL gave a particularly sound and detailed analysis of the measure in his discussion of its numerous ambiguities and inconsistencies. He made plain that his attitude was not based on any selfish California standpoint but arose solely from opposition to what he considered an unworkable and indefensible experiment.

Senator KNOWLAND took direct cognizance of the propaganda line by some upper basin spokesmen in which they would have it appear that California is against any development of the Colorado River which does not represent specific benefits for this State.

"It is a gross libel or slander," said KNOWLAND, "to say that the people of California want what does not belong to them." He stressed California's desire to receive only

a share of the river's water guaranteed under the Colorado compact.

FANTASTIC COSTS

A more deliberate assessment of the overall objectionable features of the project will bring into focus, among other factors, that a general endorsement given by President Eisenhower to upper basin development does not apply to the measure hurried through the Senate.

Further enlightenment—denied in the Senate—on the ultimate cost of the project also will be possible, including the fantastic fact that the cost of providing water to irrigate acreage not required for productive use in the foreseeable future will be more than 10 times the cost of the land.

It may be unfortunate that California's vital interest in sound development of the Colorado River and in equitable distribution of its waters may give rise to some doubts as to the State's disinterested motives in this instance, but valid objections to the project under discussion are so closely attached to questions of national welfare as to make unnecessary any approach from a purely local viewpoint.

Furthermore, regardless of legislation which Congress may immediately enact, the basic water rights of the upper and lower basin States are now in process of determination by the United States Supreme Court.

Until the Court acts, the pro and con arguments of all concerned are largely in the category of preliminary discussion.

The Fight on Communism by the University of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foe of Communism," published in the Hickory (N. C.) Daily Record of April 20, 1955. The editorial comments upon the very fine and constructive program for Americanism which has been initiated by the University of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOE OF COMMUNISM

KARL E. MUNDT United States Senator from South Dakota, in an article in the May issue of Coronet Magazine, pays the University of North Carolina a deserved compliment.

Senator MUNDT says that the most dangerous enemy of communism is American youth, after they learn the truth about this foreign ideology.

Among the foremost institutions of higher learning that Senator MUNDT lists as having pioneered in the fight on communism is the University of North Carolina.

In this connection, the South Dakotan says in 1951 40 civic-minded Tar Heel teachers, geographically distributed over the State, were chosen. University President Gordon Gray provided free instruction, dormitory facilities, and $25 to each teacher who attended the week-long sessions where the late Dr. Clyde Erwin, then State superintendent of public instruction, and other anti-Communists, analyzed fundamental issues involved in the conflict between the American and Russian ways of life.

After a week in the workshop, the teachers returned to their communities to lead in the struggle against communism. They continued their own studies that they might become more effective in teaching others the facts about communism.

The university's opposition to communism has extended far beyond the workshop. Drs. L. O. Kattsoff, E. M. Adams and W. H. Poteat traveled throughout this State, lecturing to groups. Dr. Kattsoff prepared a booklet, newspaper articles and radio talks on the subject. The University's Communications Center recorded the talks, which were broadcast and rebroadcast until millions of people have obtained fundamental facts with which to combat Red ideology.

The Superiority of Individual Farm Ownership and Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are no more solid foes of communism in America than our family farmers, who take justifiable pride in the achievements of American agriculture under the pattern of individual farm ownership and operation—the family-farm pattern so traditional to this country. Effective opposition to Communist infiltration into agriculture has been carried on by the National Farmers Union, through its support for family-owned and family-operated farms. Many of us interested in agriculture have long felt that our family-type farm pattern is one of the Nation's powerful bulwarks against communism. We are justly proud of the great record of American agriculture, as contrasted with the collapse of Russian agriculture, where opportunity for individual family ownership and operation is denied.

Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, who has effectively fought communism by proving the traditional American family-farm pattern is far superior, has written me a letter on this subject, calling my attention to a significant article from the Febuary issue of Harpers magazine. It is entitled "Marx Was a City Boy, or, Why Communism May Fail," and calls attention to trouble in the Soviet through failing to understand farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Patton's letter and the attached article from Harpers printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend them to the consideration of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Denver, Colo., April 11, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: For more than a half century National Farmers Union has had as its basic purpose the preservation and maintenance of the family-type farm.

We are convinced that this pattern of agriculture is one of this Nation's strongest bulwarks against communism, as well as being the backbone of our democracy.

The enclosed article by W. W. Rostow brilliantly points out the Achilles heel of Communist agricultural programs. The reluctance of the leaders of Russia and China to recognize the fact that family farming is basic to human society is leading to internal unrest and revolt.

This important error made by the Soviet emphasizes to me that we redouble our efforts to shape a domestic policy in America that will encourage and protect our traditional pattern of agriculture, and that we should encourage land reforms based on family-farm principles throughout the free world.

Because of the vital importance of this subject, I am taking the liberty of inviting your personal attention to Mr. Rostow's article.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON, *President.*

MARX WAS A CITY BOY OR, WHY COMMUNISM MAY FAIL

(By W. W. Rostow)

The men in the Kremlin have never liked—or understood—the farmer. A distinguished student of the Soviet explains why the resulting blunders, by Russia and her satellites, might prove fatal to their power.

I am, by profession, an economist and economic historian. The bulk of my academic life has been taken up with studying the world's economic development during the 19th century. I have just ended 3 years' work on the Soviet Union and Communist China. The task there was not to study Communist economies but to discern, if possible, the shape and prospects for change in the whole societies now dominated from Moscow and Peking: their politics, social life, foreign policy, and their economies.

The title of this article reflects perhaps the most important single idea about communism which I have acquired during these 3 years of study.

I believe that Marx failed to understand the farmer. From that misunderstanding has flowed a century of Communist theory and practice. And, more important, from Communist theory and practice has arisen a set of problems whose solution or failure of solution may well wreck the international Communist movement—or force profound and wholesome change upon it.

Perhaps the most dangerous enemy of communism is the stoic, passive peasant in Eastern Germany, Poland, the Soviet Union itself, China, and Northern Vietnam. He will certainly not revolt on his own under present circumstances; but even a police state cannot make him increase his output on the scale Communist plans require.

The passive figure of the peasant, trapped in totalitarianism, is joined as a potentially mortal enemy of communism by the farmer in the free world—notably in the underdeveloped areas and perhaps most notably, at the moment, by the awakening Indian peasant.

This, in any case, is my theme. I should like to develop it by tracing out how communism has come to tangle at cross purposes with the peasant; the consequences of this generally quiet struggle; the problems which it creates for the Communist leadership; and the opportunities it opens to the Free World.

The story begins with Marx himself. There is an excellent book by David Mitrany called Marx Against the Peasant. Mr. Mitrany's book examines the trouble communism had from the beginning with agriculture and the farmer. Marx's theory of history—though couched in the heavy and pretentious style of Germanic scholarship—is essentially a simple one. He believed that by an inevitable series of class struggles, bourgeois capitalism had conquered feudalism; and that the urban working class,

created by industrial capitalism, would inevitably inherit power and authority when capitalism had dug its grave.

This theory represented Marx's reading of British history as he looked backward and forward from the middle of the nineteenth century. As he wrote he could see in England a decline of the political power of agriculture and an increasing dependence of Britain on imported rather than home-produced food. This—plus the fact that he was a bookish city fellow—led him to dispose of the farmer, in his theory and his prescriptions for the future, in a highly casual way. For example, the Communist Manifesto of 1848, in making its recommendations for the future, simply had this to say about agriculture:

"The establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country."

In short, Marx's notion was that history would make of the farmer simply an industrial worker of one sort or another; and he could embrace the farmer ultimately in the same formula he mechanically applied to the industrial working class. The farmer, with his passionate desire to own his own piece of land and to till it in his own interest, annoyed Marx. As a theorist of history, Marx found the farmer out of place; and there is a note of human irritation and annoyance in Marx's treatment of him. Marx allowed no special place for him and for agriculture in his major writing.

One can dispose of such matters with ease—in theory. But the practical politics of Marxism, from the very beginning, ran into trouble with the peasant of Central and Eastern Europe. Before the revolution in Russia of 1917, Marxist politicians had the greatest difficulty in gaining any significant base of support among the peasants. The real discontents of European peasants, focused on land reform and redistribution, were expressed through peasant parties which grew up in the 50 years or so before the First World War. These parties were generally non-Marxist and, often, anti-Marxist. Except for a brief flirtation with the notion that the Russian village organization—the mir—could be built into a Socialist state, Marxist ideas did not harmonize naturally with the impulses of the European peasant. Brushing the peasant aside as a kind of miscast rural industrial worker, Marxism abandoned him to other leaders.

TWO PRACTICAL POLITICIANS

Now comes a monumental irony of modern history. Without the peasant's unsatisfied desire to own his land, there would not have been a Russian revolution in 1917 and, almost certainly, the Bolsheviks would not have triumphed in the Communist phase of that revolution in November 1917. Not Marxism or socialism or communism, but the peasant's great longing for land was the most powerful single engine of the Russian upheaval of 1917.

In 1917 Lenin perceived this fact. He was thoroughly prepared to junk or alter Marxist theory in the interests of the immediate struggle for power. As a practical politician, he managed to harness a good deal of the discontent which had infected the peasant-born Russian armies; and he used this non-Marxist—almost anti-Marxist—motive to seize power.

Lenin's 1917 slogans were: Land, bread, and peace. Despite 70 years of Marxism, in the showdown Lenin raised the peasant's desire for land the most effective political force to which he could appeal.

In China the peasant was even more important to Communist victory than he was in Russia. At first, the Chinese Communists sought to achieve power by mobilizing strength in the cities. They organized the industrial workers and infiltrated union organizations in the approved manner. It took a whole series of defeats, starting in 1927, to disabuse them of this strategy.

The emergence of Mao-tse Tung between 1927 and 1935 developed directly from his two perceptions: (1) That the desire of the poor peasant for a bit of land which he could call his own was a powerful political force; and (2) that if he associated the Communist movement with that force, he had a chance to build an effective military establishment in the countryside, with which he might ultimately seize power. This strategy was regarded for some time in Moscow as unorthodox.

From a western point of view, however, there is nothing inconsistent with communism about it. Lenin in his own way was equally flexible in his Marxism. The underlying truth is, of course, that long before 1917 and long before 1949, when communism was victorious in China, communism had ceased to be a philosophy of history and an ideological movement in the western sense. It had become primarily a tactical conspiracy, by a self-appointed elite, for the pursuit and maintenance of power. As such, it was prepared to make its slogans fit its power requirements. Lenin, Stalin, and Mao all did this when occasion demanded.

We are confronted, then, with a first-class irony of modern history. Marxist theory had—and has—no sympathy or interest in the desires of the farmer. Nevertheless, Communist tacticians in both Russia and China achieved power in large part by harnessing to their purposes the peasant's aspiration for his own land.

What happened to the peasant once the Communists took over? In Russia, Lenin found himself by 1921 in a position of crisis. The cities were not receiving their normal supply of food from the peasants, and famine stalked the land. Under the impact of wartime Communism, industry had fallen to about 20 percent of prewar output. Perhaps most important, Lenin faced serious opposition within the ranks of his party. There were many in the Communist rank and file who had helped make the revolution of November 1917 but were angry and distressed in 1920 and 1921 to see emerge a bureaucratic dictatorship rather than the humanistic regime for which they had fought. In this period of crisis, Lenin ruthlessly crushed his political opponents, but appeased the peasants—for the moment. He launched a new economic policy one of whose aims was to induce the peasant to produce again for the urban market.

Between 1921 and 1929 the Russian peasant was basically free. He operated the land he had gained in the revolutionary year of 1917 for his own benefit and that of his family. He sold his grain on an open market, paying a fixed tax in grain which he generally judged to be fair. The more able and vigorous peasants acquired land and grew relatively well-to-do; and Russian agriculture, sustained by individual incentive, revived.

MIRACLE BY BRUTE FORCE

With the launching of the first 5-year plan in 1929 all this changed. Stalin had triumphed as the sole successor to Lenin after 4 years of bitter infighting within the Communist Party. With his personal authority assured he turned to the problem of building a heavy industry in Russia and fastening an effective political control over the country. Whatever Stalin's economic reasons for the collectivization of agriculture may have been, there is no doubt that one of its primary purposes was to guarantee political and social control of the Russian peasantry. From a Communist perspective the Russian peasantry enjoyed an unnatural and dangerous freedom in the 1920's.

The result was, of course, the brutal rapid collectivization during which, on Stalin's testimony to Churchill, 10 million Russians died. More than that, there was a 20 percent fall in agricultural output. And as Khrushchev revealed in September 1953 Soviet farm production has never really recovered from the blow of collectivization.

How could Russia achieve its extraordinary industrial and military growth since 1929 with stagnant or even declining agricultural production? It could do so because Stalin launched industrialization at a peculiar moment in Russian history. The Russia which the Communist inherited was normally a grain-exporting nation. Before World War I Russian grain exports were as high as 10 million tons, and even in the midst of the first 5-year plan Stalin could wring 5 million tons of grain exports a year from the Russian soil and—at the cost of some starvation—from its peasants. The Soviet leadership has chosen to eat its way through its natural grain exports since 1929. And it has converted Russia into a country which may import more farm produce than it exports.

A second factor made Stalin's policy workable. Despite its relative poverty, by Western European and American standards, the Russian standard of food consumption as of 1928 could be compressed and reduced without actually causing chronic starvation. This is another margin which the Russian Communists exploited.

Third, Russia began in 1929 with a sufficient industrial capacity to avoid the need for an expanding foreign trade during its first 5-year plan. It could produce a high proportion of what it needed for industrialization from its own plants. A decline in agricultural exports in Russia did not, therefore, make industrialization impossible.

For 25 years, then, Russia has been able to afford an unproductive and enslaved agriculture. Now, however, history is beginning to catch up with Stalin's ruthless decisions of 1929. The population in Russia has continued to rise and people have moved into cities. It is clear to Moscow's planners that the smoldering, unproductive peasantry is a serious and costly problem. No issue since Stalin's death has used up as much Soviet newsprint as the agricultural problem. It does not threaten immediate crisis in Russia; but it is evident that the leaders in Moscow no longer feel the same complacency that Stalin did about the consequences of collectivized agriculture.

Much the same is true of Communist-dominated Eastern Europe. There, too, Communist collectivization policies, although somewhat less drastic than Stalin's, have broken the link between the peasant's effort and his return; and agricultural output is sagging. There, too, in the post-Stalin period the newspapers are filled with stories of agricultural shortage and low productivity.

It is symptomatic of the agricultural decline in Russia and Eastern Europe that, after breaking from Moscow in 1948, Tito almost immediately began to backtrack on collectivization. There is every evidence that Tito learned rapidly that a system which does not appeal to the peasant's self-interest is a costly totalitarian luxury.

The men in Moscow face, then, a significant dilemma. They know that high agricultural productivity demands that the Russian and Eastern European peasant be given real incentives to work hard and to produce efficiently. More than that, these concessions must appear to the peasant as permanent enough to inspire him to change his whole outlook on production. He has been beaten down and imprisoned for many years by the Communist leadership. He knows all too well the usual tricks of stick and carrot. His productivity cannot be turned on and off like an electric-light switch.

But if the peasant is to be given stable incentives, Moscow has to accept two major consequences: (1) The degree of political and social control in the countryside must be lifted so that the peasant can enjoy an im-

portant degree of individual freedom. (2) Goods must be produced which the peasant wants to buy and can buy with what he earns. This means that the amount of production going into heavy industry and armaments must be relatively reduced in favor of consumers' goods. Together these decisions involve, if they are taken—and they have not yet been taken—a significant reversal of political, social, and economic policies which communism has systematically followed wherever it has seized power.

At present Communist leadership in Moscow and Eastern Europe has acknowledged that the problem exists; but it has drawn back from a fundamental solution. Moscow has by no means decided to reverse the process of collectivization and to give the peasant the environment and the incentives he requires if food is to be produced efficiently on the desired scale. Nevertheless the discussion in the Soviet and satellite press reflects a recognition that for the long pull the situation of agriculture under communism is unsatisfactory, even dangerous to the leadership.

Thus the Russian and Eastern European peasant has demonstrated that he cannot be quickly converted into a rural industrial worker according to Marx's formula, even by the full power of a modern totalitarian state. As Mitrany concluded:

"Marx's analysis of the evolution of agriculture has nowhere been proved right; his prescription for the organization of agricultural production has never come to be practiced as part of a normal economic evolution. The Marxist view of the political standing of the peasants has been made ridiculous by the dependence of the Communist advance on the peasants' revolutionary impetus and action; while its expectation of a natural alliance between proletariat and poor peasants, as a result of class division in the village, has, in spite of much Communist effort, nowhere come to pass."

THE ATTACK ON THE CHINESE FARMER

In the Far East the Chinese peasant is beginning to make a similar demonstration. This is a different and more serious matter than it is in Europe, where the problem does not threaten an immediate major crisis. Russia and Eastern Europe can, in extremity, produce enough and export enough industrial goods to buy food abroad. To some extent this is what Russia is now doing. It is, of course, grotesque that Russia and Eastern Europe should become food-importing areas; but the situation in China is, from the Communist point of view, vastly more dangerous.

There, too, the Communists, once they had effectively seized power, turned on their peasant support much as Stalin did in 1929. They made good their promise to redistribute land from the rich to the poor peasant in 1949–50. But they did not redivide the land because they wanted a nation of small independent proprietors. They did it in order to wreck the social, economic, and political power of the village gentry and other middle-class elements in China whose income depended on the ownership of substantial amounts of land. In this way, agents of Peking supplanted the complex and diffuse authorities of village life.

When this job was done they began immediately to push the peasant into collectivized farms. The Chinese Communist model is drawn from Eastern Europe rather than the Soviet Union. Its key institution is the producers' cooperative, from whose total output a family receives a share. At first the share is computed according to the amount of land and equipment the family puts into the cooperative, plus the amount of labor contributed. But it is official policy that shares will rapidly become proportional to current labor, not past capital contribution. The family will then lose not only its capital but also its feeling of connection between output and effort. It is a share in the total that each family gets—a total averaging the vigorous and weak, the conscientious and lazy.

The producers' cooperative is buttressed by policies which require the peasant to sell all his marketable output to the government at low-fixed prices; which sterilize his cash in government banks; and which limit what he can buy, through the spreading monopoly of government stores. There is not the slightest doubt that the Chinese peasant dislikes this collectivized organization of agriculture; and there is not the slightest doubt that the Chinese Communists have the intention and the ability to complete the process of collectivization they have begun. The latest statements indicate that they expect to place more than half of China's peasants in producers' cooperatives by the end of this decade; and the government monopoly of the grain trade is already a universal fact.

Why have the Chinese Communists betrayed their peasant supporters? Why are they taking risks with the level of agricultural output in China by damaging the peasant's incentive to produce?

They have launched this policy of collectivization for two reasons. First, they feel that unless the peasant is collectivized he will not be under Communist political control. Some 80 percent of the people of China are peasants; that is, about 500 million people are in rural families. In such a nation a free agriculture means virtually a free people. And this would be a denial to the Communists of their victory. Second, the Communists have decided to build, as a matter of over-riding priority, a heavy industry base: both to supply their armed forces and to guarantee that China can later continue to industrialize out of its own resources. This requires that the government control intimately the agricultural output of the country and that the government be in a position to use it for its own purposes: to sell abroad for arms and machinery; to feed the army, the Communist administration, its horde of men in forced labor, and the rapidly growing cities. The government in Peking does not appear confident that it can achieve this control over output unless collective farms are installed. Peking appears willing, in short, to risk less output if it can fully control what there is.

This is a greater risk for Communist China in the 1950's than it was in the Soviet Union during the 1930's. Whereas the Soviet Union could achieve its industrialization plan with a 20-percent decline in agricultural output, China requires something like a 10-percent increase. This is so because, unlike the Soviet Union, Communist China must increase its foreign trade to industrialize and because population is growing so rapidly in China. Peking now claims a population increase of 2 percent per year, which means an extra 12 million mouths to feed.

What will happen if agricultural output does not increase by 10 percent? We should be quite clear that up to a point the Chinese Communists can and will balance their books with starvation. In fact, to some extent, this happened last spring and is likely to happen again next spring. A Communist-control apparatus can handle a high degree of discontent; and starvation is chronic in China.

There are, however, two dangers to Peking. First, a sustained failure of output to increase or a substantial decrease could create so vast a hunger in China that even a Communist-control system could not prevent some kind of crisis. Second, a demonstration that Communist techniques in Asia lead to chronic starvation could damage or destroy the powerful belief in underdeveloped areas that communism holds the key to rapid economic growth. It is this belief which is one of communism's greatest assets in the cold war: in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa, and even in Latin America.

REVOLUTION BY CONSENT

The most important conclusion at which I have arrived from 3 years' immersion in the study of communism is this: it lies within the capabilities of the United States and the free world to shatter the belief in communism as the unique method for rapid development. And we can do this over the next decade—by, say, 1965.

The faith and judgment which lie behind this conclusion stem not only from knowledge of how the peasant's human response to Communist methods has affected agricultural output. This conclusion is supported by results already achieved in the free world, notably in India, by the techniques of freedom, the method of individual consent.

India has begun its attempts to industrialize in a way exactly opposite to Communist China. China is investing in heavy industry. India has plowed its scarce capital, for the first 5-year plan, primarily into agriculture. China is forcing its peasants into collectives, by threat and force. India is trying to induce the peasant to improve his methods, to increase the use of chemical fertilizers, to install new irrigation facilities, to double-crop his land. All this is done painstakingly by education and example.

The results thus far are remarkably hopeful. The substantial increase in agricultural output planned in India for the first 5-year plan has been achieved in 3 years; and the evidence is that a constructive chain reaction is sweeping the Indian countryside, far beyond the demonstration villages. The returns are not yet in; but there is a distinct possibility that this truth will become evident: in underdeveloped areas, starting from scratch, with a population predominantly made up of peasants, the method of consent is not only right morally, it is right technically as well.

A free world economic program, with strong United States support, might demonstrate this simple truth, notably in the competition between India and Communist China. These two great nations are simultaneously attempting a radical transformation. Over the next decade they plan to put themselves in a position where economic growth will be relatively automatic. Throughout Asia and throughout the vast underdeveloped portions of the world, the relative performance of communism and democracy at this monumental task will be closely watched and weighed.

Even Communist totalitarianism cannot afford enough policemen to follow the peasant about in his daily round and make him produce what economic growth requires. The devices of a police state, which work with tragic efficiency in urban areas, adapt with difficulty to the countryside.

In short, the fact that Marx was a city boy gives the free world the chance to destroy in the next decade the myth that only Communist brutality can raise an underdeveloped area into self-sustaining growth, and if that myth is dissipated the chance that communism will gain power in the underdeveloped areas, whose destiny will determine the long-run balance in the world's power, will be much reduced, if not once and for all eliminated.

Youth Temperance Education Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on April 20, Gov. Paul L. Patterson, of the

State of Oregon, officially designated April 24 to April 30, 1955, as Youth Temperance Education Week. This was done through the cooperation of the Governor and Mrs. Fred J. Tooze, president of the Oregon chapter of the Oregon's Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's proclamation and the brochure issued by the Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union, upon that occasion, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation and pamphlet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH TEMPERANCE EDUCATION WEEK

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION

"Never has it been more important in the history of our Nation, and State, than now, to bring to our youth the truth on temperance," said Governor Patterson in designating April 24 to 30, 1955, as Youth Temperance Education Week.

"I urge all Oregonians to plan meetings and observances for youth-temperance education during this designated week, and further urge all Oregonians to consider the matter of youth-temperance education as a year-round project."

OREGON LIQUOR FACTS

[Population (1953)—1,521,341]

Liquor law: State monopoly, exclusive State administration. Local option on question of sale (a) of all alcoholic beverages; (b) alcoholic liquors under 17 percent alcohol by weight; (c) alcoholic liquor under 4 percent by weight.

Wet and dry territory (1953): Two cities and towns ban spirits, wine, and beer. Three and six-tenths percent of population, or 5,199 persons, live in dry areas.

Number of liquor retailers (1952):	
State	5,564
United States	481,210
Population per liquor retailer:	
State	273
United States	324
Malt liquor dealers (legal licenses):	
State	3,177
United States	199,513

Consumption of, expenditures for, alcoholic beverages (1952)

(A) Consumption:	
Total gallons:	
State	28,951,119
United States	2,926,000,000
1. Hard liquor, wine:	
State	2,784,054
United States	322,000,000
2. Malt liquor:	
State	26,167,065
United States	2,604,000,000
Per capita:	
Total gallons:	
State	19.03
United States	18.78
1. Hard liquor, wine:	
State	1.83
United States	2.07
2. Malt liquor:	
State	17.20
United States	16.71
(B) Expenditures:	
Total:	
State	$94,468,232.81
United States	9,715,000,000.00
1. Hard liquor, wine:	
State	46,750,808.93
United States	4,755,000,000.00
2. Malt liquor:	
State	47,717,423.88
United States	4,960,000,000.00
Per capita:	
Total gallons:	
State	63.41
United States	62.36
1. Hard liquor, wine:	
State	30.73
United States	30.52
Malt liquor:	
State	32.68
United States	31.84
Total gross income received from alcoholic beverages (1952)	$44,581,903.53
(a) Hard liquor, wine, including sales at State stores and agencies	42,389,764.75
(b) Malt beverages	31,389,764.75
Net income	14,751,059.20

Total traffic fatalities (1952)

(a) Mileage death rate per 100,000,000 vehicle-miles:	
State	436
United States	38,000
(b) Population death rate per 100,000 persons:	
State	28.7
United States	24.4

Urban crime

(a) Total arrests:	
1950:	
State	13,823
United States	1,036,934
1951:	
State	13,566
United States	1,091,039
1952:	
State	14,938
United States	1,138,106
(b) Rate per 100,000:	
State:	
1950:	
Murder	1.81
Aggravated assault	29.6
1951:	
Murder	1.93
Aggravated assault	22.8
1952:	
Murder	3.18
Aggravated assault	25.4
United States:	
1950:	
Murder	5.11
Aggravated assault	73.4
1951:	
Murder	4.88
Aggravated assault	70.5
1952:	
Murder	5.05
Aggravated assault	81.5

Aid to dependent children

1949:	
State	$3,713,000
United States	414,157,000
1950:	
State	4,209,000
United States	520,330,000
1951:	
State	4,913,000
United States	567,685,000
1952:	
State	4,129,000
United States	547,268,000

Total expenditures for public instruction

1940:	
State	$18,724,000
United States	2,344,049,000
1945:	
State	26,800,000
United States	2,638,666,000
1948:	
State	57,254,000
United States	4,311,176,000
1949:	
State	58,100,000
United States	5,010,236,000
1950:	
State	93,325,000
United States	5,837,643,000

FRED D. L. SQUIRES,
Research Counsel.

YOUTH TEMPERANCE COUNCIL OF OREGON

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Youth Temperance Council is to unite the young people of the community, State, and Nation in a program of Christian citizenship, to build for total abstinence for the individual and sobriety for the Nation.

MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENT

To become a member of the YTC one must sign the following pledge and pay 25 cents dues to the local council.

PLEDGE

I hereby solemnly promise, God helping me, to abstain from all distilled, fermented, and malt liquors, including wine, beer, and cider, and from all tobacco and narcotics in every form, and to employ all proper means to discourage the use of and traffic in the same.

The Upper Colorado River Project—Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorials on the upper Colorado River project. Two of them are from the New York Times of April 20 and April 24, and are entitled, respectively, "Echo Park Dam" and "Bananas on Pike's Peak." The third, entitled "GOP Squanderbill," is from the Chicago Daily News for April 21, 1955.

These editorials, Mr. President, point out the weaknesses and inadequacies of the upper Colorado River project. They refer to its excessive costs for power and irrigation, and they question whether the project is in the public interest. They point out, too, the inconsistencies in the stand of the Eisenhower administration, which, on the one hand, opposes TVA as "creeping socialism"; but, on the other hand, supports this project, where costs for power, construction per kilowatt, and irrigation are several times as high as at TVA, on the Columbia, and at other existing projects.

I hope, Mr. President, that Members of the House of Representatives may have their attention called to the wastefulness of the upper Colorado River storage project, by noting the editorials in these responsible newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 20, 1955]

ECHO PARK DAM

With speed that bears evidence of political maneuvering, the Senate has suddenly taken up the administration's billion-dollar upper Colorado Basin storage and power project containing authorization for the bitterly controversial Echo Park Dam. It is difficult to believe the Senate can be cajoled into voting for a measure that could pave the way for the destruction of the national park system.

The entire upper Colorado scheme itself should be subjected to severe analysis and

questioning. The plan involves construction over the next half century or so of a number of water storage, power, and irrigation projects in eastern Utah, western Colorado, and neighboring areas. The first phase of it is to cost over a billion dollars, with sums of untold magnitude yet to come. Quite apart from the governmental propensity for underestimating costs, the entire economic basis for this scheme has been cogently attacked as unsound. It has been shown by such authorities as former Governor Miller, of Wyoming, that power to be produced at the Echo Park site, for instance, will cost $883 a kilowatt, while power produced by steam-electric plants in the same area costs less than $170 a kilowatt. The potentialities of cheap atomic power development have, of course, not yet been scratched. So far as the irrigation aspects are concerned, the estimated costs range from a few hundred dollars to a thousand or two per acre. There are far cheaper ways to increase our agricultural surpluses, if we insist on doing so.

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated. Its construction would constitute a precedent-making invasion of the National Park System, which was established nearly 40 years ago. Creation of a dam and of a reservoir slowly filling up with silt and scarring the river banks for miles with the typical rim between high and low water levels would destroy two of the Nation's most beautiful river canyons forever.

[From the New York Times of April 24, 1955]

BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK?

With hardly a ripple, the Senate has coolly authorized a series of public power and reclamation projects for the upper Colorado Basin States at a cost that even the notoriously inadequate official estimates place at more than a billion and a half dollars. The power will be produced at fantastically high rates; the irrigation per acre will cost many times the conceivable value of the land; and as an incidental byproduct the National Park System of the United States will be threatened with ultimate destruction.

This newspaper is all for developing the underdeveloped areas of our country where feasible; but we do believe that large-scale developments ought to have some realistic relation to expected costs and benefits. It would of course be possible to grow bananas on top of the Rockies if one wanted to spend the money; but the question is, couldn't this money be spent more advantageously elsewhere? Hydroelectric power is important to the West, but is it essential to produce hydroelectric power at great cost when steam power can be produced in the same area at a fraction of the price? And when atomic power is around the corner? Even such an able defender of public power as Senator NEUBERGER concedes that upper Colorado power will be produced at a rate so high it "precludes extensive use for competitive manufacturing."

It is strange to find the Eisenhower administration, so devoted to good business management, so enthusiastic over the upper Colorado. No "partnership" is involved here, presumably because no businessman in his right mind would invest in it. And even if the economics were sound there remains the impact that Echo Park Dam, one of the units of the power and water-storage complex, would have on the national parks of the United States. This dam would raise its 690 feet right in the middle of one of the finest protected areas of natural scenery in the country and would flood two magnificent river canyons for many miles.

To construct it would set a ruinous precedent for invasion of other national parks and monuments, many of which are threatened by power, lumber, or other interests. Figures supplied by the Reclamation Bureau to prove the necessity for this dam have been proved wrong time and time again. Alternate sites have been proposed by competent engineers. There is no good reason for rushing ahead with this dam, to supply doubtful power needs decades hence, until careful studies of the alternatives have been made.

[From the Chicago Daily News of April 21, 1955]

GOP SQUANDERBILL

In all of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' record of fighting governmental waste, no chapter does him more credit than his valiant efforts against the upper Colorado water project on the floor of the Senate Monday and Tuesday.

With 8 of the arid States represented by 2 Senators apiece, the $2-billion squanderbill passed the Senate despite DOUGLAS' efforts. These Senators were joined by most of the supporters of public power.

Senator DOUGLAS himself is a strong supporter of TVA, but he deplored the "doctrinaire" attitude of those colleagues who favored the upper Colorado project just because it includes vast sums for public power as well as irrigation. He urged them to discriminate on the basis of return.

No other public power project, existing or contemplated, is so expensive per unit of power to be produced. The current will cost 4½ times as much as current produced on the Columbia; 3 or 4 times as much as current produced by the single unit dams in the Tennessee Valley, and 4½ to 6 times the cost at the TVA multiple-purpose dams.

The irrigation costs are even more fantastic. The average, he estimated, will be $2,142 an acre to bring irrigation to land which cannot possibly exceed a value, when irrigated, of $150 an acre. In Utah, the cost will reach $3,953 an acre.

This is high-altitude land with a short growing reason and the principal crop it can produce is hay. As DOUGLAS pointed out, the top price for the richest agricultural land in the world (Illinois and Iowa) does not exceed $650 an acre.

Senator DOUGLAS made the most of the curious fact that the adminstration pushes this monstrously high-cost project while complaining about "creeping socialism" in the TVA and other public power areas.

When the Government first got into the reclamation business, the beneficiaries of irrigation projects were expected to pay interest on what the Government spent. Then the interest was deferred, for short periods, and for a longer time with every new project.

The Colorado project sets a new record for deferring interest. There will be a 10-year development period in which nothing will be paid on either interest or principal. Then there will be a 50-year period in which the beneficiaries will (theoretically) pay back principal but not interest.

Interest, in other words, is deferred for 60 years. If you assume a 10-year construction period, it would actually be deferred 70 years. Yet the Government will be paying interest on its obligations all the time.

It is hardly conceivable that fiscal irresponsibility could be pushed further.

Brotherhood and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., of Detroit, Mich., on Dr. Tomlinson D. Todd's ninth anniversary of the Americans all radio program, on March 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD AND DEMOCRACY

(Address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat, from Detroit, Mich., on Dr. Tomlinson D. Todd's ninth anniversary of the Americans All radio program, Sunday, March 27, 1955, Station WOOK, 1:30 p. m. to 2:30 p. m.)

I deeply appreciate the privilege I have received in your invitation to share in the ninth anniversary broadcast of Americans All. The esteem in which your listening audience holds this program reflects the quality of your leadership and direction, Dr. Todd.

There is, of course, a great service to the public inherent in the enjoyment that a radio broadcast furnishes through its programs in either a sense of pleasure or stimulation of thinking. The greatest service, however, is that which is performed by a program of this kind which in its essence fulfills the foremost of American principles—those ideals of brotherhood and democracy.

The fostering and upholding of these principles have always been for Americans a civic, moral, and a Christian responsibility. They are the centermost part of our American way of life through which all the parts of the total can be balanced. They hold within themselves the first laws of our land, the first laws of morality and ethical conduct, and the first laws under God.

It has been precisely stated that the democratic idea upon which our Nation was founded and for which Americans have given their lives through two wars and an international conflict, is founded in human nature and comes from God who makes human nature.

The fact that ours is a government of the people, in which supreme power is retained by the people and exercised directly or indirectly through a system of representation—presents to the world our esteem of man as a human being whose stature arises from intellectual and creative powers and his practice of right or ethical conduct.

Our profession of faith in such a principle of government also expresses our faith in the brotherhood or kinship of all the people who make up our common family—a kinship that lies in the common pursuit of the objectives of such a form of government—life, liberty, and happiness.

Unless we have brotherhood among all men of our Nation, we cannot have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, because brotherhood implies an equality between all men which makes them capable of self-discipline and thus self-government. Brotherhood also implies an unlimited personal liability for the pursuit of the objectives of democracy for all men—life, the right to equal opportunities for work as embodied in the FEPC bill cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota and guest today, the Honorable WILLIAM F. LANGER, to worship freely and to live sociably with fellow man; liberty, the right to impartial laws by all men may be secured in their equal rights; and the pursuit of happiness, the state of well-being and pleasurable satisfaction arising from personal accomplishments and personal acceptance in the common family.

Brotherhood and the principles of democracy have been the subject of discussion for generations by orators, poets, governmental officials, and religious leaders, but never before has the fate of the world hung more upon the relationship of man within his own sphere of activity and the effects of

the relationship as it is intensified and as it reaches out into the outer spheres of the lands of other men. America, the leader of the free world, is faced with its moral and Christian liability for the welfare of fellowmen within and without its sphere. Only so can it give demonstration of its faith in the principles of democracy and brotherhood.

The tensions which are abroad in the world today and give rise to our fears for civilization are evidences of the lack of a strong sense of kinship between and liability for other men—the doubt of one man's belief in the equality and worthiness of others. Events have proved we cannot remove an iota or a dot, from the law of brotherhood and still accomplish democracy. So long as there exists in American men who are without equal rights under the law, men who are without equal opportunty for self expression and development or men who are unprotected, we have not fulfilled our democratic ideals. As it effects the outer world, we can ease tensions by showing others a better way of life or even our faith in such a life.

Men of all the free world and, we are sure from the testimony of those who have escaped the snare, men of the enslaved world look to America—world leader, foremost advocator of democracy—with the prayer that she will demonstrate her faith in the destiny of man.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Dinner of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by our colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, in the William Penn Hotel, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on Saturday evening, April 23, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROMANCE OF ROADS

(Address by Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, in the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Saturday evening, April 23, 1955)

One of the most spectacular developments in the United States has been the surprising increase in our population. According to the latest Census Bureau estimates, we are now a Nation of almost 165 million people.

That figure represents an increase of more than 13 million, or nearly 9 percent, above the total for the last general census of 1950. Compared with the 1940 census we have had an increase of 25 percent.

Translated into terms of human needs and the American way of life, this population increase has imposed upon us many great problems.

We need more schools to educate the growing army of young people. We need more hospitals. We must build more churches of every denomination. We must have more, better, and safer roads to accommodate the vastly increased volume of motor traffic that crowds upon our inadequate and hazardous highway systems.

I refer to these problems because they offer a challenge of such great importance to the future of our country. They should be the concern of every public-spirited American.

This evening I want to center my remarks on the urgent need for the expansion and modernization of our roads in all parts of the United States. As ranking Republican member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I have given a great deal of study to the highway legislation now under discussion. I am confident that substantial progress will be made from the standpoint of economic growth, national defense, civil defense, the safety and convenience of the traveling public and the general welfare.

This history of transportation in America is a fascinating story. It is filled with the romance of an expanding empire of freedom and opportunity. It is the story of resolute, courageous men and women who pushed westward over the mountains and plains to open new lands, to clear the forests, and to create new communities that have become great centers of industry and enterprise. From the earliest settlements along the Atlantic seaboard, the development and use of our waterways, highways, railways, pipelines, and air transportation has been one of the most important factors in our material, cultural, and spiritual progress.

In the early days the streams and Indian trails provided the only means of communication and travel. The first roads that connected scattered communities were built to accommodate horse-drawn vehicles in the unhurried pace of that day.

Military necessity was another strong influence in road development. General Braddock's road through the mountain wilderness from Cumberland, over a course now followed by the historic Route 40, and the Forbes Road from Bedford to Ohio Forks, were outstanding examples. They rank with the world's great military operations. The mission of these military campaigns was to secure the "point" where the Allegheny and the Monongahela join to form the Ohio. The prize at stake in this great struggle was the control of a continent. The British finally won after years of hard fighting. Here in the wildnerness, 200 years ago, the future of the New World was decided and the geography of Europe was shaped.

It is not necessary to recount the battles, campaigns, and individual exploits before a western Pennsylvania audience such as this. The thrilling story has been told many times by students of history. It has been brought home to us in song, folk-lore, and on the motion-picture screen.

The westward migration through the Point resulted in the settlement of the plains, the prairies, and the Pacific slope of North America. It brings to mind the great fleet of Conestoga wagons, which had their origin in Pennsylvania, and other covered wagons, ever moving westward. This is an inspiring picture. It is typically American. It embodies the American spirit of self-reliance and individual responsibility. It meant hardship, privation and often death, but it developed the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

Yes, my fellow Americans, there is romance in our roads, yet they are today, as always, the basic means of transportation. The other avenues of transportation—waterways, railroads and the air—aid and supplement the roads just as the auxiliary branches of the armed services help the "doughboy" gain and hold his objective.

Turning now to the present and the future, there is widespread agreement that bold, new steps must be taken to correct the deficiencies that have accumulated on our highway system during and since World War II.

The Nation has not kept pace with highway needs. The time has come when obsolete and dangerous roads must be replaced or rebuilt to modern standards of safety and efficiency. Larger, faster, and increased numbers of motor vehicles have added to our problem and will continue to do so. The American people now own 58 million motor vehicles and that figure is expected to rise beyond 81 million in the next 10 years. The number of vehicles using the original Pennsylvania Turnpike has multiplied by 4 in the last 5 years.

For many years roads were built where there was the strongest political pressure. There was no comprehensive plan.

Today we have a program and a plan. It was placed before Congress by President Eisenhower after an exhaustive study by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in cooperation with the Governor's conference. It calls for the expenditure in the next 10-year period of $101 billion.

To reach a better understanding of what that figure means—$101 billion—let me tell you that it is more than the cost of all wars in which we have been engaged, with the exception of World War II.

Under the President's plan, the total cost will be apportioned approximately one-third to the Federal Government and two-thirds to State and local governments.

The Federal Government will assume primary responsibility for developing the National System of Interstate Highways. This is a specially designated network of 37,600 miles connecting 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all the cities over 50,000 population. It will have controlled access and will bypass large centers of population.

The system has been carefully laid out to take care of the military and industrial needs of the country. When completed it will also be one of our greatest cultural and spiritual assets, providing easy and safe highways that will bring our people closer together and provide the means for a better understanding of our great country.

On the other systems, primary, secondary and urban, Federal contributions are to be continued on a matching basis at the rate of about $600 million a year, as provided by the Highway Act of 1954. This, incidentally, was the largest highway program ever authorized by the United States.

I have discussed the proposed program in broad outline, but there are many difficult problems involved. The most serious, of course, is how it is to be financed.

I am sure most of you are aware that I have always been a strong advocate of the pay-as-you-go plan in Government at all levels.

I have always favored the pay-as-you-go plan because it means greater economy. It avoids the danger of burdensome debt and keeps taxes at the lowest possible level.

I would prefer to have the proposed highway program carried out on that basis. But we have been told by qualified experts that even with a substantial tax increase it would take 30 years to do the job that is needed right now—and can be completed in 10 years under the plan proposed by the President.

That plan recommends the creation of a Federal Highway Corporation authorized to issue bonds to finance construction of the interstate system. The bonds will be supported by Federal gasoline tax revenues above the $622½ million now contributed to the States for all road construction other than the interstate system. It is anticipated that the 2-cent gasoline tax now levied by the Federal Government will liquidate the $23 billion in bonds in 30 years while the roads will be completed in 10 years. It will not require an increase in the tax.

There is some opposition to this financing plan. It has been argued that it is not legal to appropriate for such a long period. To my mind this objection is not valid. The same argument could be made against the bonds for the public debt and the payment of pensions because each Congress must make the appropriations.

Others contend that it is not good Government practice to earmark revenues for specific purposes. Against this is the fact that 24 States already have constitutional provisions segregating all gas tax receipts for roadbuilding purposes.

We need the roads. There is no disagreement on that score. We must have them if we are to have an expanding economy. We need them for our industrial, cultural, and spiritual advancement. We need them for national and civilian defense. We need them to reduce the frightful toll of lives taken each year by accidents on our highways. The big decision we must make is how they shall be financed. It's up to the American people to decide, for they must pay the bills.

Personally I feel the President's plan is sound. I do believe, however, that serious consideration should be given to the question of tolls. I believe that the collection of tolls, wherever feasible, on sections of roads, bridges and tunnels, would be advantageous to our country and fair to the traveling public. Or perhaps it might be wise to require the payment of a license fee for vehicles traveling on the interstate system.

In the past the romance of traveling in covered wagons, stage coaches, and packet lines were adventures pictured in the famous prints of Currier & Ives and other artists. The tying together of the Atlantic and the Pacific by steel rails was acclaimed all over the world.

The first plane across the continent was hailed as an event unparalleled in transportation.

The completion of the highway plan now under consideration will be another romantic story in American progress.

It means the mobilization of the best in engineering skill and construction ability; the assembling of material and equipment in quantities never before equalled and all coordinated with American know-how in the American way.

Dedication of Glenn L. Martin Institute of Technology, University of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, one of the foremost pioneers of aviation has been a long-time resident of the State of Maryland. One of the Nation's leading aircraft-manufacturing concerns in nearby Baltimore carries his name, and his great talent for aeronautical design has brought forth aircraft of all types. I speak of Glenn L. Martin, a respected and revered civic, business, and educational leader in my State, whose unselfish generosity has made possible the establishment of the Glenn L. Martin Institute of Technology, at the University of Maryland.

Ceremonies marking the dedication of this great center of education and research in all phases of engineering were held at College Park, Md., on March 25, 1955. Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very excellent dedicatory address, entitled "Washington Looks to Maryland," which was delivered by Lee A. DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON LOOKS TO MARYLAND

(By Lee A. DuBridge, president, California Institute of Technology)

It is a great honor to be able to participate in this important occasion on which we salute formally the opening of the new and magnificant Glenn L. Martin Institute of Technology. Surely every engineer in the country must envy you who are privileged to study or to teach at this fine place; they must envy the opportunity of molding this new institution into something which will be a signal and a unique contribution to the Nation's welfare.

It has always seemed to me that a very special opportunity lies with the University of Maryland; indeed, almost a special obligation. Here you are within a stone's throw of the Nation's capital city—the city in which decisions are daily being made which affect in a vital way the future of the Nation. The heart and mind of the whole free world indeed lie almost at your doorstep. You are far enough outside the city of Washington so that its petty squabbles and minor bureaucratic evils do not throw sand in your eyes and prevent your seeing the larger picture. Yet you are not so far away, as we are in California, for example, that the rumble of national and world problems is so attenuated as to be nearly inaudible or, at least, to be lost in the welter of local noises. But here the thunder of these problems beats directly upon you. You may wish the thunder were less loud, but you dare not ignore it. You have, indeed, a great opportunity to help tame that thunder—to probe its core and find that the noise is only the outpouring of a great store of energy which, when understood, can be diverted and put to beneficial use.

It is a truism, whose truth is not yet fully realized on the banks of the Potomac, that developments in pure and applied science over the past 50 years—indeed over the past 20—have vastly changed the nature of the problems with which Washington, D. C., is concerned. The time was, not long ago, when Government officials and legislators could be blissfully unaware of the advance of science—and still better—of the existence of scientists. It is true that when electricity displaced the horsecar, there was probably quite a ripple of excitement along Pennsylvania Avenue. The first horseless carriage, the first electric lights, the first air conditioning and the coming of television also made important changes in the living and working habits of Washingtonians. But that day when a congressional committee called in a couple of nuclear physicists to give lectures about neutrons and protons and uranium fission was a signal that a new age had arrived with which Washington was unprepared to cope.

Such signals of unpreparedness had appeared before. In 1939 a war began in Europe which, it was clear, might some day involve the United States. The possibility of trouble had indeed been apparent for several years. But, as late as the spring of 1940, there was no mechanism whereby the Government could call on the scientific community for help in preparing the United States defenses. Even then it was a private individual—who, by some providential combination of circumstances, had recently moved to Washington—who initiated such an effort. Dr. Vannevar Bush called together a small group of men who offered their services in getting a defense research organization started. The way in which the Office of Scientific Research and Development, OSRD, became a decisive factor in winning the war is now history. It is as convincing an argument as I can think of for having some good scientists and engineers always close to Washington.

Today, of course, the Government has literally hundreds of scientists and engineers in its employ in and around Washington. They are at the National Bureau of Standards, the Naval Research Laboratory, the National Institute of Health of the Public Health Service, and man yother places. What can the University of Maryland add to this picture?

Many things.

Should this university become itself a great center of weapon development? I would hope not—though there might be circumstances under which some such projects might need to be undertaken. But this is not the primary need or opportunity. Nor is this the prime function of a university. The task of the university is not to invent weapons, but to seek basic knowledge. And that represents a prime obligation of this and every other university. The University of Maryland will, I hope, become an ever-growing and thriving source of new knowledge in many fields of science and engineering. What the Government and the country can do in the future in applying new knowledge to increase the Nation's welfare and security depends on what new knowledge the universities discover today and tomorrow.

A second function of a university is to teach. And here is where your greatest contribution to national welfare will doubtless be. Washington and the Nation need many scientists and engineers. There are not nearly enough first-class institutions in this area to meet the need. We need in this immediate vicinity the finest minds to be found anywhere in the world—minds sharpened by the finest educational experience that anyone knows how to supply. Why should one have to go all the way to Boston—or Pasadena—to fill this need? Why should it not be filled right here in this campus? What an opportunity you have to make a major contribution over the next 50 years to the scientific competence and effectiveness of the Government of the greatest technological country on earth.

I want to emphasize my conviction that just ordinary scientists and engineers are not good enough to meet the needs of our Government. We need the very best. And we need men with more than just an ordinary educational experience. We need men who are educated—not just trained. We need men who are not only skilled in laboratory techniques, but who understand the principles of science and who have a creative approach to new problems. We need men who understand not only science, but the world of men in which we live.

And let no one persuade you that understanding science and knowing something about the world are mutually exclusive educational goals. Let no one tell you that engineers understand only things and that only a liberal arts graduate can understand people. That is nonsense! The scientific mind has a pretty good chance of understanding anything it tackles—for the job of the scientist is to understand. If a man has the talent for understanding, then he will be a good scientist; and if given the opportunity and incentive, he will understand other things too.

I am not saying that there are not many scientists and engineers who have failed to step outside their narrow specialties; many have refused to take an interest in nontech-

nical fields. There are many lawyers, doctors, businessmen, and politicians who are too highly specialized, too. But I do say that the principal scientific leaders of this country are not narrow-minded technicians. They are broad men of high competence whose talents can be and have been turned in many directions and who have proved outstanding citizens in every respect.

And here is an opportunity for any educational institution. A modern school of engineering must offer its students broad and extensive opportunities for work in nontechnical subjects. It must require the students to spend much of their time in these areas; and what is even more difficult, it must make them like it. I can assure you from the experience at my own institution that if smart engineers are offered challenging, meaty, stimulating courses in history, government, literature, philosophy, economics, psychology, they will not only eat them up, they will love it and ask for more. And they will be better men, and better scientists, as a result.

I do not need to emphasize further how critical is the need in and around the Nation's capital for more such broadly educated scientists and engineers.

There is still a third area in which the University of Maryland, because of its location, can be of outstanding service to the Federal Government. This is the task of providing scientific and technical advice, on a part-time basis, to the various agencies of Government. In order to explain the opportunity here, I ask your indulgence while I go back a bit and review the elements of this problem.

As I have already suggested, the United States is a very different Nation now from what it was 50 or even 25 years ago. It is also obvious that the most conspicuous changes of the last two generations have been made possible by new discoveries in pure and applied science. Our political and economic systems have not changed in principle during the past 50 years. They have provided a good environment for the development of our industrial system which has capitalized new knowledge in science and new applications of this knowledge to effect the physical transformation which has taken place in this country within the memory of most of us who are here today. The last 50 years have seen a technological and industrial revolution which can be described only in terms of almost ridiculous superlatives.

It is not necessary to point out that this technological revolution has had important and often staggering impacts upon the structure of the Federal Government. Fifty years ago our Government got along quite nicely when its only scientific activities and concerns consisted of the Smithsonian Institution, a small Bureau of Standards and a Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Today the Department of Defense alone spends $2 billion a year on what it calls research and development, and spends many more billions in putting the products of this research and development into manufacture and into the hands of trained soldiers, seamen, and airmen throughout the world. Another $2 billion a year or so goes into an independent agency which is only 8 years old and which deals with a phenomenon which was wholly unknown until 16 years ago; namely, the Atomic Energy Commission. This one single discovery of uranium fission has revolutionized our entire military posture and policy; has profoundly affected our whole attitude toward foreign relations; has affected many aspects of our domestic life; and, during the next 50 years, will produce unpredictable revolutions in our industrial civilization.

In addition, very profound, if less spectacular, effects on American living have been produced by other technological developments—developments in transportation, communication, production, and the whole mechanism of daily living.

Now it is a miraculous fact that a Government and a Constitution which were established 175 years ago have been able to meet so well the shattering tests of these revolutionary changes. Most of the countries of the world have had their government structures shaken apart not only once but many times in the past 150 years—often as a direct result of the changed ways of living and of thought which new technologies have brought about. One of the great achievements of those who formulated the American Constitution was that they left it sufficiently flexible to allow the Federal governmental structure to adapt itself to the changing needs of revolutionary times; to adapt itself to conditions which would not only have been unforeseen but unbelieved in 1776. Born in revolution, our Constitution has met the test of many subsequent revolutions.

I believe that the reason for the success of our form of government is that the Constitution, though it states clearly the principles on which the Nation was founded, leaves many of the mechanisms and machinery of Government to be developed and altered as conditions require. This means that each generation faces a new challenge in adapting the machinery of Government to the conditions which that generation faces and to the changes in those conditions which that generation itself produces.

There is no doubt that our generation has seen radical changes in our way of living. We have seen radical changes in our Government too, many of them made necessary by worldwide conflicts; others made necessary by the economic cataclysm of the 1930's; others which have been made necessary by the many complications introduced by modern technology. And there are many changes in our Government which many people think have not been necessary at all. Without entering into this controversy, I should, nevertheless, like to raise the question whether our Government has adapted itself adequately to the technological revolution which the last 25 years have brought. My answer to this question will be "No" even though I hasten to recognize the many important and necessary changes which have been made. In spite of these changes we must face the undeniable fact that while the activities of the United States Government in defense and in other fields make use of some 50 percent of the scientists and engineers of the country, and while many of the major problems and tasks of government have to do with the changes which science and technology have wrought, we nevertheless find no place in the top structure of government where scientists and engineers are brought into contact with policy or executive decisions. I think there are only two Members of the Congress of the United States who have had a scientific or engineering education. In the whole top structure of the Department of Defense there are only 2 or 3 scientists and engineers. The one scientific position in the State Department has been vacant for many months and it seems likely to be abandoned.

Now I do not mean to imply that the Government should be run by scientists or engineers; but it seems to me inconceivable that the government of a country which has gone through such a major technological revolution in recent years can get along without scientists and engineers in key spots at policy and executive levels.

How can this be brought about? Clearly, we are not going to see many scientists and engineers running for Congress, though I think it would be a good thing if a few did. We are not even going to see scientists and engineers flocking to take Government positions. It is extremely difficult to find top-quality men for the few positions that already exist. There should, however, be a few more of such top positions at the assistant secretarial level; they should pay higher salaries than they have so far paid; and strenuous efforts should be made to make them important and attractive opportunites.

I do think, however, that many departments of government could make more effective use of scientific advisory boards. A number of very successful scientific advisory groups have existed for some years in various parts of the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission. There is one in the Office of Defense Mobilization which serves the whole Executive Office of the President, including the National Security Council. There is no scientific advisory mechanism in the Department of State and none serving any one of a dozen different committees in Congress which could well use such a service.

I am not proposing the creation of the type of scientific advisory committee which meets for 1 day once or twice a year, on which occasion it is given a "briefing" by the agency which it serves, is asked a few minor questions, and then sent home after having, by implication, put a rubber stamp of approval on all activities of the agency. Rather, I am proposing more advisory groups which will meet for extended periods several times a year; groups which are brought into contact with every activity and problem of the agency; which have access to all activities of the agency and are encouraged to search out technical and scientific problems whose existence was previously unsuspected. Such a group should also have funds available so that, when it runs onto a problem requiring further study and analysis, it can set up ad hoc study teams to focus the best minds of the country on that problem.

One difficulty with such advisory committees as exist in government is that their members are scattered far and wide throughout the country—from Boston to Berkeley—and it is exceedingly difficult to keep them informed as to what is going on. If even 1 member of each such group lived in, or close to, Washington the situation would be vastly improved. Here, of course, is where the University of Maryland comes into the picture. I would like to express the hope that over the next 5 or 10 years Maryland will attract to its faculty some of the outstanding scientists and engineers in the country who have had experience in governmental affairs. These men should be encouraged to continue their interest in government affairs and, if they are competent people, their services will be in much demand. They will stimulate among their students and colleagues further interest in such affairs and this university could eventually become a key factor in bringing the talents and experience of the Nation's entire scientific community into contact with the Government and into effective collaboration in solving some of the Government's key problems.

I congratulate all those who have helped to make this event possible; who have contributed to the creation of the Glenn L. Martin Institute. I wish the Institute and the University many centuries of conspicuous success.

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at Testimonial Dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Shultz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the re-

marks made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] at a testimonial dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, held in New York City on April 20, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR MCCARTHY AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR RABBI BENJAMIN SCHULTZ, NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 20, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, our meeting tonight is long overdue. The gallant warrior we are honoring has been covering himself with glory for so many years, it's a wonder we have never stopped, until now, to say thanks.

That's the trouble, Ben, with being a solid, unwavering bastion of strength—like the Rock of Gibraltar, people tend to take you for granted. I regret this is not the 10th or 20th time we have gathered to honor you; but I thank God we have always been able to take you for granted.

Someone recently observed that no man is indispensable. As regards some matters, I emphatically agree. But in other fields, I would be more cautious. How, for example, would the anti-Communist fight have fared over the past decade without Rabbi Schultz? And how should we bear the loss if ever he were to leave his post? Some men in some jobs, let's face it, are indispensable.

What is it that can make a man indispensable in this struggle? Is it the possession of keen insights—an understanding of the fallacies of the Communist doctrine, an appreciation of the moral evil it contains? Or is it practical shrewdness in the day-to-day battles? Is it an ability to joust with the dialecticians at the intellectual level? Or is it stubborness and grit at the street level? Is it unflagging courage? Is it single-mindedness of purpose—an unswerving determination to defeat the enemy absolutely?

Each of these qualities is a scarce commodity; the possession of any one of them makes a man valuable to the anti-Communist cause. But when you find them all in one individual, you have found a rare man, indeed; and you can afford to talk about indispensability. The good Lord put in all the ingredients when he made Ben Schultz.

Ben Schultz' contributions to the anti-Communist cause are innumerable, and many of them have been cited here tonight. We have heard, and we might well hear a great deal more, of his distinguished accomplishments—as an arresting orator, as a skillful writer, as an organizer. But it is in this latter capacity—as the founder and the guiding star of the American Jewish League against communism—that Ben Schultz has performed what is perhaps his most distinguished service.

Ben Schultz, ably seconded by Roy Cohn, Benjamin Gitlow, Frank Chodorov, Judge Irving Kaufman, Eugene Lyons, George Sokolsky, Walter Winchell, Alfred Kohlberg, Ben Mandell, and countless other leaders who share his religious beliefs, has managed to expose the malicious myth that persons of the Jewish faith and Communists have something in common. This wicked falsehood has been ruthlesly exploited by the Communists for their own ends.

The Communists sow this particular seed of discord by two methods: First, they emphasize the religion of traitors or security risks in those instances where it so happens that they are of the Jewish faith. This type of propaganda, as the Communists well know, catalyzes latent prejudices and creates race hatred. Why don't the Communists comment on Alger Hiss' or William Remington's religion? The reason is obvious: There is no profit here, no conspicuous prejudice to exploit, no promise of creating division or suspicion.

The second Communist method of exploiting the race issue is more subtle. Rabbi Schultz shrewdly diagnosed it in an article for the American Mercury last summer. The Communists energetically peddle the line that anticommunism and antisemitism go hand in hand—specifically that all hard anti-Communists are ipso facto antisemitic. This slur is, of course, pure invention; but it commonly results, as Ben Schultz suggests, in 1 of 2 things—both of which give aid and comfort to the Communist. Some non-Jewish Americans are angered by the accusation, and in reaction to it, turn their resentment against Jewish people. Others are intimidated by it, and with an eye to their political fortunes, decline to take an active role in the anti-Communist fight. Either way—whether race dissension is created, or people are frightened off from joining the anti-Communist fight—either way, the Communists win.

Let's make no mistake about this: the Communists are waging a diabolically clever campaign. But its effectiveness has, to a great extent, been blunted by the work of Rabbi Schultz and the American Jewish League against communism. The very existence of this hard-hitting anti-Communist group gives the lie to a vitally important item of Communist propaganda. And I say to you that I frankly doubt there is a single organization in this country that the Communists are more anxious to destroy.

There are two reasons why I am confident that the Communists will not be successful in this. First, Ben Schultz, and his indomitable crew of heroes will not be beaten down by anybody. Second, and perhaps of even greater importance, is the fact that Jewish people are congenital enemies of communism. Those of the Jewish faith are, historically, champions of liberty. They are, traditionally, jealous guardians of the individual's freedom—political, economic, social. These things communism is determined to destroy.

And remember too that persons of the Jewish faith have, by force of circumstances, a vested interest in tolerance. It is not an interest in tolerance of moral evil such as communism embodies. But within the framework of belief in the dignity of the individual they insist on tolerance of diverse political and religious beliefs. This is a position the Communists cannot abide. Jewish people know this—they are keenly aware that in a Communist society it is only the Communist and the Communist dogma that is tolerated.

Far and away the most valuable contribution of Ben Schultz and his organization is that they dramatically symbolize the eternal hostility between Judaism and communism.

It's a personal honor to me, Ben, to be able to join in paying tribute to you. But I don't speak just for myself. I think I speak for all of your debtors—all of the American people. You have served your country well. Thank you, good luck, and Godspeed.

Atomic Powerplants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission has given out the information it is now making arrangements with a number of private power companies and, in one case, with a public utility district, for the planning and construction of atomic powerplants. This is good news, not only for our own country, but for the free world.

We have recently learned of the extensive plans of Great Britain in this field. I do not feel that it is necessary to get into a race with our friendly ally in this matter. Neither do I believe that the United States should lag behind in the development of such important peacetime uses of atomic energy.

The concern of the Atomic Energy Commission for the development and improvement of weapons is natural in this age of anxiety, yet atomic energy in its many peacetime uses can be one of the great boons of mankind. I do not think that we can for one moment forget that fact.

The development of efficient and economical atomic powerplants offers much to the world. In countries such as Sweden, Finland, and Austria which are dependent for much of their power production on coal imported from behind the Iron Curtain, atomic powerplants offer an end to an economic stranglehold.

If we succeed, as the Department of the Interior is endeavoring, in finding an economical way to make vast quantities of fresh water from sea water, atomic plants to power-pumping stations can make deserts bloom in many arid lands, and provide food and a better life for millions of people.

Every time mankind has discovered a great new source of power, the ability of the world to sustain a growing population has been advanced. We have made such advances through the use of coal, falling water, oil, and gas. We are standing now at the threshold of what may be mankind's greatest era if we can avoid war and put atomic energy to peaceful uses.

Hindsight on Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the U. S. News & World Report under date of April 8. In this editorial, Mr. David Lawrence, outstanding journalist, calls a play by play of events leading up to Yalta. Can it be said that this was hindsight? At this point, I am including the editorial in question.

HINDSIGHT?

(By David Lawrence)

(From an editorial written within 2 weeks after the Yalta Conference and published in this magazine in the issue of March 2, 1945:)

Let us examine the record before Yalta and see how the game of power politics works. The story goes back to Teheran. Here is the realistic chronology as it can be deduced from the files of the New York Times:

December 1943: Mr. Churchill at the Teheran Conference of the Big Three raises

the question of the future of Poland. Stalin demands the Curzone Line. Mr. Roosevelt is so informed. The world is told afterwards no agreements, secret pledges or partition of territory were consummated.

October 1944: Churchill and Eden go to Moscow and Stalin demands that the Polish question be settled before the peace conference is held. The American Ambassador is present at nearly all the talks.

December 15, 1944: Churchill tells the House of Commons he has decided to make an exception and not wait until the peace conference to settle the Polish question, and he reveals publicly that he has agreed with Stalin. He warns the Polish Government-in-exile to accept now or the price will be higher later on. Mr. Stalin must be appeased, he says in effect, and he betrays irritation that Mr. Roosevelt has not come through with his end of the appeasement.

December 16, 1944: President William Green of the American Federation of Labor says he hopes America will say "No" to Churchill's plan to redraw Poland.

December 17, 1944: A New York Times dispatch from London says that Churchill made a secret deal at Teheran and Roosevelt was "neutral," and adds:

"It is quite clear now that, in Teheran (December 1943), Mr. Churchill and Premier Stalin divided Europe into spheres of British and Russian influence. * * * Stalin would not agree to coordinate the Red Army's operations with those of his western allies until he had definite assurance that Britain would support Russia's claim to Polish territory as far west as the Curzon Line."

December 17, 1944: The Army and Navy Journal in Washington calls for an offensive through Poland by Russia, and Pravda denounces this publication as "a source for pro-Hitlerite propaganda," but many military men in Washington agree that Russia is stalling in order to force the hand of Churchill and Roosevelt.

December 18, 1944: The State Department issues a statement paving the way for the surrender to Stalin at Yalta. The statement says America has felt the Polish boundaries should be left to the peace conference at the end of the war but that if "a mutual agreement is reached by the United Nations directly concerned, this Government would have no objection to such an agreement." This is a tipoff that if Stalin can put across his puppet government through the Lublin Committee, the United States can be counted on to approve the ultimate recognition of some sort of Lublin government, modified, of course, to make it appear national.

December 19, 1944: The Nazi offensive is costing tens of thousands of American casualties on the Western Front as Germany, knowing that Stalin has been stalling, takes advantage of the lull on the Eastern Front.

December 19, 1944: A wave of criticism of Churchill sweeps the United States. The New York Times refers to the Churchill proposal on Poland editorially:

"It must be admitted frankly that this is not the way border problems were to be settled, under the terms of the Atlantic Charter. This is not an idealistic settlement made 'in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.' * * * We invite the attention of the Russian Government to the hazards of making decisions in a coalition war on the basis of unilateral action. This is isolationism. It engenders isolationism in others."

The Times says bluntly also that "agreement on the Curzon line is apparently to be the 'go ahead' signal for a resumption of the battle in the East."

December 19, 1944: Teamwork by President Roosevelt, who backs up Churchill's "lapse of memory" statement. Churchill in his December 15 speech had said that "it must not be forgotten that words are inserted in the Atlantic Charter, 'No changes before the peace table, except changes mutually agreed.'" Mr. Churchill next day said he was mistaken and that the words he quoted were somewhere in one of Mr. Hull's speeches. Anyway, Mr. Roosevelt now helps out by saying to a press conference that the Atlantic Charter was just a bunch of scribbled notes anyway and not a formal, signed document.

December 21, 1944: Stalin sees his way out. Dispatches announce from London that Stalin is to install the Lublin committee as the government of Poland.

January 12, 1945: Stalin apparently decides he is tired of waiting for the concurrence of Mr. Roosevelt and that, since he has Mr. Churchill's backing, the Russians can resume their offensive and take the matter of a provisional government in their own hands.

February 1945: Mr. Roosevelt agrees at Yalta to the dismemberment of the territory of an ally—Poland.

Politics on the Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the postal employees were the victims of a very cruel and shabby political trick in connection with the House action on their pay increase bill. The political maneuver was so thinly veiled that I am sure no one was fooled, much less the postal employee.

The House action, designed to embarrass President Eisenhower, will have no such result, as indicated by editorials in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Friday, April 22, 1955, and the Evening Star of Thursday, April 21, 1955, which I insert in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 22, 1955]

POLITICS ON THE PAY BILL

The House is making hard work of increasing the pay of postal employees. Last year Congress passed a postal pay bill which the President vetoed. Recently the House turned down a measure submitted by its Post Office and Civil Service Committee because it was regarded as not being generous enough. Now the House has again overridden its committee and passed a bill which appears to be headed directly for a Presidential veto. To those who have not followed the controversy, the difference between the 7.6 percent average raise which is said to be acceptable to the President and the 8.3 percent voted by the House may appear minor. But it is not merely a question of the extra $12 million a year which the House bill would cost. The Moss amendment accepted by the House would upset the administration's job classification plan embodied in the bill. Minority Leader MARTIN predicted, from what the President had said to him and written to Representative MURRAY, that the Moss bill would be vetoed.

This continued haggling over postal pay is the more disappointing because everyone agrees the postal employees are entitled to a raise. The trouble is that some legislators in both parties seem more interested in jockeying for political advantage than in writing an acceptable bill. There seems to be no prospect of passing the bill over the expected veto. Of course, the House-Senate conferees might, by herculean efforts, restore the equities of the classification plan, but this is not likely for the Senate bill calls for a 10 percent raise in postal salaries and contains no classification provisions at all. At present it looks as if the House will have no alternative to repassing the bill without the objectionable features if postal employees are to get the raises to which they are entitled.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 21, 1955]

COURTING A VETO

If Government employees again fail to obtain the pay raise which they have sought so long, they should place the blame where it properly belongs—on Congress, not President Eisenhower. Congress, for the second time, has ignored White House warnings of a possible veto of too-liberal pay legislation. And once more the implied threat of a presidential veto has imperiled the chances of an increased pay scale for all Federal workers.

The pay bill approved by the House, by a vote split largely along partisan lines, has the virtue of being less objectionable to the administration than the Senate-approved measure. The House bill calls for an average raise of 8.3 percent for postal workers, instead of the maximum 7.6 percent which the President had asked. The Senate had voted for a 10-percent increase—a figure certain to be vetoed if submitted. The House measure is better than the Senate version in another important respect—it provides for a readjustment of postal salaries according to nature and amount of work performed. Postal unions have opposed tying the pay raise and reclassification together, despite administration insistence that the two subjects go hand in hand.

Since the President personally has not stated publicly that any pay raise higher than 7.6 percent would be vetoed, there remains for the employees the hope that he might accept the House figure, if it should emerge from the Senate-House conference. But the economy-minded administration faces the fact that what is right for postal workers is right for all Federal employees. And the House action would add about $12 million to the cost of pay legislation for the postal workers alone. The President and his advisers have contended that the Government cannot afford the cost of a general raise higher than 7.6 percent. All of this advice has been shunted aside under much pressure from the organized postal workers. If the President should take a strong veto stand, there is considerable doubt that enough votes could be marshaled to override it. Thus, the present outlook for an early pay raise is clouded with uncertainty, to say the least.

Dr. Jonas E. Salk Recipient of Mutual of Omaha Criss Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON B. CHASE
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. CHASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ROCHESTER, MINN.—Dr. Jonas E. Salk, creator of the Salk polio vaccine, today was named the 1955 recipient of the $10,000 tax-exempt Mutual of Omaha Criss award and gold medal.

Announcement of Dr. Salk's election was made by Dr. Charles W. Mayo, of the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn., who heads the 14-member Criss award board of judges.

The award, the largest of its kind in the United States, was established to honor outstanding contributions in the field of health and/or safety by V. J. Skutt, president of Mutual of Omaha, as a tribute to the late Dr. C. C. Criss, founder of the insurance company, now the largest exclusive health and accident company in the world. Residents of the United States, Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, where Mutual of Omaha is licensed, are eligible for the award.

Dr. Mayo, in announcing Dr. Salk as the 1955 Mutual of Omaha Criss recipient, said, "The accomplishment of Dr. Salk may well be the greatest contribution to medicine in our generation."

Dr. Salk was elected from a field of more than 400 nominees, Dr. Mayo said. W. Earl Hall, Mason City Globe-Gazette, editor and national safety authority, was the 1954 Mutual of Omaha Criss award winner.

Other Criss award recipients have been Dr. Howard A. Rusk, of New York City, for his work in rehabilitation of the physically handicapped; and Drs. Philip S. Hench and Edward C. Kendall, of the Mayo Clinic, for their work in the development and use of cortizone.

Members of the Mutual of Omaha Criss award board of judges, in addition to Dr. Mayo, are: Ned Dearborn, president, National Safety Council; Lt. Gen. (retired) James H. Doolittle, vice president, Shell Oil Co.; Irene Dunne, actress; Henry Ford, II, president, Ford Motor Co.; Duke P. Kahanamoku, high sheriff of Honolulu; William L. Laurence, science writer, New York Times; Harold Lloyd, actor; Hon. Paul Martin, Minister of National Health and Welfare for Canada; Dr. Elmer Hess, president-elect, American Medical Association; Don McNeill, radio personality; Dr. Thomas Parran, University of Pittsburgh; Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; and DeWitt Wallace, editor of Reader's Digest.

The formal award presentation, Dr. Mayo said, will be made in June at the American Medical Association convention in Atlantic City.

Mr. Stevenson Out on a Limb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial from the Tidings, which appeared in the issue of April 15, 1955:

MR. STEVENSON OUT ON A LIMB

Adlai Stevenson is piqued and in a pout. It seems that the titular head of the Democrats is being studiously ignored, not only by Secretary Dulles but by the elder Democratic statesmen, notably by Senator GEORGE. Adlai is just not "in the know" anymore.

Anyway, there were no scintillating quips or titillating barbs when Mr. Stevenson, piping the liberal tune, said that Matsu and Quemoy were not important enough to risk the holocaust of war or the alienation of allies. These islands, he said, are as close to the mainland of China as Staten Island is to New York, insinuating that they be turned over to the Reds. Let the United Nations, he counseled, settle the strife in the straits and find a formula for the eventual status of Formosa.

Politics rather than diplomacy prompted Mr. Stevenson's summation, in that it was coupled with a scathing attack on administration policy. Mr. Dulles did not make the obvious retort that there would be no Formosan problem today, nor indeed any menace of communism in the Far East if Mr. Stevenson's party had been more realistic a decade ago. The attempt to make political capital of present hesitation on how to cope with past bungling is a shabby trick that ill serves the Nation in a day of decision.

The fact of the matter is that both political persuasions were almost in unison in the congressional resolution to defend Formosa and the Pescadores with discretionary power for the President over those minor outposts deemed necessary for their defense. We are committed to fight for Quemoy and Matsu if Mr. Eisenhower concludes that an assault on these islands is a preliminary to an invasion of Formosa. It is supposed to be smart diplomacy to keep the enemy off guard, guessing as to our intentions, whether we will or won't. Still, the Reds aren't scared a bit, to judge from the raucous voice and vow to take Formosa.

Mr. Stevenson is out on a limb, too, in his recommendation of a declaration in the United Nations on the Formosan straits. Apparently, Senator GEORGE didn't tell the former standard bearer that he had already sponsored such a resolution in the hope of an inflexible allied position on the bastion itself. Such recourse is but a wish-fulfillment. The U. N. has become a forum of propaganda rather than a center of action, a torrent of words and futile posturing. We cannot expect to find unanimity of action there on the future of freedom in Formosa. Indeed, that rostrum will fan and flame the spark that ignites the clamor for a return of the island to the Reds.

We unhappily, and we think not unjustly, read this consummation into Mr. Stevenson's words. Why otherwise does he want the U. N. to decree the future status of Formosa when we have already vowed it to the Nationalists? If small islands off the coast, even strategic, are not worth defending, then maybe we will come around to the position that even a larger island somewhat more off the mainland is not worth our blood and treasure either. We are asked to sacrifice Chiang again to preserve our concert of allies for the global struggle. The patent and palpable problem that Mr. Stevenson skirts is this: if we abandon Formosa we surrender Asia to communism.

Neither the General Assembly of the United Nations nor a new gathering of the Big Four will settle the impasse posed by the threat to Formosa. That problem will be solved in the mounting determination of the American people as expressed through its Congress to defend with all its resources this island outpost of freedom. Mao halts before our steadfast purpose. Mr. Stevenson's words but lull him with the mistaken mood that our purpose falters.

At Last, an Asian Answer to the Riddle of Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "At Last, an Asian Answer to the Riddle of Formosa," which appeared in the April 22, 1955, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky. The editorial is as follows:

AT LAST, AN ASIAN ANSWER TO THE RIDDLE OF FORMOSA

"Formosa for the Formosans." That is the policy proposed by Sir John Kotelawala, of Ceylon, at the Asian-African meeting of Bandung. He sees no good reason why the people of the island should not be given a chance to say what kind of government they want for themselves, with full independence as one choice.

"Formosa for the Formosans" is a rallying cry that should stir hearts in Asia. National independence is the ruling passion there.

It is a policy which America can embrace with enthusiasm. We have always held that people should be free to choose for themselves. "Self-determination is not a mere phrase," Woodrow Wilson reminded Congress in 1918. "It is an imperative principle of action, which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril."

It seems hardly open to argument that the thought would be pleasing to the Formosans. They have been pushed about as pawns long enough. They have a national pride of their own, which became submerged under centuries of Chinese rule. Then Japan snatched them from China in 1895. That period of captivity was broken at the end of World War II. Chiang Kai-shek and those troops remaining loyal to him ferried over to Formosa in 1949. It became the seat of Nationalist power, not through any special wish on the part of the Formosans, but because a hundred miles of blue water stretch between the island and the China mainland.

The idea of a vote by the Formosans was put forward some weeks ago by Sir Anthony Eden, and was repudiated by the Red Chinese. But the proposal then came from the West. The same kind of solution from an Eastern source could rally support from all the Asian neutrals at Bandung, and could leave Chou En-lai isolated if he refuses to agree.

The Courier-Journal has advocated such a policy for some time. We recognize that it could only be carried out under grave difficulties, because:

1. Time would be needed to organize a free and secret vote of the Formosan people. Kotelawala suggests a 5-year waiting period, under a trusteeship of the United Nations or of the Asian powers.

2. It would seem necessary to identify the Formosans themselves as voters, and exclude the couple of million mainland Chinese who came to the island in Chiang's wake. This would be a troublesome job, but not an impossible one.

3. Some assurances would have to be given to the Chinese Nationalists if the islanders should vote for independence. Many would probably choose to stay in Formosa. Another refuge would have to be provided for Chiang himself and his official family, perhaps in the United States.

4. An independent Formosa would be a weak nation. Its security would require a U. N. guarantee, and its economy would need American help.

5. No solution for Formosa will be supported by Asians or Europeans if the United States should insist on tying Formosa and the Pescadores to Quemoy and Matsu. But it is already clear that no other nation in the world feels that we have any legal or moral rights in the offshore islands, and a great many Americans agree.

These all are problems that make a Formosa solution anything but easy. Yet how much more difficult and dangerous is any other prospect in that tense corner of the

world. As Kotelawala says, the first requirement is "to decide that we aren't going to shoot." His Asian solution is the only kind with a hope of stopping Chou short of war, and of giving America at the same time a thoroughly decent out.

Oppose Hoover Commission Recommendation To Abolish Present REA Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, some of the reports or recommendations made by certain task forces of the Hoover Commission have aroused considerable comment as well as opposition in the Nation.

One of the reports that has drawn strong criticism is the recommendation to abolish the Rural Electrification Administration as we now know it.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution opposing the Hoover Committee's recommendation on REA. The resolution was adopted by 400 delegates attending the 19th annual meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative held in Madison, Wis., March 30–31, 1955. The Wisconsin Electric Cooperative is composed of 30 rural electric cooperatives.

Following is the full text of the resolution:

THE HOOVER REPORT

Whereas the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government headed by former President Herbert Hoover has recommended the abolition of the Rural Electrification Administration as we now know it; and

Whereas the committee recommends that a new Federal Corporation be set up, interest rates be boosted for loans to electric cooperatives, and that no further expansion of electric-cooperative systems be undertaken where commercial utilities stand ready to provide the service; and

Whereas this report was originally drawn up by an individual in the employ of a firm dependent upon the goodwill of the commercial utilities of America; and

Whereas the report was delegated to individuals who for the most part had a record of public antipathy to the program and expressed that attitude in their refusal to even permit a representative of electric cooperatives to appear before them to tell the story of electric cooperative development; and

Whereas three representatives of the Hoover Commission have repudiated the reports endorsed without adequate study including Attorney General Herbert Brownell, former Postmaster General James Farley, and Representative Chester Holifield, of California; and

Whereas we feel this report was calculated to destroy this program totally without regard to the continued needs of rural electrification: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this delegate body go on record condemning this report in the strongest possible terms; and that we charge the Commission operating under former President Hoover of lending its name to a reprehensible propaganda effort initiated by those same elements who have fought this program from the start; and be it hereby further

Resolved, That we the delegated to this 19th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative do respectfully urge each and every member of the Wisconsin congressional delegation to not only vote against acceptance of this recommendation, but also that the use of this Commission to achieve ulterior motives under the guise of public service be condemned in strongest terms.

Eden Is a Man as Firm as Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Eden Is a Man as Firm as Churchill" which appeared in the April 20, 1955, issue of the Gleaner and Journal of Henderson, Ky. The editorial is as follows:

EDEN IS A MAN AS FIRM AS CHURCHILL

Some in Washington are shaking their head over the retirement from No. 10 Downing Street, London, England, of Sir Winston Churchill, the biggest political figure of our time. How—these people ask—can Sir Anthony Eden step into such shoes? Compared to Sir Winston, anybody is bound to seem undersized.

I do not share this doubt. Sir Winston's greatness, in my judgment, lay less in the superiority of his policies than in his overwhelming strength of character and ability with words. Such gifts made him the indispensable man for saving Britain and the world in 1940. They may not be so necessary in 1955. For 1955, in my judgment, more resembles 1938 than 1940.

A war is threatening because of one thing: the persistent expansion of a greater and more dangerous power than the Nazi-Fascist-Japanese Axis. This war—like its predecessor—can be avoided only by courage and foresight. Has Sir Anthony Eden got these qualities?

I think he has. In fact, his past seems to demonstrate that he has had them—at times, though not at all times. Back in the midthirties he became foreign secretary with almost no particular preparation. I remember when he first turned up at a League of Nations Assembly at Geneva with the newspaperman Victor Gordon Lennox as his chief adviser.

The majority of delegates and publicists voted him a lightweight. Yet when, in 1938, the ignorant, inexperienced, and stubborn Neville Chamberlain became Prime Minister with a program of making peace with Hitler by the sacrifice of the Czechoslovaks, and even the wise Sir Robert Vansittart flirted with the idea of concessions to Mussolini in order to wean him away from Hitler, it was Anthony Eden who said no—and quit.

Things are different today? Not as much as one might hope.

Now, as in 1938, the British Prime Minister has to contend with a British people as desperately anxious to have peace that it refuses to fact the dreadful facts of international life. Our British friends are reacting to Moscow's menace and the atomic threat almost exactly as they shrank from Berlin's challenge and attack by Herman Goering's Luftwaffe.

In fact, they are even less realistic—and more frightened—now than then. Whereas the Soviet Government is telling its peoples not to be afraid of a nuclear war since it will not "end civilization, merely end capitalistic imperialism." British statesmen have been beefing that there is no alternative to coexistence but no existence.

It will not be easy—as things get worse—to reverse this current. Neville Chamberlain never succeeded and inevitably blundered into war. Can Sir Anthony do better?

He comes to power today with one strike against him and one hit to his credit. The strike was the incredible Geneva Conference of last year when, to placate his colleague, Nehru of India, Sir Anthony helped the French give half of Vietnam to the Communists. As a result, it will take a miracle to save the other half.

The hit was when, after the silly French had killed (or postponed?) West European unity and NATO seemed to be breaking up, Sir Anthony came forward with an offer of British military support that saved it.

What will his next move be? To judge by the past, he is another Europe-Firster, ready enough to see non-Commonwealth Asia fall to communism if thereby Commonwealth and European interests are preserved. This will make him popular at home and in India. It is not likely to endear him to Washington. He must never forget that part of Britain's popularity in this country, upon which the great power of the pro-British lobby in the United States is based, depended upon personal confidence in Winston Churchill.

This confidence Sir Anthony must first win. Can he do so? Will he not be driven by British public opinion, and steered by Nehru, into a whole new series of futile negotiations and successive concessions to Moscow and Peiping the result of which will surely be major war in a not-too-distant future?

Perhaps. Certainly, American policy and Indian policy are in the long run incompatible. If Sir Anthony sticks to Nehru he will lose Eisenhower. Yet this need not happen.

Sir Anthony has been quoted as believing in the absolute necessity of Anglo-American partnership. If, he sticks to this—and Eisenhower sticks to his guns—Sir Anthony will be flexible enough to meet the challenge.

For if he goes too far along the Indian path, Washington can confront him with his own greatest remark, made when he resigned from the Chamberlain Cabinet in 1938:

"There has been too keen a desire on our part to make terms with others rather than that others should make terms with us."

Precisely. Those words are even truer now than when they were spoken. Perhaps it is time to remind Sir Anthony of them.

Anniversary of the Evacuation of Boston by the British

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include with pleasure an excellent and appropriate address made by United States Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, on March 13, 1955, in South Boston,

Mass., a part of my congressional district, on the occasion of the patriotic exercises conducted under the auspices of the South Boston Citizens Association in connection with the 179th anniversary of the evacuation of Boston by the British:

When the patriots looked from Dorchester Heights and saw the British Fleet set sail out of Boston Harbor—that was a great day. I don't suppose the time will ever come in these parts when the evacuation anniversary is not celebrated. I am sure that day will never come so long as there are Americans with Irish blood here—because this was the symbol of the dawn of freedom in this great land. And if there is one thing the Irish prize above all others—above prosperity, above security, it is freedom. In that cause they have bled and died through the centuries.

Of course they knew well enough that the departure of the oppressor did not mean that all their problems were solved. But here was a real start on the road to independence and to a chance to build a land of liberty and plenty.

The climb upward from the days of oppression has been a long one. There have been setbacks. But as time goes on the ideals of the colonial patriots have been increasingly achieved. Even the most reactionary people today would not accept manners and laws and customs that were considered all right in the days of the American Revolution.

Let us not forget that the freedom for which the patriots fought was not achieved in a battle or in a campaign or in the whole War of the Revolution. After the war was won, the only people allowed to vote were male property owners. It was many years before all white men had the right to vote. It was many more years before it was conceded that all men who were not felons should have the right to vote—and this is still not fully accepted in some parts of these United States. It was many years before women were given their political freedom and the right to vote.

Those were the days in which the institution of human slavery was commonly accepted as a proper condition, not only for the black men, but also in effect for the white bondsman.

Those were the days in which the very idea that workingmen might band together to gain their economic ends was looked on as a crime and indeed, as flying in the face of providence.

What I am getting at here today is that the pursuit of liberty and of happiness is a never-ending affair. We climb one hill, we achieve another freedom or another good, and still another unsolved problem of social justice lies ahead.

Some of us close our eyes to the hills ahead. It is more comfortable that way. We can just pretend that they don't exist. Some of us look backward, to the good old days when the jobless workingman had the right to starve but not the right to beg; to the good old days when the suspicion of hard times coming meant wholesale slashing of wages; to the good old days when there was no income tax and it wouldn't have mattered to us much if there had been—because who but the rich had a dollar in those good days?

Well, I for one am not wasting my time on the good old days. It is my idea that we should try for better days, not for a few, but for all the people. It is my idea that the dignity of the individual is a value worth keeping. It is my idea that while this great Nation has done much, we still have seen but a little of the great things that are to come. That is to say, the great things to come if we keep conquering the hills ahead. I mean to make my small contribution to that end.

We are coming close to St. Patrick's Day, and I should like to say just a few words about where that sainted man would have stood had he been here on this day in 1955. I am pretty sure that he would have been looking ahead too. He had to look ahead in his day in Ireland. There he was amid a hundred pagan tribes, trying to bring the faith and education and tolerance of each other to people who must have been pretty hard to convince. He did a fine job for all the people, and we carry him in our hearts for it. It seems to me that we could do worse than get in step with St. Patrick and make this city and this State and this Nation—yes, and this world, a bit better for those who shall come to inherit what we have left.

Unrelenting Fight Against Disease Must Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Unrelenting Fight Against Disease Must Continue," which appeared in the April 21, 1955, issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky. The editorial is as follows:

UNRELENTING FIGHT AGAINST DISEASE MUST CONTINUE

With the proven effectiveness of the Salk vaccine, a battle has been won in the war against polio. Hopes are high that eventually the vaccine will provide 100 percent immunity against the crippling disease that has caused so much distress in American lives. This will not remove altogether the threat of polio, because it will be necessary for everybody to take the shots to gain immunity, and there always will be with us those persons who through neglect, ignorance, or pure hardheadness will not see to it that their children are immunized.

The average person cannot comprehend the amount of time and work that have gone into the production of polio vaccine. Every detail has been gone over painstakingly to provide the maximum of safety for children taking the vaccine. The complexity of the process and urgency of production of substantial amounts has necessitated the investment of many millions of dollars.

There has not been any doubt among informed people that it was only a matter of time until a safe and effective vaccine could be developed to prevent polio. The requirements of that vaccine included the need of combating three types of polio with one type of injection. This, in addition to other problems, delayed development of a successful vaccine. Just a few years ago little was known about polio, yet the problem was attacked with thoroughness by many trained scientists. To Dr. Jonas E. Salk goes credit for first developing a usable successful vaccine, but he in turn gives credit to those whose previous research laid groundwork for completion of the task.

All those who have donated in any way to the March of Dimes now must realize that their money has been well spent to bring about the day of liberation from the dread of paralytic polio. There is just as much consecrated effort in fighting other diseases, but the horror of children being crippled has lent urgency to the fight against polio. We must not forget that there are other battles against diseases and disasters that will not yield so spectacularly as the recent polio vaccine promises, yet deserve our continuous support.

Conservation or California?—Echo Park's Many Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the well-financed propaganda campaign against the efforts of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico may give the impression that sentiment outside of these States is predominantly opposed to the upper Colorado River storage project and Echo Park Dam. Nothing could be further from the truth. In addition to such organizations as the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the National Farmers Union, many of the newspapers from other parts of the United States have taken the time to analyze this propaganda and have come out in favor of the project.

I am submitting for the RECORD 2 editorials, 1 from the Pioche (Nev.) Record and the other from the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent-Journal in support of these projects. The editorials follow:

[From the Pioche (Nev.) Record]

CONSERVATION OR CALIFORNIA?

(By George R. Swain)

One of the major actions expected to come before the 84th Congress, and one which is expected to bring howls and, perhaps, even screams, from southern California's so-called conservationists, is the action concerning further development of the upper Colorado River project.

One needs only to visit the Lost City Museum at Overton, Nev., to get a thought which discredits any future activity or suggestion fostered by this selfish, grabbing, hypocritical group, which hides its true desires and aims beneath the title they prefer to work under—conservationists—rubbish, horseradish, "con" of the very lowest and unprincipled type.

This same group, which seems to have been organized and functioning for some time, according to their own claims, said nothing, did nothing, nor even mentioned the fact that the waters backed up by Hoover Dam would cover the Lost City, where countless ages of human history had been preserved for present-day mankind. Little did they care what happened to a valuable historical site in the State of Nevada, when they were going to be the ones to reap the lion's portion of the benefits from such a project.

Now, because some of the other portions of the original project are being brought into being, and one of them, the Echo Park project, is in the proximity of the Dinosaur National Monument, they are screaming to high heaven in an attempt to squelch the project, using the argument that the waters will cover the graveyard of these historic remains.

They do not bother to state that the fact is that these precious remains are some 50 miles from where any of the water, construc-

tion, excavations, or any other part of the Echo Park project will reach.

They have not bothered to look at the true facts. They have only used imagination and intrigue in an attempt to hypothecate, even steal, the rights of the upper basin States in order that they may control the entire flow of the Colorado River.

They are even too blind and self-centered to see that if the other portions of the original river project are not completed, and soon, that they will suffer along with the rest of the States involved. Ask anyone who will look at the picture sensibly and take a look at the low level of the water in Lake Mead at the present time.

Hoover Dam was not built as a powerplant or irrigation project. It was constructed as a flood control and conservation project.

Yet, during the past year or more, the water has been continually lowered in order to supply electrical energy to power-hungry southern Californians. The water has been wantonly spilled through the huge generator turbines, so fast that lower dams—the Davis and the Parker and others—have not been able to control the flow. Much of this spilled water has passed by into Mexico and the Gulf of California wasted forever.

It would be far better, in the minds of those who can see and will see, for other dams to be built in the upper river, dams that could and would assist in lowering the power load at Hoover and could control the flow of the river so in fat years, when as much as 25 million acre-feet has been known to flow past Lees Ferry in Arizona, the water could be stored above and allowed to run down more or less as needed, rather than all in one wasteful gush, to be spilled into the sea.

While Nevada is considered as one of the lower basin States, it has a vital interest in the upper basin projects. If there be anyone in the State who does not agree with this statement, they should talk to such men as Senator Alan Bible, former Attorney General William Mathews, Senator George Malone, Congressman Cliff Young, and others who have made a study of conditions. They will tell you that Nevada is not now receiving its just share of the water or power from the project and that indications are that unless the upper basin projects are completed, there is little chance that it will receive its share.

[From the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent-Journal]

ECHO PARK'S MANY BENEFITS

With the passage of the upper Colorado River storage bill, one of the finest recreation areas in America will be within a few years of actuality.

This, the Yampa-Lodore recreation area in Dinosaur National Monument, will provide the first look at some of America's finest and most spectacular canyons for thousands of tourists, 20 miles upstream from the dinosaur beds from which the entire monument gets its name.

The Colorado and its major tributaries, the Green, Yampa, Gunnison, Dolores, and San Juan Rivers, are the great canyonmakers of the West; on their way to the Gulf of California from the snow-capped Rockies, these rivers carve literally thousands of spectacular canyons across the high plateaus of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona.

The most famous of these is the Grand Canyon of the Colorado in Arizona, one of the major wonders of the world.

Yet there are other canyons, not quite so spectacular as Grand Canyon, which are of awe-inspiring beauty.

The deep canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers are among the most spectacular.

Yet because they are located in areas almost inaccessible except by horseback, these canyons have been seen only by a handful of people compared with the thousands who visit other scenic wonders of the West.

At the time the original 80-acre site of the dinosaur relics was expanded to more than 200,000 acres, it was understood that some of the best sites for power and water-storage reservoirs were included in the monument, and these were exempted from provisions of law which prohibit the building of dams or reservoirs in national monuments.

Plans developed over nearly 50 years by the Bureau of Reclamation, and included in the upper Colorado River storage project, call for a stream regulation and power-producing dam at Pat Lynch Hole, now called Echo Park, 20 miles up the Green River from the original Dinosaur Monument.

Here a 525-foot concrete dam is planned at the bottom of the 2,500-foot deep canyon.

The dam will back up water for more than 60 miles up the precipitous canyons of the Green River, and more than 40 miles up the deep canyons of the Yampa River.

During the past 20 years, only a few hundred people have made the dangerous (though exciting) trip down the rapids of the Green and Yampa Rivers. The lakes, deep in the bottoms of these canyons, will eliminate most of the dangerous rapids.

Tourists, heretofore barred from the area by the dangerous river passage and the rugged terrain of the surrounding mountains, will have a chance to see the beauty of these canyons in safety.

But to the people of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the important thing about the Echo Park Dam and its beautiful reservoir is not the scenic enchantment which visitors will be able to see for the first time; the important thing is that the reservoir will permit them to use a portion of the water allotted to the upper basin States in the Colorado River compact of 1922.

These dams and other smaller projects will bring new irrigation water to nearly half a million acres in the four States, and will provide water for the growing cities of Denver, Salt Lake City, Albuquerque, and the atom city of Los Alamos.

Altogether, 6 major dams and 17 smaller projects are planned.

The money advanced for the dams which will mean so much to the people of these four States will all be paid back much of it with interest, within a 50-year period. The dams will provide a new source of power, much needed in the expanding mountain empire, and will permit the development of many natural resources.

World Loses Great Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "World Loses Great Scientist," which appeared in the April 20, 1955, issue of the Messenger and Inquirer of Owensboro, Ky. The editorial is as follows:

WORLD LOSES GREAT SCIENTIST

What the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb mean to our civilization in years to come will have much to do with establishing Albert Einstein's place in all history. But even with the future of the world depending largely on what happens to those two powerful forces, Einstein was still ranked by many as the outstanding mind of his time, one of the immortals of science.

It was his fellow scientists, too, who paid him what was possibly his greatest compliment. Asked by the trustees of Riverside Church in New York to name the greatest scientific figures of all time so that they could be enshrined in stone in the magnificent new building, Einstein's contemporaries unanimously selected him to rank with such immortals as Hippocrates, Euclid, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton. He was the only living person named.

When British physicists and astronomers met in the fall of 1919 after Einstein's theory of relativity had been proved, the president of the Royal Society declared Einstein's calculation was "one of the greatest—perhaps the greatest—of achievements in the history of human thought."

It was Einstein who gave science the theoretical knowledge needed for the atom bomb. Existence of atomic energy became known as a result of his relativity theory.

His life was propelled by two great drives; his hatred of war and his love of democracy. He was an ardent pacifist until he felt there was no pacific way to defeat fascism. As a lifelong seeker of democracy he accepted German citizenship only after Germany became a republic in 1919, and renounced it when Hitler began his persecution of the Jews. He made his home in the United States from then until his death.

Few will deny that Einstein was in his own particular field the greatest man who ever lived. But he was greater still because of his philosophy of life.

Through all of his years he sought to live his life as an individual, wanting only to work in privacy for the good of mankind, and to sit and think. And the sitting and thinking resulted in his showing our world in a truer perspective and in his helping us to understand a little more clearly how we are related to the universe around us.

And yet this man who so influenced the lives of his own generation and generations to come was ever humble and modest. To the adulation accorded him he shyly replied: "Let every man be respected as an individual and no man idolized. It is an irony of fate that I myself have been the recipient of excessive admiration and respect from my fellows through no fault of my own."

If others could have followed his example, even a bare majority scattered throughout the world, this great scientist would have died a happy man. As it was, he was embittered insofar as he had come to a free nation and enjoyed for a while its great freedom of action and expression. During and after World War II he saw that man was not living successfully with his fellowman and that as a result it affected his freedom and that of others.

He still liked his adopted country but he floundered hopelessly seeking a better way, even to the point of grasping at a false hope forwarded by leftist Henry Wallace, presidential candidate in 1948.

We are sorry that this happened to the great man, but despite this we can see many fine points in him that we can emulate.

If everyone would seek enjoyment in the success of others and make a greater effort toward fulfillment of the individual as he strived to do this would certainly be a utopian world which Einstein first thought he had found in America. He forgot, though, that man, unlike the pure sciences, unfortunately, fits no formula.

We still have a long way to go, but we hope to arrive at a plateau of peace and harmony some day through hope, faith, and effort, just as Einstein showed the world unbelievable marvels of science.

Louisiana Tidelands: No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I set forth tidelands editorial No. 2 entitled "The Tidelands Situation: No. 2," appearing in a recent issue of the Times-Picayune, of New Orleans, La.:

THE TIDELANDS SITUATION: NO. 2—DOES STATE GET JUST SHARE?

As interpreted by laymen, including President Eisenhower, the Tidelands Act of 1953 was intended to restore to the coastal States their offshore lands whose title was placed in question by a United States Supreme Court decision. This decision held that the Federal Government had paramount rights in these lands.

To a large degree, the desired result has been achieved. Enactment of the legislation which had support of the Eisenhower administration opened up development of offshore oil and gas fields which had been halted by the efforts of the Truman administration to take over the tidelands for the Central Government.

In the first quarter of 1955 the State of Louisiana received approximately $15 million as its share of royalties, rentals, and bonuses from offshore mineral leases.

The greater number of these leases, if not all of them, were within 3 miles of the State's coastal line—that is the coastline established by the United States Coast Guard as marking the end of inland waters and the beginning of the open sea.

Despite the language of the Tidelands Act referring to the State's coast, lessees holding mineral leases within this coastline established by the United States Coast Guard paid oil royalties to the Federal Government, instead of to the State, on approximately 20 million barrels of petroleum produced under 42 State leases up to December 1954.

Collection of this revenue by the Federal Government, as we see the situation, reflects an attitude in Washington which is not justified by existing or past circumstances.

We believe that the State is entitled to revenues from all lands between its shores and a line 3 leagues beyond its coastline. Certainly, as we understand the situation, Louisiana is entitled to all revenues from lands within its coastline.

The Federal position, it seems to us, is founded on a contention that there is something indefinite or obscure about the phrase "coastline."

Under an act of February 1807, Congress authorized the President to cause a survey to be taken "of the coast of the United States, in which shall be designated the islands and shoals, with the roads or places of anchorage, within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

This act, obviously, emphasized the difference between "shores" and "coast or coastline."

Under a later act of Congress the United States Coast Guard was authorized to, and did, establish the coastline of Louisiana—as well as of other States. This line is the same line as that redefined under Louisiana law. It extends from Chandeleuer Lighthouse in a curved line following established aids to navigation, including Pass-a-Loutre lighted whistle buoy 4, South Pass lighted whistle buoy 2, Southwest Pass entrance channel lighted whistle buoy, Ship Shoal lighthouse, Calcasieu Pass lighted whistle buoy 1, and Sabine Pass lighted whistle buoy 1.

Some of the revenues going to the Federal Government instead of to the State government are from leases on submerged lands within this well defined coastline.

When Attorney General Fred S. LeBlanc goes to court to sustain Louisiana's boundaries, it seems to us he should seek to establish the State's claim to this particular mineral revenue.

Hiring the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the article included in my extension of remarks, Hiring the Handicapped, appearing in the April 25, 1955, issue of Time magazine, is worthy of consideration by business in general:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED—A MATTER OF GOOD BUSINESS

To keep pace with the expanding demands of consumers, United States industry needs a steadily increasing stream of skilled and productive workers. One great manpower pool that many businessmen have neglected is handicapped workers. In 1954, according to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, there were 7 million Americans of working age who were severely handicapped—by blindness, the loss of a limb, by tuberculosis, epilepsy, or some other crippling disease. Of the total, only a relative few were permanently employed. But the estimates are that some 4 million can eventually be rehabilitated and gainfully employed. Not only would rehabilitation lead them into happier lives, but with the increasing complexity of such United States industries as electronics and aviation, handicapped people can actually perform many skilled and delicate jobs better than able-bodied workers.

Dozens of public and private groups are already hard at work on the problem. President Eisenhower has set up a top-level committee to promote the hiring of physically or mentally handicapped. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is doling out $30 million in Government aid to State agencies to help put the handicapped in jobs. Overall, some 60,000 disabled workers found jobs in industry in 1954, and the United States Government estimates that the number will jump 200 percent by 1959. But this will tap only a fraction of the potential manpower.

Many businessmen are frankly reluctant to hire the handicapped because they fear that such workers are prone to injury, will hurt themselves on the job and thus boost insurance compensation rates. The fears are largely groundless. Some State compensation laws make a company responsible for a worker's total disability, regardless of his previous injury. However, 42 States now have second injury funds which protect employers against paying total disability compensation for injuries to an already handicapped worker. But the biggest reason for the lag is that businessmen simply do not think that the handicapped are good workers.

Actually, a handicapped worker in the right job does just as well as his able-bodied neighbor. Says the National Association of Manufacturers, in its Guide in Hiring the Physically Handicapped: "In the past decade, production records of thousands of physically handicapped persons in industry indicate beyond any question that so-called handicapped workers are equal to—and in some instances better than—their able-bodied associates in such important factors as attendance, turover, safety, and productivity."

The records of individual companies bear out the NAM. In Dallas, Chance Vought Aircraft employs 297 disabled among its 12,500 workers. Heart cases work at tool design, polio victims as technical writers, amputees operate automatic machines and lathes. The company found that there is not only less malingering and absenteeism but better production and greater safety consciousness among this group than in any other. Ford Motor Co.'s assembly plant in the same city has 600 handicapped workers in its 2,700-man work force. Says personnel manager, John McKee: "After all, if a job can be done with one arm, why shouldn't an employer hire a man with one arm to do it?"

Few United States companies, big or small, create special jobs for the handicapped. Few have to. In Detroit, Chrysler has placed thousands of physically handicapped workers in good jobs since 1943, thoroughly tests each applicant for what he can do, then finds a job to fit. General Motors has the same type of system at its Dayton, Ohio, Frigidaire plant. For example, an ex-punch-press operator who got tuberculosis of the spine checks for leaks in refrigerator units passing through a tank of water, a job that does not require him to stoop or twist.

With the increasing specialization of United States industry, more and more jobs are opening up for handicapped workers. What the handicapped lose in flexibility because of their disability, they make up by concentrating on a single job, or a few jobs, learning to do them better. Firestone has 150 deaf employees alone. Allis-Chalmers, IBM, Hughes Tool, Procter & Gamble, Bulova Watch Co., Eli Lilly (drugs) have all found use for handicapped workers; electronic firms such as RCA, Western Electric, General Electric are using them to assemble delicate TV and radar circuits. At Lockheed's big plant at Marietta, Ga., the company last year saved $65,000 by employing a Griffin, Ga., workshop for the blind to pick over the factory sweepings, salvage thousands of tiny nuts, washers, and screws that fell to the floor below its B-47 production line.

On the record, handicapped workers are pulling their own weight in United States industry, and there are millions more who are willing and able to hold down good jobs.

The Flag Speaks—An Essay by High School Student Winning Bill of Rights Speakers Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of having been heretofore granted unanimous consent so to do, I am pleased to present the text of what appears to me as a very unusual, pertinent, and constructive essay. I wanted you and all my other distinguished colleagues to read it. It was one of the award essays during Bill of Rights Week in Los Angeles County, Calif., especially in the great 23d

district which I have the honor to represent this my fifth term in this great legislative body.

With these remarks I also include the text of the award which was made to Marsha Caddell by the Bill of Rights Commemoration Committee.

It is appropriate I further refer to Miss Caddell as a senior of the South Gate High School in Los Angeles County, Calif., and that this winning essay was recited by her at many parent-teachers association meetings, high school and elementary student body assemblies, service clubs, and other community groups. She is a member of the Rainbow Girls, the YWCA, and is very active in her community church, is one of the student leaders of this great high school, and is also a member of the Future Teachers of America, and the California Scholarship Federation. Miss Caddell is one of the trained members of the public speaking class so ably directed by Mr. Ralph L. Beckett, faculty member.

I am honored to present this for your reading by reason of the written permission of Miss Marsha Caddell and her parents. I have had the pleasure of meeting her personally as she is one of the very patriotic, active young American citizens in my congressional district. I am sure you join with me in complimenting her upon this essay and its high achievement.

Bill of Rights speakers' award presented to Marsha Caddell.

In recognition of your participation in the Bill of Rights speakers' program, dedicated to the preservation of the American way of life as contained in this historical document.

Awarded by the Bill of Rights Commemoration Committee.

JOE CRAIL,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 1954.

THE FLAG SPEAKS

(By Marsha Caddell, 8452 San Carlos, South Gate, Calif., senior at South Gate, Los Angeles County, Calif., High School)

As I rise and look over my land I think I am the proudest, strongest, and bravest flag of any flag in the world. I grew up with my country. I remember I had but 13 stars and now I have forty-eight; my country only had 10 amendments now she has 22.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution are called the Bill of Rights. Though some Americans don't realize it, they are the foundation of our liberties. Within these 10 amendments are the words that make my people free. Religions of any kind are accepted in my country, be they Catholic, Protestant, or Jew. The people are free to speak their opinions and their homes cannot be searched without a warrant or soldiers cannot be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner. Every person is entitled to a speedy public trial and may not be subject for the offense twice.

In my country all people are created equal and excessive bail shall not be required nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted regardless of race, creed, or financial position. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury.

As great and far-reaching as the Bill of Rights is, it cannot assure my people the perfect political and social order without their help. My people are guaranteed freedom of speech, but are not guaranteed that truth will always be spoken. It assures them trial by jury, but it cannot assure them the fact that jurors will always return just verdicts. It gives them the right to vote, but it does not guarantee them that they will cast intelligent ballots. They are guaranteed the right to hold and be elected to public office, but are not guaranteed competence, ability, or honesty. These things my people must guarantee for themselves.

Many people in my country don't appreciate the freedoms they have. They should always remember that their Government was created for protecting their rights. They must guard their rights, if need be, with their lives, or they may find them taken away. They must fight for freedom, not only their freedom, but the freedom of every American. They must fight as hard as they can, and as long as they live.

In the days ahead, there will be a struggle between those who believe in individual freedom, and those who would subordinate the individual to the dictates of government. There will be a struggle, too, between those who would transfer even greater powers to the Federal Government and those who would stand by the Bill of Rights. All my people are called upon to solve these problems.

It's wonderful to fly above free people in a free land. I should know. I am the flag of the United States of America.

Program for Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the April 21, 1955, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

PROGRAM FOR POLIO VACCINE

At least three points about the Salk polio vaccine need to be cleared up fast to relieve public anxiety and impatience.

First, the country should be given an accurate statement on supplies and be assured that everything humanly possible is being done to get maximum production at once from the pharmaceutical laboratories.

Second, it is essential to have an equitable system of distribution to make sure that the vaccine goes first to those regions and age groups in most immediate need. Time is an urgent factor; everybody wants immunity for the greatest possible number with all haste. There will have to be priorities, but it would be comforting for parents to know how soon all 60 million children under age 20 can be inoculated.

Third, ability to pay must not be a consideration. No child should be deprived of the vaccine by economic reasons. This is a public health matter. Government, doctors, and the drug manufacturers as well have an overpowering obligation.

It is perhaps understandable that a certain amount of confusion has risen. The discovery of a great boon has brought emergency problems of unpreparedness. Not even the experts seem to have fully appreciated the universal appeal or all the complexities of putting the vaccine to work on a quick and fair basis. Of course, it can be said that the problems of application are comparatively short-range and that in the long view the battle against polio has already been substantially won. But this is no time for anything resembling equanimity. Even one child killed or crippled by polio this year through lack of money or effective organization is too much.

Tomorrow there will be a conference at the White House to review the facts and presumably to decide on a course of action. The choice is apparently between some form of control or going on with confusion. It seems to us that a program of supervision is essential. Federal sponsorship may be necessary, or perhaps the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis can be placed in charge. But this immediate problem is too big to be left to chance.

It must be settled fairly and firmly in a manner that will inspire public confidence. And, above all, the solution must be found at once.

Mental Health Study Act of 1955

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration House Joint Resolution 256 providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I would not impose upon the Members at this late hour of the day if it were not for three particular things I would like to say.

In the first place I would like pay a very sincere tribute to the chairman of our committee and the ranking member of our committee, both of whom for many years have been interested in and actively advocating constructive, farsighted legislation in the field of health. I know that this particular bill, as the chairman of the committee said during the course of his remarks, constitutes one of the major pieces of legislation we will enact at this session.

Second, I want to point out for the RECORD, so there will not be any misapprehension, and I do not think anybody has referred to it, that the American Medical Association was represented before us through witnesses who heartily endorsed this particular legislation, so there is no controversy on it from that point of view.

Thirdly, I want to read a brief excerpt from the report which struck me as I heard it as one of the most encouraging things that could be said in regard to handling this terrible problem of mental health. Dr. Daniel Blain, medical director of the American Psychiatric Association, said:

The despair that consigned the mentally ill to simple custody for life in mental institutions is rapidly being displaced by the realization that mental illness is not hopeless and that the great majority of the mentally ill can be treated and returned to the community in a relatively short period of time.

• • • • •

Another most auspicious change in people's thinking lies in the general trend

toward deemphasizing the conventional mental hospital as an almost exclusive tool for dealing with mental illness. This has been in no small measure due to the wisdom of the Congress in encouraging the development of community clinic services under the National Mental Health Act and through the Veterans' Administration. Increasingly, the mental hospital is thought of as merely part of a network of community services, all of them designed to forestall or prevent hospitalization if possible, and to shorten it if not.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am particularly glad that the gentleman mentioned the services performed by the chairman of our committee and the ranking minority member of the committee. I have been a member of this committee for many years and it is impossible to imagine two men with greater zeal on these health problems than our chairman and our former chairman. Their efforts have been tireless and ceaseless and at all times intelligent and constructive.

Mr. HESELTON. I thoroughly subscribe to what the gentleman has said and I express the hope that at long last we will find that this action which has been initiated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] will be called by their proper names.

Cut This Down to Size

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News under date of April 22, 1955:

CUT THIS DOWN TO SIZE

The time has come for the United States to end foreign giveaways and replace them with trade easements, private investment, and technical assistance.

On the military side, our free grants should be restricted to nations which have stood up to be counted on our side.

Many Americans who thought the pending expiration of the Foreign Operations Administration meant the end of ladling out gratis economic dollars were disappointed by President Eisenhower's message to Congress Wednesday.

This envisaged starting another big giveaway program, this time in Asia. We already have sunk billions in that area down a rat hole. Congress should cut the requested $3,530,000,000 nearly half, leaving in armed assistance to proved friends like South Korea and Turkey, and maintaining "point four" technical aid programs so that underdeveloped countries can get on their own feet. Most of these peoples are looking for jobs, not charity.

Furthermore, a much greater proportion of our assistance should be routed to our friends, the deserving Latin American republics.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Proclamation of Free and Independent Ukrainian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated March 5, 1955, which I have received from Dr. N. Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota State branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., on the subject of the recent celebration of the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of A Free and Independent Ukrainian Republic, together with a radio address delivered by Dr. Zukowsky on January 23, 1955, on the same subject.

There being no objection, the letter and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 5, 1955.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am taking the liberty of writing you regarding our recent celebration of the 37th anniversary of the Proclamation of Free and Independent Ukrainian Republic, and 36th anniversary of act of union of all Ukrainian territories in one independent and indivisible state.

Radio programs, special church services, and other celebrations were held in North Dakota during January, with newspapers carrying publicity on these events commemorating Ukrainian independence.

This proclamation was issued by the Ukrainian Parliament, the Central Council on the 22d day of January 1918, in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine. The free and independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by countries all over the world, among them Russia, which soon afterward attacked the independent state.

The love of democracy and freedom lives on in the suppressed Ukraine, for, although the republic was shortlived and fell under the forcible occupation of the Russian Communists in 1922, the resistance of the Ukrainian people to Communist totalitarianism has not ceased until this day.

At the same time our committee had the opportunity to read the staff reports of the Subcommittee To Study the U. N. Charter of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In this series of studies (particularly in staff study No. 4) Ukraine is referred to in comparison with Texas, i. e., that Ukraine is as much a part of the Soviet Union as Texas is of the United States. Moreover, the study urges the exclusion of Ukraine from the U. N. on the basis that it is not a nation but a part of the Soviet Union.

This sort of thinking is, of course, completely without basis, since Ukraine in the international sense was and is a nation in itself. It has been recognized by the great powers, including Soviet Russia, England, France, and others throughout its history. To disclaim its status as a nation simply because it is under Soviet Russian tyranny would necessitate the exclusion of Czechoslovakia and Poland from the U. N. because they are also under Soviet domination.

The object of the Soviet regime is to absorb cultures and nations in order that the peoples which they enslave would offer less resistance to their tyranny. Such a move on the part of the United States would greatly diminish the feelings of the enslaved Ukrainians toward this country, because they look upon America as an ally in their struggle. Were America to deny their very existence as a nation we would play into the hands of the Communists.

Enclosed is a copy of the speech I gave on January 23 by transcription over the Bismarck and Dickinson radio stations. Also is enclosed declarations signed by people at rallies held at Wilton and Belfield during January.

On behalf of our State branch of North Dakota, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., and the 20,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living in North Dakota, I would appreciate your inserting these statements, including this letter, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of public record.

We also urge you to consider these aspects of the question when the staff studies are reported to your committee.

Very sincerely yours,
Dr. A. ZUKOWSKY,
President, State Branch, UCCA, Inc.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION SPEECH—37TH ANNIVERSARY OF RENEWED UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Speech given by Dr. A. Zukowsky, president of State branch of UCCA, Inc., over stations KFYR, Bismarck, and KDIX, Dickinson, on January 23, 1955)

From coast to coast Americans of Ukrainian descent today are observing solemnly the 37th anniversary of the renewal of the independence of Ukraine which was proclaimed by the Ukrainian Parliament—the Central Council (Rada)—on January 22, 1918 in Kiev.

This celebration is not merely a Ukrainian one.

With the growth of understanding of the meaning of the celebration in America it increasingly becomes an American celebration. The governors of many American States, the mayors of many American cities proclaimed today as "Ukrainian Day."

So it was last year. So it was 2 years ago.

Today many of our States have raised the historical yellow and blue flag of independent Ukraine together with our Star-Spangled Banner to demonstate the identity of ideals which the two nations fought for under these flags.

What is the meaning of today's celebration for America? To find it we must look back into the yellowed pages of history and the blood-stained pages of the recent decades, and also look ahead into the future.

Ukraine is one of the oldest European nations, with a cultural and governmental tradition going back for more than a thousand years. This should no longer be news to any American. Many elaborate statements by eminent Americans about the glorious past of Ukraine can be found not only in books and articles but also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of recent years.

The Ukrainian people are a traditionally democratic nation having always cherished freedom above all material treasures, and having throughout many centuries never ceased to fight for it.

Through her vital geographical position, through her immeasurable wealth of natural resources, the fabulous richness of her soil—Ukraine was always the main object of aggression of her neighbors, whereas Ukraine fighting for her own rights never had any aggressive intentions toward others.

So the history of Ukraine is a history of an unafraid and determined struggle for freedom and independence, for the unification of all the Ukrainian territories in one free and independent Ukrainian state—a struggle which in recent history brought a short-lived but complete renewal of independence for Ukraine 37 years ago and the unification of all the Ukrainian territories in the Ukrainian Democratic National Republic on January 22, 1919.

It was then that the Ukrainian people rightfully and freely expressed their will concerning their state. And the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence of 37 years ago is as lawful and valid today and for the future as is our own American Declaration of Independence.

The fact that the tyrannical forces of Communist Russia have overrun the independent Ukrainian Republic does as little change the validity of this declaration as the fact that the predecessor of Communist Russia—Czarist Russia—brutally violated the Pereyaslav Treaty, which was exclusively a military alliance, has ever changed the historical right of Ukraine to independence.

The Ukrainian people, having the sole right to decide upon their own destiny, rightfully and freely decided 37 years ago. Therefore all discussion whether Ukraine should be federated with Russia or possibly torn apart for the convenience of her neighbors is now belated.

We repeat—the Ukrainian people have proclaimed their will when they were free to do so. So there was and there continues to be an independent Ukrainian state.

This state is enslaved now.

It is enslaved because there was no understanding of Ukraine's struggle against Communist Russia 3½ decades ago. Communist Russia now threatens the entire yet-free world. Ukraine was her first victim. There were many to follow years later: the Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and so on. There will be more if there will be no real understanding of the enslaved people here in the free world, particularly in America.

The Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives for the investigation of the Communist takeover and occupation of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. has given through eye-witness testimony ample evidence of the unlawful tyrannical rule of Soviet Russia in Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the other countries incorporated in the U. S. S. R.

Ukraine is our strongest ally behind the Iron Curtain; it is an ally which never stopped and will never stop fighting the enemy of human freedom. The Ukrainian people look for encouragement primarily from America, for they recognized long ago the identity of American and Ukrainian ideals.

The policy of liberation proclaimed by President Eisenhower is an essential part of our foreign policy. It is a part which will play a vital role in future developments of the world. And in designing this our policy, we should always keep in mind that Ukraine is the key problem of Europe, that as long as justice is not restored to Ukraine there will be no peace for the world.

Had we helped Ukraine when she fought Communist Russia so desperately 3½ decades ago, the world would be different today. There would be no Soviet Union, the life of millions and millions starved and tortured to death by this regime would have been spared, our American sons would not need to die in Korea, they would not have to perish in Communist prisons, there would be no fighting in Indochina, there would be no universal constant fear.

History has taught us a grave lesson. This lesson should have made the American people and their representatives aware of the importance of Ukraine. However, recent developments show that some of our otherwise outstanding legislators and politicians have not given this problem sufficient thought.

How else can we explain the recent proposals to alter the charter of the United Nations to exclude Ukraine and Byelorussia from membership in that organization, with the argument that this would reduce the voting strength of the Soviet Union and that Soviet Ukraine and Byelorussia are even so not independent?

Why not go even further and exclude all the nations of the Soviet bloc such as Poland or Czechoslovakia? At the present they are exactly as independent as Ukraine or Byelorussia are. Their representatives are all representatives of the Soviet Government, and none of them is the representative of his nation.

By excluding Ukraine and Byelorussia from membership in the United Nations, we would only hurt our strongest allies behind the Iron Curtain, showing them that we are going along with their enemies and denying their right to independence.

Ukraine and Byelorussia alone should not be excluded from the U. N. in order to leave the Soviet Union with two less votes, which, with the existence of the veto, would not improve the situation. In the event that the Soviet Union itself should be excluded, Ukraine and Byelorussia should remain as members, because they are victims of Soviet aggression.

Not the nations should be questioned, but their representatives. And we would gain immeasurably in our international position and moral strength if we would deny the acceptance of the present U. N. representatives of Ukraine and Byelorussia which were put there exactly as those of Poland or Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. This would leave their seats empty for the time being until their nations are liberated, or representation could be given to those who will really represent the Ukrainian and Byelorussian people, as the representatives of Nationalist China in the U. N. do now.

We should be able to realize that by questioning the right of Ukraine or Byelorussia to their place in the U. N. we make another fatal mistake. We would actually strengthen the Soviet Union by hurting our allies behind the Iron Curtain. Let us not repeat the ignorance of three and a half decades ago which has cost our Nation so many precious lives. If we are not actively helping our allies now, let us not discourage them by doing injustice.

The celebration of the anniversary of the renewal of Ukrainian independence is the occasion for us Americans to think of the future of the world, of the future of our America.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY DECLARATION

Thirty-seven years ago the Ukrainian people renewed their sovereign rights on Ukrainian territory.

The Ukrainian Parliament—the Central Council (Rada)—proclaimed the renewal of the independent Ukrainian state on the 22d of January 1918 in the capital—Kiev.

The free and independent Ukrainian National Democratic Republic was recognized by England, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Italy, the Vatican, Argentina, Georgia, the Don Cossack Republic, and Russia.

But continuing along the old path of Russian imperialism, Communist Moscow attacked the independent Ukrainian Republic and overran it despite the desperate resistance of the Ukrainian people. Thus the new republic became the first victim of Communist Russian aggression. It also became the first nation to resist the aggression of Communist Moscow which today threatens the entire still-free world.

The Ukrainian Government of the Independent Ukrainian Democratic Republic went into exile. Communist Moscow set up by force and violence the Communist regime and government in Ukraine.

But the people, faithful to their democratic traditions continue to fight against this regime and the Soviet Government.

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at the celebration of the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of independent and free Ukrainian Republic in Belfield, on January 23, appeal to the Government, representatives, and people of the United States of America to help the Ukrainian people to restore their own democratic government.

We declare that the proposal to exclude Ukraine from the United Nations is against the interests of our country, against our American policy of liberation. The present regime in Ukraine and its right to represent the Ukrainian people can and should be questioned. But no one can question the right of Ukraine to be a member of the United Nations.

N. M. PROKOP, *Chairman.*
FRANK KORDONOWY,
JOHN B. SHYPKOWSKI,
JOHN KYTYOR.

Dated January 23, 1955. Belfield, N. Dak.

True copy: I, the undersigned, certify that the above was typed from and compared with the original copy and is correct.

HENRY WILLIAMSON,
Notary Public, Kidder County, N. Dak.
My commission expires June 15, 1955.

JANUARY 23, 1955.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY DECLARATION

Thirty-seven years ago the Ukrainian people renewed their sovereign rights on Ukrainian territory.

The Ukrainian Parliament—the Central Council (Rada)—proclaimed the renewal of the Independent Ukrainian State on the 22d January 1918, in the capital—Kiev.

The free and independent Ukrainian National Democratic Republic was recognized by England, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Italy, the Vatican, Argentina, Georgia, the Don Cossack Republic, and Russia..

But continuing along the old path of Russian imperialism, Communist Moscow attacked the independent Ukrainian republic and overran it despite the desperate resistance of the Ukrainian people. Thus, the new republic became the first victim of Communist Russian aggression. It also became the first nation to resist the aggression of Communist Moscow which today threatens the entire still-free world.

The Ukrainian Government of the Independent Ukrainian Democratic Republic went into exile. Communist Moscow set up by force and violence the Communist regime and government in Ukraine.

But the people, faithful to their democratic traditions continue to fight against this regime and the Soviet Government.

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at the celebration of the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of the independent and free Ukrainian Republic in Wilton, N. Dak., on January 23, 1955, appeal to the Government, representatives and people of the United States of America to help the Ukrainian people to restore their own democratic government.

We declare that the proposal to exclude Ukraine from the United Nations is against the interests of our country, against our American policy of liberation. The present regime in Ukraine and its right to represent the Ukrainian people can and should be questioned. But no one can question the

right of Ukraine to be a member of the United Nations.

ALEX CHORNEY,
Chairman.
ANDREW DRIBNENKI,
NICH SALOGUK,
WILLIAM SAWICKI,
PAUL HRUBY.

True copy: Above copy was typed from and compared with original copy, and was found to be correct.

HENRY WILLIAMSON,
Notary Public, Kidder County, N. Dak.
My commission expires June 15, 1955.

What Price a Merchant Fleet?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a very commendable and concise booklet entitled "What Price a Merchant Fleet," which has been prepared by the committee of American Steamship Lines.

There being no objection, the text of the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE A MERCHANT FLEET?

Decisive action on the continued strength of our country's merchant shipping fleet will be taken soon by the 84th Congress when it considers recommendations from the President and the United States Maritime Administration for appropriations to maintain this fleet.

These appropriations, for the Government's fiscal 1956 year, include a request for $115 million required to meet contract obligations of the Administration with American-flag steamship companies. These obligations represent payments due under the terms of long-term operating differential subsidy contracts between the Government and the companies for regularly scheduled voyages over essential world trade routes.

The ships making these voyages are owned and operated by 16 United States-flag lines. They are modern, efficient ships. They form the hard-core nucleus of our Nation's oceangoing passenger and cargo fleet, so essential to our national security and our commercial welfare.

The $115 million needed for operating differential payments to this fleet in the fiscal year 1956 represents a reduction from the $125 million required for the fiscal year 1955.

Amounts in each year represent a substantial increase over appropriations in previous years, both before and since the end of World War II. To understand why such increases are necessary it is important, first, to know why our Government helps to maintain a United States-flag merchant fleet.

HOW, AND WHY, DOES GOVERNMENT SUPPORT SHIPPING?

Congress in 1936 recognized, and so stated in the preamble of the Merchant Marine Act, that "it is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that * * * the United States foster the development and encourage the maintenance of" a merchant marine.

In this act Congress also recognized that if America is to have a privately owned and operated merchant fleet this fleet must have Government financial support. This is so because America's standard of living is higher than any other in the world. American shipowners cannot pay United States wage, subsistence, shipbuilding, and other costs and still compete with foreign operators whose costs are much less.

In the rates they charge for cargoes American shipowners are competitive with foreign ships. These rates are usually arrived at through conference agreements in which both American and foreign shipowners have a voice. Operating within this rate structure, the foreign operator, with his lower costs, is able to make a profit. But the United States shipowner, with his higher operating costs, cannot maintain this competitive rate without Government assistance.

LAW ESTABLISHES PARITY FOR UNITED STATES SHIPPING

Recognizing this fact, Congress set up by law machinery whereby American ships can be placed on a parity basis with foreign ships through operating and construction differential payments. These payments are designed to make up the difference between foreign costs and United States costs.

Such assistance is available to American shipping lines if they meet certain rigid requirements, and if the need for the regular service they provide over essential world trade routes is established after careful Government investigation.

Sixteen United States-flag shipping companies have qualified for differential payments under the Government program.

Each regularly serves world trade routes needed to meet our country's commercial and national defense requirements.

Each receives parity payments on the basis of contract services rendered the Government over these trade routes.

Each company is an independent American enterprise, but also works in a unique partnership arrangement with Government.

Government payments do not guarantee these lines a profit, nor do they ensure against loss. Just as a golfer is assigned a handicap to enable him to participate on an even basis with his competition, so do steamship owners get payments to put them on a parity basis with their foreign competition. As the golfer can win or lose according to his skill, a steamship owner can profit or not according to his abilities and the fluctuations in his business.

The Government program of support for shipping is unique in an important way. It provides that the companies, when earnings permit, pay back to the Government all or part of the operating payments made them. This is the only Government aid-to-industry program that has this pay-back feature. It has resulted in substantial return payments to Government since the program began in 1936.

While it differs in method, our Government's program for assisting the maritime industry is duplicated by most other major maritime powers. Virtually all assist their merchant fleets through direct or indirect subsidy.

WHY HAVE SHIPPING APPROPRIATIONS INCREASED SINCE THE WAR?

One important reason is that the Government has been making payments on a backlog of unpaid subsidy obligations totaling some $120 million. Some of these go as far back as 7 years.

Because of this the appropriation requests for recent years were not in fact representative of actual requirements for those years. Congress and the Maritime Administration are fully aware of this past obligation and progress is being made in eliminating the backlog. As a result, Congress is being asked now to appropriate funds to pay these prior year commitments in addition to paying for current contract performance. The effect of this is shown in the adjoining chart depicting what share of recent Maritime Administration payments to shipping companies represent past-due obligations for prior years, and what represent current costs.

A second reason why maritime appropriations have increased is the general rise in costs. As the cost of living has gone up in recent years for everyone, so has the cost of doing business. American shipping costs, like those of other businesses, have increased tremendously since the war's end.

For example:

Comparisons of the costs for a fairly typical C–2 cargo ship operation show that monthly base wages have increased 77 percent since 1947.

Overtime wage costs for this ship are up 187 percent because overtime activity (affected by the establishment of a 40-hour workweek aboard ship) and rates have both increased substantially.

Cost of feeding the crew, supplying the ship, and maintaining and repairing it have gone up 124 percent.

In 1947 a United States freighter plying one of the world trade routes serviced by American-flag ships had an average voyage cost of $744 per day. The same vessel on the same voyage in 1953 operated at a cost of $1,324 a day.

The American shipowner repairs and maintains his ships in American yards, and at American rates for labor and for materials. This is one of the requirements of his contract with the Government.

He buys his supplies and his foodstuffs from American industry and agriculture.

His costs are therefore the product of the American economic system, and, compared to foreign systems, it is a high cost economy.

Increases in United States ship operation costs since the war have been far greater than any similar increases in foreign shipping. Postwar developments have served to widen even further the historical difference between United States and foreign costs, putting United States operators at more of a competitive disadvantage.

At the same time, the fact that American shipowners who operate under Government contract man, supply, repair, and maintain their ships with United States labor and materials is an essential part of our national policy for shipping. Only in this way can we maintain self-sufficiency as a seafaring power, and only in this way can we have available to the Nation all the integrated parts of a ship operating and building industry when those skills are needed.

The effect of this program on our national economy is considerable, both in terms of ship and shoreside employment, and payrolls, and expenditures that reflect themselves in every State of the Union. These shipping companies spend between $300 million and $400 million annually in supporting the domestic economy.

There are other factors that also have influenced higher operating payments by Government. As postwar world trade has developed American ships are making more voyages. There has been an increase in the number of Government-certified trade route operators, and consequently there have been more ships that qualify for support. Since the postwar resumption of subsidy payments to shipping there has been a significant increase in the number and size of our American-flag passenger fleet. This is desirable so that America can compete for passenger travel across the high seas, but it is vitally important to national defense because these passenger ships form a needed troop transport reserve. They are constructed so that they can be transformed quickly into troop carriers should the need arise.

IS THIS AN ESSENTIAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE?

It costs money to help maintain an American Merchant Marine, and the costs, as

shown, have grown in recent years. Is this an essential cost?

In the mission it performs, a fleet of United States cargo and passenger ships is vital to our national security. If we did not have American-flag ships our ability to defend our country and meet our worldwide commitments would be nullified.

Recognizing the essentiality of a merchant fleet for defense, it must also be recognized that appropriations to support this fleet have been relatively small in comparison with Department of Defense appropriations.

For the fiscal year 1955 defense appropriations totaled $35,500,000,000. Maritime appropriations (including the cost of operating and construction subsidies and all other maritime administration costs) totaled $175,900,000 * * * about one-half of 1 percent of our total defense budget. For fiscal 1956 the defense appropriations recommended by the President is $34 billion. For maritime it is $240,900,000 * * * less than three-quarters of 1 percent of the defense budget.

Dependent as our industrial society is upon world commerce and the imports of essential raw materials for our factories and our mills, we cannot survive without ships.

We import by ship two-fifths of our copper, and nearly a third of our lead and zinc, all classified as strategic minerals by the Munitions Board.

We are almost entirely dependent upon foreign sources for our tin, nickel, and platinum.

Of the 20 alloying elements necessary for steel production, the United States is deficient in about a dozen.

There are those who say that we can rely upon foreign shipping for thees imports and we need not maintain an American fleet. History has disproved this fallacy. Neither in peace nor in war can America depend upon foreign countries for its ocean transport. To do so under present world conditions would be to invite disaster.

Measured either by the standards of Government assistance to other segments of the American economy, or the individual cost to the taxpayer, the support program for shipping is modest. Its intent—to maintain a strong merchant fleet—is little different from other Government support programs designed to encourage and strengthen industry and agriculture. These take the form of parity payments to agriculture, depletion allowances for raw material producers in industry, and the accelerated depreciation and tax writeoff aspects of defense industries, all in the national interest.

Shipping lines that participate in the support program have been and are acutely aware of the rising costs of their operations and the attendant possible increased cost of Government support. They are engaged in aggressive programs to promote trade and to reduce costs ashore and afloat. At the same time they have increased freight rates where practicable.

Through trade promotion and advertising they increase cargo carryings and encourage passenger travel, thereby improving profit opportunities. This in turn reduces the need for Government assistance.

A recent survey shows that in the 4-year period, 1950–53, these lines spent in excess of $48 million to promote and develop trade and travel. An additional $14.5 million was spent in advertising. The lines maintain offices in every State and every major marketing area of the world, and their ships fly the American flag in ports around the globe.

The undersigned steamship companies through their sizable capital investments have a corporate stake in seeing that the Government support program is responsive to the present-day needs of American shipping.

But they, as all citizens, also have a patriotic interest in seeing that our country continues to maintain a strong merchant fleet in view of our commitments for the mutual defense of the free nations and our national dependence upon foreign trade.

The need for expanded world commerce is now receiving the close attention of Congress. It has the endorsement of President Eisenhower who, in his foreign economic policy message on January 10, 1955, said:

"The Nation's enlightened self-interest and sense of responsibility as a leader among the free nations require a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for the fuller operation of the forces of free enterprise and competitive markets.

"Our own self-interest requires such a program because

"(1) Economic strength among our allies is essential to our security;

"(2) Economic growth in underdeveloped areas is necessary to lessen international instability growing out of vulnerability of such areas to Communist penetration and subversion;

"(3) An increasing volume of world production and trade will help assure our own economic growth and a rising standard of living among our own people."

An indispensable element in this program is a strong American-flag merchant shipping fleet. Adequate appropriations to maintain this fleet and to meet the Government's contract obligations are an investment in the solvency and security of the United States.

COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN STEAMSHIP LINES

American Export Lines, Inc.; American Mail Line, Ltd.; American President Lines, Ltd.; Farrell Lines, Inc.; Grace Lines, Inc.; Gulf and South American Steamship Co.; Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc.; Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc.; Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; Pacific-Argentine-Brazil Line; Pacific Far East Line, Inc.; Pacific Transport Lines, Inc.; Seas Shipping Co., Inc.; Oceanic Steamship Co.; United States Lines Co.

Office of the committee: 1701 K Street, NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Freedom of Information as Related to the Legislative Branch of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of appearing on a panel of the American Society of Newspaper Editors to discuss the freedom of information as related to the legislative branch of the Government. I was the moderator of the panel.

Participating were William R. Matthews, publisher and editor of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., and V. M. Newton, Jr., managing editor of the Tampa Tribune of Tampa, Fla.

Little could be added to the discussion in this area which was not reflected in the papers read by the participants and myself. I believe, however, that the diversified points of view should prove of interest and benefit, especially in these particular times when there is every indication that censorship is the signpost on the road from the Pentagon.

I am presenting the statements by the participants and myself in the order which they were delivered and without comment. Each speaks for itself.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OF LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS ON A DISCUSSION PANEL OF THE RIGHT OF THE PRESS TO KNOW ABOUT LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Members of the panel, I appreciate this opportunity of participating in this discussion. As you know, I have been for many years identified with legislative inquiries. For the last 5 years, consecutively, I have been either chairman or ranking member of an investigating subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. I should like to state to you, therefore, my view of the right of the press to have access to the information obtained in these inquiries.

I stand flatly upon the proposition that the legislative business must be conducted in the open; and for dissemination of information to the public so that, in our democratic system, the weight of an informed public opinon will support and sustain legislative action.

That is a declaration of the principle and a practice which I have followed in Congress. I am supported by the long standing and historical rules of the House of Representatives. The House rules provide that "all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except when the committee is marking up bills (and that, of course, means actually agreeing on the text of legislation as distinguished from legislating) or for voting (and, of course, that provision is obvious) or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session."

Thus, the House has by established usage limited executive (or closed) sessions to these three classes of matters.

The House has lately added an additional rule relating to the circumstances under which an executive session may be called, in the first instance, as follows:

"If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall (1) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; (2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and (3) receive and dispose of requests from such persons to subpena such additional witnesses."

These rules are almost identical with the rules of our subcommittee.

I have referred to these rules to indicate our tradition in the Congress for open hearings. I support that usage in a democracy for the reason that the objective of any inquiry in the Congress must be the improvement of the legislative process or the need for legislative action, corrective or otherwise.

That purpose can only be served, in my opinion, when the weight of public opinion fortifies the findings of a legislative body. Obviously no such opinion can be formed unless the public has access to information. It is upon the public and to the public that the legislature must look for its support.

Bear in mind that the Congress cannot and is not charged under the Constitution with the enforcement of laws. It has neither the facility nor the continuity to provide for enforcement. In the case of the House, its tenure is marked by the constitutional limit of a 2-year term. Thus, the House especially must depend, as the whole of the Congress must depend, upon a clear and adequate understanding by the public of its legislative concerns, facts, and recommendations. Anything short of that norm is self-defeating.

However, there are some other very plain constitutional principles involved. While we demand unity for the public good, we respect and intend to protect the right to diversity of thought.

The right to differ within the framework of the law is as American as the soil on which we walk and the flag under which we live. The application of that principle is entitled to a full constitutional protection and must be respected in every forum, be it legislative, executive, or judicial.

The American right to differ is expressed and protected in the principle that a person because of diversity of view, or misfortune, ought not to be intimidated, defamed, or degraded in a public forum against his will. So the whole of it, in my very simple view, gets down not to a question of the right of the public to know, but to the duty of the public to protect all of its citizens, great and small, uniformly and effectively.

On the other hand, I believe we must be sparing, judicious, and conscientious in the application of the rule of secrecy; and that there are times when even this personal privilege must be subordinated when the good to be accomplished outweighs the strictly personal consideration.

For example, an individual having a contract with the Government certainly must expect that everything in relation to the contract is and ought to be a public matter.

If in the process of investigating such a relationship an individual is concerned, certainly the public interest in the enforcement of the laws of the contract between the Government and its citizens or the need for reformation of laws or regulations as disclosed by such ventures is a legitimate subject for public consideration.

Thus stated, in my very simple view, every argument stands for the disclosure of the legislative investigations. Yet I think no one would disagree with what we placed in our rules.

There have been, however, certain practices which, in my view, are to be condemned. I do not believe it is the contribution to the public good to turn a hearing of the Congress into a stage performance with the actors preening themselves before the camera; and with the viewers taking over the conduct of the proceedings. The information elicited at these hearings is for other purposes than entertainment. That type of hearing gets itself into the postion where the reproduction of the hearing becomes more important than the subject under inquiry.

In our subcommittee we do not deny any member of the press the right of access to the hearings not to any member of the pictorial media the right to reproduce what is to be seen at the hearings. On the other hand, it makes a mockery of a legislative process to have a hearing interrupted during its course by the taking of pictures or television cameras or other unseemly interruptions. In my opinion, it serves no legitimate legislative purpose. There are many hours in a day during which actors can perform outside the legislative halls.

Now, a word about release of information in executive sessions. We have provided by rule that no one member and no group of members, only a majority of our subcommittee may release the text of any such information.

Finally, I think I must say in complete candor that the dignity and decorum, the dispatch and the demeanor of persons at a hearing, are in every instance but the length and shadow of the judgment and discretion, the restraint and the capacity of the chairman and the committee conducting the inquiry. No law and few rules can cope with every human quirk. But the healthy and wholesome use of the gavel by the chairman can enforce the rules and can keep hearings within the bounds of propriety, good conduct, and public decency. And that can be done without doing violence either to the principle of open and fair dealings or full and frank discussion.

Mr. Matthews followed me with this statement:

Let me reassure you that I am an ardent worker for freedom of information. For nearly a lifetime I have been battling in its behalf as a fighter on the firing line. Some of the battles I have won; some I have lost. Most of them could have been evaded had I followed an easy-going, disinterested policy. They have cost me money and they have cost me heartaches. As long as I have a breath to breathe I will continue this same vigorous policy.

From this experience I have learned some lessons, some of them painful and some disillusioning. That is why I challenged Russ Wiggins' report a year ago. My experience has taught me that there are limits to where news media can go; limits to what they can demand in the way of freedom of information.

For instance, as a newspaper editor I insist that no news media has a right to invade the privacy of any American home or family life. That goes for the lowliest, and it reaches up to the Roosevelts and the Eisenhowers. I insist there is a right of privacy on personal and family matters that is a precious and indispensable part of the right of freedom.

These limits apply to legislative and administrative processes, from school boards up through Congress. There was a time, when I was a young crusader, that I denounced executive sessions of our city council. When such a demand worked to the advantage of articulate demagogs, while hindering rather than helping good government, I modified my stand.

Reporters of Tucson newspapers sit in on the executive sessions now but they scrupulously refrain from writing any comment on what goes on. We maintain always the fundamental policy that the public is entitled to know what is done at official meetings of any public body.

Legislatures and our Congress are entitled to a varying amount of privacy in the work done by their committees. If committees are to function in a way that will command respect for democratic government, they must be able to do much of their work in privacy.

Important committees, such as the Committee on Appropriations, have an enormous job to do. To insist that the press and the public have a right to sit in on all such meetings ignores the give and take, the compromises that must be made, and the massive amount of detail work that must be done. Members have to be able to think aloud without the fear that some speculative question might make them look ludicrous to the public. They must be able to bargain with their fellow members. Bargains and compromises cannot be made unless much of this speculative thinking goes on. Compromises require all committee members to give in, in order to reach a conclusion. Able and sincere committee members could easily be made to look foolish by making concessions to expedite the work of the committee.

On the other hand, demagogs, of which every legislative body has a surplus, would thrive on seeing their sensational charges, their eloquent pleadings, and their irresponsible chatter, publicized. The committee is one place where they can be shut off. The floor of a legislative body is the place where they have ample opportunity to glorify themselves with their loose talk.

After all, the work of a committee is a necessary administrative procedure designed to formulate what is a proposition, a resolution, for debate upon the floor of the legislative body. With a bicameral legislature the records will show these resolutions are subject to debate and most of them are amended in some form before they become law. From what I have seen of legislative work, democratic government will be harmed, not bettered, by any requirements that all committee meetings be open and the votes of the members recorded. Members may vote one way on a committee in order to facilitate a report, and vote another way on the floor of the legislative body.

The fact is that any mandatory requirements on open meetings can be dodged by unofficial meetings in homes, clubs, hotel rooms, and private offices. No law can prohibit them. This process is used from time to time, even now, by leading members of some committees who want to thrash out their differences by frank discussion.

Much as I insist on this right of privacy of committees, I insist with equal emphasis that it is not an absolute right. There are many times when committee meetings should be open. There are times when responsible parties like the press have the right to appear and to ask questions, to demand reports, in behalf of the public welfare. Those are the times when a newspaper should take the initiative in performing a public duty, instead of begging for some law to prevent what it wants on a platter. Those are the times when editorial judgment has to be used.

As my time grows short, let me sum up:

1. I am a vigorous exponent of freedom of information, but I have learned from long experience that there are limits to what can be demanded. I am unqualifiedly opposed to this doctrine of absolute rights. A tendency of so many of us Americans to think in terms of absolutes is one of our big weaknesses.

2. The limits on freedom of information cannot be defined with a rigid line because situations vary. Editors should be expected to put their abilities, their spirit of fair play and public interest to work. Committees must have privacy to perform their routine work.

3. The decisions and the minutes of all legislative and administrative bodies should be made public or available to responsible parties.

4. Meetings of legislative committees and administrative boards should be open on demand by any responsible party where specific information on questions of high public importance should be made available.

5. Public documents, excluding the errata of informal office memoranda, should be made available to the public, when publication does not impair national security.

6. At this time, when we are doing so much shouting about freedom of information, I cannot help remarking how some of those who have done the loudest shouting boiled over in indignation at the publication of the Yalta papers.

In my opinion, the Potsdam and Cairo documents should be produced. They are historical records. National security is not involved. Unless we are now starting to write our histories so as to protect some and glorify others, the way the totalitarian powers do, these documents should be published. Some of us who took part in these great events of the past generation would like to know, before we die, what really went on.

Is this too hot a question for our own Freedom of Information Committee to handle Or must hot issues be avoided?

I think our committee ought to get busy on it, and so should those responsible for Washington news coverage, instead of waiting for a New York newspaper to crack the barrier.

Mr. Newton closed with the following remarks:

Fifteen minutes, the time allotted me here, is hardly time enough to penetrate the secrecy which enshrouds Federal Government,

as any Washington correspondent will tell you today.

During 1953, congressional committees held 3,105 meetings and a survey shows that 1,357, or 44 percent, were secret meetings held behind locked doors with press and public barred.

During 1954, congressional committees held 3,002 meetings and 1,231, or 41 percent, were held behind locked doors.

Few of these secret meetings dealt with defense or security affairs. Instead, they dealt with virtually every matter before Congress. Nearly every one of the Appropriations Committee meetings, in which our public servants decided how to spend the citizen's tax funds, was held in secrecy.

Much of this legislation conceived and congealed behind the locked doors of these secret congressional committee meetings was railroaded through Congress with a minimum of debate and with little opportunity for the restraint of public opinion to be exerted. Actually, some of it did not see the light of public print until it became law.

In my correspondence with Members of the United States Senate over this matter, Senator JENNER, of Indiana, at that time chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, wrote me last April as follows:

"Another reason for the railroading of legislation through Congress is the very large role played in legislation by the bureaucracy of the executive branch. They frequently draft the bills. They write the arguments for the bills. They fill the RECORD of hearings on bills. They have supporting groups which come in and testify to the approved line. Ordinary citizens cannot meet such well-financed, well-organized competition. It may appear as if the sentiment is all in one direction on a bill and Congress hears little or no objection, and so moves quickly to pass it."

Now when you add Senator JENNER's damning statement to the fact that nearly half of all congressional committee meetings are held secretly behind locked doors, you can reach only the conclusion that the ordinary American citizen has very little to say about our legislation. Under such a system, the ordinary American citizen is deprived by his elected representatives of his inherent right to exert constantly the pressure of public opinion upon his free Government. And any student of history soon learns that free government cannot long last in such secrecy.

Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, wrote me that the secret committee meetings were necessary to mark up bills and to prevent the Congressmen from being self-conscious and from dropping into oratory. Yet it is in the same peace and quiet of these secret meetings that amendments are tacked onto the bills and other changes made that the American people should know about at the time and not after the fact, when too often it has been too late.

Senators HOLLAND, of my Florida, SMITH of Maine, PAYNE, DIRKSEN, GILLETTE, WELKER, ELLENDER, and HENDRICKSON expressed great and tender concern over the danger of needlessly ruining the reputations of witnesses and appointees before public meetings of the committees. But what about the case of Harry Dexter White, the Communist spy? His appointment was considered and confirmed in a secret meeting of a Senate committee and then railroaded through Congress. How in the world can the interests of the American people be properly protected unless all the facts are made public at the time and not after the fact, as in the case of White?

Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, wrote me that he felt the American people would be more informed if their legislators are allowed to work in the privacy of their own arguments. Isn't this the modern philosophy in Federal Government today, that Government belongs to our public servants, and that the American people are entitled only to that information which our public servants think they should have?

Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, wrote me that the secret meetings were necessary to protect our Congressmen from the bureaucrats and the lobbyists. But what about the protection of the American people from those same bureaucrats and lobbyists? What about giving the people a look at the bureaucrats and lobbyists in action?

Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, wrote me that the publicizing of the committee's work prior to final decision, and I use his exact words, "might lead the citizen into actions harmful to himself." In reply, I asked the Senator if he could name just one case in all history where free, open government, under the constant restraint of an alert and informed public, has "led the citizen into actions harmful to himself." On the other hand, any student can dig out of the pages of history thousands of cases wherein the politician, acting behind the locked doors of secret government, really dealt the citizen a knockout punch.

Senator BENNETT, of Utah, wrote that it would be impossible for our Congressmen to reach a compromise in a public committee meeting. This poses an interesting question. Does free American government today consist of nothing more than a secret compromise between two political parties without the restraint of the people's opinion? Isn't this a sad commentary on free government, anyway you look at it?

Later in our correspondence, Senator BENNETT wrote that if the congressional committee meetings were opened to the public, it would force the committees to adjourn to secret meetings in so-called smoke-filled rooms. In reply, I wrote that a group of Congressmen meeting unofficially in a smoke-filled room would have no official power whatsoever. They could not draw a bill; they could not vote on a bill; they could reach no official decision. And if the American people ever tumbled to the fact that our legislation was being cooked up in a smoke-filled room, I am sure that we would have a new set of public servants in Congress after the next election.

Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, suggested that I propose the plan of open meeting to the board of directors of my newspaper and invite the reporters of competitive newspapers to sit in on all meetings of our board of directors. In reply, I reminded the Senator that American citizens, through considerable taxation, are stockholders in their Government and had the right to check on the actions of their public servants just as the stockholders of a newspaper have the right to check on the actions of their board of directors.

Senator IVES, of New York, wrote me that the quiet atmosphere, divorced from the temptation of public expression or political maneuver to gain advantage in the eyes of the public was much more efficient than a public sounding board. In reply, I asked this question: Which is better for the people, the harmony of the secret communistic government in Russia, or the turbulence of free, open democratic government in America? I think the answer to this question also would answer all of the questions involved in the quiet atmosphere of any secret meeting in government. We cannot afford to sacrifice the basic freedom of our country for expediency or because another way is speedier, easier, or more efficient. The world's history shows that once you sacrifice freedom, you regain it only through bloodshed.

Of the 62 Senators with whom I corresponded on this matter, only 25 stated they were for open committee meetings. And only 11 had the courage to state outright that they were opposed to the open meetings. The others hemmed about this qualification or hawed about that reservation. Thirty did not even condescend to answer my original letter.

Now, 25 Senators are not a very high percentage of the free world's greatest legislative body in favor of the free people's inherent right to know about their Government. And it is with great sadness that I tell you, after a number of years struggling with this national problem, that many other people, including some within our profession, think that a little secret government is all right.

Yet we can no more have a little secret government than we can have a little freedom, a little justice, or a little morality. Of course, we do not have absolute freedom, absolute justice, or absolute morality today. Yet our adherence to these great absolute principles, even though we yield a little here or compromise a little there in actual practices, has give the world the greatest free civilization of all time.

And I tell you with great personal conviction that should we ever veer away from our absolute principles of freedom, justice and morality, even though we occasionally compromise them in practice and in deference to human frailties, we will consign the great American experiment to that limbo of fallen civilizations.

So I tell you also, with equal conviction, that we in the newspaper profession are deeply obligated, under the precepts of free government, to fight with all our might for the absolute principle of freedom of information; for it is only through upholding that absolute principle, in the face of human frailties, that a free people can be guaranteed the maximum of information of government, so necessary to retention of freedom.

Speaking of human frailties, I am reminded of a school board in South Georgia, which closed its doors to both press and public last year. In defending the board's action, its chairman announced to the press, and I use his exact words:

"You are crazy if you think we are going to wash our dirty linen in public."

It is a great pity that we do not have such unadulterated honesty in our Federal Government today. There is, for instance, the question of our national security. No editor of the free American press will question the right of the free American Government to withhold that news which would endanger national security and give aid and comfort to the enemy. But every editor will question the right of the Federal politician to abuse this privilege by the withholding of legitimate news in the name of national security but which has nothing to do with national security.

Last May the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee locked its doors and held secret deliberations on the bill for a separate Air Academy. I wrote Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, then the chairman of the committee, about the matter of these locked doors. He replied that this was a classified matter and then he arrogantly demanded to know what right I had even in writing him. Yet as an American citizen who pays taxes, I could not help but wonder what political pressures were being exerted back of those locked doors, first by rival armed services, and second, over the matter of a site for the new academy. And certainly the complete revelation of all the facts and discussions on this important matter would not have given aid and comfort to the enemy.

I could go on for hours and hours citing similar cases wherein our Federal politicians have abused their privileges in the regulations to protect our national security. But my time is limited and before I close, I would like to dwell for a moment upon what the precedent of secret Government in our

Congress has done to the rest of American Government.

Our Congressmen may think a little secret Government in their committees is all right, yet this precedent has so spread in Washington today that we have developed a new philosophy of government. In most of our 2,000 Federal executive agencies and bureaus, Government largely is conducted behind the locked doors of the secret executive session; legitimate facts and records of Government are withheld; and the people are spoon-fed information only in the form of handout releases from Government press agents, which often are propaganda carefully devised to promote and prolong the political life and interests of the officeholder. More and more, our public servants, once elected or appointed, assume that the people's business is their private domain and that any critical voice raised against this philosophy is that of a deadly enemy.

Sixteen months ago President Eisenhower revised President Truman's Executive order giving the right to certain Federal officials to withhold facts of Government in behalf of national security. He eliminated the classification "restricted" but retained the three classifications of "confidential," "secret," and "top secret."

This should have released a mass of information, particularly from the Department of Defense, but it didn't work out this way. On June 1, 1954, a Department of Defense directive created a new classification for official use only, and it set forth the purpose to assure the proper custody, preservation and use of official information which requires protection in the public interest.

The Department of State a short time later adopted this same new classification of for official use only, and then stamped it upon even its press clippings.

But, in view of the precedent of congressional committee secrecy on matters of the people's business not concerned with national security, why shouldn't our other Federal governmental agencies protect the public by barring the people from even looking at the press clippings they save?

Why shouldn't the appointed public servants of the executive branch of our Government lock out the people from their procedures if the elected public servants of the legislative branch can get away with it? Where shall we draw the line on a little secret government?

Furthermore, the congressional precedent of secrecy is spreading to the lower levels of American Government. And, when a Georgia school board and North Carolina legislators rise up and announce that they are going to deliberate their people's business in secrecy just so long as Congress deliberates the American people's business in committee secrecy, then I say in all sincerity that the time has come for our Congressmen to examine their consciences over the matter of freedom of information, or the American people's right to know about their Government.

Thank you.

Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4644) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, out of a sense of simple justice I am impelled to urge prompt passage of this bill, H. R. 4644, designed to extend a reasonable cost of living pay adjustment to our postal employees.

We all know that whenever the cost of living rises, as it has been doing for the past several years, persons with fixed incomes suffer the most. Some workers can obtain raises to offset at least a portion of the increased cost of living, but those whose incomes are stationary or whose salaries are set by law have serious trouble trying to keep up with rising prices and maintain their family on a decent living scale.

Such is the current predicament of our Federal employees. Their salaries are set by law, and it takes action by the Congress to raise their compensation. An important consideration in this connection is that while Federal employees may organize, they are not allowed to strike; and, to have the record present the truth on this subject, let us remind ourselves that they have never shown any disposition to strike. They have been content to rely upon a sense of fair play on the part of Congress and the general public.

May I also remind you that the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and practically extend them adequate salary compensation.

It is only ordinary commonsense and recognition of the facts of life that if our Government employees are sufficiently compensated to enable them to reasonably meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist ideas.

Two Hundred and Twenty-five Million Dollars for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 21, 1955:

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLARS FOR HOUSING

The soundness of New York City's future in many respects, social and economic, depends on the clean-up of slums and the satisfactory supply of decent housing. Hence we welcome the $225 million housing plans, combining Federal and city aid, approved by the board of estimate.

Of the 14,915-family apartment units proposed 8,230 in nine projects would be federally subsidized low-rent dwellings. These might rent for about $10.50 a room and would be limited ordinarily to families whose income ranged from $3,000 to $3,700, depending on the number of children. The subsidy goes to keeping down the rent. The city housing authority pays yearly to the city, in lieu of real-estate taxes, an amount of money equal to about 10 percent of rental income after light and gas.

The no-cash-subsidy part of the new program will provide 6,685 dwelling units in 8 projects at a rental of perhaps $20 to $22 a room. Income limits to be eligible for these apartments have not yet been set, but similar, though less expensively constructed, housing allowed family income to range between $4,100 and $5,400, also depending on size of the family. The city receives taxes based on the value of the site (plus improvements) when acquired at the tax rate then current.

Neither of these types of public housing is an innovation. The no-cash-subsidy plan was used in the O'Dwyer regime. But the policy of combining low-rent and middle-income housing in the same area, as is planned in some cases, is a constructive departure. This should create a better-rounded community, and be a greater stimulation to improvement of the surrounding area.

Warren Moscow, executive director of the city housing authority, invites private capital to come in and supplant the city as builder of any of the middle-income projects under the newly liberalized tax-relief housing legislation approved by Governor Harriman. There is still plenty of work for private and public capital to do for housing in New York, and there is—we are happy to say—a great deal of building underway. There are sound reasons for the optimism Mayor Wagner expressed in a speech early this week about the city's future. The present stage of troubled self-examination and expenditure of greater exertion in several fields may later be seen to have been a turning point for the better.

Favor Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters in support of the Hells Canyon Dam as a multiple power and irrigation project.

Following is the full text of the resolution:

Whereas Senate bill 1333, introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and 22 other Senators, proposes the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon which would develop the full hydroelectric potential of the site and, in addition, it would provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas the erection of a high dam at Hells Canyon would be far superior to the proposal of building a series of low dams: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters, assembled in semiannual meeting in Madison, Wis., on April 21, 1955, go on record favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1333 and the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Wisconsin Representatives in Congress and to the Nation Hells Canyon Association, 1135 East Salmon Street, Portland, Oreg.; to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; to Senator WAYNE MORSE; and to the general office of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America at Indianapolis, Ind.

Editorial Tribute to Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State System of Higher Education, under the able direction of Chancellor Charles D. Byrne, has stood firm for academic freedom and open discussion, in having Bishop G. Bromley Oxman and Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer speak on the Oregon campuses.

Despite the threats and attempts to stifle free discussion by a small minority, Oregon, unlike her neighboring State university, has stood firm.

Bishop Oxnam spoke in Portland at Portland State College, under the auspices of Methodist Bishop A. Raymond Grant, an outstanding churchman and religious leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial of April 14, 1955, from the Register-Guard, of Eugene.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SUBVERSIVE WAS THE BISHOP?

The Eugene Freedom Club, in a mimeographed bulletin circulated by mail, criticizes this newspaper for incomplete reporting. The club complains that our precede stories about the university appearance of Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam failed to include specific information about the subversive organizations and publications with which he had been associated. To a degree we plead guilty. At the same time we look askance at the report of the Freedom Club. Charges, we think, should not be published without an answer to those charges, when such answers are available.

It is of the greatest importance that the bishop was not summoned to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He asked to appear to clear up matters that had caused the committee to mention him unfavorably over a period of 7 years.

The bulletin points out that Congressman DONALD JACKSON, of California, called the bishop "one who served God on Sunday and Communist fronts the balance of the week." More of this quotation should be used to give a better picture of Mr. JACKSON. After referring to the bishop as a gentleman who now presumes to criticize the work of your House committee in its investigation of identified Communists, Mr. Jackson said:

"Bishop Bromley (sic) has been to the Communist front what Man-O'-War was to thoroughbred horseracing, and no one except the good bishop pays much attention to his fulminations these days. Having served God on Sunday and the Communist front for the balance of the week over such a long period of time, it is no great wonder that the bishop sees an investigating committee in every vestry."

The Freedom Club bulletin sets out that the bishop was associated with seven organizations and publications it calls "subversive." Also, it says, there are 8 more which it doesn't list. Let's look at the 7:

"1. The National Council of American Soviet Friendship. During the war he addressed a meeting of this group. Also at the meeting were Edward Stettinius, Jr., the Earl of Halifax, Henry J. Kaiser, Philip Murray, William Green, A. F. Whitney, and Serge Koussevitsky. Messages came from Generals Eisenhower, Devers, and Patch. In November 1945, General Eisenhower said in a message to the council, "I wish your council the utmost success in the worthy work it has undertaken." After the war Bishop Oxnam resigned from the group.

"2. The Protestant and the Protestant Digest, magazines cited as subversive. He was an editorial advisor for a short time, although he never attended a board meeting. He resigned February 11, 1942, when he suspected the publications might be party line.

"3. Soviet Russia Today, another magazine. He wrote an article for it in April 1945, before the European war was over. Two United States Senators also contributed.

"4, 5, and 6. The American Committee for Spanish Freedom, the Medical Bureau and the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. These organizations flourished during the Spanish civil war. He belonged because "I despised Franco and that entire regime, just as I did Stalin and the regime in Russia today." He contended that at the beginning of the Spanish war the Nazis were not supporting Franco and the Communists were not supporting the Spanish Republicans. He argued it was proper for a clergyman to be interested in aiding victims of war.

"7. The Methodist Committee for Social Service. The bishop questions the subversive character of this organization at the time he belonged. There appears to be a confusion between this group and the Methodist Committee for Social Action, a later group with which he was not connected and for which he makes no defense."

These facts ought to be as important in a discussion of the bishop's background as the fact that he was cited by the committee. When the bishop was here this week he complained that the Velde committee was "less interested in getting facts than in getting me." The same criticism, it appears, may be leveled at the Freedom Club.

Tuesday morning the bishop read the Freedom Club's bulletin and said, "My oh my. How do they spend their time?" It's an excellent question.

Thanks to My Sons in the Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding letter to the editor, written by Mrs. George Poppen, of Carthage, S. Dak., and printed in the Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak. The Members of Congress who have voted on the question of requiring military service will find that one mother has put into words what millions of parents must have felt in greater or lesser degree.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SO LONG"

To the EDITOR:

I just said "so long" to my youngest son, for what I hope to be the last time while he is in the military service. We had a wonderful month together while he was home on Navy leave, after 30 months, 29 of them spent at NSC, at Pearl Harbor. He is no longer the boy who entered the Navy 3 years ago, but a man with grown up thoughts and ideas.

He will soon be free to make plans for the future, like attending college and taking up a profession or whatever the future has in store for him. He like his brothers before him had to give a few years of his life to Uncle Sam. One served in the Army during World War II and another served in the Navy, part of that time in the Korean incident.

I am not a hero mother. Each time one of them had to leave I would have stopped him if I could. Had heard about boys getting deferred, but strings always had to be pulled, besides didn't know what strings to pull. Like many mothers I voiced the thought "why mine, some don't have to go." After each one graduated from high school there was always that universal call from Uncle Sam to be reckoned with first of all.

So I said "so long" time and again.

Army basic, Navy boot, at least my vocabulary was enlarged, words I never knew existed became household language.

Short furloughs, hectic days mostly from the day of homecoming until that awful day of parting again. Now for me that is nearly over. I can look back with a mixture of feelings. The heartache and tears are in the past now, and a feeling of pride is coming to the fore.

Bad as I hated to see them go I know now I was proud of them because they were going out to do their bit for our great country. Sure, they did no more than what thousands of other mothers and sons have done or are doing, but we all feel that our boy is a bit special.

I was proud of their letters, of each new rate, of little gifts. How many get a corsage of orchids all the way from Hawaii to wear to a mother-daughter banquet? When something hurt them I hurt and when things were going smooth I was happy. I learned about boot and basic, bivouac, hit the deck, and short timers' attitude, etc., thanks to my sons in service.

Right now there is a lump in my throat, but remembering past experiences, I know there will soon be letters telling about new interests. New duty, new officers, most of them fine understanding fellows, new buddies, and of a happy meeting with an old one. Best of all soon I shall share plans for the future, be it school or a job.

It's "so long" today, but in a few months there will be "Hi, Fritz" welcome home.

MRS. GEORGE POPPEN,
Carthage, S. Dak.

To Private Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1955

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Phil

Bladine, published in the McMinnville (Oreg.) Telephone Register:

TO PRIVATE HANDS

With completion of the sale of 24 synthetic-rubber processing plants the Government has taken itself out of still another business. The Government built the synthetic rubber plants early in World War II to overcome the loss of natural rubber sources.

More than $700 million in Federal funds was poured into the project, but because of the urgency of the need there was little inclination to count the cost. Experiments to produce natural rubber had gone on for years without results. The wartime program produced a usable product in a matter of months.

Despite the fact that the plants were built under the most extravagant conditions, the rubber plant disposal board has realized more than $300 million in the sale.

Leftwing criticism that the Government's disposal action has fostered concentration of rubber manufacture in a few giant corporations is unfounded. Buyers have included the Big Four in the rubber industry—Firestone, Goodyear, Goodrich, and United States Rubber—as well as several syndicates. This disposition of the plants will lead to more intense competition among rubber manufacturers on a more equal footing. What critics of the sale who shout "monopoly" favor is Government monopoly.

Sale provisions set up by Congress require the new owners to guarantee continued supplies for small business, to produce a minimum of 500,000 tons of general-purpose synthetic rubber annually and to return the plants to the Government in event of a national emergency affecting rubber supplies.

But the basic provision is Washington's restoration of ownership of a prime industrial actively to private hands.

Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4644) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, during the 83d and the present Congress, I introduced legislation providing a substantial pay increase for postal employees. I have consistently supported a pay raise of at least 10 percent for all Federal employees.

I would therefore like to state my reasons for voting against the inadequate pay raise and reclassification bill reported out by the Murray committee and against the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

I believe that the amount provided in this bill as amended, is insufficient, inadequate, and unfair to postal workers. I feel that these faithful public servants are entitled to an increase of at least 10 percent and I regret very much that the Members of the House have not been permitted to vote for that increase as provided in S. 1 when that bill passed the Senate.

Because of my strong feelings in this matter, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for the small increase provided by the House version of this legislation as presented to us today. Further, it is my conviction that post office employees should not be forced to accept a reclassification plan they do not want.

Tribute to Tamara Jaffe, Queen of Annual May Festival at Lewis and Clark College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a success story, created by hard work and deep suffering, including escape 10 years ago from the bonds of communism, is the story of Tamara Jaffe, who will be crowned queen of the annual May festival at Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg., May 6 and 7.

Tamara Jaffe stands as proof of the important and exceptional contributions new Americans are making in our cultural and social life.

Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, for whom Lewis and Clark College was named, stand as honored names this year as our Nation celebrates the sesquicentennial of the completion of the great Lewis and Clark Expedition.

Mr. President, it is with much pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this tribute to Miss Tamara Jaffe from the columns of the Oregon Journal of April 14.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIRL WHO ESCAPED REDS CHOSEN COLLEGE QUEEN

Tamara Jaffe, who 10 years ago escaped from the Communists and started life anew in the United States, will reign as queen of the annual May fete at Lewis and Clark College May 6 and 7.

For Tamara, the festival will be 2 days of happiness, something she has known little of in her 22 years of life.

Born of Russian parents in Berlin, Germany, Tamara, with her mother and two brothers, was deported to Siberia in 1941. There, they spent 4 years of primitive existence on a collective farm. Her mother and brothers eventually died of the rugged life, cold weather, and poor food.

To escape the Communists, Tamara finally posed as the adopted daughter of a British woman and, with the help of the British Ambassador, they fled through Finland and Sweden and then to England. After nearly a year in a London boarding school she received permission to come to Portland to join her father, Boris, whom she had not seen in 7 years.

The pretty brunette speaks German, French, Spanish, and Russian in addition to near-perfect English. She is a political science major and plans for a career in the United States Foreign Service after graduate study.

Tamara cooks and keeps house for her father, sews and works after school as a salesgirl in a downtown store.

Others in her court are Catherine Delistraty, Portland, and Joanne Forstrom, Centralia, Wash., crown princesses; Elsie Baker, Portland, senior princess; Alice Schmidt, Lebanon, junior princess; Marilyn McLean, Tigard, sophomore princess; and Verle Pilling, Portland, freshman princess.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, George W. Healy, Jr., editor of the highly respected and influential New Orleans Times-Picayune, has rendered a public service in having reproduced a series of editorials on the subject of the explosively controversial tidelands issue. I hope I will render a service in having these illuminating editorials reproduced here and spread on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune has never faltered in its stalwart support of the individual States in their fight to retain title to that which they lawfully possess. Now that it has been determined by the Congress that the States do have the right of possession to their tidelands, the new issue of just what do the tidelands consist has been raised by those diehards who refuse to accept the decision of the Congress in its full meaning and embrace. While one part of the fight has been won, much remains before a full and complete victory becomes final.

The consistent fight of the New Orleans Times-Picayune has been one of the brightest spots in the unfaltering battle to retain for the individual States that which belongs to them. The position of the New Orleans Times-Picayune in this instance only reflects the position which it has consistently taken whenever the rights of the individual States have been challenged or involved. Its editorials have always spoken out against violation in any form of the fundamental principle that each State of the United States is a sovereign State.

Any comment on the long and hard fight to restore the tidelands to the States would be incomplete without mention and full recognition of the role played in the fight by Judge Leander H. Perez, of Louisiana. True, there were many who contributed their full ability to the fight to restore the tidelands. The roll will be long when called but at the head of the list will be the name of Judge Perez.

When others grew feint of heart and others were tempted to compromise, and still others were frustrated to the point of surrender, it was Judge Perez who

never even momentarily faltered or hesitated. Even today when there are those who would settle for less than what rightfully belongs to them, Judge Perez stands as the uncompromising foe who of any individual or any group who would take an infinitesimal part of that which rightfully belongs to the individual States.

Fighters like Judge Perez are necessarily positive and determined men. Their objective is the success of their cause and not the niceties and subtleties of the suave compromiser or the clever manipulator. These kind of men and these kind of leaders fight to the death for that in which they believe. So it is with Judge Perez, and better is his State and his Nation for such a fighter. There are those who will disagree with him but there are none who will challenge his courage and his determination nor his resourcefulness in battle. I again salute him.

Here are the series of the New Orleans Times-Picayune editorials to which I have referred:

ALL WANT MINERALS MONEY; FLOW SHOULD BE INCREASED

Three recent developments in the situation affecting revenues received by the State of Louisiana from offshore minerals, it seems to us, merit extended comment.

First of these was the repeated statement by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay that Louisiana's tidelands claim is one based on a 3-league, rather than a 3-mile limit. Although, after prompting, the Secretary said that he had intended to testify before the House Appropriations Committee that the Federal Government claims title to submerged lands beyond a line 3 miles from the Louisiana coast, his actual testimony to the contrary appears to us to have been significant.

The second of the developments was the issuance of a statement by Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general of Louisiana, that the State will go to court relatively soon to sustain Louisiana's boundaries. It is and should be the State's contention, in our opinion, that the Louisiana boundary is 3 leagues, slightly more than 10 miles, beyond the coastline.

Third of the developments was a continuing action by State and city agencies to find ways to spend the money which Louisiana is receiving from offshore minerals. Most recent of the spending suggestions was a recommendation by city officials of New Orleans that tidelands oil revenues be used to pay part of the cost of a new incinerator here.

For many months this newspaper has contended that first call on money received through the sale of the State's mineral wealth should be conceded to elimination or reduction of the staggering State debt.

To exhaust the mineral resources of Louisiana without reducing the debt of Louisiana, we submit, would be worse than folly.

The joint committee of the Louisiana Legislature which is headed by Senator W. M. Rainach has accepted suggestions that tidelands money be used to retire the public debt, with amendments.

This committee believes that the money should be used three ways: One-third to retire the State debt, one-third to improve the State school system, and one-third to build and maintain highways.

A firm dedication of the minerals revenue to the purposes recommended by this committee, it seems to us, would be wise. Certainly it would prevent dissipation of the windfall which won't last forever to pay inflated current expenses.

In the first quarter of 1955, royalties, bonuses and rentals received by the State from its mineral lands aggregated $33,908,707. These figures were obtained from the office of Mrs. Ellen Bryan Moore, register of the State land office.

Of this income, slightly more than $14,800,000 was from offshore minerals and more than $19 million was from inshore royalties, bonuses and rentals.

If the rate of the first quarter is continued throughout 1955, the State's income from its minerals—exclusive of severance taxes—will exceed $130 million.

This income, of course, is tremendous; but in the opinion of students of the situation, Louisiana still is not receiving its just returns from minerals being severed from submerged lands off its shores.

One of these students, Leander H. Perez, is convinced that a positive stand by the State to protect its claim to all lands within its historic boundaries should substantially increase the revenue realized by the State from its minerals.

An elaboration of this thesis will be presented in succeeding editorials in this series.

DOES STATE GET JUST SHARE?

As interpreted by laymen, including President Eisenhower, the Tidelands Act of 1953 was intended to restore to the coastal States their offshore lands whose title was placed in question by a United States Supreme Court decision. This decision held that the Federal Government had "paramount rights" in these lands.

To a large degree, the desired result has been achieved. Enactment of the legislation which had support of the Eisenhower administration opened up development of offshore oil and gas fields which had been halted by the efforts of the Truman administration to take over the tidelands for the Central Government.

In the first quarter of 1955 the State of Louisiana received approximately $15 million as its share of royalties, rentals, and bonuses from offshore mineral leases.

The greater number of these leases, if not all of them, were within 3 miles of the State's coastal line—that is the coastline established by the United States Coast Guard as marking the end of inland waters and the beginning of the open sea.

Despite the language of the Tidelands Act referring to the State's coast, lessees holding mineral leases within this coastline established by the United States Coast Guard paid oil royalties to the Federal Government, instead of to the State on approximately 20 million barrels of petroleum produced under 42 State leases up to December 1954.

Collection of this revenue by the Federal Government, as we see the situation, reflects an attitude in Washington which is not justified by existing or past circumstances.

We believe that the State is entitled to revenues from all lands between its shores and a line 3 leagues beyond its coastline. Certainly, as we understand the situation, Louisiana is entitled to all revenues from lands within its coastline.

The Federal position, it seems to us, is founded on a contention that there is something indefinite or obscure about the phrase "coastline."

Under an act of February 1807, Congress authorized the President to cause a survey to be taken "of the coast of the United States, in which shall be designated the islands and shoals, with the roads or places of anchorage, within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

This act, obviously, emphasized the difference between "shores" and "coast or coastline."

Under a later act of Congress the United States Coast Guard was authorized to, and did, establish the coastline of Louisiana—as well as of other States. This line is the same line as that redefined under Louisiana law. It extends from Chandeleuer Lighthouse in a curved line following established aids to navigation, including Pass-a-Loutre lighted whistle buoy 4, South Pass lighted whistle buoy 2, Southwest Pass entrance channel lighted whistle buoy, Ship Shoal lighthouse, Calcasieu Pass lighted whistle buoy 1, and Sabine Pass lighted whistle buoy 1.

Some of the revenues going to the Federal Government instead of to the State government are from leases on submerged lands within this well-defined coast line.

When Attorney General Fred S. LeBlanc goes to court to "sustain Louisiana's boundaries," it seems to us he should seek to establish the State's claim to this particular mineral revenue.

LOUISIANA'S CLAIM TO LAND 3 LEAGUES FROM COAST

Under the Tidelands Act of 1953 "title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters" were "vested in and assigned to" the respective States.

A section of the Tidelands Act provided further that the "seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline." This section provided also, however, States admitted to the Union after its original formation might establish such boundaries but that "nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by the Constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore approved by Congress."

The latter provision apparently was intended particularly for the benefit of Texas, which was a republic before it became a State—under a treaty establishing its boundary 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles, beyond its coast line.

This provision appears to us to apply also to Louisiana, giving this State title to submerged lands 3 leagues beyond its coast line.

Reason for this interpretation is the language of the act of Congress of April 8, 1812, under which Louisiana became a State of the Union.

This act of admission established the seaward boundary of the new State at "three leagues of the coast."

That the Congress acknowledged that it could neither take away from nor add to a State's territory was manifested a few days later, on April 14, 1812. On this date the Congress added to Louisiana lands which had been claimed by Spain, which are known today as the Florida parishes, "in case the Legislature of the State of Louisiana shall consent thereto."

The Louisiana Legislature subsequently did "consent to" the Florida parishes being added to the State.

In view of the language of the act which admitted Louisiana as a State and of Congress' acknowledgement that it lacked the power to take from or add to a State's territory, without its consent, it seems to us clear that Louisiana had a boundary more than three miles beyond its coast line "at the time such State became a member of the Union."

During prohibition it was generally understood that the Federal Government had no jurisdiction "beyond the 3-mile limit." This understanding was shaken, of course, by the "I'm Alone" case—in which the rum-running boat I'm Alone was captured far beyond this "3-mile" limit.

Whatever the origin of this popular conception or misconception, it has no support in the language of the 1783 Treaty of Inde-

pendence, which settled the Revolutionary War and fixed the boundaries of States then bordering the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes.

Probably because the Atlantic coast States had substantial interest in fishing, the boundaries of the original States touching that coast were fixed by the treaty at "20 leagues from shore" into the Atlantic Ocean.

The Continental Congress on August 4, 1779, had instructed the treaty commissioners of the Continental Congress to insist on the 20-league boundary as an ultimatum.

Before Louisiana was admitted as a State, with a boundary three leagues from its coast, the area of the Louisiana territory—as shown by early maps—extended even farther into the Gulf of Mexico, to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

It seems to us that State officials are obligated to maintain Louisiana's right to the submerged lands three leagues beyond its coastline.

SHOULD RESIST BUREAUCRAT ATTEMPTS TO FIX BOUNDARIES

Several years ago, during the Truman administration, an agent of the United States Department of the Interior prepared a map of the coast showing where the Department believed Louisiana State jurisdiction ended and Federal jurisdiction began.

This newspaper published that map, with the comment that—by strange coincidence—the line drawn by the agent to divide State lands from Federal lands cut across the entrances of bays in which there was no oil production but drove deep into bays and coves where there were producing oil wells.

Judging by dispatches from Washington, there still are employees in the Interior Department who think that they have the power to determine where Louisiana's lands stop and where Federal lands begin.

As a matter of record, the Federal Government had little, if any, interest in the so-called tidelands until oil was discovered in submerged lands off the shores of California and Louisiana.

Also as a matter of record, the Federal Congress never has given to the Department of the Interior the power to establish State boundaries or, for that matter, to fix coastlines. Congress first made the President responsible for establishing coastlines. Later the responsibility was shifted, by law, to the Secretary of the Treasury and then to the Secretary of Commerce and, finally, in 1946, to the commandant of the Coast Guard.

An attempt was made to legally authorize the Secretary of the Interior to "define and publish lines" marking areas of State jurisdiction, but this authority was taken out of the Tidelands Act of 1953 before its final passage.

Nevertheless, Washington correspondents, including this newspaper's Paul Wooton, have been informed that the Department of the Interior is having its agents make aerial pictures, draw maps, and perform other work to "establish State boundaries." This apparently is being done on the theory that the Department of the Interior has authority to decide what oil belongs to the States and what oil belongs to the Federal Government when petroleum is produced from offshore lands.

This theory, we contend, has no basis in law and should be discarded, in addition, on the basis of practical considerations. The record of the department of the interior in handling Federal oil lands, before the adoption of the Tidelands Act of 1953 and of the companion statute which provided for the department's leasing of mineral lands in the outer continental shelf, was far from brilliant. Federal oil lands were leased for 50 cents per acre when adjoining State and private lands were leased for many dollars per acre.

Just because the Federal department received a surprising $250 million when it opened its first bids for leases on the Outer Continental Shelf—after adopting bidding procedures formerly used only by the States—is no justification for it to follow bureaucratic precedent and try to take in more territory than the law allows.

The only authority which the interior department has to justify its recent actions is an interim agreement reached with Gov. Robert F. Kennon and members of the State mineral board.

This "interim agreement" was reached, dispatches reported, "in an atmosphere of mutual cooperation" on September 28, 1954, to prevent State and Interior Department officials from seeking bids for leases on the same tracts of land.

At that time Governor Kennon said that the State government and the Federal Government should seek some agreement on what is the shoreline of Louisiana. Since the Tidelands Act is concerned with the State's coastline, rather than its shoreline, and since the Coast Guard definitely has established the State's coastline, it is difficult for us to comprehend why officials of either the Federal Government or the State government should be bothering about a shoreline.

The Tidelands Act itself defines coastline as the seaward limit of inland waters. This is the line as defined and established by the Coast Guard and, obviously, is a definite line. In most places the Louisiana shoreline is an indefinite, shifting line—depending on tides, wave wash, accretion and other factors.

The full definition of coastline contained in the Tidelands Act is: "The term 'coastline' means the line of ordinary low water along the portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters."

As we view the situation, there is nothing vague or complicated about this definition.

Since the act of Congress which admitted Louisiana as a State in 1812 fixed its seaward boundary within 3 leagues of coast, since the Coast Guard established the State's coast line, and since the Tidelands Act restored to the States lands within their historic boundaries, there seems to us no justification for discussion of shore lines or other factors which should have no bearing on the matter.

The "interim agreement" reached by the State and Federal officials, we believe, should be discarded in favor of a permanent agreement, in which the Department of the Interior should recognize the realities of both the letter and spirit of the Tidelands Act of 1953.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, in an appearance before the House Appropriations Committee, recently said that 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles ,applied to Louisiana as well as to Texas—in the determination of off-coast State boundaries.

The printed report of the executive hearing contained the following:

"Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask you further about the drilling off the coast of Louisiana. This is, of course, outside the limit of 3½ miles.

"Secretary MCKAY. It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. I was under the impression that the 3 leagues only applied in the case of Texas.

"Secretary MCKAY. It applies both in the case of Texas and Louisiana.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. It applies in both States?

"SECRETARY MCKAY. Yes, sir.

An attorney for the Interior Department immediately expressed belief that Secretary McKay had made a "slip of the tongue." Next day Secretary McKay wrote the committee chairman saying that the Department supports the contention that the Federal Government owns lands "3 geographical miles off the coast of Louisiana."

Secretary McKay, it seems to us, was correct when he said, "It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON."

A Congressman's Periodical Report to the People of Cleveland and Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert my address delivered over radio station WHK, Cleveland, on April 24, titled "A Congressman's Periodical Report to the People of Cleveland and Ohio":

During the past week there have been many interesting and indeed important events on the Washington scene. There have been developments in the international field, with which we are very much concerned, because they have a direct bearing on the security and well-being of each and every American.

Last week was highlighted by a dinner honoring SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, which brought together some 3,500 leaders of the Democratic Party from all 48 States. Former President Truman was among the speakers and he gave every evidence that he had lost none of his old fire and persuasiveness as a campaigner. There was an atmosphere which gave every indication that the rank and file membership of the Democratic Party is looking forward to a new and inspired leadership within the ranks of the party. The inspiration of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and Woodrow Wilson was in abundant evidence at this national Democratic dinner and I have every reason to believe that the party will present to the people in 1956 a program based upon the great ideals expressed by Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson. The Democratic Party, by its tradition, has offered the best leadership toward the goal of world peace with freedom and justice for all.

Congress debated the appropriation bill for the United States Information Agency. During the debate, I made one basic criticism. My criticism was that we have failed to fully understand the tremendous power for good inherent in the United States information programs and the relationship they have to the urgent question of peace or war. I believe that most Americans are agreed that the crisis which now grips the world is best described as a struggle for the hearts, the minds, and the allegiance of all the people of the world. On the one hand, the forces of human freedom of which we are a leading part, seek to show all the people of the world that they can attain their aspirations more quickly and more surely by their association with us. On the other hand, the evil forces of despotism as represented by Communist imperialism, seek to lull mankind into a deep slumber during which time the chains of slavery will be thrown over the entire world. In this struggle, I brought to the attention of the Members of the House that the Russians spent somewhere between $1 billion and $1½ billion a year on their false propaganda programs as compared with $77 million appropriated last year for all our information programs.

As a practical example of the way Russian propaganda works, I pointed out that in 1953 alone, the Russian Communists published over 1 billion propaganda books in 40 different languages which were used to penetrate every nation on the face of the globe. These publications put out in pamphlet and book form, sold for a price of from 5 cents to 50 cents—books which obviously would cost several dollars to reproduce—but which the Russians subsidize in order to promote their propaganda line.

I reminded Members that it did not take Congress long to recognize that there was great power for good or for evil in the new force called nuclear energy, which caused Congress to establish a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to make certain that this great force would be kept in the hands of the American people. I, therefore, urged that Congress establish a joint committee on international information programs in order that they might be placed on a level and scope commensurate with their importance to the urgent question of peace or war. There is no doubt in my mind that ideals such as we Americans cherish and their transmission to the multitudes of people throughout the free world, form a weapon in the struggle between the forces of human freedom and those of Russian slavery, which ideals may, in the end, be more powerful and conclusive than nuclear energy. I intend to push this measure in Congress until there is created such a joint committee, because I believe we have a lot to learn in the field of propaganda if we are to make rapid progress toward our national goal of peace with freedom.

On January 24 I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to testify on H. R. 1. H. R. 1 is the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, a bill to extend the trade agreements authority of the President for another 3 years, and among other things, to permit him to negotiate tariff reductions up to 5 percent during that period. At the time this bill was first under consideration there was strong indication on the Washington scene that Harold Stassen, who has just been relieved of his duties in connection with the Foreign Operations Administration, was advocating either the giving or selling of our surplus food stocks to the Russian despots. He was advocating this ill-advised maneuver under the slogan—"Barter Butter for Manganese." From my long-time study of the Russian Communist empire and the struggles of the enslaved people against their rulers, I felt compelled to appear before the House Ways and Means Committee to impress upon them that if we were to give or sell any of our surplus food stocks to the Russian despots, we would be doing a great disservice to the enslaved people who are struggling to defeat communism and to regain their freedom and independence. I also pointed out that one of the greatest weapons the people have against the despotic regime is that of withholding food from the state which would bring about a crisis within the empire because food shortages bring about grave and sweeping discontent and further opposition. Several days ago Moscow admitted to the world in an editorial appearing in Pravda, leading Communist mouthpiece in Moscow, that the farmers within the Red colonial empire had wrecked the planned agricultural economy and appeared bent upon forcing a crisis within the Communist empire. Pravda revealed that the farmers are withholding more food stocks than they turn over to the state, and that these food stocks are consumed by the farmers, given to their friends, or destroyed. While Pravda called for grave punishment of all the farmers because of their wrecking the production program, by the same token it was forced to admit that the farmers of Ukraine, Bylorussia, Lithuania, Turkestan, and the other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union were engaged in a constant struggle against the tyrants of Moscow, and that they were doing so at grace risk to their own lives. How anyone, including Harold Stassen or others within the Eisenhower administration, could possibly think of selling or giving our surplus food stocks to the Soviet Government in light of these established facts, is beyond me. The Eisenhower administration is supposed to stand up for a program of liberating the captive non-Russian nations from communism, and it had better not be tempted by the lush profits held out by the Russians as a reward for trading or exchanging our surplus foods for their low-grade manganese.

On the international scene, a great deal of attention was focused on the Afro-Asian Conference taking place this week at Bandung, Indonesia. This is the first time in history that the nations of Asia and Africa have ever come together for the purpose of discussing common problems or common aspirations. Before this conference opened, there were some misgivings that this conference could do little more than criticize Western civilization for its past implication in colonialism and imperialism. Much of this apprehension was due to the fact that Chou En-lai, the notorious Chinese Communist conspirator, along with Nehru of India, were among the sponsors of this conference. There was no doubt in any one's mind concerning Chou En-lai and his and his evil deeds of the past, but Premier Nehru has been a big question mark in the minds of statesmen who earnestly seek peace and freedom, because of Nehru's truculence and his unquenchable thirst to become spokesman for a large segment of mankind. These misgivings have, in large measure, been dissipated, because of the courageous and foresighted stand taken by the statesmen of Egypt, Iraq, the Philippines, Pakistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Turkey, Afghanistan, and others. The leading spokesman for the people of Asia and Africa did not hesitate to identify Russian communism as a new type of colonialism—a type of colonialism far more dangerous and more tyrannical than any form of colonialism or imperialism yet visited upon the human race. Many of the great Moslem leaders spoke out with spirit, condemning communism because it denied God in the affairs of man. Still others made it clear that the new and inspiring era of national independence which has finally come to South Asia and Africa must defend itself against the new Russian colonialism—and that to preserve their national independence, these nations must develop common programs of security and economic advancement. In my opinion, the Bandung Conference boomeranged against the Russian despots and isolated the Russian stooge, Chou En-lai. Moreover, it should serve as a practical object lesson for the vacillating Nehru, whom we hope will now give up his precarious fence-sitting of neutralism and join the forces of human freedom and progress.

In my judgment, the Bandung Conference did much to break up the Communist propaganda that there is a wave of the future, namely, that Russian communism will eventually triumph and for that reason, it is smart to aline yourself and your nation with Russian communism. Russian propaganda boasts its great conquests over 800 million people covering one-third of the world's surface. This so-called wave of the future has been stopped by United States aid to Greece and Turkey, its assistance to Iran, our Berlin airlift, and our fight in Korea. The efforts of the Bandung Conference to break up the Communist free ride on the wave of the future may very well have set a new course which will, in the end, upset Moscow's timetable, for enslavement of these newly independent nations.

The House passed a bill to increase salaries of post-office employees. The administration recommended an average salary increase of 7.6 percent. However, an amendment by Congressman Moss, Democrat of California, was adopted, raising the average salary increase of 8.278 percent. The major difference created by the Moss amendment is that before the amendment was adopted the bill carried an average of only 6.7 percent increase for the majority of the employees. The Moss amendment brings the increase up to where all of the employees in the lower grades will receive approximately the same percentage of increase in their annual salaries.

The Senate Labor Subcommittee conducted hearings to increase the minimum hourly wage in interstate commerce which is now a penurious 75 cents. The administration advocates 90 cents per hour. Others more realistic to the needs of workers and heads of families and the increased cost of living advocate $1.25 per hour to which I subscribe.

The House authorized the construction of 24 combatant ships, including a new *Forrestal* type carrier, about 60,000 tons, which will be the fifth of its type. Also authorized were 3 atomic submarines, 10 auxiliary ships, and the conversion and modernizing of 28 ships, some into guided missile ships, the total cost is estimated at $1,317,000,000.

Upper Peninsula of Michigan a Highly Desirable Site for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the March 18 edition of the Ironwood Daily Globe, of Ironwood, Mich., setting forth very clearly why the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is a highly desirable site for industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPPER PENINSULA CALLED A PROFITABLE SITE FOR INDUSTRY—LOW-HUMIDITY WEATHER IS LABELED "HEALTHFUL AND INVIGORATING" ASSET—INDUSTRIAL REALTORS PRAISE CHARACTER OF RESIDENTS IN REPORT

DETROIT.—Industries pointing toward "more efficiently serving the vast Midwest and Northwest markets" were told today they could "profit handsomely during the next decade" by building in Michigan's upper peninsula.

The advice came in a report by the Michigan chapter of the Society of Industrial Realtors on an upper peninsula survey.

It described the upper peninsula as one of the few remaining "industrial location frontiers in a good general marketing area," and said that its low-humidity weather was "healthful and invigorating" and an industrial asset.

"Within 500 miles of the upper peninsula," the report said, "are 50 million users and consumers of a wide variety of manufactured products—a tremendous market, easily reached."

Cooperating with the Society of Industrial Realtors (SIR) in its survey were the United States Department of Commerce, the Michigan Economic Development Department and the Upper Peninsula Development Bureau.

It is entitled "Industry Location Advantages of Michigan's Upper Peninsula."

The report says that the most numerous industrial opportunities are for those industries which would utilize the area's considerable natural resources of forest products, farm crops, and minerals.

It listed as available minerals: limestone, dolomite, feldspar, andalusite, talc, asbestos, iron oxide, lake clay and lake sands, as well as copper.

"These opportunities," is says, "include increased lumber manufacturing and greater use of veneer logs now being shipped out."

It adds: "There could be future possibilities of petro-chemical industries resulting from the crude oil line now traversing the area."

The report continues:

"Industries such as light metal manufacturing, electronic and scientific instruments, and other fabrications requiring skillful, capable workers have good opportunities.

"Any additional technical manpower needed for these would be attracted by the area's excellent living conditions.

"One of the most important single industry location advantage of the Upper Peninsula is the character of its residents. Their records in many diverse industrial employments show a high worker productivity—10 to 15 percent above that of other areas—an adaptability to changing production methods, and excellent attitudes toward their jobs."

Turning to the Upper Peninsula's weather, the report said that the climate throughout the year is healthful and invigorating, and added:

"Stories on weather endeavor to portray the unusual. Consequently the occurrence of an occasional low winter temperature or a heavy snowfall in the upper peninsula is interpreted with considerable misunderstanding.

"Temperatures are moderated by the bordering Lakes Michigan, Superior, and Huron, and these large bodies of water also insure the absence of smog or other forms of air pollution."

It compared average July and January temperatures of several industrial cities with that of the upper peninsula. It showed the peninsula's average July temperature was a cool 65.1. Its January average of 14.8 compared with 13.1 for Minneapolis, 25.5 for Detroit, 20.6 for Milwaukee, and 25.3 for Chicago.

Some of the high productivity of upper peninsula workers was credited to the region's pleasant surroundings and recreational facilities.

The report said the peninsula is well covered by 23 newspapers and 10 radio stations, with 16 television channels having been assigned the area.

On the question of water, a scarcity of which has hindered industrial development in some other areas, the report says:

"In this period of growing concern for adequate water in so many areas of the country, the unlimited quantity and top quality of the upper peninsula supply is of prime importance.

"According to the Michigan Water Resources Commission, the water in bordering Lake Superior has 50 parts hardness which places it in the category of rain or distilled water. Lake Michigan water is of high quality, too."

On the availability of land, the report comments:

"Ample land suitable for industrial sites is available in practically all sections of the peninsula. Several cities have excellently zoned industrial districts and others are planning them.

"Coal and fuel oil are delivered to all port cities by bulk carriers and tankers. A large oil pipeline from the Canadian Alberta field to Sarnia, Ontario, refineries runs the entire length of the peninsula.

"Everyone works better in pleasant surroundings with recreation facilities easily available.

"Residents of the area are less affected by possible economic cycles than people in metropolitan centers because of the opportunity to supplement their income with farms, woodlots, hunting, fishing, and tourist services.

"The number of industrial establishments increased 95 percent between the 1947 census and the first quarter of 1951. Iron and copper ore reserves are sufficient for many decades of continued mining activity."

The Cain Mutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there recently appeared in newspapers across the country a syndicated column by Holmes Alexander, with the headline "The Cain Mutiny." The subject of the article is our ex-colleague, Harry Cain, from the State of Washington, now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I ask unanimous consent that these short remarks concerning Senator Cain's position on the internal security system be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAIN MUTINY
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—"Rocks in his head" is what some of ex-Senator Harry Cain's friends are saying about him, but they're wrong.

"Stars in his eyes" is the proper diagnosis for Cain's running critique of the hodgepodge internal security system which President Truman clapped together and President Eisenhower has done precious little to improve.

Cain is a bona fide conservative. He's an Eisenhower appointment to the Subversive Activities Control Board. For these reasons his strictures against the octopus commie-catching laws and practice have fluttered the dovecotes of Republican orthodoxy.

A party loyalist, it's said, shouldn't give any comfort to the other side. A patronage-eater shouldn't nip the hand that fills the trough.

But Cain's philosophy goes much deeper than this trivial political etiquette. What I'm going to write may seem exaggerated, but I'm taking care to be exact in my estimate of Harry Cain. Into politics there often wanders a man or woman whose purposes are high up on the plane of patriotic service. Too often such a person loses the gleam and becomes an empty thumping tub or tailor's dummy for hanging fine phrases, or a professional patrioteer. It's a far rarer person who keeps the shinging vision, come good luck or bad. Such a man is Harry Cain.

This isn't to say that he is a brain or a flame or a blithe spirit. But some men like to plow a field, to shake a test tube, to sing a song. This man Cain is what Nathan Hale would be without a firing squad. Cain has one life and he lives it for his country. His only regret is that he can't do more.

Adversity had something to do with his dedication. His defeat in 1952 by Senator HENRY (SCOOP) JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, closed the door on Cain's career in competitive politics. We talked about it at the time. He told me that his fundamentalist views on private property and other phases of the Constitution, strictly interpreted, were not for our time and age. He conceded that he had probably run his last election.

But another matter, not unrelated to his 1952 defeat, was on Cain's mind. Senator JOE MCCARTHY had come to Cain's State to campaign for him and was booed from a platform. But something about McCarthyism, as a violent antidote for communism, disturbed Cain. He told me over a 2-hour luncheon table:

"This fight against communism isn't just for this year or even for our lifetime. It's a long, hard battle, the end of which nobody can see. If we've got to win it by use of the concentration camp, the secret police, and confidential informer, we will have lost—not the battle maybe, but the war. America won't be America any more."

He didn't have any answers to the problems at that time. But he was looking for answers. As a friend of 30 years' standing of the Eisenhower family, particularly of Edgar Eisenhower, but including brother Ike, Harry Cain could probably have had a better job than he's got. But the post on the SACB, created by the McCarran Internal Security Act, gave the ex-Senator just what he wanted—a chance to study the Communist conspiracy versus the American Constitution.

Cain is not a lawyer. He's a history reader. It would be a long while, he told me, before he would open his mouth on the internal-security subject. Last January almost 2 years to the day, he had his first say. Last week he spoke out again. Both times he said in effect that our internal-security system, intended as a rattrap for the Communists, is too often a boobytrap for free-speaking, free-stepping, though foolish, Americans.

Without offering a blueprint, Cain has made some practical suggestions. He wants a cutoff date for persons who joined subversive organizations in the long, long ago. While recognizing the Government's need for undercover agents, Cain sees no reason why casual or volunteer accusers should not be forced to repeat their charges in open courts or hearings.

But above and beyond his remedial measures, not all of which may be workable. Cain has preached what in religion we call fundamentalism. It's a good word for back-to-the-Constitution, too. Fundamental to the Constitution are the rights to be publicly accused, speedily tried on specified charges. Fundamental, also, as Lincoln noted in the matter of secession, to the right of a government to preserve its life.

These joint rights are a double duty in which the Truman administration failed. And in which, to be charitable about it, the Eisenhower administration has not conspicuously succeeded. That's what Harry Cain is talking about.

A Rock Was Found

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a clipping from the Lead Belt News, Flat River, Mo., which is an article entitled "A Rock Was Found," by Adella Breckenridge Moore, of Caledonia, Mo. It is an interesting

article surrounding the historical figure of Andrew Henry, fur trader:

A ROCK WAS FOUND

(By Adella Breckenridge Moore)

In the spring of 1953, Hazen A. Hawks, Drummond, Idaho, found on his farm on Conant Creek a granite rock 2 by 3 and 6 to 8 inches thick. Cut on the rock in letters about 2 inches high and ½ inch deep were the names of A. Henry, J. Hoback, P. McBride, B. Jackson, L. Cather, also the date 1810, a face in profile with the suggestion of a beard and a cross. The first two names are memorialized in southeastern Idaho in the names of lakes, forts, and streams.

The name of Andrew Henry, fur trader, is not a stranger to southeast Missouri. Missouri histories have given him a fair amount of space and from them we learn that Andrew Henry was born in Fayette or York County, Pa., about 1775. He was a son of George Henry and Margaret Young. For his first appearance west of the Mississippi River, we go to a small, aged pocket notebook now in my possession. It was the property of my grandfather, George Breckenridge, who bought land in Washington County, Mo., near Old Mines, in 1817. In 1818, he bought land south of Caledonia in the Bellevue Valley. On June 19, 1819, he arrived with his large family at that farm from Maury County, Tenn. He was a surveyor and had established lines for the Government and is known to have surveyed in Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee before coming to the Territory of Missouri.

The notebook is interesting and notes on various subjects may be found. The page from which we quote does not have any connection with any other pages in the book. "First time Andrew Henry came to this country was in April 1800; stayed here nearly 2 years, returned to Nashville, and returned to this country in February 1803, resided in Ste. Genevieve for some time, some short time after he returned the second time he heard of the purchase of this country by the United States at which time Paschal D'etchemonde is the man that had the clame that William Morrison now owns. William C. Carr boarded at Pascal's house at the time in 1803. Rufus Easton also lived at Ste. Genevieve, Thomas Oliver at the same time, Nathaniel Cook was there the first and second times I was there and obtained clames himself. Thomas Maddin also Surveyor. Valle died in March 1803. Governor Lassus Antoine Sular Surveyor General of Upper Louisiana."

For the Ste. Genevieve District of Upper Louisian the Court of Common Pleas met at the house of Andrew Buat and was organized December 11, 1804. The judges appointed were Moses Austin, Jacques Guiboard, Benjamin Strother, John Hawkins, Francis Valley. The venire of the Grand Jury was composed of the following: Joseph Spencer, William Hickman, John Price, Joseph Pratte, Andrew Henry, Pascal Detchmendy, Charles Smith, Robert J. Browne, John Stewart, Charles Bates, Thomas Alley, Abraham Baker, William Murphy, David Murphy, Clark Camille DeLassus, James Hunter, John Burget, Samuel Bridge, Aquilla Low.

It is in connection with this court that we introduce the following copy of an original paper in the collections of the Missouri Historical Society, house in Jefferson Memorial, St. Louis: "To whom it may concern: Know ye that I, James Wilkinson of the Territory of Louisiana, do by these presents in virtue of the power lodged in me by a law of the said Territory entitled 'A law regulating the oath of officers,' I appoint and commission Thomas Oliver, Esq., to administer the oath of office to James Maxwell as a justice of the general quarter sessions of the peace and of the common pleas. To Camile De Luzie, ditto. To Amos Bird, ditto. To John Hawkins, ditto. To Charles Smith, ditto. To Andrew Henry, ditto. To Francis Valley, ditto. Given under my hand and seal at Ste. Genevieve the 21st day of November 1805."

On December 16, 1805, Andrew Henry married Marie, daughter of Louis Dubriel Villars and Marie Louise Valle. William H. Ashley was one of the witnesses to the marriage. He separated from his wife January 3, 1806, and divorced her October 16, 1807.

About that time Andrew Henry was much interested in Masonry. Early in March 1805 Western Star Lodge No. 107 A. F. & A. M. had been organized at Kaskaskia, Northwest Territory, just across the Mississippi River from Ste. Genevieve. The first petitions for the degrees received were from Walter Fenwick, George Bullitt, and Andrew Henry.

From "Territorial Masonry" by Ray V. Denslow, we learn that in 1806, Andrew Henry, George Bullitt, and Dr. Aaron Elliot petitioned the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania to form a lodge at Ste. Genevieve in Louisiana Territory. Accordingly the lodge was instituted on July 17, 1807, and Andrew Henry became one of its first officers. This lodge ceased to exist in 1824 but Mr. Denslow has given us a list of the members, and I quote: Stephan F. Austin, George Bullitt, John B. Bossier, G. A. Bird, Richard G. Bibb, Bartholomew Bertholdt, William Bates, James G. Brady, Robert T. Brown, Sebastian Burtscher, William Cabbeen, Nathaniel Cook, T. T. Crutenden, Edward Cheatham, Alexander Craighead, James Clark, Josiah Dodge, Peter Daggett, Henry C. Dodge, Azariah Dunn, John Donnahoe, James Dowlin, Aaron Elliott, Charles Elliot, Elias A. Elliot, Henry Elliot, D. P. Etter, Ezekiel Fenwick, Nicholas Fleming, John J. Guion, Andrew Henry, William Hickman, Joseph Theodore F. Tong, John B. Janis, Hertick, Simon M. Hubbard, John Jones, Joseph Kimball, Henry Kiel, Louis Lassous, Harvey Lane, Lewis F. Linn, James Martin, Josiah Millard, John McArthur, Andrew Miller, Israel McGready, Josiah McClenahan, Thomas Oliver, John Oklass, Joseph Perkins, Jacob Pettit, Henry Pinkley, Nathan Pusey, Francois Legnier, Daniel Roe, Edmund Roberts, John H. Robertson, Otho Shrader, John Scott, John Smith, William Scarcy, Reuben Smith, Andrew Scott, Robert Terry, Francois Valle, William Varner, Walter Wilkinson, John H. Weber, James Wood, Thomas M. Welch, Nicholas Wilson, Coleman Withlow, Samuel H. T. Young.

In 1806, Francis Azor died. Breton assigned his grant to Walter Fenwick and Andrew Henry. (See History of Missouri, vol. 1, p. 367, by Louis Houck. Used by permission of Gibboney Houck of Cape Girardeau.)

On July 4, 1806, in a letter from Moses Austin to Andrew Henry as found in the Austin papers he asks Henry as a peace officer for protection from seizure of a three-pounder in his possession. On August 7, 1806, H. Austin writes to John Smith and refers to a meeting they had in the presence of Mr. Henry. The above reference to the Austin papers was received in a letter under date of December 21, 1953, from Miss Barbara Kell, reference librarian of Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis. I want to thank the society for the help that it has given in this Washington County story of early-day community building.

On June 10, 1807, the Ste. Genevieve Court appointed William H. Ashley, William Strother, James Keith, and Andrew Henry, to view a road from Ste. Genevieve to Mine a Breton.

On June 21, 1808, the law of the territorial legislature incorporating Ste. Genevieve Academy was approved and the following trustees named: James Maxwell, Jean Baaptista Valle, Jacques Guibord, Saint James Beauvais, Francis Janis, Jean Baptiste Pratte, Walter Fenwick, Andrew Henry, Timothy Phelps, Aaron Penniman, William Shannon, George Bullitt, Henry Dodge, Harry Deal.

Also in 1808 the Missouri Fur Co. was organized with the following named persons as stockholders: Benjamin Wilkerson, Pierre Chouteau, Manuel Lisa, Auguste P. Choteau, Reubin Lewis, William Clark, Sylvester Labadie, Pierre Menard, William Morrison, Andrew Henry. There were 150 men in the expedition when it left St. Louis.

Under date of June 5, 1810, Andrew Henry writes to Francis Valle on the Madison and understands that Valle regrets having left the fort. If he wishes to remain he may do so under arrangements he had with Manuel.

On October 8, 1811, Wilson Price Hunt with about 65 men reached Fort Henry on the Snake River. (See Missouri Day By Day, vol. I, p. 190, edited by Floyd C. Shoemaker.)

On June 4, 1812, Missouri Territory was created out of the territory of upper Louisiana. The previous five districts of this territory, St. Charles, St. Louis, Ste. Genevieve, Cape Girardeau, and New Madrid were created counties of the same name by proclamation of Territorial Governor of Missouri Benjamin Howard. The first territorial legislature met in the summer of 1813 received a petition from the citizens of Mine a Breton and surroundings asking that a county by the name of Washington be erected out of the townships of Breton, Bellevue, and part of Big River Township. The date December 1, was set for the activities of the organization to begin. Accordingly the first court of common pleas met January 4, 1814. The first judges of this new county were John Stanton, William Sloan, and Martin Ruggles. The sheriff was Lionel Brown whose father and brother are buried in Potosi and who is said to have been related to Aaron Burr. He was later killed in a duel with the notorious Jack Smith.

The first jury was composed of Andrew Henry, foreman; Abraham Brinker, Solomon Daily, John Perry, Jr., John Hopkins, Joshua Morrison, Philip McGuire, Joseph Cross, Nicholas Hays, John Hughes, Zopher P. Evans, Josiah H. Bell, David Smith, William Hughes, David Wheeler, John H. Weber, Peter W. Lore, Moses Bates, Edward Cheatham. This information is found in the book of common pleas housed in the probate office of the Washington County courthouse.

Andrew Henry's return from the West in late 1811 found much talk of Indian warfare and by the time that Washington County was completely organized the citizens were formed into military companies. It has been handed down in the family of my grandfather, Timothy Phelps, that the two were in the same company at one time. Both came out of the War of 1812 with "major" added to their names. In the Sixth Regiment, county of Washington, William H. Ashley Lieutenant Colonel commanding and Andrew Henry Major of First Battalion.

In the "Missouri Gazette and Illinois Advertiser," St. Louis, October 12, 1816, appeared the following notification: "The following named gentlemen have been recommended as commissioners to take the testimony in cases arising under the act authorizing the payment for property lost, captured, or destroyed while in the military service of the United States and for other purposes. For the county of Washington: Moses Austin, Andrew Henry, John Brickey, Israel McGready, Samuel Perry. Should any of the above mentioned feel not disposed to serve in that capacity, they had better signify it to Richard Bland, commissioner of claims, at the City of Washington and name some other person to serve in their respective places."

On August 19, 1815, Andrew Henry and Samuel Perry signed Daniel Dunklin's bond as sheriff of the county for the sum of $10,000.

The records show that Andrew Henry owned slaves. During the latter part of the year 1816 to show that he and his household were not roaming the woods for deer meat to eat as so many had been doing at Mine a Breton a dozen years before, we go to the account book of my great-grandfather, Daniel Phelps, now in my possession. We note that at that time the Breton of the French had changed in spelling to the Burton of the Americans. We quote:

"Mine a Burton, October 4, 1816, Andrew Henry to Daniel Phelps and Co., Dr., October 8, 1816, to beef, 115 lbs. at 4 cents, $4.60; October 12, 1816, to beef, 122 lbs. at 4 cents, $4.88, total, $9.48; November 27, 1816, balance by note, $9.48."

Through this year and the next citizens of the Missouri Territory were discussing ways and means of securing statehood. A map of that period shows two counties north of the Missouri River, St. Charles and Howard. South of the river were St. Louis, Ste. Genevieve, Cape Girardeau, New Madrid, and the newly created county of Washington. The talk was concreted into action by the circulation of five memorials, which, after securing about 60 signers each, were sent to the Territorial Delegate, John Scott, to be presented to Congress. The people enumerated their grievances and prescribed the boundaries of the new State. Two of these memorials with their signers are still in existence and are to be found in historical society collections. One has 68 and one 69 signers. One is a note penciled on the margin, saying that the first 18 names were the members of the grand jury of Washington County of the October term 1817. There are a few names on both memorials. Seventy percent of the names on both memorials were from Washington County. The names of the grand jury are copied first and some of the best known names of that day follow:

B. J. Thompson, David Wheeler, Joseph McMurtrey, John Hawkins, Thomas Higginbotham, John Stewart, Moses Ferguson, John Hutchings, Timothy Phelps, John Tulk, John Trimble, Jr., A. Miller, John Jones, John McIlvaine, Josiah H. Bell, Jacob B. Rambo, William Hughes, John Frazier, Louis Valle, William Ficklin, George W. Jones, James Austin, Daniel Dunklin, Abraham Brinker, Zachariah Goforth, Nicholas Hayes, Isaac W. Jamison, William H. Ashley, Israel McGready, John Rice Jones, Robert T. Browne, John H. Weber, Andrew Henry, Ben Horine, John McCormick, James Donnell, Hugh McIntyre, Samuel Huitt, Laken Walker, Amable Partnay, Jason Frizzel, Felix Hedding, Absalom Eaton, Barnard Coleman, Alexander Craighead.

From an issue of Missouri Gazette, which is also preserved in Missouri Historical Society collections, dated October 1, 1818, we copy.

"The sale of lots, in the town of Caledonia, Belleview, Settlement, Washington County Missouri Territory, will commence on the 15th day of May next. The town is situated in the largest tract of fertile land in this county; it is surrounded by many valuable farms, the products of which have already found their way to New Orleans; a still greater number of farms are now opening; men of wealth from almost every State in the Union are making purchases. Land which 12 months ago sold for $1.50 per acre is now selling for $5.00. The main road by Potosi to Cape Girardeau, the county of Lawrence, Arkansas, Ouachita, Red River, and all of the southwestern country passes through the town. Within the limits of Caledonia, are three excellent springs, the largest of which affording water enough for a mill in the center of the town and within the square laid off for public uses." Signed: Alexander Craighead.

A search of the county deed records shows that Ananias McCoy and William Buford each deeded to Alexander Craighead 17 acres of land for the purpose of having a town laid off. The three elegant springs so close together had attracted settlers and attracted attention to the coming sale of lots. Mr. McCoy and Mr. Buford each reserved a choice of lots for their own use. Andrew Henry owned lots 25 which Frank Larmer now owns and lot 19 where Jane Thompson's house was built some years later and has lately changed owners. The street connecting the two lots was named Henry Street. Some other owners of the first town lots were Zachriah Goforth, Willoughby Goforth, Robert Sloan, John Rice Jones, Robert Stevenson, W. O. Stevenson, Thomas Reed, Joseph McCormack, Alexander Russell, Moses Russell, James Johnson, Jacob Moyer.

In the year 1818 or 1819 Our Fur Trader married the second time, Miss Mary Fleming, daughter of one of the original owners of the Mine a Joe property, which is described as being located 18 miles southeast of Mine a Burton and outside of the horseshoe described by Grand River as it circles Mine a Burton and Potosi. The Flemings have been enterprising people through the years in St. Francois County. There were five children born to that union: Missouri died young, Jane, Patrick, Mary, and George who was born February 3, 1830, and died February 20, 1867. Jane married Robert Cain, died leaving two children, Andrew and Mary Catherine. Andrew went to California in early manhood and his life is lost to us. In early adult life, Mary Catherine Cain located at Bonne Terre and peddled, in her buggy drawn by one horse, Singer sewing machines. She became a rather eccentric and familiar figure in the town and surrounding country. Her will left her property to the Methodist Church in Bonne Terre. Patrick married first Miss Amanda Hangar, of Bellevue Valley. She was the daughter of David and Mary Hangar. Amanda Henry died leaving one daughter, Mary, who became a schoolteacher and was in demand as a teacher in this and surrounding counties. Patrick Henry left Bellevue and located near Salem, Dent County, where two sons were born to his wife. They also went West in early manhood. In later years she went to keep house for her father and died there and is buried beside her father.

Mary Henry married John A. Harris, son of Rankin Harris and Vicy Breckenridge, daughter of George Breckenridge, whose pocket notebook was quoted above. Mary died young leaving 2 small children: Firman and Ava, who died very young. All 3 are buried in the Bellevue Presbyterian Cemetery near Caledonia. John A. Harris is buried near Durango, Colo. George Henry married Angeline Harris, a daughter of Rankin Harris. They settled on a farm adjoining her father's which was known as Big Lick. Four girls, Georgeanna, Lucetta, Nevada, Carrie came to bless the home. It was in February 1867; the Civil War had left the valley so stripped of provisions that times were very hard. Mr. Henry had gone out about Webster, now Palmer, to engage in mining to help earn a living for his family. The word reached Mrs. Henry that he was very sick, that she must come at once. She went and brought the remains back to lie near his sister, Mary Harris. Only a little more than a month later her fifth daughter was born and named Grace George Henry.

The oldest daughter, Georgeanna Henry, married William Denton of Bismarck. They spent a long life together, which was mostly spent on the Big Lick farm. Lucetta Henry made a teacher and taught in this and surrounding counties. But the rigorous winters were too hard on her physical strength and she died young. Nevada also died too young. Carrie married Rufus W. Williams and bore several children. One son, Paul Williams lives near Bismarck. His son, Paul Vernon Williams, has been a recent mayor of Bismarck. Grace George Henry made an outstanding teacher in this and adjoining counties. The last 13 school years of her life she taught in the grades in the Flat River schools from which she was retired several years before her death.

From various histories we learn that Andrew Henry and William H. Ashley went again to the Rocky Mountains on a fur-trading expedition in the spring of 1822. On July 10, 1822, Benjamin O'Fallon writes to Ramsey Crooks that 2 companies are contending for wealth in the upper country: Ashley and Henry and Missouri Fur Co. The former had the misfortune to lose a boat and it may arrest the progress of their expedition. On September 8, 1824, James E. B. Austin writes to his older brother, Stephen F. Austin, and mentioned Henry's return from the Stony Mountains a few days ago saying "he has suffered much and met with many misfortunes." So for the third time in 25 years, Andrew Henry comes back home.

We do not know where Mary Fleming was living at the time of his return. The fact that he had owned so much land in and around Caledonia would lead us to think that she might have lived on some of the different holdings. We infer that he was not leading the active life he had done for so many years. Harmony Township, in which the mining town of Webster, now Palmer, was located, does not appear in the Washington County records until 1828. On May 28 of that year the court appointed judges of the election and named polling places in the various townships. For Harmony Township the judges appointed were Moses Scott, A. W. Hudspeth, and Andrew Henry. The election to be held at the house of Andrew Henry, which was used for the same purpose in 1830. On May 10, 1832, Ahijah W. Hudspeth, William Clark, and Andrew Henry were judges, the voting to be done at the home of Reuben Smith.

Before next election time the mortal remains of Andrew Henry had been laid in a lonely grave on a hillside where his neighbors and friends had promised him to carry out his request. The rumor trickled down to us that Andrew Henry did not stay with his wife much more after he came back from fur trading than he did while he was gone. He died June 10, 1833, with the youngest child about 3 years old. The fact that all of her living children married in Bellevue Valley leads us to think that she lived in Bellevue.

Some years ago the State of Oregon asked Missouri for the location of his grave, with a view to erecting a monument over it. No one then living could point out the lonely grave. Now I am told by old residents of Palmer that their own cemetery is located on a side hill near the town. I cannot keep from wishing that some day it will become the Andrew Henry Memorial Cemetery and be so designated.

The appraisers of the Andrew Henry estate were Moses and John Scott and Samuel Baird. F. Manning was the administrator. Who bought what at the sale makes an item of interest in this Washington County story of Andrew Henry and his associates. We quote in part:

G. Tennison, iron wedges, etc., $1; James Robinson, smoothing iron, 25 cents; T. W. Hopkins, 2 coffee mills, 51¼ cents; L. Tennison, lock cain, $4.37⅓; Samuel Baird, old basket and weeding hoe, 37½ cents; Samuel Allred, old pine table, 18¾ cents; E. Gillam, folding table, $1.93¾; Samuel Baird, shot gun, $5.12½; Jerry Campbell, spring and steeple, $1; John W. Maxwell, 6 volumes, Pinkston's Travels, $18.50; John W. Maxwell, 10 volumes, American State papers, $8.25; James Gobbet, historical register, 93 cents; Samuel Baird, Burns' Poems, $1.30¼; W. J. Walker, 10 volumes Sterns' Works, $10.06¼; James Gobbet, 1 History of England, $1.37½; Samuel Baird, 1 Modern Chivalry, $1.50; James Gobbet, Atlas and Geography, $1.87½;

T. D. Blount, 1 companion for girls and boys, 25 cents; W. N. Pledge (?) armful of old books, 68 cents.

There was a violin priced at $4 and a Yankee clock.

From Missouri Republican, St. Louis, June 18, 1833, page 3, column 4:

"Departed this life, after an illness of a few days, at his residence in Harmony Township, Washington County, on the 10th inst., Maj. Andrew Henry, a man much respected for his honesty, intelligence, and enterprise. Major Henry was one of those enterprising men who first explored the wild and inhospitable regions of the Rocky Mountains and at that time was a partner of the first American Fur Co. that was formed for the prosecution of that trade."

Not all references have been tabulated but the sources of information have been the collections of both historical societies and the county records.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....The Capitol Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The Work of the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a lecture by Mr. A. J. Wagner, General Manager, Tennessee Valley Authority, at the University of Wisconsin, on April 21, 1955. The lecture was most interesting and most timely.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORK OF TVA IN THE REGION AND IN THE NATION

(Excerpts from lecture of Mr. A. J. Wagner, General Manager, TVA, at Seminar in River Basin Planning, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Apr. 21, 1955)

I should like to have you keep in mind that while the TVA operates largely in a relatively small region of the United States, its benefits are not so confined. Besides its responsibilities for carrying on certain Federal activities in the Tennessee Valley, it has national responsibilities also. This is true of its activities in research and experimental production of fertilizer and in the demonstration of new and improved fertilizers. The Fertilizer-Munitions Development Center of TVA at Muscle Shoals performs in the fertilizer field the same functions as the United States Forest Products Laboratory here in Madison performs for forest industries and the users of forest products. Your University College of Agriculture and your State Agricultural Extension Service and many farmers in this State have coperated in testing and demonstrating TVA fertilizers.

The navigation channel provided by TVA is an important addition to the Nation's inland navigation system of 9,000 miles. To mention but one item, it has widened the market for Midwest grain, with new elevators and mills in the valley importing their materials by barge. More than half the average annual benefits of TVA's flood control are to be found not in the Tennessee Valley but in the basins of the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, where the reduction of flood crests helps protect cities and towns and millions of acres of farm land.

TVA's national defense functions are obviously as important to the people of Wisconsin and New York as to those of Alabama and Tennessee. In the last war, its plants produced three-fifths of the military phosphorus used by the Armed Forces, as well as other munitions. Its power output helped produce aluminum and chemicals, not to speak of its vital part in the development of the atomic bomb. TVA's chemical know-how is now assisting the Army Chemical Corps in producing an important ingredient of nerve gas at a new plant at Muscle Shoals.

In the first 9 months of the current fiscal year—July 1954 through March 1955—the TVA power system produced nearly 35 billion kilowatt-hours, of which nearly half (more than 15 billion kilowatt-hours) was used by Federal agencies, mainly the Atomic Energy Commission. This was about half again as much power as was used by all the 1,375,000 homes, farms, factories, and businesses served by the municipal and cooperative distributors of TVA power in the same period.

Despite these facts, I am sure that you have heard complaints that the TVA area is somehow a favored region in Federal expenditures. In a way, this is to be expected, simply because TVA's unique character among Federal agencies has attracted a great deal of public attention. "Why," people ask, "should we pour all that money into that one small area?"

It's a question that deserves some brief attention. The "favored region" idea rests on an implicit assumption that Federal expenditures should somehow be equally distributed among regions on some such basis as population or area, although the shortcomings of this assumption are obvious. Federal expenditures are made where the need and opportunity exist and where such expenditures will further the national interest. We don't spend Federal money for harbor improvements in Nevada simply because New Yorkers are so favored. We spend harbor money where harbors exist. We develop river navigation where the rivers are susceptible of such navigation.

However, given the premise, I am sure that it will surprise a number of people to learn that, far from being a uniquely favored region, the Tennessee Valley is far from a favored region.

Let's take expenditures for water and power resource development, which are primary interests of TVA. The Federal Treasury's total investments for such purposes in the Tennessee Valley region as of June 1953 had amounted to about $235 per capita. In the alluvial valley of the Mississippi—that stretches from a little above Cairo, Ill., to the mouth—the Federal investment has amounted to $390 per capita. In the Central Valley of California, where development was started after TVA, the per capita Treasury investment is $175, not substantially lower than in the Tennessee Valley.

This tells only part of the story, however. In the Tennessee Valley, the largest part of the per capita expenditures represents investment in the power system, and all this will be fully repaid to the Treasury. The investments for flood control and navigation in the Valley, which won't be paid back, amount to about $403 million, or $115 per capita. In the Mississippi alluvial valley, the total costs for flood control and navigation have been nearly 3 times as high—$1,185,000,000, or $390 per capita, for which the Treasury will not be reimbursed.

Thus the ultimate net cost to the Treasury for complete water resource development in the Tennessee Valley will be far lower on the Tennessee than on the Mississippi. Ultimate net costs are likely to be higher also in the Missouri, Colorado, and other river basins than in the Tennessee.

Another primary interest of the TVA is land and agricultural development, it being a principle of an integrated program that development of a river and of its watershed go hand in hand. However, most of the Federal expenditures for land and agriculture development in the Valley, as elsewhere, are made through the United States Department of Agriculture. Here again we find the Tennessee Valley is not favored. Taking the expenditures of both the United States Department of Agriculture and TVA from 1934 through 1953, the average per member of the farm population has amounted to about $707 in the Tennessee Valley, only about 58 percent as high as the comparative figure of $1,228 for the Nation as a whole.

You might think, from some of the descriptions you've read, that the Tennessee Valley is a region simply crawling with Federal bureaucrats, drawing great sums from the Federal Treasury. On the contrary, Federal payrolls per person in the Tennessee Valley have amounted to only $500, or about 31 percent of the United States average of $1,595. Furthermore, in 1934 about 3.9 percen of the total Federal civilian employees were located in the Tennessee Valley region; in 1953, that proportion had dwindled to only 2.8 percent of the total.

The Tennessee Valley also fell behind in other categories of Federal expenditures. In one category, and one only, the valley did lead—that of construction. This includes, over the period 1934–53, the construction of two major AEC projects, the Arnold Engineering Development Center of the Air Force, and various arsenals and military installations, as well as TVA facilities. The construction expenditures in the Tennessee Valley averaged $700 per person, as compared with $320 in the Nation; however, it must be remembered that construction accounted for only 6 percent of total Federal expenditures—a small factor in total Federal expenditures.

The Tennessee Valley fell far behind as a seller of goods to the Federal Government during this period. On a per capita basis, United States purchases in the Tennessee Valley amounted to $520 per person, whereas the national per capita average was $2,300. The valley average was but 23 percent of the national average. Even TVA was not very kind to the valley on this score, for only about 40 percent of TVA's purchases up through the fiscal year 1954 have been from the region. Of about $1,555 million of purchases by TVA, about $933 million have been made outside the seven Tennessee Valley States. Examples are $288 million in Pennsylvania, $119 million in Ohio, $140 million in New York, $92 million in Illinois, and $58 million in Wisconsin.

Federal expenditures for military procurement and construction alone in a number of States were several times as great during the 5 years 1950 to 1954 as the total TVA expenditures over the entire 21 years of its history. During the period 1940–45, military procurement and construction in New York State alone was 10 times as large as all of TVA's expenditures to date.

When Federal expenditures of all types are taken into consideration, it is apparent that the people of the Tennessee Valley region are a long way from being favored proteges of the Federal Government. In fact, on a per capita basis, the Federal expenditures in the Tennessee Valley from 1934 through 1953 have been only about 48 percent of the national per capita expenditures—$2,600 in the Tennessee Valley, compared with $5,430 in the Nation.

I want to make it very clear that I am not complaining on behalf of the people of the Tennessee Valley about this imbalance of expenditures among regions. I am sure that the valley people recognize that Federal expenditures must be made where necessary for the overall good of the country. Federal money has been, and will be, spent in many areas of the country for various purposes—improvement of the St. Lawrence River, the Colorado, the Columbia, the Missouri, and the Delaware; purchase of military and other supplies wherever they may be most economically and efficiently secured; research and development in mineral and forest resources wherever the national ends may best be served.

I am confident that the people of the valley realize, as I am sure you do, that the real test of the worthwhileness of Federal expenditures is whether or not the Nation gets a full dollar's worth of value for each dollar of investment. In the Tennessee Valley we are sure that this has been accomplished.

Correspondence Between Senator Kefauver and Representative Gwinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between Representative RALPH W. GWINN and myself as it appeared in the Star of Elizabethton, Tenn., on April 3, together with the explanation by the Star of the correspondence.

There being no objection, the correspondence and explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA: KEFAUVER VERSUS GWINN

(Back in January the Star, in its morning mail, received one of those extension of remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This particular one caught the editor's eye because of the title: "Twenty Years of Experience With Our First Socialist-Communist Experiment."

(Its author was Representative RALPH W. GWINN of the 27th District of New York.

(Representative GWINN's attack on the Tennessee Valley Authority (the Socialist-Communist experiment) and his uncomplimentary remarks concerning Tennessee drew from this newspaper a column-length editorial which pointed out that TVA's defense becomes Tennesseeans' obligation, since unfair attacks upon the public-power system appear to become direct attacks upon the people of Tennessee themselves, and that the biased and inaccurate estimates of TVA became, willy-nilly, biased and inaccurate estimates of Tennessee and Tenneseeans.

(Representative GWINN received a copy of this editorial and wrote a letter to the Star in reply to it. He mounted a nine-point attack upon TVA which would "summarize the facts as I seem them," he said.

(The Star was interested in the facts as Representative GWINN saw them, but it was also interested in how Representative GWINN's views would appear in the eyes of one of the men who knows TVA intimately and has championed its cause. With this in mind, Representative GWINN's letter was forwarded to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, with the request that the Congressman's points be answered, so that both might be published simultaneously.

(This was done, with the result that the Star's readers, in the exchanges below, may see the major arguments against TVA and the rebuttal to these arguments. Juxtaposed, they make very enlightening reading. Here they are:)

NEW YORK CONGRESSMAN ANSWERS STAR EDITORIAL IN NINE-POINT ATTACK; CHARGES REMARKS MISREPRESENTED

EDITOR, STAR:

One of your subscribers has sent me your editorial printed in the February 6, 1955, edition of the Star entitled "Also at Stake: Our Reputation." It appears the editorial was prompted by my remarks regarding TVA printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8, 1954.

Near the beginning of the editorial is this statement:

"1. There is not a word of truth in what Representative GWINN said or implied." In other parts of the editorial I am represented as "spewing a wildly inaccurate speech," that I used loaded statistics and that in general my remarks were "tripe." These charges would be less serious if all your readers had the benefit of reading my remarks, rather than your interpretation of them.

Men of good faith and good intentions can honestly disagree as to the merits of nationalizing basic industries. But the holding of different opinions gives no license to misrepresent the facts. Surely the people who are sought to be convinced and who must pay the taxes to support such adventures as TVA are entitled to all the facts and the unvarnished truth.

I find it difficult to answer your editorial, for nowhere does it cite my facts and prove them wrong. Mere characterization does not constitute rebuttal. At one point my remarks are completely misrepresented. I did not say that the people of Tennessee are less well off than they were in 1933. Of course, Tennessee has made progress in the last 20 years but she has not progressed as rapidly or as well as her sister States in the South that still rely on the private production of power.

Should you see fit to print this letter as a reply to your editorial let me summarize the facts as I see them for the benefit of your readers:

1. The TVA has permanently flooded 660,000 acres (an area the size of Rhode Island) including rich farmland capable of yielding $27 million worth of farm produce annually. Thus, rather than controlling floods, TVA has permanently flooded more land than the Tennessee River could, left in its natural state.

2. The low-cost power produced by TVA has created such a demand (at least 100,000 homes in Tennessee are heated by electricity) that the supply has never been able to meet it. No other section of the country, supplied by private utilities, has experienced a shortage of power. It is worth mentioning that the private power industry is presently expanding to the tune of $2.5 billion.

3. The TVA is a complete monopoly in its reservation, having forced out all competitors by law. It is subject to no State regulations.

4. Allocation of costs among the various TVA operations have been consistently made on basis favorable to power production.

5. TVA pays no Federal taxes.

6. TVA pays only a small sum in lieu of State taxes which in 1954 amounted to $3,578,668, or about 2.7 percent of its total revenues. On the other hand the Consolidated Edison Company of New York which supplies my district paid $113,447,477 in State and Federal taxes for 1954, or about 24.4 percent of its revenues.

7. Except for a low rate of interest paid on about $65 million worth of bonds which were bought by the United States Treasury, TVA has paid no interest at all on the money it has borrowed or which has been advanced to it. It has been estimated that if TVA repaid the Federal Government for the interest costs alone of Federal moneys spent through TVA, the bills from TVA to its customers would have to be increased over $40 million a year.

8. The taxpayers of the Nation have spent $2 billion in TVA and in recent years congressional advances have averaged in excess of $150 million a year. The 1954 appropriation was $188,546,000.

9. TVA has only made a book repayment of $101.1 million which is $87 million less than the appropriation made in the single year 1954.

Those are the facts. I believe the people are entitled to have them. When they do, I am sure they will come to the proper conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. GWINN.

TENNESSEE SENATOR ANSWERS GWINN'S LETTER TO STAR: CHARGES CONGRESSMAN GREATLY MISREPRESENTED TVA

EDITOR, STAR:

I am glad of the opportunity to present the other side of the TVA case in answer to Representative RALPH GWINN, of New York.

Congresman GWINN's letter of February 14, 1955, to the Elizabethton Star, as well as his speech of April 18, 1954, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, greatly misrepresents the facts about TVA and the Tennessee Valley.

This can be illustrated by his first point in his letter, regarding flood control. In comparing the amount of land inundated in the TVA reservoirs with the land protected from floods, Congressman GWINN simply omits the fact that the TVA system, by holding back water and increasing the effectiveness of the Mississippi levees, helps protect 6 million acres of productive farmland in the Mississippi River Basin from floods. This is 10 times the amount of land inundated in the TVA reservoirs when filled to the brim, not counting the land and cities and towns in the Tennessee Basin which are protected.

In his speech, Mr. GWINN claimed the Army engineers said the Tennessee "would not seriously flood more than once in 500 years," although there would be some spring overflows which would leave a fertile sediment on the land. Actually, as their report shows, the Army engineers said 230 lesser but damaging floods could be expected in 500 years, or about 1 every 2 years. In fact, in 1946, 1947, and 1948 there occurred what would have been without TVA control, the 5th, 6th, and 7th largest floods in the history of the river at Chattanooga. Had it not been for the TVA system, these floods would have deposited a fertile sediment in the homes, stores, and factories of the city, causing $36 million of direct flood damage in 3 years.

In the second point in his letter, Mr. GWINN fails to mention the major reason the power supply situation is tight in the valley region: Namely the large proportion of TVA power going to AEC and to other Federal defense agencies, which are of immense importance to the entire country. Last year TVA's sales to these agencies totaled about 12 billion kilowatt-hours, an amount about equal to that sold to the 150 distributors serving 1,350,000 consumers, and within a couple of years it will reach about 30 billion kilowatt-hours a year. This fact helps explain why TVA appropriations have been large in the past few years. Essentially of course, this point in Mr. GWINN's letter raises the question of whether it is better to have a high demand for power at low, but profitable, rates or to have ample power available at high, exorbitant rates which limit customer use.

In general, Mr. GWINN resorts to some indefensible calculations—the sources of which he does not give—to improperly inflate TVA's power costs. For example, he figures interest not simply on the investment in the powerplant in service but on all the money invested or expended by TVA, for navigation, flood control, fertilizer and munitions research, and so on. Yet surely he must know that the Federal Government has spent many millions of dollars for navigation improvement in his own State of New York—as much or more than in the entire Tennessee Valley—which the people there will neither pay back to the Treasury or pay interest on, through their electric bills or otherwise. When he asserts that TVA allocations of investments have been consistently made on a basis favorable to power product, he ignores the report of the Federal Power Commission in 1949, made with the assistance of the United States Army engineers, which approved the allocations.

When Mr. GWINN tries to compare TVA's payments in lieu of taxes with the tax payments of private utilities, he ignores the fact that TVA is entirely a wholesaler of power while the private utilities sell power at retail at much higher rates. Actually, when the tax equivalent payments of TVA power distributors are added to the TVA payments, the consumers of TVA power (except for Federal agencies, which properly are exempt) pay about 6 percent of their electric bills for taxes whereas the proportion for surrounding companies for State and local taxes ranges from 4.6 to 11.4 percent. While TVA is not subject to income taxes, it must be remembered that all its earnings belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. GWINN's letter obscures the fact that, far from being "subsidized," TVA rates are a paying proposition. TVA books, kept in accordance with the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts for all utilities, show that its revenues have been sufficient to cover all the costs of producing and selling power and to leave a margin equal to an average return of 4 percent on the power investment over the past 21 years. This return is about double the cost of money to the Government.

A word might be said of Mr. GWINN's statistics by which he attempts to show Tennessee lagging behind in economic development. These are selected indexes, provided as Mr. GWINN said in his speech, by the United States Chamber of Commerce. Such indexes as gross postal receipts, for example, are questionable as indicators of overall economic progress. Total income is a more reliable index. In the United States between 1933 and 1953, total income increased 485 percent, in the Southeast 642 percent, in the Tennessee Valley region (including parts of 6 other States besides Tennessee) 649 percent, and Tennessee 655 percent. These figures confirm the fact, known to all Tennesseans, that the State is making very satisfactory economic progress and that the TVA program of resource development has been a helpful factor in that progress.

Yours sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

The Threat of the H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article written by Thomas E. Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. The article, entitled "Science and Religion Must Join if World Is To Survive H-Bomb," poses an interesting judgment of atomic development in the world today, and makes certain prophecies which I think it will be well for all persons to consider.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article first appeared in Better Homes and Gardens, and later in Time magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE AND RELIGION MUST JOIN IF WORLD IS TO SURVIVE H-BOMB

(By Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, in Better Homes and Gardens)

Man now can make weapons capable of reducing the world to the primitive conditions of the time of Cain and Abel. He even has, within the range of his grasp, means to completely exterminate the human race. Today, scientists can make a good educated guess as to the number of bombs needed for total world catastrophe—to scatter to the four winds, in a matter of seconds, the civilization it has taken man so many centuries to put together. No wonder some ask, "Are we not playing with things that belong to God?" The concerted, atheistic threat against all we hold dear has increased and grown bolder in the ratio that the hydrogen bomb has surpassed the rifle. We, in turn, must remain armed to the teeth to contain that threat.

I believe that God meant us to find the atom. Admittedly, we are wrestling with the greatest alteration in man's relation with Nature since the upheaval at the time of the Garden of Eden. But his fundamental relation with God has not changed one whit. The same trial that tested the first man in Eden, and every man since, challenges us in the atomic problem. It is the exercise of choice, the dangerous freedom to use God-given power for good or ill. I do not mean for a moment that science is wrong, but only man's worship of it. Surely, a part of our duty, the effect of the primal urge implanted by our creator, is to discover more and more of the world we live in. But science can give man mastery only over matter. It never reaches ultimates.

I greatly fear one thing. If men will not clothe the bare framework of science with the warm garments of true humanism, they will end up by making machines their god and mathematics their only dogma. The rising paganism of the western world will make our civilization cold as interstellar spaces, ruthless as the atoms which smash each other.

Against our fears, I oppose a great hope. The physical discoveries, which have shaken the spiritual faith of some men, are also shaking the philosophic foundations of materialism. I have noticed a new, extremely encouraging disposition on the part of some nonreligious scientists. They are beginning to acknowledge that the concept of divine creation should no longer be dogmatically excluded from rational speculation about the origin of the universe. To my mind, there are today startling possibilities for a religious breakthrough into the secular mind. The time is ripening for a marriage of religion and science.

THE EXPERTS

The fact is, atomic bombs are dangerous only because some atomic men cannot be trusted. Our crisis today comes from man's greed and will to power, his refusal to submit to reason. As Christians, we must hope that in the Kremlin's dictatorial mind there can eventually be sown some small measure of skepticism as to the value of the barren earth which any atomic war would bring. We must pray for that, with our lips and with the example of holy lives.

I have been especially surpprised to see that the unbelievers among scientists sometimes seem more concerned for the peace than those of us who believe the peacemakers are blessed. It is not their excess of good will, but rather their sharp knowledge of what nuclear war would do to this planet. Therefore, if one does hope to be blessed as a peacemaker this critical year of 1955, he must grasp the facts of atomic life. The American public cannot leave it to the experts. In this cosmic drama, the bald truth is that there are no experts. It is not enough to be merely a technician. For unless the technician in some small way is enamored of the idea of becoming a saint, he will fall short of success. He will not only exemplify the definition given by one learned educator who called the mere technician "a man who understands everything about his job except its ultimate purpose and its ultimate place in the order of the universe."

No, the essential ingredient to atomic survival is a broad base of informed and interested civilians. It is the only way in which we can cope with the immoral fatalism that considers war inevitable—with the folly that professes unconcern over man's darkest threat. Surely, these ostrich attitudes are like the frivolity of those who deny the reality of hell by refusing to think about it. Perhaps the secrecy with which we have guarded certain especially sensitive areas of atomic information contributes to this apathy. But the extent of this secrecy is greatly exaggerated; it is more an alibi for than an explanation of our abandonment of the normal functioning of public opinion. The fact is, the greatest atomic decisions must come from the heart and the soul, not the skilled brain that comprehends a cyclotron.

ATOMS ABROAD

We face a problem that calls for a heart-and-soul solution. Here we have a technology and industrial capability that are unsurpassed, a pool of brilliant scientists who could accelerate the development of atomic power. Overseas are "have-not" nations which desperately need that power now, but which may never enjoy it if they must first acquire the technical skills and supporting industries to produce their own reactors. Shall we fail them? Shall we say, "We could have atomic electric power if we wanted it. But, unlike you people, we don't really need it today, and so its development can wait for economic and financial forces to move it ahead." Actually, though we are investigating many different reactor types, there is only one operating reactor in the United States today. I very much fear that if we fail to push a broad, vigorous program in this field, we will be accused of following a "dog in the manger" policy. I fear even more to consider the consequences if the U. S. S. R. should win the industrial-power race. Certainly, the price tag for nuclear-power reactors would be very high, with the purchasers surrendering their birthrights and civil liberties as the down payment. What a tragedy if world leadership in reactors fell into Soviet hands by our spiritual default.

I do not mean to speak in tones of careless reassurance as one sometimes does to a child. For all you and I know, it may be the incomprehensible and inscrutable will of God to make the 20th century "closing time" for the human race.

But we do know from the law He implanted in us that we have a personal obligation to use the normal means to stay alive as long as possible. Our Nation and the human race have an inescapable duty to the Almighty to avoid an ending of this civilization until God's good time. Once, a wise and simple man named Francis was hoeing in his garden. Someone asked, "If an angel appeared to tell

you, Francis, that tonight you are to die, what would you do?" And St. Francis very calmly said, "Keep on hoeing in the garden." With all its tremendous complications, with the very future of the human race at stake, our atomic agony comes down to this. We keep on hoeing and await God's will.

Our Greatest Economic Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a most stimulating address by Mr. J. R. Cominsky, publisher of the Saturday Review. The address was delivered last year before the Rochester (N. Y.) Ad Club, but I believe that it is perhaps even more pertinent and provocative today than it was a year ago.

It furnishes important light on one of the most important challenges of our time—to make education a living, continuous force for all our people throughout their lifetime; for the 36 million children now in school and college; and in particular for Americas 7 million living college graduates.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cominsky's learned remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GREATEST ECONOMIC WASTE

(Address by J. R. Cominsky, publisher of the Saturday Review, delivered at a luncheon of the Rochester (N. Y.) Ad Club on April 8, 1954, at the Powers Hotel)

Today, I'd like to place before you a few thoughts that have to do with the very essence of living in this or any other community in this wonderful country of ours. May I first deal with a few maxims that seem trite and obvious—but, as we grow older it seems more necessary to elucidate the obvious than to clarify the obscure.

What we are all confronted with is a twofold problem—the problem of making a living and the problem of making a life. The former—making a living—is relatively easy and there are numerous patterns and formulas to achieve a satisfactory result. The latter—making a life—is inexpressibly difficult, and challenges all our talents and resources.

Nobody understood this better than George Eastman. In building a world-famous industry in this community he had assured a comfortable and secure livelihood for tens of thousands of families. But he did not stop there. He saw so clearly the role of education, music, recreation, public health and government in their relationship to human happiness that he gave millions to achieve the greater goal—the making of full and useful lives in his own time and for generations to come.

Let us focus then on the making of lives or rather on the values and principles that make for full and useful living. We can simplify this by looking first at the four great pillars that support our free society and the civilized world. These are:

1. A powerful and productive economy known as the free-enterprise system.

2. A strong and cohesive political system, known as the democratic form of government.

3. Our many-faceted educational system that is the not-so-secret weapon of our democratic way of life.

4. Our spiritual faith as encouraged and practiced in a free society.

In the relatively brief time allotted me today I can deal with only one aspect of one pillar supporting our free world and that is the pillar of education.

Those of us who are closest to the education world and the people in it are staggered by the magnitude of our educational operation and its influence on our society. For some weeks now I have been corresponding with key people in Washington in an effort to give you today one figure that would represent the operating cost of our educational plant in the United States in a single year—1954. There have been all sorts of checking and doublechecking, and the figure may still be vulnerable, but the percentage of error will not be great, no matter how you analyze it. And, believe it or not, the United States is pouring $15 billion into the operation—this has nothing to do with plant investment—of its educational system this year. I was anxious to get this figure because in a gathering with so many businessmen $15 billion is still a fairly respectable amount of money. It is also a staggering responsibility to administer a project of such scope as well as to get an adequate return on the investment. And, so, I come to the focal point of my talk today—and that is how to cash, to a greater extent, the astronomical sums of money that we are now using to develop the minds of our people.

Those of us who are involved in education, in publishing, in religion, and related fields consider ourselves primarily a part of the age-old and continuing struggle for the preservation of values, standards, and principles that are the very foundation of a free society. Values, standards, and principles have always been under attack, and the only difference lies in the fact that in each generation man thinks that the attack of his time is the most violent of all time. Those who have struggled for the preservation of values through the ages have always been a minority but they have been successful beyond their dreams because as we look at the world today we realize that values are still held in the highest esteem in great areas by countless millions of people.

I had a rather unusual personal experience several months ago when I spoke at the Corning Glass Center at a seminar of educators and industrialists on a theme that I called the Age of Wested Miracles. I pointed out that probably never before in the history of man had he been blessed with so many miraculous adjuncts to living in its fullest sense, but that we had hardly begun to make the use of those miracles, particularly in the field of communications, in relation to their potential good. Hardly had I given this talk, which I thought had a rather low hydrogen content, when I was amazed to find it being widely reprinted in symphony-orchestra programs in Boston and Cleveland and in other publications and being hailed as a teaching instrument for the young. As a matter of fact, I was most touched by a letter I received from the diocesan director of the Catholic Church in Cleveland, who said: "Nowhere have I found a finer digest of the ideas we are attempting to promote among the quarter of a million young people in our Catholic Youth program in the diocese of Cleveland. Be assured that you will be quoted ad longem et latum in our feeble yet energetic efforts to make our youth realize the great dignity of being rational creatures of God, and to encourage them to test their great potentialities in the interest of the common good."

The fight for values, however, is not confined to the church; it is a responsibility and duty for all men of good will. One of the finest statements on values was one we were very proud to publish in a recent issue of the Saturday Review, when, in discussing the great problems of our generation, Charles A. Lindbergh said: "I believe that the solution lies within ourselves, and that we can find it nowhere else. Our parties, movements, laws, and codes are important, but they are only outward manifestations of our inward values. * * * To achieve a civilization based on human values requires the desire within ourselves. * * * The character of man still forms the essential core of a lasting civilization."

Recently, President de Kiewiet made a much-admired move in the field of education when he announced a sweeping reorganization of the undergraduate program that assumed a larger responsibility for the young men and women who come to Rochester than just the classroom concept. He is striking a blow in the direction of strengthening and protecting important values as they affect the students' full intellectual, spiritual and social capacities. What Dr. de Kiewiet is doing at the undergraduate level will ultimately have to be extended to a lifetime concept in which all factors in the community, including notably the school, the church, the newspaper, the magazine, the library, motion pictures, radio and television will play highly important and cooperating roles.

Our greatest economic waste today, as I see it, is something Henry Adams so long ago described as a "waste of mind." In treating of this, Dr. de Kiewiet said: "There is waste of mind when economic or social conditions prevent a talented young man or woman from achieving the best of which he or she is capable through education. There is waste of mind when those who enter educational institutions are neglected, or poorly taught or poorly advised. The present mortality of students in our colleges, those who fail to complete their college education because of academic failures or other reasons, is a wastage of our intellectual capital."

I agree. But to me, perhaps the most appalling of all the waste of mind is what happens to the college gradute after he receives his diploma—the number who drop dead mentally, as it were, once the 4-year course is completed. Latest available figures show that our population includes 7 million persons who are described as "living college graduates," To what extent these people are "living" is a moot point. When I recently wrote a letter to one of the leaders of adult education in America I started it by saying: "This may startle you but it is my very deep conviction after long and mature deliberation that the most fertile field for adult education in the United States is among college graduates." To what extent these people are getting too worked up about the man in the street whose educational opportunities have been limited and from whom often too much is expected when a high percentage of 7 million college graduates are dragging their feet in keeping abreast of the great issues and challenges of our time and failing to participate in the crucial decisions. Here is waste in its most glaring and unconcealed form, waste that makes questionable the wisdom of our $15 billion annual operating cost if we cannot do something to make more valuable to our society, the finished product.

A program for extending the mental capacity of our citizenry beyond the day of college commencement is a growing need that represents a challenge not only to our educators but to all communicating media and to our society in general. It is shocking to realize that man has been equipped with

mechanisms of communication beyond the fantastic imagination of even a Jules Verne but that he is communicating so little, and is so inadequate and inept in transmitting human knowledge that is being developed at a cyclonic pace but being implanted in men's minds at a comparative snail's pace.

• • • • •

We are living in what is probably the most complicated age of human history. Not to get rich but merely to survive and function normally a man requires today many times the knowledge he required a decade or two ago. Education, being the unfinished business that it is, cannot protect anybody too far in the future in this world of drastic change and development. I recently read a statement that with the world moving at its present pace, any education except in the broadest terms is obsolete within 20 years.

And so, it becomes a major national problem to extend the educational and informational processes beyond graduation. Here are some major areas that deserve careful examination in meeting this challenge:

Area 1—The university: To reach the desired goal may involve drastic changes in our curriculum whereby the college student is not only being given courses but being indoctrinated and informed with specific programs as to how to continue his thought processes beyond the day he is through attending classes. We may have to think in terms of some postgraduate home-study courses built on the foundation laid in undergraduate work. The undergraduate must not only learn but learn how to continue to learn.

Also, the alumni office of the university—and of all colleges and universities—may have to take on a new scope and importance. The alumni office may have to be charged with the great responsibility of a continuing study of its graduates to ascertain how many are identifying themselves with useful organizations and agencies dedicated to the social, political, and economic progress of our country. If it is ascertained, as it is very likely to be, that much too low a percentage is making its knowledge and training available in these important areas, then the reasons why will have to be determined and some definite plan developed to overcome the inertia.

Area 2—The outside world: Here, a more determined effort will have to be made to draft, as it were, educated people to participate in those programs designed for the public welfare by the groups that represent the leadership of our country. This, of course, is a supplementary effort to buttress the effort colleges and universities would be making in this direction.

In the outside world we all have a great responsibility to bring our interest to bear on the growing and increasingly powerful mass media to devote a greater share of their efforts to matters affecting the public interest, to make them realize that they are an important part of our educational and informational apparatus that can tip the scales in many crucial areas of thought and action. We must keep insisting that the mass media must realize that an overemphasis—what amounts to almost an obsession in the area of entertainment, a philosophy that it must give what it thinks the public wants rather than what the people need—can tend to nullify a great deal of our costly educational machinery and make more difficult the solution of the major problems of our time. It is not hard nor does it require great ingenuity or inventiveness to draw a crowd if we are willing to stoop in our standards. And, of course, the more we stoop the bigger the crowd we can attract. But what we must become most concerned about is not merely the size of the crowd but what we are presenting to it.

Good taste is not limited or a precious thing in the United States of America. It has pretty wide acceptance when it is offered to the masses. There is plenty of evidence to support this, including the notable fact that more persons go to concerts of serious music in this country than to baseball games. Latest figures for attendance at art exhibitions show baseball also trailing in that area of interest. Perhaps not too kind a thing to say, with opening day just around the corner.

• • • • •

We cannot ignore the fact that the degradation of standards of taste and idealism represents a tremendous blow against our whole educational mechanism. It is damaging a mechanism that, as I have stated, costs $15 billion a year to operate. Having dealt with the university and its undergraduate influence and with the mass media that create a good deal of the climate in which we live, may I—not as a major solution of our difficulty but as a specific approach—deal briefly with an idea in the university orbit that at least might be a step in the right direction although relatively a small step. Please understand that this is not presented as a panacea—I wish it were—but as an attempt to focus again on the problem of keeping mentally alive our 7 million college graduates.

For some time, I have been suggesting to the university authorities here and to alumni groups that Rochester might do a pioneering job in setting up an alumni magazine that would not only serve the graduates of the university but be a powerful force in the community among persons who have never had the privilege of a college education. It was my thought that leading members of the faculty and graduates all over the world who have special knowledge and understanding in every area of activity, pool their mental resources and practical experience in a Rochester magazine that would go not only to all graduates of the community but be available to persons anywhere in America who wished to subscribed, graduates or not. Also, it would be available to anybody in this community, on a subscription basis or at the newsstands, so that a high level of discussion and analysis of problems close to the minds and hearts of every person could be made available as never before.

The university would have some tangible and practical benefits from such an operation, in my opinion, in that it would establish a closer relationship with its graduates and would arouse in them a sense of gratitude for continuing their education in vital areas in a changing world. New members of the faculty would become known to older graduates through the expression of their ideas—much more important, incidentally, in appreciating them than the obituary-type notice that now appears in every alumni magazine when an addition is made to the faculty.

Also, I can see the community which now has a considerable financial stake in the University of Rochester—particularly after what transpired recently—rising with appreciation to the fact that here were values now being contributed to the community that had not even been promised in the great development campaign.

It is impossible to talk about education, good taste or mass media without a passing reference to television, of course. I recently read the following statement in an important new book: "TV, it must be very seriously said, is no mere gadget; it is one of the great milestones and possibly gravestones in the whole history of culture."

I favor the great milestone concept. I am not particularly worried about television destroying our civilization. As a matter of fact, I welcome it because it is another important communicating device that can be made one of the most powerful forces we have ever had for raising the intelligence level of our people.

• • • • •

And may I let you in on some good news. Coincident with the miracle of television, which has been thrilling but also frightening to many, people have discovered that they have minds. The startling fact is that more people read more good books last year than ever before in our history—in fact, the volume of books of the highest quality that were purchased by Americans came as something of a surprise to the book publishers who approached these projects with no small amount of fear and trepidation. To reduce the gamble, the publishers made these books available with paperback covers at 25 to 75 cents and the avid public that devoured mountains of them were interested in such racy titles as the two Mentor volumes of Homer's "Odyssey" and "Iliad," selling at 35 cents each. The anticipated sale for each of these staples was optimistically put at 100,000 copies but the public snatched up more than a million of each within a year and a half.

This would seem incredible if I did not immediately restate the fact that there are now more than 7 million living college graduates in the United States constituting the very basis of our middle-class informed society—and at least that number who never entered an ivy-covered building but are thirsty for knowledge. Little do we realize the strength and power of this group in shaping the life of America, and those manufacturers, whether they be of books or magazines or other products, who are catering to this mass market, are finding it highly receptive of ideas, services and products at the same level as their reading diet.

• • • • •

Man's survival has always hinged on his understanding of values and principles that are the responsibility of all concerned with the spoken or written word. His willingness to fight for values and principles has made possible our free society. But the fight is never finished. And we, as a part of the continuing struggle, may have to fight harder than man has ever fought before for one very simple reason.

Man in his great ingenuity has now fashioned means of mass communication that have practically eliminated time and space, and have placed a new burden of responsibility on the whole civilized world. Our defense system, however, still centers primarily about the home, the church, the public school, the public library, the many forms of the printed page, the motion picture, and the air wave. And since all of these will only be as effective as those who manage or administer or direct them—the educated man is destined for the role of the front-line fighter. He must know not only how to fight but what he is fighting for. And that's a job for all of us.

Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a television broadcast on medical research delivered on April 12 over the ABC network by the distinguished commentator and Peabody award winner, Mr. Martin Agronsky.

While hailing the great achievement of Dr. Jonas Salk, Mr. Agronsky presented some telling statistics on how little this country is spending annually on medical research. The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, recently completed hearings on a bill sponsored by myself and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to provide $90 million over a 3-year period in matching grants for the construction of research facilities. Some of the country's most eminent scientists appeared before our committee and presented testimony to the effect that medical research in this country is severely hampered by lack of building and laboratory space. If we are to emulate the great achievement of Dr. Jonas Salk in the other major diseases which afflict the American people, we must give the young scientists of this generation the tools with which to work.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Modern medical researchers lifted yesterday from the hearts of all parents one of their greatest fears—that polio might kill or cripple their child. From Ann Arbor, Mich., there came the happy news that Salk polio vaccine works, and that it works safely. The official figures show this: The vaccine proved 80 to 90 percent effective in preventing polio. Of 440,000 children vaccinated last summer, only 113 developed polio; of these, only 71 suffered paralysis; and, most heartening of all, only 1 child among the vaccinated youngsters died of polio.

The comparative figures among 1,400,000 nonvaccinated children—who were also part of the test—tell the rest of the story. Seven hundred and fifty of them contracted polio. Of these, 445 were paralyzed and 15 died. Dr. Salk, himself, declared yesterday he is certain his vaccine can be made almost 100 percent potent to wipe out the terror polio has presented for centuries.

Last night Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, announced our Federal researchers' tests of the Salk vaccine enabled her to license it as safe for public distribution. All through the Nation now the stamping out of polio can begin; in fact, in many communities, will begin within a few days through the mass vaccination of American youngsters. The children, until more quantities of the vaccine are available, will come first—a decision with which no one would quarrel. Afterward adults will have their turn and the process will have been set in motion which is expected to make polio as much of a rarity in our country as smallpox.

There is no doubt, either, that as soon as is humanly possible our polio vaccine will—in the American humanitarian tradition—be made available to other nations. It seems reasonable to assume the world beyond our country's borders will welcome this achievement of American scientists with at least as much respect and infinitely more warmth than the other great American scientific discovery that was first demonstrated at Hiroshima.

That's one side of the polio story today. The other is told best with some facts and statistics. The first of these facts is negative. It is that no direct contributions from our Federal Government went to finance this brilliant victory over polio. And there are some statistics. We spend in our country annually now, some $4 billion on all kinds of research. The United States Government foots half this bill directly—some $2 billion. Let's break it down a little further. Of the Government's $2 billion—at least 80 percent—some one billion six hundred million, goes to military research—that is, to atomic and conventional weapons development. Of the remainder, only $47 million goes annually for direct medical research. Compare these figures—one billion six hundred million for weapons—$47 million for medical research. Agricultural research also gets Federal money. Some one hundred millions each year to fight cornborers, hoof and mouth disease, etc. That's about twice what we spend for human medical research.

A few more statistics. The Atomic Energy Commission gets for weapon testing an annual allocation of $260 million—which might be compared to the Government grant for cancer research of $14 million a year. And here's a figure—a Navy supercarrier costs $216 million—that sum alone is more than the total amount our Federal Government spends on its human research.

These statistics combine to raise a couple of pertinent questions. These: What's happened to our standard of values? What price a human life today? These are not new questions. They were, in fact, put in essence in 1888, 67 years and 2 world wars back, by another great medical researcher—the Frenchman, Louis Pasteur, who discovered a cure for rabies and the process of milk purification which bears his name.

At the opening of the Pasteur Institute in 1888 Pasteur said this: "Two opposing laws seem to me now in contest. The one, a law of blood and death, opening out each day new modes of destruction, forces nations to be always ready for battle.

"The other, a law of peace, work, and health, whose only aim is to deliver man from the calamities which beset him. The one seeks violent conquests, the other relief of mankind.

"Which of these two laws will prevail, God only knows."

Sixty-seven years later, the words of this Frenchman in whose tradition the young Pittsburgh doctor, Jonas Salk, has followed so worthily, provide a penetrating and bitter comment on the nature of contemporary man which needs no embroidery.

Mr. Corsi and the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Corsi Proves Nothing," published in the Washington Sunday Star of April 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CORSI PROVES NOTHING

Two weeks ago this newspaper expressed the belief that Edward J. Corsi was being offered up as a sacrifice in the hope of propitiating Congressman WALTER of Pennsylvania. Since then, testimony in a Senate committee's investigation of Mr. Corsi's difficulties with the State Department has indicated that this criticism of Secretary Dulles was unwarranted.

There still is reason to believe that Mr. WALTER's charges against Mr. Corsi, charges which have not been supported by facts, may have been the precipitating factor in the removal of Mr. Corsi as Deputy Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act. There is also reason to believe, however, that Mr. Dulles was amply justified on other grounds in wanting to dispense with Mr. Corsi.

These grounds come down to a matter of personality—to Mr. Corsi's propensity for what Democratic Senator MCCLELLAN calls "wild" statements. Mr. Corsi charged, and failed to prove, that Mr. Dulles was guilty of a "whole string of falsehoods." He charged, and failed to prove, that he, Mr. Corsi, was a victim of "Nazi" tactics. He charged, and failed to prove, that a "security gang" in the State Department had undercut the refugee program. He made charges, which he failed to prove, of "sabotage," of "national scandal," etc. In fact, not only did he fail to prove any of these charges, but the testimony of witnesses who were not immediate parties to the controversy was all against him.

It seems reasonable to conclude that Mr. Corsi talks too much and too extravagantly. It is also a reasonable inference that Mr. Corsi's days in the State Department would have been numbered if Mr. WALTER had never opened his mouth.

Contribution of Jews to Cause of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on January 30 of this year the American Jewish Committee held its 48th annual meeting in New York City. That occasion was highlighted by a great address on the subject of freedom, delivered by that eminent jurist and spokesman for the cause of liberty, Judge Learned Hand.

On the same occasion, Mr. Irving M. Engel, president of the American Jewish Committee, delivered a comparably brilliant speech, also on the subject of freedom, with specific reference to the contribution made to the cause of freedom in this country by Americans of Jewish faith.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Engel's fine remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight we commemorate three centuries of Jewish experience in America. Our tercentenary is but a split second in time between two eternities—the past and the future.

So we look backward to look forward. We look inward to our spiritual roots to see further growth.

We ask: what lies ahead for us? Can you imagine with what feeling this same question was asked, 300 years ago, by the first little band of 23 Jews standing on the edge of this yet unmeasured continent?

Let us build no myths about that little band. Like the Pilgrims before them, and all who came later, they were not instruments of destiny, but mortals, with mortal frailties. They did not come to America well endowed with worldly goods. Their meaning for us lies rather in the heritage they brought and the legacy they left. For what cargo could the cramped hold of their ship, the *St. Charles*, or the *Mayflower* before it, carry to

these shores so precious as the moral and spiritual values of the Old Testament? Upon these precepts, which have endured the crucible of centuries, rest the foundations of this Republic.

These 23 Jews knew themselves as settlers, struggling for survival in an untamed land, contending with a hostile governor. But we know them now as an advance guard in the battle for human rights. For in 3 brief years, they won these basic rights:

To enter the country.
To bear arms for the common defense.
To travel and trade.
To have their own burial ground.
To practice their religion.
To own homes.
And, finally, to enjoy equal citizenship.

There would be many battles to come. Indeed, some of these battles are still being waged. But these first victories helped determine the course of the next three centuries of Jewish experience in America. Nay, more, they helped determine the character of the American Nation. They won for us—and in the long run for all Americans—the right to participate in American life without loss of identity. Because these 23 at New Amsterdam did not buy equality at the cost of sacrificing their heritage, they helped shape the spirit of all America-to-be.

Witness Gov. Peter Stuyvesant himself—the man who sought to transplant the bigotry of the Old World to the New. He wrote in angry protest to his superiors: "Giving (the Jews) liberty, we cannot refuse the Lutherans and Papists."

We speak of the American Revolution. But let us keep in mind this other, earlier revolution—a revolution without gunpowder that was launched a century before the Spirit of '76. It was part of the never-ending revolution against all forms of oppression.

Out of this bloodless revolution came an America free of an all-powerful established church; a land of dissident voices and conflicting sects. Lacking orthodoxy, there could be no heresy and no persecution of heretics. And so the market place of ideas flourished and the country was enriched by diversity of faiths, creeds, and origins. And this very diversity has created tough and resilient bonds.

Thus America moved beyond the best that the Old World had to offer: the idea of toleration or sufferance, to a nobler, more fitting concept; equality in freedom. This is what Washington meant when he wrote to the Touro Snynagogue: "It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights." Undoubtedly then, as now, the practices of the time fell short of this concept. But the powerful persuasion of a principle was at work.

* * * * *

Like all immigrants, they found that America spelled problems as well as promises. They found sweatshop and tenement; they found hostility as well as acceptance. But when the balance was struck, there was always the presence of opportunity that turned the scales for them and their children. For theirs was esentially the same experience as that of the first 23 settlers. In a land of diversity, they too could become Americans without sacrificing their identity as Jews. They were not thrust into the "melting pot," and lost in a vast American monolith.

Wherever the doors of opportunity opened, Jews joined their fellow Americans in building this country. They are to be found alongside Americans of other faiths and creeds in the myriad human enterprises of the arts and sciences, business and labor, government, medicine and law, philanthropy and communal service. They helped write America's songs and gave it laughter and gaiety—and deep feeling.

But beyond individual gifts—the fruits of creative hands, devoted hearts, and ranging minds—what did Jews give to America? Are not the uniquely Jewish gifts those of the spirit I mentioned earlier from which spring our earliest and deepest American traditions? For the Old Testament was revered by the Puritans no less than by the Jews. They studied Hebrew and the Judaic heritage. And the Pilgrims' first Thanksgiving was patterned after the Harvest Festival in the Bible. The laws of early colonies in Massachusetts and Connecticut were based on the rules of equity contained in the Scriptures.

The prophets furnished the intellectual arsenal of the revolution. God's covenant with Abraham helped batter down the divine right of kings. Ethical concepts of justice, righteousness, and mercy were the Hebraic mortar which cemented the foundations of American democracy. Biblical verities, known for 5,000 years, were woven into the fabric of American society.

And, as befits The People of the Book, the Jews continued in America their traditional reverence for learning, their intellectual eagerness, their opposition to the closed mind and conformist pressures. In them coursed a deep current: Call it liberalism in the true sense of freedom from prejudice and bigotry and removal of the barriers to self-fulfillment. Call it also conservatism in the classic sense of defending eternal truths and values.

However, Jews may differ on many social, economic, and political questions of the day, it is no accident that they have unwaveringly supported democracy. It is no accident that they have sought to keep the golden land open to all—a refuge for exile and rebel, for men driven from their own lands by want or tyranny. It is no accident that they have been sensitive to whatever threatens any group or individual. Liberty is indivisible—that lesson they have learned well. So they have ranged themselves in behalf of civil rights and civil liberties. They have opposed segregation and discrimination. With Americans of all creeds they have fought nazism, fascism, and communism—those "isms" which deny the infinite worth of the individual human being and crush him beneath an all-powerful state.

The program of the American Jewish Committee has been molded by appreciation of America as a land of diversity—appreciation of our heritage as Americans and as Jews. Through this committee we have dedicated our energies for almost a half century to affirming our faith as Jews; enriching our spiritual heritage; strengthening America; preserving and extending democracy; making human rights secure throughout the world.

To realize these goals we have been engaged in far-ranging activities, carried on by dedicated communal leaders and a devoted staff. We have been engaged in a pioneering enterprise, a vast social engineering effort to secure the bulwarks of democracy through education and law; through court tests; through advancement of intergroup concord; through all the formal and informal means of communication which bind our society together. We know, too, that democracy's surest foundation lies not in statutes but in the hearts and minds of men. Therefore, we have worked with our fellow Americans to strengthen freedom of opportunity, to assure equality for all, to keep the climate of America free.

In earlier sessions, you have discussed our multifaceted programs whereby we seek to secure the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad. Among these are four vast areas so central to all our efforts, so relevant to our examination tonight, that I venture to single them out for you: our concern with human rights abroad and at home; obtaining security for Jewish communities abroad; the special problems of Israel, and, lastly, American-Jewish communal life.

The vast problem of international protection of human rights is our direct concern. For upon the eventual construction of effective international guaranties rests the ultimate well-being of all mankind. And when future historians record the successful outcome of this prolonged and difficult quest, they will report the contributions made by two whom we esteem so highly—Judge Proskauer and Jacob Blaustein, our two living past presidents, now our honorary presidents. Their vision first took shape here at the committee. They carried forward this bold, imaginative approach to the State Department in Washington and won support there. Then at San Francisco, in 1945, in the face of greatest odds, in the company of the leaders of America's foremost voluntary organizations, they saw it finally emblazoned in the United Nations Charter. For the first time in history, nations subscribed to the broad principle of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

I shall not give you soft words about the progress we may expect or belittle the obstacles ahead. The principle of international cooperation throughout the U. N. which shone so brightly a decade ago has suffered reverses. Perhaps we were too optimistic. But now we must not yield to frustration and bypass the U. N. We cannot cry retreat. Until there is an international bill of human rights, until there is a Genocide Convention, until there are other international safeguards, which one of us is safe? Is peace itself safe?

We must help carry these concerns to our fellow Americans. As a non-governmental agency accredited to the U. N., we must assist its efforts to attain dignity and peace for all mankind.

Turning to the domestic scene, how staunch are the guaranties of our own Bill of Rights? This is one of the gravest questions confronting us. If by ignorance or imprudence we miscalculate the threat to our freedom, or if, spurred by fear, we erect ill-conceived security measures, we shall inflict upon ourselves wounds perhaps no less deep than those we could ever receive from Communist conspirators. The problems of achieving security while safeguarding individual liberties cannot be solved by pretending that a Communist conspiracy does not exist. Neither can they be solved by pretending that the sprawling, elephantine network known as the loyalty-security program does not carry within it fearful menace to our own liberties. Both risks must be faced simultaneously.

Why are these problems before the American Jewish Committee? Because on the one hand, the continuing welfare of this Nation and of all its citizens depends on cauterizing subversion. This affects us as it affects all citizens. And we are concerned as Jews. Where through irresponsibility, as in the Ladejinsky affair, the seeds of suspicion are sown, freedom is imperiled. Others—the bigot and the xenophobe—renew their efforts to twist differences of national origin, race, or faith into indices of disloyalty. Let freedom falter and a time of critical danger is upon us. There may be only a few short swift steps from confidence to fear, from harmony to hatred, from safety to persecution.

As a public contribution to help devise ways of maintaining national security while preserving individual liberty, AJC sponsored an intensive study of the manifold aspects of this problem. That sober analysis, entitled "American Security and Freedom," has been widely hailed in the Nation's press, on the floor of Congress, and in many quarters where the issue has been seriously studied. One of its key recommendations calls for the

creation of a Presidential Commission to re-examine the entire loyalty-security program. AJC vigorously endorses this recommendation.

A thorough study and improvement of current clearance procedures is imperative if this Nation is to protect itself adequately against unrelenting Communist threats. In the deepest sense, the very terms of the security program itself, as well as the conflicting interpretations it is given, impair the security of the Nation that it is intended to preserve. Terms like "subversive," "derogatory," "security risk" need far more rigorous definition than they have been given lest they become weapons turned against us. Fear of the consequences of honest reporting may cripple our Foreign Service. Important procedural safeguards are still denied to accused employees. The Nation may be deprived of the services of intelligent, experienced and devoted men and women because they have been tagged "controversial."

These grave defects have now harassed two administrations. They will not be corrected until a thoroughgoing review of the entire system is undertaken and improvements made. Creation of additional coordinating or review units is not a substitute for a painstaking and intelligent overhaul.

With these considerations in mind, the committee, in concert with other responsible bodies, will continue to press for a Presidential commission to develop means of protecting our national security without injustice to individuals or further damage to the Nation.

A second major area of our committee's concern is defending the civil and religious rights of Jews the world over. The committee indeed was founded in 1906 to help Jews in Eastern Europe suffering from barbarous onslaughts.

What has made us ever sympathetic to the plight of Jews in other lands? Certainly our ties with Jews abroad are not political. Rather we are moved by sentiments based on common tradition and religion.

This past year we have responded as fully as we could to our fellow Jews in the still war-benumbed countries of Europe. Those are continuing problems and too complex to permit swift sketching. Communities have been fractured; new patterns must be developed. Similarly, special conditions confront the Jews of Latin America. And still unrelenting pressures beset 2,500,000 Jews in Iron Curtain countries.

This past year, north Africa, like a massive atomic pile, reached a critical stage. As authorized by your executive committee, Jacob Blaustein, John Slawson, and I flew to Tunisia, Morocco, and Algeria. We were accompanied by Zachariah Shuster, director of our European office, and Abe Karlikow, his assistant. It was a fact-finding mission to ascertain the conditions and prospects facing some 500,000 Jews.

These are lands of fierce contrasts—extremes of wealth and poverty; bursting cities and hillside caves; the East versus the West, the old versus the new.

There, in lands stirring from feudalism, fired by nationalism, stand the Jews. Some are descended from forebears who settled there 2,000 years ago. Around them swirls a contest between a France reluctant to yield her power and increasingly restive, impatient Arab nations-to-be. Between both forces are the Jewish communities, eager to stay if assured full rights, fearful of what the future may bring in the wake of French withdrawal or waning influence.

The situation is too delicate for sloganizing as "nationalism versus colonialism." The problems of 240,000 native Jews in the theocratic and feudal state of Morocco are different from those facing 50,000 native Jews in Tunisia; in Algeria almost all the 140,000 Jews are French citizens. Yet this much does apply universally: We seek to help insure that these lands, part of a region that cradled mankind, shall not entomb the Jewish communities. In so doing we shall help promote peace and stability in that turbulent region.

In conferences with Jewish community leaders and Arab rulers and spokesmen in North Africa, and with high French officers and our own State Department, we advocated: Guaranteed equal rights for all, including the right of each man to determine freely whether to remain in full security and equality, or to emigrate with his property. In short, we urged for Jews and for all minorities in north Africa the guaranties of the international bill of human rights.

Through our Paris office, through discussions here with the State Department, and through contacts established with Jewish leaders in those lands, we shall endeavor to help speed the peaceful and orderly solution to the north African crisis.

Our record on Israel is a third illustration. We endorsed the Balfour declaration soon after it was issued, and since then we have supported, first, Palestine and, later, Israel, as a home and haven for those Jews who have had to go there or have wanted to go there. Simultaneously we have tried to work for Arab-Jewish understanding. Our emphasis has always been on the humanitarian, not on the political; on helping human beings in need, not on ideological slogans. For us the state was never an end in itself, it was the only means left for transferring survivors of the Nazi holocaust from the despair of the DP camps to the security and dignity of a home in which they were wanted.

Because of the American Jewish committee's non-political orientation, generally referred to as non-Zionist, we were in a strategic position, always working clearly within the framework of American interests, to contribute to the progress of Israel and help clarify the relations between that country and the American Government as well as between Israel and American Jewry. We have helped to secure economic aid for Israel from the United States in the form of grants-in-aid; we have also helped to secure loans from the Export-Import Bank, and materially contributed toward the successful effort of obtaining the restitution payments by West Germany.

Our ceaseless work for peace in the Near East is entirely in accord with United States policy and interests in that area. Often, at the request either of our own Government or of the State of Israel, we have undertaken important and delicate tasks, and rendered services which have been greatly appreciated by our own Government as well as by Israel. For these services we in turn owe our two honorary presidents a large debt of thanks.

Is it necessary to repeat what we all know—that this concern with Israel has nothing in common with any doctrine or ideology of Jewish nationalism? Anyone who has the slightest acquaintance with American institutions and with the attitudes of American Jews knows that this involves no question of loyalty or allegiance. The loyalty and allegiance of American Jews are unreservedly to the United States.

Further clarity of the distinction between Israeli citizens and American Jewish citizens was secured in 1950 by Jacob Blaustein, then president of the committee, through personal conferences with Ben-Gurion, then Israeli Prime Minister.

Our last concern turns us homeward to our philosophy of the American Jewish community. Do not 3 centuries of Jewish experience in America tell us this about ourselves: If we have wrought changes upon America, America too has wrought its changes upon us? The interaction has been mutually beneficial. This new land evoked new communal patterns—patterns of voluntary association in keeping with the American spirit of voluntarism. Separate enclaves do not thrive here for the same reason that kept out their physical counterparts—the walls of the ghetto. In this land which encourages diversity, each man speaks for himself, each organization only for those members it actually enrolls. We reject the proposition that American Jewry is, or should be, a single mass with but a single will, a single voice, a single chosen instrument.

Time and again a central authority has been urged in the name of unity, efficiency, central planning, economy, order versus chaos, etc. Such calls have been rejected by the majority of American Jews as alien to the spirit of voluntarism. AJC's founding president, Louis Marshall, father of our distinguished chairman tonight, stated that no formal convergence of American Jewry is possible outside the framework of voluntary association.

* * * * *

This celebration is a testament of freedom, of achievement under democracy, of fulfillment, and enrichment. As such, its message speeds forth from us around the world to bring the light of freedom to men of every race, color, and creed. Our three centuries of experience is America's eloquent answer to rebut Communist propaganda. Let us challenge the totalitarian world: where can they match this testament?

The Tercentenary's meaning is also deeply personal. It calls upon us to affirm anew our determination to enrich our spiritual heritage. Each of us will find this meaning deep in his own spirit, in his relations to his fellow men and to God.

Thus the Tercentenary commemorates the greater aspects of Judaism and American democracy. To this fruitful and inspiring national celebration many individuals and organizations have contributed. As for our role, I need do no more than quote from the American Jewish Tercentenary Committee which declares that this celebration was spurred by the American Jewish Historical Society and the American Jewish Committee. For the magnificent direction of this national celebration, we pay tribute to Mr. Tercentenary himself, Ralph Samuel, one of our vice presidents.

And so, with neither arrogance nor smugness, but with thankful heart, and courage for the future, we commemorate what has gone before. And this, too, reflects America, for its climate nourishes men who are confident, not craven.

Fundamentals of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, in which tribute is paid to a speech made by the President yesterday in support of H. R. 1. We all join in the hope that the President and others in the administration will take a more affirmative lead in support of the measure which is so vital to the Nation.

Particularly, Mr. President, the editorial compliments my colleague [Mr. GORE] upon the outstanding presentation he made yesterday on the floor of the Senate in support of the proposed legislation. The editorial points out that now is the time for others in the Congress as well as in the administration to get behind the measure, which is somewhat bogged down at the present time, and to try to rescue the program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDAMENTALS OF PEACE

President Eisenhower yesterday reaffirmed his administration's dedication to peace with another plea that it be underwritten by stronger economic ties between the free nations. "Either we foster flourishing trade between the free nations," he said, " or we weaken the free world and our own economy." The President underscored his argument for closer ties with other peoples with the dramatic announcement of plans to send a new atomic powered merchant ship around the globe. The picture he drew, with the consequent effect on communications, should shake the confidence of the most confirmed protectionists. For science and invention are making the peoples of the world interdependent whether they want to be or not.

But the President's speech may have come too late to prevent serious damage to his trade program—and serious damage to America's position of leadership. The Senate Finance Committee amendments adopted last week, to give added protection to the textile industry and strengthen the hand of the Tariff Commission to to the embarrassment of the President, may have opened the flood gates. Yesterday the President appealed to the country to support him in his fight against crippling amendments of the reciprocal trade program. But the Finance Committee continued to be the object of protectionist propaganda designed to undermine the whole program.

At about the same time the President spoke in New York before the annual meeting of the Associated Press, Senator GORE of Tennessee gave the Senate one of the most eloquent and convincing statements it has had on the significance of the trade program. It was the kind of speech administration leaders should have been making for months; they have been strangely silent in the face of mounting opposition to the Eisenhower proposals. Although the President's program had been in serious trouble, its supporters seem not to have known how to counterattack. Senator GORE brilliantly showed the way in his long, skillfully documented account of the effect of foreign trade on the textile industry.

Because of the intense pressure put on him by textile management and labor to amend the trade program, the Tennessee Senator sought to find out for himself what logic there was in the textile arguments. He found, and presented elaborate statistics to support his conclusion, that the industry's difficulties are not due to imports, that it has an overwhelming stake in exports, and that the liberalization and expansion of world trade can bring important net returns to the cotton textile industry. He felt entirely justified, therefore, in condemning the textile lobby, which has been powerfully organized and directed, for its shortsighted campaign.

Let us hope that these forceful utterances by President Eisenhower and Senator GORE will give new strength to Senators who are trying to follow the national interest rather than the dictates of poorly informed groups that want protection at any price.

Military Job Changes Since 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert a brief analysis and accompanying charts on changes of duties and training requirements of military jobs in the armed services.

In any look at the technological changes in the offensive and defensive methods of maintaining our national security, one is apt to overlook the tremendous revamping necessary to provide a workable scheduling of adequate proficiency levels of service personnel.

To give some guidance in our thinking on this vital problem, which I have discussed at some length with Assistant Secretary of Defense, Carter L. Burgess, the following information will, I believe, prove most helpful:

MILITARY JOBS IN THE ARMED SERVICES—CHANGING DUTIES AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS, 1949–55

A review of the jobs of the enlisted men in the armed services during the past 6 years reveals a series of changes in each service. These job changes have been made in the interest of better manpower management to reflect the changing technology of the armed services. Table I is a list of major job changes since 1949, including new, revised, and deleted jobs. The training time to reach an entrance level of proficiency in these jobs is also shown.

A significant number of new jobs have been created, such as, guided missile propellant explosive specialist, jet mechanic aircraft and atomic weapons nuclear assembly specialist, reflecting the results of technological development in new scientific fields. Some jobs have become obsolete, such as, the signalman in the Navy, due to these same technological improvements. The complexity of many jobs has become sufficiently great so as to require the breakdown of 1 military job in 1949 into 2 or more separate new jobs. For example, in radar maintenance in the Army in 1949 there were 3 specific jobs. Today the Army requires 7 different jobs for this area of work. Major developments in each service are summarized in succeeding paragraphs.

Between 1949 and 1955 the Army's system of classifying military jobs has undergone two major revisions, in 1950 and now in 1955. The general trend has been that jobs are grouped and related to one another on a functional basis. Likewise, substantial changes have been made in school-training requirements due to increased complexity of the specialty and the division of a single job into two or more new jobs. This tends to simplify training and to accelerate productive time on the job. This latter point is especially noticeable in Army with 2-year inductees as compared to the other services with 3- and 4-year enlistments.

Both the Navy and the Marine Corps have made considerable changes in their job classifications since World War II. The changes, as in Army, represent new skill requirements commensurate with technical innovations. For example, a Navy destroyer in 1940 had fewer than 200 electronic tubes; in 1955, a destroyer has over 5,400 such tubes.

As new weapons and equipment have been acquired by the Air Force, they have had two effects on Air Force military jobs. One has been to add entirely new jobs related to the installation, operation, and maintenance of the new equipment; a second has been to radically alter the content of the jobs originally established in relationship to older, less complex equipment. This modification of existing jobs to meet the needs set by new and improved equipment results in a system in which jobs are not dropped entirely, but often are drastically changed.

Table II indicates for a sample of jobs the comparative length of time, 1949 to 1955, required for a person to qualify in a skill. More time is required today than 6 years ago to train personnel on jobs that have become more complex, as radar repairman or gunner's mate. Some jobs, as aviation ordnanceman, have become sufficiently complex as to be split into new jobs, thereby often reducing the training time for a specific job.

TABLE I.—*Department of Defense changes in military jobs since 1949*

ARMY	*Training time (months)*
Additions—Job titles:	
Medical records specialist	7
Surface to air missile materiel chief	10
Surface to surface missile materiel chief	10
Surface to air missile fire control chief	15
Surface to surface missile fire control chief	12
Guided missile mechanical specialist	5
Surface to air missile electronic specialist	11
Surface to surface missile electronic materiel specialist	12
Nonelectrical instrument repairman	7
Guided missile materiel crewman	6
Guided missile fire control crewman	6
Atomic weapons electronic assembly specialist	6
Atomic weapons nuclear assembly specialist	7
Fixed station transmitter repairman	10
Fixed station terminal repairman	11
Fixed station receiver repairman	10
Aircraft repair foreman	9
Helicopter maintenance supervisor	10
Cargo helicopter pilot	12
Airplane repairman	9
Soils technician	7
Medical equipment repairman	9
Aircraft powertrain and engine repairman	9
Rotor and propeller repairman	6
Aircraft instrument and electrical systems repairman	9
Target airplane mechanic	6
Helicopter repairman	10
Atomic weapons electrical assembly crewman	5
Fixed station radio attendant	8
Aircraft maintenance crewman	8
Signal parts specialist	6
Guided missile propellant explosive specialist	6
Engineer parts specialist	6
Ordnance parts specialist	5
Transportation parts specialist	4
Quartermaster parts specialist	4
Clinical technician	16
Integrated fire control electronic repairman, M–33	8
Integrated fire control electronic repairman, T–38	8
Chemical parts specialist	6
Integrated fire control electronic repair helper	10
TV equipment repairman	8
TV cameraman	6
Radio relay and carrier operator	6
Guided missile mechanical repairman, corporal	7
Guided missile mechanical repairman, Nike	6

ARMY—continued

Additions—Job titles:	Training time (months)
Guided missile doppler system repairman, corporal	6
Guided missile computer repairman, corporal	7
Guided missile radar repairman, corporal	7
Guided missile internal guidance system, repairman, corporal	8
Guided missile launcher control repairman, Nike	6
Guided missile acquisition radar and computer repairman, Nike	8
Guided missile track radar repairman, Nike	9
Guided missile internal guidance system repairman, Nike	7
Light Antiaircraft artillery integrated fire control equipment mechanic	13
Medium or heavy antiaircraft artillery integrated fire control equipment mechanic	13
Field artillery radar mechanic	10
Guided missile electronic repair helper	10
FA radar crewman (field artillery)	8
AAA radar crewman (antiaircraft)	8
Heavy antiaircraft artillery fire control crewman	8
Light antiaircraft artillery fire control crewman	8
Surface-to-air missile electronic assembler	9
Surface-to-surface missile electronic assembler	9
Surface-to-air missile fire control crewman	8
Surface-to-surface missile fire control crewman	8
Light fire control equipment repairman	11
Heavy fire control equipment repairman	11
Doppler repairman (corporal)	11
Computer repairman (corporal)	11
Radar repairman (corporal)	11
Internal guidance repairman (corporal)	12
Acquisition radar repairman (Nike)	12
Track radar repairman (Nike)	12
Internal guidance repairman (Nike)	12
Atomic weapons nuclear assembler	11
Radar repairman	10
Electronic warfare repairman	10
Electronic navigation equipment repairman	13
Civil mechanical engineering assistant [1]	3
Mathematics-statistics assistant [1]	3
Chemical engineering assistant [1]	3
Electric electronics assistant [1]	3
Physical sciences assistant [1]	3
Biological sciences assistant [1]	3
Social sciences assistant [1]	3
Deletions—Job titles:	
Electronic fire control equipment repair supervisor	11
Electronic fire control equipment repairman	9
Medical technician	8
Guided missile assembly chief	10
Guided missile warhead specialist	10
Guided missile propulsion specialist	9
Guided missile mechanical guidance specialist	9
Guided missile electronic guidance specialist	9
Guided missile assembly crewman	7
Single side band radio repairman	7
Fixed station radio repair supervisor	9
Radio teletypewriter repairman	8
Special weapons assembly specialist	8
Special weapons electronics specialist	8

[1] These military jobs are occupied by highly specialized civilian-trained men, all of whom held one or more academic degrees, who are inducted into the Army and who are under the scientific and professional program of the Army.

ARMY—continued

Deletions—Job titles:	Training time (months)
Fixed station radio repairman	7
Guided missile repairman	10
Guided missile internal guidance system repairman	11
Guided missile external guidance system repairman	11
Heavy antiaircraft artillery fire control mechanic	12
Guided missile guidance components repairman	10
Guided missile repair helper	7

NAVY

Additions—Job titles:

A. General service

	Training time (months)
Guided missileman	25
Aviation fire control technician	25
Aviation guided missileman	25

B. Emergency for mobilization

Fire control technician (A) (automatic directors)	12
Fire control technicians (M) manual control directors)	10
Fire control technician (U) (underwater)	12
Fire control technician (G) (missile guidance systems)	12
Electronic technician (N) communications)	12
Electronic technician (R) (radarman)	12
Electronic technician (S) (sonarman)	12
Damage controlman (A) (ABC defenseman)	10
Aviation electronic technician A (aircraft equipment)	12
Aviation electronic technician G (ground equipment)	12
Aviation electronic technician O (ordnance)	12
Aviation boatswain's mate A (air ship rigger)	9
Photographer's mate A (aerial cameraman)	12
Torpedoman's mate E (special electric)	12

A. General service

Deletions—Job titles:	
Fire controlman	20
Aviation electronics man	20
Aviation photographer's mate	22

B. Emergency for mobilization

Boatswain's mate K (canvasman)	5
Torpedoman's mate S (special)	12
Torpedoman's mate E (electrical)	8
Fire controlman S (surface weapons)	10
Fire controlman S (underwater)	10
Radioman N (radioman)	12
Radioman E (landline telegrapher)	10
Communications technician A (analytical aide)	12
Communications technician M (maintenance man for Sp. Equmt)	12
Communications technician O (operator for special equipment)	10
Communication technician R (radio specialist)	10
Personnel man S (supervisor Women's Reserve	6
Personnel man R (recruiter)	8
Personnel man W (chaplain assistant)	6
Damage controlman P (painter)	8
Aviation electronics technician A (aircraft equipment)	12
Aviation electronics technician G (ground equipment)	12
Aviation electronics technician O (ordnance)	12
Aviation ordnanceman F (fire controlman)	12

MARINE CORPS

Additions—Job titles:	Training time (months)
Personnel accounting analyst	6
Lawyer enlisted	7
EAM operator	10
EAM key punch operator	6
EAM accounting operator	16
Enlisted jet pilot	17
Jet mechanic aircraft	11
Reciprocating mechanic aircraft	11
Chief jet mechanic aircraft	23
Helicopter aircraft mechanic	11
Airborne intercept operator	8
Explosion ordnanceman dispatch technician	11
Wire chief	20
Field radio operator	5
Radio telegraph operator	9
Cryptographic equipment repairman	10
Bulk fuel man	7
Legal clerk	6
Engineer equipment mechanic	10
Engineer equipment mechanic foreman	19
Engineer master mechanic	16
Aviation control tower operator	12
Ground control approach operator	13
Ground-control intercept operator	12
Aviation radio technician	14
Aviation radar technician	14
Aviation fire-control technician	14
Ground-control approach technician	12
Air-launched guided-missile electronics technician	16
Radio and TV information man	7
Atomic, biological, and chemical man (defensive measures)	16
Aircraft radio technician	14
Aircraft radar technician	14
Integrated fire-control technician, medium AAA	16
Integrated fire-control technician, light AAA	16
Integrated fire-control technician, guided missile	16
Deletions:	
Airborne intercept operator	6
Jet-power-plant maintenance mechanic	7

AIR FORCE

Additions—Job titles:	
Airborne electric countermeasures specialist	9
Electric countermeasures repairman	9
Ground electronics countermeasures specialist	12
Guidance systems mechanic	10
Fire-control systems mechanic	12
Weapons-fusing systems specialist	10
Nuclear specialist	9
Aircraft electrical gunner	9
Electronic fuel-control repairman	10
Jet-engine mechanic	9
Inflight-refueling specialist	7
Weapons mechanic	9
Aircraft loadmaster	5
Motion-picture photographer	13
Motion-picture specialist	11
Aircraft-landing-control operator	8
Control-systems mechanic	9
Instrumentation mechanic	10
Photographic-equipment repairman	12
Mechanical accessories and equipment repairman	9
Munitions specialist	8
Air-frame repairman	9
Rescue and survival specialist	6
Survival training and personal-equipment specialist	10

TABLE II.—*Length of time to qualify in a skill*

ARMY	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Wheel vehicle mechanics	9	10
Infantry squad leader	16	18
Radar repairman	16	18
Fire control maintenance (Artillery)	6	10
Petroleum supply	4	6
Communications center specialist	8	7

NAVY	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Quartermaster	15	15
Electronics technician	21	21
Fire control technician	23	23
Torpedoman's mate	12	18
Gunner's mate	12	16
Aviation fire control technician	(*)	25
Aviation ordnanceman F	10	(*)
Air controlman	15	18

(*) In 1949, the job was only a part of the overall duties of an aviation ordnanceman. By 1955, the work has become so complex as to warrant a rating.

AIR FORCE	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Weather forecasting	20	21
Armament systems maintenance	19	22
Aircraft and engine maintenance	22	24
Radio-radar system maintenance	21	23
Metalworking	17	17

MARINE CORPS	Months	
Job:	1949	1955
Amphibian tractor mechanic	18	18
Aviation ordnanceman	20	20
Radio technician	12	13
Radar technician	21	23

The Department of Commerce and the Alleged Defense Essentiality of the Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a letter which I addressed to Secretary of Commerce Weeks some 10 days ago:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. April 15, 1955.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This morning, I read newspaper reports of your press conference and was very much surprised to learn that you told newsmen you had never seen the report prepared last year by the Defense Department concerning the jeweled watch industry.

It was particularly disturbing to me that you were unaware of the contents of this report in view of the fact that: (1) Your Department took the lead in persuading ODM last year that the domestic jeweled watch industry was essential to national defense; (2) you and other Commerce officials have frequently testified before congressional committees concerning the vital role which the four jeweled watch companies supposedly play in our defense production, and (3) at the present time, the Commerce Department is sponsoring an exhibit by the domestic watch industry emphasizing the unique importance of these firms in the defense procurement picture.

I think you will agree with me that the Defense Department is in an excellent position to evaluate whether the skills and facilities of the watch industry are truly vital to national security. Certainly, it would have been advisable for you and other Commerce officials to have studied the Defense Department's report on this subject—which was made available to you although it was suppressed from the public and the Congress for obvious reasons.

For your information, I am attaching a copy of the Defense Department report, which was recently declassified. You will note that the report can hardly be considered as obsolete since it was prepared less than a year ago after the most exhaustive study. Mr. C. S. Thomas, who was then Assistant Secretary of Defense and is now Secretary of the Navy, emphasized that "the report has had the benefit of the most thorough examination by technical experts of the three military departments. The conclusions have been reached after careful consideration by cognizant officials of the Department." Certainly, nothing has happened within the past year which would give the Defense Department a valid excuse for changing the findings and recommendations in this report.

The conclusions reached by the Defense Department were as follows:

(1) "The timing devices used in the ammunition program were produced by the jeweled watch manufacturers, nonjeweled watch and clock manufacturers, and others completely outside the horological group. There does not appear to be any part of the manufacture or assembly of mechanical time fuses that is peculiar only to the jeweled watch industry."

(2) "Only 11 percent of the total mobilization requirement (for all timing devices) planned with industry, is with the jeweled watch industry."

(3) "There is in no way a unique requirement for it (the jeweled watch industry) in the fuse program." Many manufacturers outside the jeweled watch industry "are capable of producing mechanical time fuses and rear fitting safety devices. Every part is being produced by some company other than a jeweled watch firm."

(4) Mobilization requirements of the Defense Department for jeweled watches and chronometers are "nominal," far below World War II levels. Sufficient capacity "will remain and can be used for current procurement needs and be the basis for supplying the mobilization requirements. If, in the future, it should become apparent that sufficient capacity will not be maintained and available, the Defense Department can then procure all of its requirements of jeweled movements for the mobilization reserve"—i. e., can easily be stockpiled.

(5) The needs of the Defense Department for industrial capacity clearly demonstrate that "no special nor preferential treatment for the jeweled watch industry is essential."

I hope that you and other Commerce Department officials will study this document carefully. In view of this authoritative report by the Department of Defense, it seems hard to understand why the Commerce Department continues to insist upon further Government protection for the domestic watch industry—particularly in view of the current prosperity of these firms and the hardships which have been imposed upon American watch importer-assembler firms, United States exporters, and millions of watch customers who now must pay higher prices.

Actions by the administration to curtail watch imports have a direct result on the ability of the Swiss to purchase American agricultural and industrial products. The farm population in my district is keenly aware of the fact that their market for cotton, rice, and other commodities is sharply reduced when other nations are deprived of the dollars they need to trade with the United States.

In view of the fact that the Defense Department has conclusively stated that there is no need for special Government action to protect the domestic watch industry, the administration should immediately reconsider its moves which have been so destructive of international trade and friendship with the Swiss.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Our Country's Aim Is Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared on the front page of the Washington Daily News on April 20, 1955, presenting the consensus of opinion of the various Scripps-Howard editors of the Nation. The title of the editorial is "Our Country's Aim Is Peace," and it is very thought provoking.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR COUNTRY'S AIM IS PEACE

Editors of the 19 Scripps-Howard newspapers meeting here yesterday agreed unanimously that a dramatic restatement of America's position in relation to world affairs is due soon.

The editors concluded that it is high time something be done to dampen the widespread notion—which seems to be shared even among some of our friends and allies—that America is hellbent for war.

After hearing detailed reports from Scripps-Howard foreign-policy experts, after many hours of discussion which expressed the viewpoints of men representing communities from coast to coast and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, the editors formulated this statement of Scripps-Howard policy:

America should take the peace initiative away from Moscow. We should prove to civilized opinion that we, more than anybody else in the world, want and need peace because we, above all others, have more to lose by war.

This is a job which the President of the United States can do far better than anyone else.

The time and place also are of vital importance. And they are near at hand—as if made to order.

In June the United Nations will hold a special commemorative session in San Francisco on the 10th anniversary of the signing of the charter. Many of the foreign ministers of the world—maybe even Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov—will be there.

We respectfully suggest that it would be fitting for President Eisenhower to open that conference in person with an appeal for a new effort to establish peace. He should put before the world America's case for peace in a new and vivid light.

It would be a chance for the President again to demonstrate the lengths to which the United States is willing to go to attain peace. He could:

Offer to disarm to any limit the other powers would be willing to go under strict regulation.

Propose to ban mass-destruction weapons if others would agree to cheatproof supervision and inspection.

Suggest that the United States would agree with others and with adequate guaranties of compliance to limit the proportion of key resources that could be used for arms so that more could go into peaceful goods.

Reiterate the right of civilized peoples everywhere to governments of their own choosing, at free elections, by secret ballot, and without outside interference. * * *

Emphasize that we seek nothing that belongs to anyone else; that there are no strings attached to our offers; that all we ask in return for reciprocal arms reduction is the dropping of Iron and Bamboo Curtains—the opening of frontiers not only for international inspection teams but also for plain, ordinary people.

The President could catalog the peaceful moves by this country, its participation in peaceful projects, and its genuine desire to do more. He even could recall his 1953 offer to devote a large percentage of the savings from any real disarmament to a world fund to help man enjoy the fruits of this tormented old earth.

He would have to emphasize, of course, that the United States was not seeking abject appeasement. Distasteful as military life is to Americans, they also know—as the President himself has so aptly put it—that a soldier's pack is not nearly so heavy as a prisoner's chains.

President Eisenhower has done all this before. But it is now 18 months since his atoms-for-peace proposal to the United Nations and 2 years since his last full dress speech on peace. Efforts to attain peace and to portray the United States in its rightful peaceful role require constant stimulation.

All we seek is peace. But the Communists claim they want peace and we want war. Too many people, unfortunately, believe the Communists.

Ten years ago this June the hopes of man were focused upon the newly born United Nations. Ten years of bitter experience in a divided world has tempered those hopes.

But that experience has not lessened the hope that surges in all men's breasts that somehow, someway, somewhere a way will be found to implement the first line of the U. N. Charter—

"We, the people of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

At San Francisco next month President Eisenhower has an ideal place before the United Nations to remind the entire world that American policy is peace and that America is prepared to go to great lengths and to make great sacrifices to attain it.

Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, recently May Craig, Washington columnist for the Guy Gannett newspapers in Maine, returned from a trip to Europe and Russia. May has written some excellent columns about her visit to Russia itself. The first two of these columns appeared in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, on April 21 and 22. They are entitled "May Sleeps in Sight of the Kremlin" and "A Visit to the Tomb of Lenin and Stalin." I ask unanimous consent that these interesting reports on scenes behind the Iron Curtain be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of April 21, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—MAY SLEEPS IN SIGHT OF THE KREMLIN

(By May Craig)

Moscow, April 1.—Last night I slept in sight of the red star that shines on the highest spire of the Kremlin. It is bitter cold and snowing. In the streets women in short skirts and high boots are shoveling the snow away. We arrived last night in a storm in a two-engine Russian plane, from Warsaw, on a runway humpy and slippery with ice, though heavy snow had been piled off to the side. The pilot had to feel his way in; we circled around for more than half an hour before we found the airport. Same in Vilna, entry point for Russia. Vilna was once in the Baltic State of Lithuania.

There is a fine new air terminal at Vilna, two-story, marble and red carpets, comfortable lounge, excellent toilets even with tissue-paper removable covers for the seats. We went through customs with no trouble, just a spot check. I did not have to open anything. However, we had been told to leave our little red canvas plane bags and other personal hand luggage on the plane, but when we got into customs we found this had been brought in also; my little portable typewriter had not, though it had been opened on the plane. We had to fill out a long questionnaire as to how much money we had, whether we had opium or anything like that, printed matter and film, etc., plants, fur, and many other items.

The lunch was plus and minus. First, excellent orange-colored caviar; then a big plate of chicken-rice soup, also excellent. Main course was bad—a sort of fried sausage cake, very greasy, french fried potatoes, ditto; red cabbage, cooked, ditto; rice, ditto. Dessert was "compote," consisting of three small pieces of apple and one small plum, floating in thin red juice. No coffee or tea; the men had beer which they said was thin but good.

We had left Warsaw without seeing any official, though we had asked. They said there was not time. We did not get a positive refusal, we just didn't, and this I find happens very often and is very exasperating to an American. In Warsaw I mailed off some stories to my papers. I had to take them to a post office; open, so they could see there was no money enclosed. The two women at the post office looked inside, took out a few sheets, glanced at them and put them back. I sealed them. There was a lot of palaver about how much postage to put on; they do not have much mail going outside the country.

Maybe we did not see officials because they had not heard from Moscow and didn't know what latitude they had; whether it was a snub, or whether Moscow wanted to give out whatever was given.

At cocktails at the American Embassy I met a keen young man, Bogdan Lewandowski, in charge of the British-American Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who has been 5 years one of the Polish delegation to the United Nations, and speaks excellent English. He asked about my trip so far, and I told him of our frustration, our sense that we had not been allowed to make the most of our time and see things and people in Prague and Warsaw. He said we had not given adequate notice and didn't stay long enough. I said we had asked for visas as long before as November and had not known until we got to Paris, a week before we left London for Prague, that we could come.

Section of the Warsaw Airport from which we left was much better than the section we came into, which I told you was so unattractive. The main part, where we waited for our plane to depart, was comfortable, with a big map, in inlaid wood, on the wall, plants, and a small bar where coffee was the equivalent of $1.75 per cup, without milk or cream; tea by the glass at 75 cents. We had no trouble with customs or money leaving Warsaw. It took about 5 hours to Moscow, including the Vilna stop, and the 2 hours' change in time made it seem late when we got to Moscow in the twilight. The soldiers and officials at Vilna were most courteous, and when we arrived in Moscow there was a representative of our Ambassador, some American newspapermen, some Russian newspapermen to meet us. There were no photographers to take pictures of arrival in any of the Iron Curtain countries. At Vilna there were many planes parked far off to the side of the airfield, which was a desolate, vast expanse of snow. The landings made by the pilots on the icy runways were very smooth. We got no snacks on the plane from Warsaw to Moscow.

The dinner we got at the National Hotel, here, in sight of the Kremlin, was perfect. Stan Johnson, the Associated Press man, helped us order and we sat relaxed and mellow after the meal, nicely served by pleasant waiters. Then we went out in the bitter snowy wind to walk around Red Square, past the red marble tomb of Lenin and Stalin, and looked at the Basilica of St. Basil, the high wall with crenellated top, and Red Star shining over all. My room is large and ornately furnished; there is hot water and heat in the radiator.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of April 22, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—A VISIT TO THE TOMB OF LENIN AND STALIN

(By May Craig)

Moscow.—A religious awe is wrapped around the tomb of Lenin and Stalin, now the twin patron saints of Soviet Russia and its satellites. Outside the great red marble tomb queues of people, a half mile long, wait in sun and icy winter, on the 4 afternoons a week when they are allowed to enter and file, 2 by 2, past the 2 glass-enclosed, bronze sarcophagi in which the 2 leaders of modern Communists lie embalmed.

As "guests" we were allowed to go to the head of the line of people who stretched interminably across Red Square, down the street, around the corner and into a park. It was bitter cold and we shivered in our coats as we waited for the chimes from the tall Spasskaya Tower to sound quarter to five. We waited perhaps a half hour, on the edge of the Square, a long way, perhaps a distance of 3 or 4 blocks from the tomb beside a young, immobilized soldier in long overcoat and black leather boots, who had halted us at this spot. Behind us waited the long files of people who had waited perhaps 2 hours. After the clock on the Kremlin tower chimed, another soldier came, saluted, and motioned that we follow him. We paced very slowly, across the Square, past two other soldiers standing singly at points along lines white-painted on the pavement. Everything was quiet, nobody spoke. We felt the influence of the stolid soldier-guide with his slow steps.

When we arrived directly opposite the tomb with its massive, solid block-on-block architecture, we could see the soldiers with bayoneted rifles, standing on either side of the entrance, up the wide, deep steps. We followed, through a massive door, into the dim interior, beautiful dark green marble, even the floors. Downstairs into a crypt, still in that slow walk, still deathly still, past more silent guards, through a massive door into the crypt itself. The 2 sarcophagi stand high on bronze bases, topped with ornamental bronze. Everything is gloom, except the brightly lighted sarcophagi and the two bodies, which stand out with startling lifelikeness. Lenin has been dead for 31 years, yet it seemed as though he would speak.

The raised sarcophagi are in a sort of pit, level with the floor as we entered, but as we went up steps, we were level with the shoulders of the soldiers who stood stiffly at attention on the pit floor, so that we were on a level with the bodies themselves. Slowly, two by two, we walked past Lenin, turned past their feet, walked past Stalin, then down the steps and out a door opposite the one we entered.

Lenin is nearly bald, his right hand is clenched in the famous Communist salute, he has a little pointed beard. Stalin looks as we have seen him in pictures, sandy hair, large mustache. Lenin's face is intellectual, he is frail. Stalin, the man of steel, is massive as the architecture of the tomb. The embalming is amazing; possibly the vacuum inside the glass is the secret. Stalin's hands are open, palm down, in a most natural position. The smallpox pits which in pictures mar his face, were not noticeable. He wore his medals on his breast.

The whole scene was dramatic, melodramatic, if you wish, and after you got out, into the bright cold blue day, you said that to yourself. But while you were going through, you felt the immense impact as a shrine. The Communists are trying to take religion away from the people; they are putting the state, communism, Lenin who preached it and Stalin who imposed it for so long, in its place. It reminded me of Hitler who sought to put the swastika and the sword on the altar; of the ancient Pharaohs and Caesars who were presented to their people as divine. This tomb is part of the Communist rule of the people, shrewdly and imaginatively designed as part of the plan.

Back of the great tomb itself is a sort of memorial garden, with stone walks, long, low marble strips, 2 feet above the ground, the mass graves of the martyrs of the revolution of 1917. Back of these are individual graves, with tablets and bronze and marble tombstone of individual heroes. Behind all this, the ponderous locked doors piercing the ancient crenallated red-brick wall which surrounds the Kremlin, which is a vast collection of cathedrals, palaces, offices, the grand Kremlin palace, the art galleries.

In the wall, back of the mass tomb and the individual memorials, which enclose the actual bodies, are engraved plaques about 1 by 2 feet square, enclosing the ashes of other leaders of the Communist movement. One of the latest is Andrei Vyshinsky, well known to Americans in the United Nations who died recently. We followed our guide, still 2 by 2, but walking faster now in the bitter twilight cold, down the granite steps, to the sidewalk, across Red Square to our waiting automobiles. The slow double line of people was still twisting serpent like toward the tomb, as far as we could see. Is this devotion? Or does the block leader keep account and remind Ivan and Ina every so often that they have not been lately?

The Display of the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith a resolution adopted by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Colonists at their convention meeting held in Washington recently.

Copies of the resolution have been sent to the leadership of the House and Senate by Mrs. William L. Ainsworth, chairman of the resolutions committee, and Mrs. Frank G. Grau, national president of the organization:

DISPLAY OF THE FLAG

Whereas the flag of the United States of America is the symbol of our Nation; and

Whereas there is an ever greater need for display of our flag, not only on public buildings, schools, and State institutions, but from every home throughout this country; and

Whereas a general display of the flag by our citizenry would reaffirm faith in our constitutional Republic,

Resolved, That the 34th general assembly of the national society, Daughters of the American Colonists, through its active membership, urge all citizens to own and display the flag of the United States of America at their homes on all those days set aside for special display of the flag as designated by section 2 (d) of the Flag Code, Public Law 829; and be it further

Resolved, That the Flag Code be observed as in section 2 (f) regarding display of the flag in or near every polling place on election days; and be it further

Resolved, That funds be provided by the State and Federal Governments for the supplying, the cleaning, and/or replacement of United States flags in all Federal courtrooms and on Federal properties where United States flags are customarily flown.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leaders in the Senate and House and to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

The Yalta Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written—the newspapers and periodicals, stated in radio and television broadcasts, and spoken here—the case about the release of the Yalta papers. There is much half information, false information, and impertinent information about the position of the State Department in this matter.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, made a complete statement on the subject before a committee of the other body on April 19, 1955, and yet confusion still exists in the public mind about what he said. The hearings of congressional committees, though printed, are not easily read by or readily available to the general public. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a somewhat better medium for disseminating public statements of this nature. Accordingly, I am inserting into the RECORD a copy of the statement made by Secretary Dulles on the subject of the release of the Yalta papers:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Let me say at the start that I believe that it was right that the Yalta papers should be made officially public. I believed—and still believe—that the American public, historian and citizen alike, is entitled to all relevant information on this remarkable chapter in world history that could be divulged without jeopardizing the national security. In this respect I share the view expressed by the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., who, as Secretary of State, participated in the Yalta Conference. He said, in 1949, that "it is important for the public to know exactly what took place in the Crimea, and, almost equally important, what did not take place." That was said in the preface to his volume "Roosevelt and the Russians," which very fully reproduces his detailed record of the Yalta Conference.

The official United States publication has now taken place. I am glad to review with you the background and the chronology of events in connection with it.

I

The volumes on the Malta and Yalta Conferences were two of a number of volumes in the Foreign Relations series requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its report for fiscal 1954. The request grew out of the supplemental hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations on May 15, 1953, which considered a 4-year publication program submitted by the Department of State. This program involved the reduction of the backlog of 26 volumes which had been compiled but not published, along with the publication of a series of volumes on our relations with China during the 1940's and another on the World War II conferences of heads of Government. The Senate Appropriations Committee's report of May 28, 1953, requested the Department of State to "allocate sufficient funds from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, 1954' to provide the necessary personnel and other related expenses essential to start reducing the backlog" of the Foreign Relations volumes, and referred with approval to the 4-year program submitted by the Department.

In the hearings for fiscal 1955 the Senate Appropriations Committee had before it a report from the Department showing the proposed schedule of publication which listed the Malta-Yalta volume as having top priority for publication in the series on World War II conferences.

The Senate Appropriations Committee's report for fiscal 1955 stated:

"The committee reiterates its firm conviction that the historic and documented record of our international relations as compiled in the Foreign Relations volumes should be continued aggressively and in unexpurgated form. Every effort should be made to make these documents available just as soon as security considerations will permit. Accordingly, the Committee is recommending $227,280 for this specific purpose."

The Yalta papers were ready to be sent to the printer early last September. If they had been printed at that time they would have been ready for publication in October. The question of whether to publish in October was put to me while I was in the Far East in September. On my instructions, Assistant Secretary Carl W. McCardle cabled the Department from Tokyo on September 11, 1954, as follows:

"With respect to date of publication, Secretary believes that it should not be published until after the congressional elections. If the publication could have taken place a month ago, that would have been all right; but to publish only 2 or 3 weeks before elections would, he thinks, damn the entire operation as political, and in the eyes of students discredit it as politically motivated. They would be suspicious that the selection and omission of documents had been politically motivated. He would, therefore, recommend publication sometime about the first of December."

That December date was not met because of unexpected developments. The British Foreign Office, in accordance with customary practice, had already been shown the documents of British origin, and had cleared these, with very minor exceptions, which did not affect our foreign policy. But toward the end of November 1954 the Foreign Office asked to see the entire collection of documents, including those of United States origin.

In view of the understandable British interest in the minutes and related conference papers, the Department sent the entire set of galleys to the Foreign Office for its information. This was done on December 2, 1954.

By early January, no comments had been received. So, on January 10, 1955, I sent a personal message to Foreign Secretary Eden telling him of our desire to proceed with publication without further delay and expressing the hope that he had no objections. On January 13, he replied that he still had some questions which he suggested we could discuss together at Bangkok the following month. He requested delay until then.

In deference to the Foreign Secretary's wishes, I postponed the publication. However, under the pressures of other matters, Sir Anthony Eden and I failed to talk about this at Bangkok.

Accordingly, upon my return from Bangkok I decided that, while awaiting British approval, a limited number of galleys should be printed and made available on an official basis for departmental use and use by those committees of the Congress who had a special interest in them. On March 10, I cabled Sir Anthony recalling that he had planned to talk to me at Bangkok about the publication of the Yalta papers, but that in the pressure of business we had both overlooked this. I said that, in deference to his views, I was still holding up general publication, but that I did plan to make copies of these documents available to the appropriate congressional committees, for their official use.

On Monday, March 14, at the regular noon briefing of the correspondents who cover the State Department, the State Department spokesman, Mr. Henry Suydam, announced this program. This announcement was premature, in the sense that it was made before Assistant Secretary Morton had had the opportunity to consult with the appropriate members of these committees.

Shortly after lunch on the 14th, I saw news ticker reports which indicated that the chairman generally preferred that their committees not take custody of the papers, but thought it would be better that the State Department make them generally public.

Assistant Secretary Morton confirmed this, and I then asked him to send the following letter to the respective congressional leaders:

"Pursuant to congressional authorization and appropriation concerning special conference volumes the State Department has compiled the papers relating to the Yalta and Malta Conferences of 1945. It is deemed inadvisable at this time to issue these papers in volume for public distribution. Since, however, the papers have actually been compiled and since they may be of interest to your committee members in their official capacity, but not for publication, the Department of State will, if your committee so desires, make a limited number of copies available on a confidential basis."

These letters were written Monday evening, March 14, and delivered by hand on Tuesday morning, March 15.

The Tuesday morning press indicated that the delay in publication was widely ascribed to British objections. So, at 9 a. m. on Tuesday, March 15, I telephoned the British Ambassador. I expressed the view that, in the light of the wide public interest which had, by then, been aroused, it was better for Anglo-American relations to publish at once rather than to allow the impression to gain ground that the United Kingdom had something to hide—which was not the case. The Ambassador indicated his concurrence. I said I would advise Sir Anthony Eden of my views and the Ambassador said he would do the same. He indicated that he felt confident that I would get a quick answer from Sir Anthony. Accordingly, at 10:30 a. m., I sent a message to Sir Anthony saying that I thought it undesirable to perpetuate a situation which created an atmosphere of mystery and concealment, and that, accordingly, unless he felt strongly against it I proposed to publish.

I should, at this point observe that I had already carefully considered the possible impact of publication upon the international situation and particularly upon the pending ratification of the Paris Accords by the German Bundesrat and the French Council. I concluded that that impact would not be unfavorable.

At 10:30 on Tuesday morning, I spoke over the telephone with Senator GEORGE and informed him generally of the position and that I hoped shortly to be able to release the documents generally.

At 11 on Tuesday morning, I had my regular press conference, at which I said:

"The Yalta papers are at the present time in galley-proof form. They are available here in the State Department for consultation on a restrictive basis by Members of the Congress who are on committees that might be concerned with them, and we are still studying the matter of their full publication."

While Assistant Secretary McCardle and I were preparing for my press conference, Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, telephoned Assistant Secretary McCardle's office and left the following message for him:

"Tell him while he is with the Secretary that I have had a long talk with GEORGE about the Yalta business and I think I ought to see the Secretary after the press conference if I can."

When my press conference was finished, Assistant Secretary McCardle brought Mr. Reston to my office. Mr. Reston said that his impression of his conversation with Senator GEORGE was that the Senator wished to see the Yalta record made public by the State Department. Mr. Reston urged that it was of the utmost importance that the papers be published as a whole and not in garbled form; that unless the New York Times did this, no one else would, but that this would be very expensive and take time. Therefore, if there was to be any comprehensive publication, they had to have an advance copy since it would involve setting up an enormous printing job.

I said that such matters fell under the jurisdiction of Mr. McCardle, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who was a former newspaperman. Thereupon the two left.

I subsequently learned that Mr. McCardle gave a galley proof to Mr. Reston about 8:30 p. m. that evening (Tuesday). This involved an exercise by Mr. McCardle of a discretion that was his. It involved no breach of security. On November 5, I had taken and recorded a decision to publish without deletion on an expedited basis. This constituted authority to declassify under Executive Order 10501. The galley proofs, on March 3, were marked "For Official Use Only," under Mr. McCardle's instructions. This was not a security classification but a purely internal classification which Mr. McCardle himself had imposed and which he had full authority to remove.

At 10:12 a. m. of Wednesday, March 16, the British Ambassador phoned me that his Government agreed to publish and that a confirmation cable from London was on its way to me.

At 12:45 on Wednesday I lunched at the Capitol with Senators KNOWLAND and BRIDGES. This appointment had been made 5 days before, on March 11. They mentioned that they had heard a rumor that the New York Times was going to publish the Yalta documents on March 17. I expressed surprise, but said that I thought that we would release the documents that afternoon to all news media. When I returned from lunch, I found the confirmation cable from Sir Anthony Eden agreeing that we should now publish.

Also, shortly after I returned from my lunch with Senators BRIDGES and KNOWLAND, Mr. James Hagerty phoned me that he, too, had heard that the New York Times was planning to run the Yalta papers the next morning and I made to him the same reply I made to the Senators, namely, that I planned a prompt general release.

At 3:45 I talked with Assistant Secretary McCardle and asked him to arrange promptly to release the documents generally. This was done and there was a general publication the next morning (Thursday, March 17).

II

The decision to publish the Malta-Yalta records required decision as to just what to publish. As to this I relied primarily upon Dr. George B. Noble, who has served as Chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research or of the Historical Division since 1946.

The task was not easy. There were no agreed tripartite minutes. The only records available are those which were made by certain members of the respective delegations. These were done on a national basis and no distinction was recognized between formal and informal conversations.

At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, minutes were kept of the meetings not only of the Council of Ten, but for the most part of meetings of the Big Four (France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States). These were circulated among the interested delegations and became substantially "agreed minutes." These minutes, which have been published, contain many casual comments of the nature of those to be found in the records of the Yalta discussions.

Where the participants in a conference do not themselves make any distinction in their remarks, as by asking that certain remarks should be treated as off the record, it is extremely difficult for subsequent historians themselves to make the distinction. Secretary of State Stettinius in his volume did not eliminate all of the so-called chit-chat. The record published by the Department of State was the actual record as compiled by certain of the participants and supplied by them to the Department of State for its records.

The most complete record is that of Mr. Bohlen who acted as interpreter. Early in 1949 he had checked and cleared for accuracy the proofs of Mr. Stettinius' book, and in July 1949, Mr. Bohlen transmitted his own record to the Division of Historical Policy Research.

It will be recalled that the report of the Senate Appropriation Committee for fiscal 1955 called for publication of the "unexpurgated" record. I should, however, say that a very few casual or informal remarks have nevertheless been omitted which might have done harm without adding anything of substance to the record.

In some cases remarks which otherwise might have been omitted by the above test have been included because they had previously been incorporated in authoritative memoirs and given wide publicity. The harm, if any, was done, and omission in the official record would merely have served to raise question as to the validity of the publication.

III

To sum up:

(1) At no time have I had any doubt about the desirability of publishing the story of Yalta. This, indeed, seems to have been the view of three of my predecessors who have held office since the Yalta Conference. I have already quoted Mr. Stettinius, the Secretary of State at the time, as to how important he judged it for the public to know exactly what took place at Yalta. His successor as Secretary of State, Secretary Byrnes, published in his memoirs his notes on the Yalta Conference. Secretary of State Acheson early in 1949 cleared the publication by former Secretary Stettinius of his extensive record of the conference.

The view that there should be publication was not only an executive judgment, but also explicitly endorsed by the United States Congress which appropriated the funds for prompt and full publication.

It has been a matter of common knowledge for approximately 2 years that publication was in process, and this has seemed to meet with general approval.

(2) The timing was judged opportune, in the light of the general international situation, and I think it has proved opportune. Furthermore, the timing was such as to avoid any approximation to a domestic election period.

(3) When publication was finally agreed upon, there was full publication of the volume which covers the Yalta Conference. I believe that at least two newspapers, within a few hours of the release, carried the full text of about 300,000 words, while others carried very substantial portions. This served the indispensable purpose of assuring that the American people and interested peoples abroad would easily and quickly get the main story in full and not be dependent upon extracts which might have been selected for partisan purposes or for reasons of pure readibility.

(4) The Yalta papers are now where they belong—in the public domain.

Strong Reserve Can't Be Built on Volunteer Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by George Fielding Eliot, a commentator on military affairs with a national reputation. He points out how futile it would be to try to build our reserve strength and not have some form of compulsion. In other words, some form of discipline which require that a trainee obey the military rules and comply with the obligation he assumed when he entered the program. That is what the reserve bill, which will soon be considered by the House of Representatives, provides.

The editorial of Mr. Eliot follows:

STRONG RESERVE CAN'T BE BUILT ON VOLUNTEER BASIS

(By George Fielding Eliot)

There seems to be a curious blind spot in that mental vision of many of the distinguished members of the House Armed Services Committee in their current examination of Reserve legislation.

They were quite ready to recognize the need for continuing selective service (2 years active duty) because otherwise the Army could not be kept up to the required strength.

They appear quite willing to require men who have completed this 2 years of active duty to be compulsorily transferred to a component of the Ready Reserve (including the National Guard) for a further period of Reserve service, and to put teeth in the law.

They recognize, however, that adequate numbers for the Ready Reserve (especially the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve) cannot be obtained by this method, and further that it would be desirable to enlist a due proportion of our young men directly into these Reserve units, after a period of basic training.

With its reduced strength the Regular Army cannot possibly absorb anything like the number of young men who annually reach the age of 18: indeed, the long delay between registration (at 18) and induction (now generally 21–22) results in uncertainty and dislocation in individual lives which has a seriously adverse effect on the morale of our youngsters.

So a new form of service—6 months of basic training plus 7½ years in a National Guard or Reserve unit—has been set up.

But the committee appears reluctant to apply the principle of compulsory induction to this type of service. This one is to be purely voluntary.

Why? It is difficult to see any sound reason for saying to a young man: "If we need you for 2 years, we'll take you whether you like it or not, and you'll have to serve in the Reserves afterward, too. But if we need you only for 6 months' basic training, plus a period of Reserve service, we won't take you unless you volunteer."

Also it is difficult to see how the Congressmen imagine that a truly Ready Reserve (especially on the Army side) can be maintained in adequate numbers by voluntary enlistments, when all our experience since Washington's time shows the exact contrary.

The ideal Army National Guard or Army Reserve unit should have a large proportion of active, youthful men, who have already received basic training before joining the unit: given a regular annual intake of such young men, plus a due proportion of ex-draftees with 2 years of experience, a really Ready Reserve unit can be built up which can take the field in 30 or 60 days—that is, as soon as it could be sent to any overseas theater in any case.

But if we are to depend on voluntary enlistments we shall, as all our history proves, be leaning on a broken reed. And this time we just can't afford any broken reeds.

The real crux of the matter is the buildup of the Army National Guard combat units. Ask any experienced Regular officer whether he would feel differently about the proposed reduction of the Regular Army if the 6 armored and 21 Infantry divisions of the Army National Guard could take the field on M-day plus 30 days instead of (as at present) M-day plus 6 to 9 months.

The reason the National Guard can't do better today is that they don't have an assured intake of pretrained men. They can never have such an assured intake in sufficient volume unless the law requires this form of service.

Unhappily, this 6 months' training proposal has been viewed by many Congressmen as a sort of camouflaged version of UMT, which Congress has habitually shied away from. Politically, UMT has two strikes on it already.

Yet it is the expression of a principle without which the American people can never have the ready trained manpower to meet the hairtrigger emergencies of modern times.

It is to be hoped that our legislators will think less of politically objectionable symbols and more about the central question—if we aren't willing or able to pay enough full-time soldiers, how shall we make certain that we have enough part-time soldiers ready to go if as and when the next whistle blows?

We won't get 'em by voluntary enlistment, gentlemen. That's for sure.

Annual Congressional Tour of New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, once again Members of Congress and their families will visit New York City, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, May 6, 7, and 8.

Full information regarding the trip is contained in the following copy of a circular which has been sent to all Members of Congress:

ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL NEW YORK TOUR OF 1955

The cost will be $37.50; children 5–12, $32.50. Make reservations today—just phone Extension 366.

Remember our schedules are arranged on daylight time.

This 3-day tour includes every expense except your individual tips.

YOUR SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 6

Leave Washington via Pennsylvania Railroad, 10 a. m. Luncheon in dining car. Arrive New York Pennsylvania Station, 1:45 p. m.

Party goes direct to Pennsylvania Station 31st Street entrance and board motor coach for trip to city hall. Reception, Hon. Robert Wagner, the mayor of New York City.

Party will return to Paramount Hotel. Motor coach will leave Paramount Hotel at 4 p. m. for transfer to Italian Steamship Co., new superliner *Christoforo Columbo;* 6:30 p. m. motor coach will transfer party to Toots Shor's Restaurant for reception and dinner. Our host will be the Pan American Airways. Evening will be open.

Saturday, May 7

8:30 a. m.: We board motor coach for transfer to the United Nations for breakfast and a complete tour of the headquarters.

11:00 a. m.: We board motor coach for transfer to Port Authority of New York liner for New York harbor trip. This is the most interesting trip in New York City. Luncheon aboard ship.

3:30 p. m.: We arrive pier for motor coach transfer to Hotel Paramount.

5:40 p. m.: Motor coach will transfer our party to the Waldorf Astoria Hotel—reception and dinner. Our host will be Edward F. McGinnis, assistant to the president of Joseph E. Seagram & Son. Cocktails, Basildon Room at 6 p. m. Dinner, Jade Room, 7 p. m. The evening will be yours to attend theaters, etc.

Sunday, May 8

The morning will be open for all members of our party to attend church. 11 a. m. motor coach will take us for trip to United States Maritime Academy at Kings Point for in-

spection and luncheon. Buses will leave the Academy at 3 p. m. We will arrive Pennsylvania Station at about 5 p. m. Our train will leave Pennsylvania Station at 5:30 p. m., and we will arrive Washington 9:35 p. m. Dinner in the dining car on our return home.

Those members interested can make reservations by calling Mrs. Powell, Extension 366 or 1830. Reservations must be made immediately.

The Second Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, citizens of San Diego, Calif., have prepared, printed, and signed a petition to Congress under the caption of the Second Declaration of Independence. This document vividly presents the danger our present Constitution is in and deserves as wide a circulation as possible. If we lose our own constitutional form of government, it will be due to the apathy of the citizens themselves. We have had so much liberty that we take it for granted. Patrick Henry thought otherwise when he said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and at this moment when we are surrounded with world isms, and have allowed ourselves to ignore the warnings of Washington, this document may well be, in time, our second declaration of independence. With the names of 59 signers attached, it reads:

PETITIONING SEPARATION FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

When in the course of human events a free and sovereign people find themselves enmeshed in entangling alliances with other nations to the jeopardy of their own security and freedom, it becomes necessary for them to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with these nations, and to resume among the powers of the earth, that separate and equal station which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, and a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to such separation. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to reestablish their independence, as a people, on such Christian ideals and principles as will effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that alliances between nations, long established, should not be changed for light or transient causes; and accordingly all experience has shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them to absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards, or to renew those established by constitution, for their security.

Such has been the patient sufferance of the patriotic, God-fearing citizens of these United States of America; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to petition their Congress to dissolve all alliances with world government programs, and especially the United Nations and affiliated nations. The history of world government promoters and leaders is a record of continued restrictions of individual liberty and national sovereignty of free nations, having in final object the establishment of absolute tyranny over the free people of the United States. To prove this let facts be submitted to a candid world. Like Jeroboam, king of ancient Saxon-Israel, who abolished the worship of God in his nation, the world government planners have prohibited even the mention of the name of God and His Christ in all United Nations meetings and assemblies. And like Omri, another king of ancient Saxon-Israel, who substituted his own statutes for the divinely codified laws of his nation, the world government planners engineered the adoption of the charters of the United Nations Organization, the World Bank, the United Nations Economic, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and other United Nations agencies, by having these charters ratified as treaties, thus making them the supreme law of the land, contrary to the spirit of the first Declaration of Independence and bypassing the provisions for amending our National Constitution. Following the pattern used by Fascists and Nazis, and now practised by the Communists, the world government planners have given dictatorial powers to United Nation officials, who are not elected by, nor responsible to, the people of the United States; and, under the United Nations Charter, administrative officials of the United States have assumed powers which have not been delegated to them by our National Constitution, nor by action of the American Congress. Among the countless instances of usurpation of authority and exercises of unconstitutional powers are the following:

They seek to control the economic life of our Nation through a World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. They have squandered our wealth and our resources through years of "lend-lease," by financial and military support to both the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and by outright gifts in various "foreign-aid" programs. They advocate loyalty to a super world state, amounting to treason to our own United States. Under shibboleths of peace and liberty, they embroiled us in two world wars, and when our Armed Forces had won smashing victories in both of these wars, they lost the peace. In each instance they laid the foundations for future wars through a vacillating policy of appeasement and diplomatic retreats, and by aiding and abetting the economic and military buildup of our potential enemies. They sent our American Armed Forces into battle in Korea, without action or approval by the American Congress, and they have plotted to prevent successful prosecution of that war by hamstringing our great military leaders, MacArthur, Wedemeyer and Van Fleet, and by failing to secure full cooperation from our so-called "allies." And they engineered a stalemated "truce" in Korea, which is, in effect, a victory for our enemies. They vilify and castigate, as "isolationists," patriotic Americans, whose first loyalty to the United States, but through "internationalist" bungling, appeasement, and even treachery, the world government planners have alienated traditionally friendly peoples and nations, and they have stirred up envy, fear and distrust among all the nations of the world, thus "isolating" the United States until today we stand alone.

They have infiltrated traitors and saboteurs into positions of power and influence in our Government and public activities, and they seek to discredit and silence those who try to expose these termites. And these planners further conspire to limit and abridge the God-given inalienable rights of the free citizens of the United States, by working for the adoption and ratification as treaties, of the United Nations Human rights covenant, and the United Nations Genocide Convention, under which United States citizens could be transported to foreign lands, to be tried in alien courts, on trumped-up charges of alleged violations of these charters, or for crimes against the United Nations. They are preparing amendments to the United Nations Charter designed to completely eliminate all national sovereignties and to give the United Nations power to raise and maintain an international army, under United Nations command, to enforce all United Nations edicts and orders. They propose to present these amendments for adoption in 1955, when the United Nations Charter can be amended by a majority vote of the member nations. At the root of all world government plans is an anti-God cabal, against which the inspired prophets have warned, which seeks to prevent the great people of the United States from fulfilling their divine destiny as a "light and an inspiration for all or the oppressed peoples of the earth."

Therefore, we, the undersigned God-fearing, free citizens of the United States, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, do petition the Congress of the United States to sever all alliances with the United Nations organization and all affiliate agencies, and to solemnly publish and declare, in the name, and by the authority, of the good people of the United States, that the United States are, and of right shall remain, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the United Nations, and that all political ties between them and the United Nations is and ought to be totally dissolved; and as free and independent States they retain full power and right to protect the rights and the dignity of their free citizens, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance and dependence on the protection of God, through His Son, we pledge allegiance to our flag and the Republic for which it stands, and to each other we mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Address of Carmine G. De Sapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio on the occasion of a dinner tendered in his honor by the Israel Bond Organization, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on Monday evening, April 25, 1955.

Mr. De Sapio, the secretary of state of New York, is also the Democratic national committeeman of New York State, as well as the Democratic leader of the county of New York. He was the recipient of this great honor in apprecia-

tion of the fact that he has done so much in behalf of the State of Israel. The 2,000 people who turned out to honor him purchased a total of $1,750,000 worth of bonds. This was an evidence not only of their great confidence in these bonds as an investment and in the development of the State of Israel, but also their overwhelming desire to indicate to Mr. De Sapio their devotion to the many fine and outstanding causes which he espouses. The dinner was attended by people in all walks of life.

His address follows:

My dear friends, with all my heart I thank you.

No man could remain unmoved by the warm things which were said of me tonight. I am deeply grateful to the distinguished guests who have paid me such undeserved kindness, and I will always cherish the beautiful award with which I was presented. But, most of all, I shall always try to be worthy of the soul-satisfying honor of being permitted to lend my name and my little help to this vital work, to this great cause.

I am so very thankful to all of you.

Six million Jews were slaughtered in our time, in the maddest orgy of hate since the Lord said to Moses, "And I am come down to deliver my people."

The ashes of these 6 million men and women and children—their dust and their bones—tonight lie buried in our hearts. And if the weight is heavy, it is at the same time uplifting. If the burden is severe, it is at the same time exhilerating. If the responsibility is foreboding, it is at the same time inspiring. For as each person's conscience is seared, so is his determination sharpened. And as each of us is reminded of what was, so are all of us rededicated to what should be.

That you should select me as the symbol for this rededication, is the greatest tribute of my life and the most meaningful honor I have ever known.

I am a Catholic. As such, it is my heritage to be my brother's keeper. It is my faith to love my neighbor. For it was Saint Peter who said: "In every nation he that worketh righteousness, is accepted with God." And through the ages, through tears and terror, through massacre and mutilation, through pain and pogrom, the Jewish nation retained its righteousness and brought dignity and culture, and progress to all in its reach. Through the centuries, Jews gave to the world learning, literature, laws, and love. And today Israel gives to the world a new lesson in enterprise, in courage, and in faith.

I am an American. As such it is my heritage to cherish freedom. It is my duty to protect liberty. That is why I am so proud that the United States formally recognized the State of Israel 20 minutes after she declared her independence on April 27, 1948. And that, too, is why I deplore the shipment of arms to Arab countries, to those who threaten Israel's security, and, therefore, our security.

But Israel will survive. Israel will survive the arrogance of all her enemies and the shortsightedness of some of her friends. Israel will survive because there are men and women like you—in our country, and all over the world—who have the vision, the morality and the awareness to meet our responsibilities; to fulfill our obligations and to recognize the truth of our dependence each upon the other.

And Israel will survive because her people have the courage, the wisdom, and the determination to build, to grow, and to succeed.

Tonight, on the eve of only the seventh anniversary of her independence, it would take volumes to record Israel's achievements. But to me the most miraculous of all her incredible accomplishments, has been the absorption of almost three-quarters of a million immigrants in this short period of time. And this tiny nation already has this vast number of people constructively and usefully at work creating new frontiers of progress—building a modern industrial and agrarian democracy in the otherwise feudal and decadent Middle East.

Israel's immigrants, like America's immigrants, found more than a mere sanctuary from oppression. They found an opportunity; a challenge to apply their skills and their wills to the construction of a new homeland and to the creation of a new life. And although they have not yet found the peace which Jews eternally seek, what they are doing and building, secures that peace for all of us.

The land of Israel today is the spiritual blood bank from which every Jew all over the world draws the plasma of his faith. But to me, a non-Jew, it means even more. The land of Israel stands as a fortress for freedom; as a bulwark for democracy; as an ally in the struggle against godlessness and tyrrany.

And to America, Israel stands as a stalwart supporter in a cold war which has the entire world gripped in the agony of fear.

People of all religions—who love liberty—rejoice and find hope in Israel's growing strength. And the purchases of bonds—in increased quantities—make Israel so much the stronger.

To the extent that our generation takes part in this historic and moving work, will we secure the futures of the generations to come.

As for me, the privilege of joining with you in this important and noble cause is a very deeply gratifying experience for which, again, I thank you with all my heart.

The Prairie Grouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter to Mr. Charles H. Callison, Conservation Director of the National Wildlife Federation, from a personal friend of mine who resides in my home community of Black River Falls, Wis. I want to commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues as it presents a lucid picture of the problems confronting conservationists in the State of Wisconsin, with particular regard to the prairie grouse:

BLACK RIVER FALLS, WIS., *April 20, 1955.*

CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director,
National Wildlife Federation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CALLISON: With the plight of the prairie chicken in mind I would like to make an unusual request. It is rather a bold plan, but nothing is impossible in politics. The opponents of prairie grouse have used steamroller tactics and politics, so I believe that we who wish to save this bird, should not hesitate to use similar methods. The greatest enemy of the pinnated and sharptail grouse in Wisconsin is the paper and pulp industry, and the conservation department is pretty much controlled by it. The conservation department has promised lands for these birds, controlled burning, game crop laws, multiple land-use principles; but nothing has been forthcoming and nothing will be.

I've been in the thick of this fight for 10 years. In our State, management of lands for these birds poses no knotty problems. It is the change of policy that is so difficult. Research has recently showed us that if nesting cover is provided the prairie chicken will survive. However, each year more and more openings are planted to pine and the Conservation Department is very well aware of what they are doing to the prairie grouse. One cannot expect help from the Game Division of the Department as they are controlled or overshadowed by the Forestry Division. In giving a replay of the Wildlife Federation's radio script 2 years ago to a county board, and incidentally, acquiring 3,800 acres to be set aside for a grouse project, I was openly thwarted twice by top-ranking Game Division personnel.

Mr. Farley of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service was quite surprised to hear that in our State we must fight the paper and pulp industries for wildlife. I surmised that possibly you also might be in the dark concerning our problems, hence the rather lengthy introduction to the theme of this letter.

Wisconsin has an area composed roughly of 58,000 acres known as the Central Wisconsin Conservation Area (CWCA). This area is owned in its entirety by the United States Department of Agriculture. It is generally known that this area is to be given to the State of Wisconsin. Naturally it is very eager to acquire it. Would it be possible for you to attach a "string" to this gift? Could you persuade the Department of Agriculture to stipulate that Wisconsin could qualify for this gift of 58,000 acres, if the State in return, would set aside 20,000 acres of other State-owned land for grouse management. Of course the State wolud have to agree to establish and maintain suitable habitat for these birds. The areas to be of the State's own choosing. This would roughly be a third of the number of acres of the gift. I sincerely believe that this could be done.

It would definitely be a victory for the grouse. I've talked this over with Mr. Lester Johnson, our Congressman, who is an ardent conservationist, and he has agreed to help. Although he is of the opposite party, I respect his ability, integrity, intelligence and ambition. Possibly he can get Congressman LEE METCALF of Montana and other conservationists to help in Congress. Representative REUSS, I'm sure will do his part. I know Mr. Farley personally and I'm almost positive he'll do what he can. Assistant Director Ernest Swift is undoubtedly familiar with the CWCA area, and with Wisconsin's grouse problems and can supplement much.

Under separate cover I am sending you a booklet "Sharptails Into the Shadows" by Fred and Fran Hamerstrom and their assistant Os Mattson. They are nationally known authorities on prairie chicken. They are greatly concerned over this bird's survival and have stated that unless something is done soon for this bird its doom is inevitable. When the Hamerstroms say that, it's time to listen for they are in the habit of knowing what they are talking about. Their booklet will serve as a sort of vade mecum to Wisconsin grouse problems.

I know not of the prairie grouse populations by States but I can surmise that helping the birds in Wisconsin will certainly affect the national picture. This is surely the business of the National Wildlife Federation. This is why I wouldn't hesitate in asking for help from Congressmen other than those from Wisconsin. This is pretty much a national problem. You've probably noticed that I've mentioned the sharptail problem along with that of the pinnated grouse. The sharptails aren't your prime concern now but in helping one you'll be helping the other.

Sincerely,

DON BERG.

Engineers' Contribution to the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, at the 75th annual banquet of the Michigan Engineering Society at Birmingham, Mich., on April 2, 1955.

It should be said that Dr. Danielian, as president of the St. Lawrence Association, made a tremendous contribution toward molding public opinion in favor of this great project, the St. Lawrence seaway. He, more than any other man, journeyed throughout the Great Lakes States and the Middle West presenting the facts connected with this international undertaking. After many years of close study and investigation for one of the agencies of our Government, he became one of the best informed individuals in our country in regard to this project. Great credit is due to him for the individual effort he made as president of this association in bringing about the approval of this undertaking. His name always will be associated with the St. Lawrence seaway, as will the name of the association of which he is president.

The notable address which he delivered on the occasion above mentioned should be read by all Members of Congress for the factual information it contains, and I commend it to my colleagues.

His address follows:

I want to express here in Michigan my deep-felt gratitude for the full-fledged cooperation we have received in Washington from all of the congressional representation from this State. I want to mention in particular, because they are good personal friends of mine, Senator CHARLES POTTER and Congressmen GEORGE DONDERO, GERALD FORD, THAD MACHROWICZ, and LOUIS RABAUT. These men have never failed, as their colleagues from Michigan have never failed to respond to any reasonable and constructive suggestion for the advancement of the welfare of Michigan and the Great Lakes States.

Without appearing to detract from the contributions made by citizens in other walks of life, I think it is appropriate for me to emphasize tonight the contributions made by the engineering profession to the advancement of civilization, both here and abroad, in the development of natural resources. Engineers have not always been merely handmaidens of enterprise; they have often led the way; they have created, promoted, and, finally, constructed some of the finest works of man. Whether in uniform or civilian clothes, the gleam of creative imagination is ever undimmed in their eyes.

Ever since 1895, the record is replete with studies and recommendations by engineers, nearly all of them members of the United States Corps of Engineers who, acting upon congressional authorization, studied, approved, and recommended the Great Lakes-to-ocean seaway. If the country had accepted their advice 30 years ago, we would have had this project at a third of the capital cost, and the country would have reaped its benefits in two world wars.

In my own personal experience, ever since 1940, I have found that the most creative thinking and constructive cooperation the supporters of the seaway have had from any quarter came from the United States Corps of Engineers. I mentioned Gen. Tommy Robins. I must add Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, who was Chief of Engineers at that time, and his successor, Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler.

Lt. Gen. Lewis Pick, who conquered the jungles of Burma during the war by building the Ledo Road, known as Pick's Pike, and conceived and created the Pick-Sloan plan, as a result of which the face of the Missouri Basin is being changed, was equally and forcefully interested in the St. Lawrence seaway and made a great contribution to its realization. General Sturgis, now Chief of Engineers, General Robinson, now Deputy Chief of Engineers, and General Potter, division engineer in Omaha, have always taken a personal interest in the seaway project.

I think it is only fair that the country should know that it is the Corps of Engineers who conceived this project, who planned it, in cooperation with their Canadian colleagues, who helped sell it to Congress, and who are now designing and building it for the future benefit of the country. This is a deserved recognition of their talents. While others may be in the public eye, the engineers unostentatiously are busy at the tasks which they love best—to create and to construct.

One may disagree with the United States Corps of Engineers on matters of detail and policy, but one can never question their devotion to the national welfare. As one interested in the St. Lawrence seaway, I am glad to pay a deserved tribute, and I hope the country will realize the debt we owe to the corps. The names of Generals Sturgis and Robinson and Colonel Olmstead, the district engineer at Buffalo, immediately in charge of construction, will be as closely identified with the St. Lawrence project, when the history of this undertaking is written, as General Pick's name is attached to the Pick-Sloan plan and General Goethals' name recalls the Panama Canal.

But the job in the Great Lakes area will not be wholly done by the construction of the seaway locks and canals. There is much work yet to be done and we are going to depend again upon the Corps of Engineers to do the job.

The navigation facilities to be constructed under the seaway program will cost the United States and Canada together approximately $270 million. The power phase of the project to be constructed jointly by the State of New York and the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario will cost an additional $600 million. Thus, $850 to $900 million will be invested between Prescott and Montreal, Canada, a distance of 114 miles on the St. Lawrence River.

The power output from the St. Lawrence Dam will total more than 12 billion kilowatt-hours annually, to be divided equally between the two countries.

When completed, the seaway project will consist of a control dam, a dam and powerhouse, and a series of locks and canals. There will be 7 locks on the St. Lawrence River, plus the 8 locks on the Welland Canal already constructed, all 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet over the sills. The whole project is a tribute to the genius of American and Canadian engineering.

The original St. Lawrence Waterway plan encompassed a sailing route from the ocean through all the Great Lakes and as far west as Duluth, Minn. We have, however, not yet reached that goal. There is work still to be done.

The enabling seaway legislation in Canada and the United States does not include any navigation within the Great Lakes themselves. In effect, this puts a very definite terminus of the deep-water system some 22 miles south of Detroit, at the western end of Lake Erie.

There is a report on the feasibility of deepening the connecting channels of the three westernmost Great Lakes. In addition to their engineering studies, the corps must conduct a survey of use and savings, and weigh these potential savings against the cost of the proposed navigation projects. In the matter of deepening the connecting channels, the Corps of Engineers have reported that for every dollar spent on the project, the savings to our shipping interests will amount to $1.78.

This work would involve dredging the Detroit, St. Clair, and Sault Ste. Marie, and the Straits of Mackinac. Their current depth of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound compare unfavorably with the seaway's controlling depth of 27 feet—a depth necessary for the usual oceangoing ship engaged in foreign trade.

There is another bit of unfinished business on the seaway which is also of importance to all Great Lakes ports.

In the first flush of victory over the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, almost everyone tended to lean back in complacent contentment. The assumption was common that all that had to be done was to wait and let the ships sail in. The seaway, however, is in a competitive business. It must prove economical to the user. The potential shipper who contemplates using the seaway has one thought, "Am I going to save money by using the seaway?" The question of costs and toll charges, consequently, is of immediate importance. The establishment of just and equitable toll rates by both governments is as vital as the establishment of suitable depths.

Another problem that must be ironed out before the seaway can achieve its full potential is the limited expansion capacity of the Welland Canal. This connecting link between Lakes Erie and Ontario bypasses Niagara Falls and the swift rapids of the Niagara River. The canal has 8 locks which raise or lower ships some 323 feet.

To lock a ship through a single lock takes approximately 50 minutes, which limits the daily passage to 14 ships in each direction. Allowing for delays, and for noncargo lockages, there are estimated to be available during a shipping season of 244 days approximately 5,770 lockages both ways, or 2,885 lockages in each direction. From these figures, the Canadian Government estimates the practical capacity of these single locks to be around 46 million tons, assuming that 75 percent of the ships will be 10,000-ton vessels, 25 percent, small canal boats.

Now, what can we expect in the way of traffic when the St. Lawrence seaway is opened—traffic must pass through these Welland locks? We have heard optimistic figures as to expected St. Lawrence seaway traffic. The latest one is 52 million tons by 1965. I do not quarrel with this figure. It is possible. What concerns me is how are we going to get this up and down the Welland Canal. I mentioned the Canadian Government's estimate of 46 million tons as the practical capacity of the Welland Canal. At first glance this would appear to be ample. On closer examination, however, we find that in 1953, 19 million tons of traffic traversed the Welland Canal, leaving 27 million tons of incremental capacity for new busines. I am informed by practical shipping men that this figure is too generous; that the Welland locks are already used much closer to capacity, and that their additional carrying capacity is much more modest than my figures would indicate.

The expansion of this limited capacity of the Welland Canal should be one of our most important objectives for the coming years. I do not know the dollar cost of the expansion of the Welland Canal, but if five of the single locks there had to be duplicated, the cost would be in the range of $100 million—quite comparable to the amount of money we would have to put into the deepening of the connecting channels, a good deal of which will have to be spent on the Canadian side of the boundary waters. The Welland Canal is wholly a Canadian responsibility. All we can do is to bring these facts to the attention of the right people in the Canadian and American Governments.

This additional work will come to a little over $200 million, about equally divided between Canada and the United States. Added to the $900 million already committed for power and navigation, it makes a sizable sum of $1,100,000,000 to be spent from Montreal to the Soo. All but $100 million is already provided for. All but $100 million will be self-liquidating by the consumers of power and the users of the seaway.

The deepening of the connecting channels, then, the establishment of equitable toll rates, and increasing the capacity of the Welland, thus define the work yet to be done to bring this great project to its full achievement.

An International Volunteer Group Similar to World War II's Flying Tigers Could Hold the Line in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the eyes of the world focused on Formosa and the China coast, the following article by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, as reported by Tom McClary in the May 1955 issue of the magazine Flying, is very timely:

FREEDOM NEEDS AN IVG

(By Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, reported by Tom McClary)

For 2 years I have urged formation of an IVG—an International Volunteer Air Group—set up along the lines of the Flying Tigers. I can see no other effective stopgap which can protect free Asia without involving us diplomatically—a sphere in which we have been notably unsuccessful in the Orient.

Despite the invincibility of the Seventh Fleet and the massive retaliatory power of Strategic Air Command, our situation is highly perilous, due to lack of a hard-core policy.

Mao does not believe we will fight for a free Asia unless we are directly attacked. This is Mao's strongest weapon, his claim that it is about time free Asia got over any illusions about the United States as a dependable ally. And as it watches free Asia dwindling, the Orient wonders if Mao could be right.

Consequently, if free Asia is to maintain faith in itself, the governments involved must immediately be supplied with a mobile, devastating air arm, able to hit wherever needed, and without the waste of time involved in partisan debate and international power politics.

Let us take a square look at the high spots as the free Asian is compelled to do.

For 20 years Chiang Kai-shek, on his own, was able to nullify Soviet imperialism. His fight did not fail until we pulled the rug from under him in 1949, by summarily cutting off his supplies. Then we tacitly gave Red China the go-ahead in Korea by pulling out our forces and subsequently changed our mind after the damage was done. We temporized again by forbidding MacArthur to destroy bases from which he was being attacked because they were north of the Yalu * * * and at a terrible cost in American lives.

In 2 years the neutral U. N. Commission has failed utterly to bring about a democratic consolidation of Korea. In fact the Commission is forcibly prevented from observing in North Korea, where it is known that truce terms are a farce. Contrary to the truce, fortifications have been built, modern military airbases constructed, war planes imported, and munitions stockpiled.

Vietnam fell to the Soviets for simple lack of effective air cover. Presently Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand are the scenes of broad scale Communist infiltration.

And now most recently, we have permitted Mao to gain more face by our abandonment of the Tachens.

The fact is that the American people have not been given a true picture of the situation involved in withdrawal from the Tachens. These islands are not, as commonly pictured, merely outposts of nominal value to Formosa. They are Formosa's outer breastworks against the mainland. But even more importantly they are the only radar early-warning stations to serve both Formosa and Okinawa. Abandonment of the Tachens puts Okinawa under equal peril with North Formosa—permitting no more than 15 minutes warning against Red bombers (twin-jet IL–28's), which can strike from the network of airbases around Kiangsu and Chekiang.

The report goes around out here that the Red China dictator has told both the Burmese and Nehru of India that he will take Formosa this year, despite the fact that Congress granted authority to President Eisenhower to make personal decision regarding defensive military action, thus cutting time impediment to resistance. Mao still thinks he can depend upon leftwingers in Congress and around Government to throw road blocks to effective resistance, if he decides to attack Formosa. The Reds have bragged so long and loud about their early liberation of Formosa that they may not be able to turn away from the attack without disastrous loss of face * * *a fate worse than death in the Orient. But whether or no, the impression is rife that we are a "paper tiger" * * * vacillating with the winds of opportunism.

At this moment the full power of the Soviet Military Advisory Commission and of Red China is concentrating on rushing to completion the military airbase network in the area; Shanghai—Nanking—Chuchow—Ningpo. Most obviously this network is not aimed at Formosa but at Japan, Korea, and Okinawa. Completion of this network will go far to compromise the preservation of our Far East perimeters.

Let me point out that, except for propaganda purposes the Communists do not need possession of Formosa. All they actually require from a strategic standpoint are Formosa's outer radar warning stations and outer island defenses. Korea, on the other hand, is strategically essential to a Red conquest of the Pacific. I fully agree with Republic of Korea Ambassador Ben Limb's recent article in Flying on this point. With Formosa's outer defenses in their hands, the Reds well may swarm first against Korea with MIG–15's and TU–4's. Such a circumstance would certainly jeopardize our whole security in the Pacific.

If anything could be a deterrent in this situation, an IVG would have by far the best chance without forcing us into a shooting war of global dimensions. Quantity of planes and manpower is, for the time being, of secondary importance to thwarting the aggression of Red China. Her Achilles heel is currently lack of transportation. Only 1 railroad runs down the coast, and all advanced-type repair parts, aviation fuel, and munitions must come by rail from Russia. Against this set of conditions, an IVG could operate with great deterrent effect. Nor could Russia complain because the whole pattern of Soviet effort in the Orient is set up on "volunteer" organization and "technical commissions."

As the Red Chinese now look back upon the Korean war, they refer to it as a "rehearsal." On foot and without air power, they point out, they swept across the Yalu and in a few days marched almost to the tip of Korea. They boast that a comparable move with MIG–17's, IL–28's, and paratroopers, would produce another result.

In my opinion, a good part of America's confused policy in the Orient stems from lack of understanding of precisely what help is needed * * * despite the fact that Admiral Radford was explicit in his explanation. Free Asia does not need ground troops from America. Properly trained and equipped, the Asiatic soldier is tough enough. Free Asia needs sea blockade and air cover. With these protections the Nationalist Chinese forces could have landed on the mainland and run over the Reds; nor do I believe that this would have sparked a general war * * * and most especially not if the air cover was IVG.

When the suggestion encountered hot debate and lack of approval in the United States, Mao considered that once more he had the same green light he had had in respect to the Yalu. He greatly intensified his fifth column in every free country in Asia. It was perfect psychology because Asia knows that, without equivalent airpower to match Red China, the Nationalists do not have a chance; and if the United States does not furnish the airpower, where is it to come from? The only answer I know is an IVG. Operational costs would be less than one-half that of a formal military organization of the same combat strength.

From the hundreds of applications which I have received from all over the world—including some from behind the Iron Curtain—a crack, elite squadron could be in action in 3 months—a self-supporting wing of 75 planes manned by 475 volunteers in 6 months.

The casual, work-a-day citizen may never understand it, but in every country in the world there are men with a passion for freedom, willing to fight and die for it. Maybe aviation has an unusual appeal to such men. Of this I can not say for certain. What I can say is that I can gather swiftly and surely an advanced pilot cadre which will have combat superiority to meet the situation.

For the Flying Tigers I was supplied with nothing but hastily assembled P–40 Curtiss Hawks with which to fight off the armadas of Japanese Zeros and German Messerschmitts.

For an IVG, I estimate the cost, per wing of foreign pilots, to be seven and a half million dollars anually. Cost of planes and munitions would be approximately the same as for a formal military establishment. I would recommend that such a group be placed under the advisory supervision of the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, with a congressional watchdog committee to oversee procurement and expenditures.

I am convinced that a comparatively small IVG, modernly equipped with American aircraft, could nullify Red aggression in the air. It would be a means of doing something that has to be done unless free Asia is to be thrown to the dogs.

The recent SEATO conference at Bangkok, February 23–25, revealed the urgent need for tangible military units to resist the anticipated advance of communism in southeast Asia. Despite the insistence of the Thais upon the stationing of SEATO military units in Thailand, the United States promised roving units to be available in the general area and no other SEATO conference power volunteered military units of any type for immediate resistance to Communist aggression. The conference adjourned after appointing a SEATO military committee to work on measures to cope with communism.

The International Volunteer Air Group would be an ideal military unit for this purpose. Patterned after the oft-used Communist volunteer aggression units, except that it would be truly international and really volunteer, it could be kept in a high state of training and technical supply for immediate use in any area threatened by communism in southeast Asia. Its use would relieve the United States and other SEATO powers of the Communist charge of intervention in the internal affairs of Asiatic states, as well as the possibility of precipitating a war between Red China and the United States. The employment of an IVG in southeast Asia should also eliminate the chimerical fear of opening a world war, since it is hardly conceivable that the U. S. S. R. would start such a war because of the operations of a volunteer group.

And I submit that a cadre of volunteers who passionately love freedom, fighting of their own free will, would sound a trumpet call of hope to free Asia such as has not been heard since the dark shadow of Marxism began to engulf the Orient.

Petition of Green Bay, Wis., VFW Regarding the Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, there follows a petition passed by both the Brown County (Wis.) Council, VFW, and Noble-Straubel Post, No. 2037, on April 12 and April 14, respectively:

RECOMMENDING DISSOLUTION OF HOOVER COMMISSION

We, the members of the Brown County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in regular meeting here assembled, make it known, recommend, and petition our congressional Representatives and Senators that they dissolve the Hoover Commission at the expiration of its activities on May 31, 1955, and kindly request that it not be extended further time for the reasons which we cite below.

The Hoover Commission which was created to bring about economy and efficiency in Government has seemingly made the veteran, the Veterans' Administration, and veterans' preference in Government employment its prime target for effecting most of their prescribed economies by recommending:

Review of all service-connected disability claims for compensated veterans, with cutting same as their prime objective.

Attacking the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program.

Curtailment of building and renovation of hospitals now standing or contracted for.

Closing of 19 hospitals throughout the country. (Recommended.)

Putting admission to veterans' hospitals on a priority basis, with pauper's oath with addendum necessary.

Recommended drastic changes in the veterans' preference laws as provided by Congress to the veterans in civil-service employment.

These and many more too numerous to mention have been recommended. There were 14 recommendations made affecting veterans, only 2 which were deemed commendable. So we trust you will use your good offices to counteract any further extension being granted this Commission. We are told that there have been more recommendations come from the Hoover Commission than from the President of the United States.

Thanking you for any favorable support you may grant us, we remain,

Very sincerely yours,

BROWN COUNTY COUNCIL, VFW.
CLAYTON J. THYES,
Commander.
IRVIN V. SHEEDY,
Adjutant.

The Hells Canyon Dam Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Aden Hyde, editor of the Eastern Idaho Farmer, and printed in the March 31, 1955, issue, sets forth the serious concern the people of my congressional district feel toward the Hells Canyon Dam proposal. Water for the irrigation of farmlands in the upper Snake River area is vital to the economy of that area.

The article follows:

VIEWS AND NEWS ON SUBJECTS HERE AND THERE

(By Aden Hyde, editor, the Eastern Idaho Farmer)

It took residents of the Snake River Valley a few days to recover from their astonishment when a Senate subcommittee scheduled grassroots Hells Canyon Dam hearings at Lewiston, Pasco, and Portland.

But after that initial incredulity wore off, it certaily didn't take long for the screams to reach Washington. So the Senate committee condesendingly whacked Lewiston's hearing time in half and decided to spend some part of a whole half day in Boise.

That concession—which wasn't much, for sure—really stirred up the folks in the Snake River Valley. The end isn't yet, either. There will be more sharp words stemming from bewildered and irritated Idahoans begore that hearing junket comes to the Northwest.

It is still beyond our comprehension why Hells Canyon "grass roots" hearings didn't include the Snake River Valley in the first place. Lewiston, Pasco, and Portland, indeed.

Not one acre of land below Hells Canyon Dam will be irrigated because of that structure's construction. Pasco is in Washington on the Columbia River above the mouth of Snake River. And as for Portland, why not hearings in Honolulu and Tokyo?

The only possible inference in scheduling hearings at Pasco and Portland is that the whole Hells Canyon matter, downstream, has become nothing but a grab for Federal power—Federal power turbined by Idaho and Wyoming water and diverted downstream, away from Idaho entirely.

The Eastern Idaho Farmer is well aware of the insistent argument that the Government of the United States would never use Idaho's water for downstream power purposes.

Well, that's exactly what the Government of the United States would be doing if Hells Canyon Dam is built for the power benefit of anybody living in the vicinity of either Pasco or Portland. Can't take our water? That's exactly what WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER are proposing to do right now.

At least, they are going through the motions. Senator HENRY DWORSHAK has publicly charged that the Hells Canyon authorization legislation, this impending congressional grass roots junket and the Lewiston-Pasco-Portland hearings is nothing but politics, designed to embarrass the Eisenhower administration. In private correspondence, the senior Idaho Senator has gone further than that; he has said that he doubts if either MORSE or NEUBERGER really want to have Hells Canyon built. They are just using the demand and the opportunity for political effect in public-power-conscious Oregon.

We do not mean to imply, of course, that there is anything in the present situation which warrants the assumption that the Government will, simply by building Hells Canyon Dam, put all existing Idaho water rights in immediate jeopardy. What we do say—and no more fully informed authority on that is Congressman HAMER BUDGE who has made it his specific business to learn all there is to know about that—is that big Government can do just that.

But present water rights do not include all the water originating on the Snake River watershed in Idaho and Wyoming. Somebody long ago suggested to the Eastern Idaho Farmer that no great vision is required to look forward to the time when industry, in search for water, could easily find the Snake River Valley a place to its liking—and that the Snake River plains may some day be spotted with factories and inhabited by 5 million people.

But that could never be unless Idaho is free to develop all its water resources—and that's impossible if prior rights are established downstream.

Senator HERMAN WELKER got into the act with this statement:

"I am sick and tried of having the people who pioneered and who toiled with shovel in hand to build an irrigation system being made political pawns of poltical interests of neighboring States."

"It is my duty to support and defend the sovereign rights of the people of Idaho. And I shall fight until the last breath in my body to keep those rights from being sold across a political cacus table.

"I am determined that the vast agricultural developments of my State shall not become a 'dust bowl' monument to the misguided political proponents of a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Once the high dam is authorized the rights of industrious farmers who have made this State will be a thing of the past."

That's pretty much on the fire and brimstone side but it probably well reflects the exasperation which many Idaho citizens feel.

Our final thought is to return to a statement which former Col. F. S. Tandy, chief of the Army engineers' office at Walla Walla, made shortly after he was retired:

"Give me $400 million for upstream storage and I'll make a desert of Hells Canyon."

Colonel Tandy, with long flood-control experience to support his conclusions, believed in storing water where it falls, not far downstream.

With that conclusion, the Eastern Idaho Farmer concurs. What's more, we fervently believe that Idaho's destiny will be determined by what happens in Hells Canyon.

Louisiana Tidelands No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as I stated in the RECORD the other day, it is my desire to present to the Congress a series of articles on tidelands which appeared in the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La. I set forth below the third in this series of four editorials, which is entitled "The Tidelands Situation: No. 3 in a Series:"

THE TIDELANDS SITUATION: NO. 3 IN A SERIES—LOUISIANA'S CLAIM TO LAND THREE LEAGUES FROM COAST

Under the Tidelands Act of 1953 "title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective State, and the natural resources within such lands and waters" were "vested in and assigned to" the respective States.

A section of the Tidelands Act provided further that the "seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline * * *." This section provided also, however, States admitted to the Union after its original formation might establish such boundaries but that "Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by the Constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore approved by Congress."

The latter provision apparently was intended particularly for the benefit of Texas, which was a republic before it became a State—under a treaty establishing its boundary 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles, beyond its coastline.

This provision appears to us to apply also to Louisiana, giving this State title to submerged lands 3 leagues beyond its coastline.

Reason for this interpretation is the language of the act of Congress of April 8, 1812, under which Louisiana became a State of the Union.

The act of admission established the seaward boundary of the new State at three leagues of the coast.

That the Congress acknowledged that it could neither take away from nor add to a State's territory was manifested a few days later, on April 14, 1812. On this date the Congress added to Louisiana lands which had been claimed by Spain, which are known today as the Florida parishes, "in case the Legislature of the State of Louisiana shall consent thereto. * * *"

The Louisiana Legislature subsequently did consent to the Florida parishes being added to the State.

In view of the language of the act which admitted Louisiana as a State and of Congress' acknowledgement that it lacked the power to take from or add to a State's territory, without its consent, it seems to us clear that Louisiana had a boundary more than 3 miles beyond its coastline at the time such State became a member of the Union.

During prohibition it was generally understood that the Federal Government had no jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit. This understanding was shaken, of course, by the *I'm Alone* case—in which the rum-running boat *I'm Alone* was captured far beyond this 3-mile limit.

Whatever the origin of this popular conception or misconception, it has no support in the language of the 1783 Treaty of Independence, which settled the Revolutionary War and fixed the boundaries of States then bordering the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes.

Probably because the Atlantic Coast States had substantial interest in fishing, the boundaries of the original States touching that coast were fixed by the treaty at 20 leagues from shore into the Atlantic Ocean.

The Continental Congress on August 4, 1779, had instructed the treaty commissioners of the Continental Congress to insist on the 20-league boundary as an ultimatum.

Before Louisiana was admitted as a State, with a boundary 3 leagues from its coast, the area of the Louisiana Territory—as shown by early maps—extended even further into the Gulf of Mexico, to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

It seems to us that State officials are obligated to maintain Louisiana's right to the submerged lands 3 leagues beyond its coastline.

Suggested Rules for Negotiations With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, suggested rules regarding negotiations with Red China are advocated by Mr. Robert T. Oliver, of State College, Pa., an authority on Korea, in the following editorial which he wrote for the May 1955 issue of the Korean Survey, which is published by the Washington bureau of the Korean Pacific Press:

NEGOTIATIONS: SUGGESTED RULES

Inescapably, the basic question immediately before the world is not whether but how to conduct negotiations aiming toward a global settlement. Until world war actually starts, our very concept of civilization demands a continuance of efforts to prevent it by salvaging agreement through discussion. Even so, the question is not how to preserve peace (which can most surely be accomplished by surrender) but how to preserve the values of liberty. This means that negotiation must be conducted with liberty, rather than peace, as its fundamental aim.

On the basis of the experience of the past decade, the following guiding principles emerge as indispensable guides:

1. We must negotiate from strength; and strength means a sword in hand, not in a sheath. Even when the United States had the world's only hoard of atomic bombs, this unused strength did not help us. On the other hand the Communists use strength in a way that counts heavily at the conference table. By way of contrast, consider Korea and Indochina. In Korea in 1951 the UN had the Communists beaten. But when we commenced to negotiate, we stopped our military pressure—and lost the negotiation. In Indochina the Reds poured all their strength into an attack on Dienbienphu during the Geneva Conference—and won. Our great aim is to relax tensions to achieve a calm atmosphere for talk; the Communists move quickly to create tensions as a threatening background for talk. To overmatch them, we should move greatly increased military power into Korea and Formosa before we enter another conference, and should make plain our instant readiness to use it if talk fails.

2. We must have a genuine alternative if negotiation fails. In Seoul in 1953 Secretary Dulles urged President Rhee to agree to the truce on the ground that it is better to reunify Korea by conference than by war. But Dulles was unwilling to pledge that if negotiation failed, war would be resumed. The Communists, accordingly, knew in advance they could reject all reasonable proposals without penalty. From this and many other lessons we should realize that to enter into still another conference on Asian problems will be fruitless unless we make it clear that in the event conference fails we do have other alternatives: perhaps a blockade of Red China, or a positive guarantee of the present dividing line in southeast Asia, or bombing raids of the mainland from Formosa, or renewal of the fighting in Korea. Unless there is a clear penalty for failure at the conference table, the Reds will not make any concessions.

3. We must not let our policies be undermined by weak allies. In case a world war breaks out, America will be the chief target of attack and will have to do most of the effective fighting. Yet we let Atlee of England and Nehru of India dictate a policy of no victory in Korea. We let Mendes-France dictate a surrender in Indochina, partly at the behest of Anthony Eden who, at Geneva, described himself not as America's strongest ally but as an honest broker between us and the Reds. It is simple common sense that we who will have to struggle to win the next war, if it comes, must be allowed to follow our own judgment (based on our own needs and beliefs) as to how that war may be prevented.

4. We must not blind ourselves to the fact that war may be inevitable. It is conceivable that both sides may renounce war from fear of the hydrogen bomb; but the human race has fought against all manner of weapons all through history, and the millenium may not have arrived in our time. By constant reiteration of the unspeakable horrors of the hydrogen bomb, we undermine our own moral responsibility for making any sacrifice needed to preserve our democratic society. On March 20 Secretary Dulles wisely warned: "The time may come when we shall have to sacrifice peace to secure our liberties." The great tragedy would be acceptance of a "peace at any price" psychology. The instant we reach that point, the Reds will have won the opportunity for world domination. Liberty is worth even more than safety.

Resolution on Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Anselm Forum, Inc., of Gary, Ind., passed the following resolution on April 17, 1955.

Congress should endorse the recommendations set out therein to protect the rights of American Indians on legislation involving their interests and welfare:

Whereas it has become the policy of the United States, since the passage of House Resolution 108, in 1953, to bring to an end all Federal considerations enjoyed by the Indians residing within the territorial limits

of the United States, because of their Indian status; and

Whereas the Congress has further declared its intentions by enacting into law acts terminating the special relationships existing between the Government and six separate tribes—the Klamaths, and the Uintah-Ouray—forcing liquidation of tribal assets, placing tribal lands on tax rolls despite treaties, statutes, and long-standing customs. This creates a serious threat to homes and income; and

Whereas this action, justified as a means of integrating the Indians into our common way of life, has been undertaken against the will and judgment of most Indian leaders. There has been almost no long-range preparation of the Indian by the Government for private citizen status. His inexperience in self-government requires formulation of an intelligent program for his eventual adjustment to American life. Only adequate economic opportunities for decent standards of living will make a modified termination possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Gary Anselm Forum be on record as opposing all future legislation in the Indians' behalf without prior consultation and agreement with the tribes involved.

ANSELM FORUM, INC.
GARY, IND., *April 17, 1955.*

Federal Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since the turn of this century the Federal Government—under both Democrats and Republicans—developed a power policy that is realistic and sound. As the power policy developed, it gave consideration to the interests and welfare of the public.

In recent years, however, there has been a tendency to turn away from this public power policy. I know that the people are aware of this trend. In support of this contention, I wish to insert in the RECORD, a very fine resolution adopted by 400 delegates attending the 19th annual meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative held in Madison, Wis., on March 30–31, 1955.

I commend the resolution to my colleagues for their study and consideration. The resolution outlines the development of our Federal power policy, and it also comments on the trend away from this policy by legislative and administrative action.

The full text of the resolution follows:

FEDERAL POWER POLICY

Over the years since 1900 there has evolved through congressional and executive action what has become known as the Federal power policy. The development of this policy has been under the legislative leadership of men of both major political parties and under the administrations of both Republicans and Democrats. By 1950 it could be said that the Federal power policy embodied the following principles:

1. That the Federal Government not only has a responsibility to regulate navigation and commerce and to prevent flood damage on and along our navigable streams, but to develop our great hydroelectric resources through construction and operation of great multipurpose dams.

2. That the power developed at federally owned and operated dams should be sold on a low-cost basis with preference given to public agencies and nonprofit cooperatives in the amounts of such power sold.

3. That as an incident to the marketing of power from Federal hydroelectric projects the Federal Government should construct and operate transmission lines to carry such power to main load centers where that is necessary in order to give practical effect to the preference clause.

4. That regional development of waterpower resources in the interests of navigation, conservation, flood control, and power generation is a responsibility of the Federal Government in order to bring the benefits of our great waterpower resources to the greatest number of people.

5. That it is proper and necessary for the Federal Government to construct and operate steam-generation plants in order to firm up and make more valuable power developed at federally owned hydroelectric dams.

6. That the Federal Government has a responsibility to aid in bringing electricity to unelectrified rural areas through making loans available to cooperatives and others for the construction of generation, transmission and distribution facilities for this purpose.

This evolving Federal power policy has seen the development of the great Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administrations numerous other great dams, including those on the Missouri River and the marketing of power at rates which have encouraged the development of industry and agriculture on a scale which would have otherwise been impossible. And as a result of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 we have seen a transformation in rural life which has brought tremendous benefits to rural America in the past with even greater benefits indicated for the future.

But this Federal power policy and its tangible expression in low cost power for industries, homes and farms have not come about without struggle nor without bitter opposition from monopoly interests who seem to think that the term "public welfare" is synonymous with stockholder profits and who try to make the public believe that when they try to do something for themselves through their Government they thereby become Socialists, if not dangerous Communists.

Events of the past few years indicate that not only are these opponents of our Federal power policy still fighting to destroy it but that they are enjoying a measure of success that threatens to scuttle the achievements of 50 years of efforts in behalf of all the people.

Recent legislative and administrative proposals to emasculate the preference clause in the marketing of Federal power, to sell or lease Federal transmission lines and even whole projects, such TVA—to build no more Federal power dams, to turn over hydro sites such as Hells River Canyon to high cost private power exploitation and the recent recommendation of the Hoover Commission on Federal Lending Agencies to abolish REA and insurance increase costs to REA cooperatives—these and many others, are startling evidence of the effectiveness of the money powered propaganda drive of private utility interests.

Now, therefore, the delegates to the 19th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative do hereby resolve that—

1. Our membership give full support to the preservation of our Federal power policy formulated and put into effect between 1900 and 1950.

2. We vigorously oppose current efforts to weaken and destroy that Federal power policy.

3. We support measures to extend the benefits of our Federal power policy through such acts as Government construction of Hells Canyon and other great dams, the construction of large base load steam plants to supplement and firm up hydropower and the interconnection of these plants with hydrofacilities to extend low-cost power to other areas and load centers and eliminate existing regional discrimination in rates.

4. We commend our national association, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, for the vigorous fight it has made in our behalf to preserve our Federal power policy, and we pledge our continual support of these efforts to the end that the benefits of low-cost electric power be extended to all our peoples to help makes a better and stronger America.

Success on New Shores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on April 18, 1955, by Mary Hornaday, called "Success on New Shores":

SUCCESS ON NEW SHORES
(By Mary Hornaday)

New York has been largely built by wave after wave of immigrations from Europe. Most recent of these resulting from Hitler's persecution of the Jews has just passed a landmark with the 112-page 20th anniversary edition of Aufbau, unique German language weekly which has not only provided a forum but even families for these uprooted people.

From the point of view of Aufbau and its ex-Berliner editor, Dr. Manfred George, this latest immigration has been "more or less successful" though some of its most talented members have gone back to central Europe and others are operating, in this air age, on both sides of the Atlantic.

This immigration, symbolized by Aufbau, was unique in that it did not get stuck in the slums of New York's lower East Side. Its members were largely cultured, quick-witted people, who took large apartments in the Riverside Drive area and, though they had to rent out 4 of their 5 rooms, never left what they call their bourgeois setting. They were people who knew a little English from their school days and something about American ways and history.

In its early days Aufbau, which belongs to a nonprofit group called the New World Club, performed a valiant service by knitting together in the free atmosphere of America the threads tossed across the seas by people who had been scattered over the face of the globe by Hitler's inhumanity. The Red Cross reported that 80 percent of its searches instituted through Aufbau brought results.

Some of the older immigrants found families for the first time. Aufbau's anniversary edition records the case of Mary, a cook in Omaha, Nebr., an immigrant from East Prussia 50 years before, who put an ad in Aufbau in September, 1950, and in January, 1951, had a letter from a sister in Israel who she didn't even know existed.

Arriving in a general era of full employment, Aufbau's readers can count up among themselves today many successful careers not only in cultural fields but in business and industry. The anniversary edition pays tribute to Stefan Lorant, noted authority on Abraham Lincoln and Rudolf Flesch, author of the best-seller, Why Johnny Can't Read, and also to immigrants less well known to those outside the world of big business.

They mention, among others, Leo Jolson, who has built up a $250,000 business importing Necchi sewing machines from Italy; Leichtman, who built up the Commercial State Bank & Trust Co. of New York; Alfred Moses, who landed with $11 in his pocket, whose Almar Manufacturing Co. making plastic purses and raincoats has become one of Georgia's leading firms; Jack Minkus, the stamp king of New York; and Erich Sternberg, department store magnate in Louisiana.

With most of its readers literarily and musically inclined, Aufbau has devoted much space in the last 20 years to cultural subjects, encouraging especially the off-Broadway productions in which refugee artists got their best opportunities. Ten years ago when Aufbau took its first survey of the enrichment of American culture by refugee artists and writers, the scene was considerably brighter than it is today. A lot of refugee artists who could not conquer the American market have returned to Europe and several of the top ones have passed away.

But a new generation of youngsters writing in English is just coming to the fore and a notable phenomenon since World War II is the number of German-speaking artists working both sides of the Atlantic at the same time. Included in the latter group are Erich Maria Remarque, Hans Habe, Oscar Karlweiss, Francis Lederer, and Oscar Homolka.

Still another way in which Aufbau, which means to "build up," has been living up to its unique purpose (and operating without a deficit) has been in its attempts to heal the breach between Adenauer's Germany and the Jewish people who suffered under Hitler.

Today Aufbau is read in Germany as an American paper—not widely but by people who count in its long-term campaign to get both the post-Hitler Germans and the resettled Jews to see that a new day has dawned in which they must get along together.

"This part of our work is not easy," says Dr. George, "Many of our people have very bitter remembrances and are very emotional in their reactions. We don't say to them that they have to condone and forget what Hitler did, but we have tried to impress on them that hate cannot be productive. We have tried to contact those forces in Germany which could be counted on and have tried to build up bridges of understanding. We are fighting neonazism in Germany."

As an American newspaper representing an ex-German minority within the American Jewish minority, Aufbau was happy to have a salutation from President Eisenhower and from Chancellor Adenauer on its recent anniversary.

Free World and Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Picayune of April 19, 1955:

FREE WORLD AND FORMOSA

With one exception, Secretary of State Dulles noted in commenting on Adlai Stevenson's speech broadcast nationwide last week, the former Democratic presidential nominee's ideas on the Formosa Strait crisis parallel what the Eisenhower administration is doing. That single exception, according to Mr. Dulles, is that Mr. Stevenson would ignore "the loyalty and resources" of a principal ally, Nationalist China.

But it seems to us there is still another exception between Mr. Stevenson's ideas and what appears to be the Dulles policy in the Far East. Mr. Stevenson stressed the need for the free world "to join with us in an open declaration condemning the use of force in the Formosa Strait" and agreeing to "stand with us in the defense of Formost against aggression." While the State Department may be moving quietly and undercover toward this very objective—and there have been evidences of that goal in the United Nations—there has been no open effort toward lining up free-world agreement and concerted action in Formosa. Only Britian has — with qualifications — supported the United States statements on the Formosa Strait. For the most part that support has consisted of explanations to Parliament by Sir Anthony Eden as to what Washington means by its somewhat shifting evidences of attitude.

Naturally Mr. Stevenson's address contained statements betraying political motivation. His effort to pin blame for a "dead-end policy in Asia" on the Republican administration is an example. But by and large aggressors in Peiping will gain no comfort from Mr. Stevenson's speech. Despite the doubts on the need to fight for Quemoy and Matsu islands, it backs the American policy of doing everything possible to settle the Formosa Strait crisis peacefully and accepts the necessity of defending Formosa from Red China.

Most Beautiful Spring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the many people who travel western Pennsylvania are impressed with the beauty and enchantment of the scenery. I myself have traveled in many parts of the world, and I have yet to see anything that can surpass western Pennsylvania in the summertime.

With your permission, I am including an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press, which adequately expresses the beauty and charm of western Pennsylvania.

MOST BEAUTIFUL SPRING

Few places in the United States, or in the world for that matter, are as beautiful in spring as western Pennsylvania. The reason may be our abundant April showers, or the hills that show spring's finery to advantage.

Spring comes gradually here. First the grass, which has seemed dead for months, becomes a vivid green. Then the forsythia bushes and dandelion blooms add splashes of gold. A little later, peach and pear trees become pink and white clouds, and their blooming is followed by the snowy glory of apple blossoms.

Fields become purple with violets just before the trillium raises its hooded head in the woods. Then the skirts of many woodlands show lace petticoats of dogwood.

Usually the various waves of spring's advance overlap. That is especially true this year, when an unusually warm April has brought out the apple blossoms while some forsythia still is in bloom.

Any resident of this area who doesn't go out in the country in the next week or so will miss the finest scenery of the year.

Report on a Minimum Wage Rate Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a document entitled "What Wage Floor Would Be Necessary To Protect Connecticut's Great Industrial Labor Force Against the Migration of Industries From the State?", which was prepared by Dr. Sar A. Levitan, an outstanding economist on the staff of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

I requested the Legislative Reference Service to conduct this survey with a view of determining what national minimum wage floor should be established in order to protect Connecticut's industrial labor force from runaway industries migrating to labor market areas of surplus labor supply, indecent wages, and substandards of living.

The Legislative Reference Service, of course, makes no recommendations. Consequently it would be unfair to read into this study any support or opposition to any specific proposal for the modification of the Federal minimum wage law now pending before Congress. This study is based upon a comprehensive survey and an objective analysis of the facts. I commend Dr. Levitan for his excellent presentation of a vital economic problem.

I hope that this factual study will be of benefit not only to me but to other Members of the House:

WHAT WAGE FLOOR WOULD BE NECESSARY TO PROTECT CONNECTICUT'S GREAT INDUSTRIAL LABOR FORCE AGAINST THE MIGRATION OF INDUSTRIES FROM THE STATE?

(Prepared by Dr. Sar A. Levitan)

MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION TO DATE

Minimum-wage legislation in the United States dates back to 1912, when the Commonwealth of Massachusetts passed the first State minimum-wage law. Since then more than half the States have enacted minimum-wage legislation. Twenty-three of the thirty States and Territories with minimum-wage legislation have limited their coverage to women and/or children. Twenty-two States, most of them in the South, have no minimum-wage laws.

Two of the seven States that have extended the protection of their minimum-wage laws to men as well as women have a statutory minimum-wage rate of 75 cents an hour. These two States are Connecticut and Massachusetts. Connecticut was the first State to set a statutory minimum equal to the current Federal rate. Beside these two cases, State coverage has been largely limited and the statutory minimum wages comparatively low.

The Federal Government entered the field of minimum-wage legislation with the enactment of the National Industrial Recovery Act codes. In 1938 it passed permanent minimum-wage legislation with a 25-cent minimum that became effective in October 1938. This minimum was increased to 30 cents a year later, and during the war a 40-cent minimum became effective. The floor on wages was further increased to 75 cents in the beginning of 1950.

THE CASE FOR MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

The justification for minimum-wage legislation is twofold:

1. It attempts to raise the standard of living of those who are at the bottom of the economic ladder and tries to provide these with a minimum standard of living.

2. Minimum-wage legislation recognizes that the existence of low wages tends to debase the living standards of workers enjoying higher wage levels and acts as a drag upon the economy. Substandard wages, in the words of the Fair Labor Act, constitute an unfair method of competition in commerce and interferes with the "orderly and fair marketing of goods and commerce."

The Fair Labor Standards Act declares it to be the policy of the United States to try to correct as rapidly as practicable the depressing effects that substandard wages exert upon the overall wage structure. This is to be accomplished, however, without substantially curtailing employment or the earning power of those individuals involved.

REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

Minimum wage legislation normally affects directly only a small percentage of wage earners—those at the bottom of the economic ladder. It apparently has not appreciably reduced wage differentials among the several sections in the country or among different occupations.

Detailed regional information on wage distribution is available for manufacturing. Data published recently by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveal that in April 1954, there were in the United States some 1,282,000 production workers in manufacturing whose hourly earnings were less than $1 an hour, while more than double that number were earning less than $1.25 an hour. One out of every five production workers engaged in manufacturing in the northeast were earning less than $1.25; in the South a comparable percentage was 50 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated cumulative distribution of production workers in manufacturing industries by straight-time average hourly earnings,[1] United States and regions,[2] April 1954*

[In thousands]

Average hourly earnings [1] (in cents)	United States	Northeast	South	Middle West	Far West
Under 75	23	3	18	2	(3)
75 and under 80	380	58	283	34	5
80 and under 85	575	111	398	59	6
85 and under 90	817	186	519	100	12
90 and under 95	1,069	280	634	138	16
95 and under 100	1,282	360	723	179	20
100 and under 105	1,656	491	882	250	33
105 and under 110	1,925	594	991	301	39
110 and under 115	2,243	724	1,103	368	48
115 and under 120	2,518	838	1,194	429	57
120 and under 125	2,823	964	1,283	504	72
125 and over	9,767	3,534	1,281	3,874	1,078
Number of workers	12,590	4,498	2,564	4,378	1,150
Average hourly earnings	$1.68	$1.67	$1.36	$1.80	$1.94

NOTE.—For footnotes see end of next table.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated cumulative percentage distribution of production workers in manufacturing industries by straight-time average hourly earnings,[1] United States and regions,[2] April 1954*

Average hourly earnings [1] (in cents)	United States	Northeast	South	Middle West	Far West
Under 75	0.2	0.1	0.7	(3)	(3)
75 and under 80	3.0	1.3	11.0	0.8	0.4
80 and under 85	4.6	2.5	15.5	1.3	.5
85 and under 90	6.5	4.1	20.2	2.3	1.1
90 and under 95	8.5	6.2	24.7	3.2	1.4
95 and under 100	10.2	8.0	28.2	4.1	1.8
100 and under 105	13.2	10.9	34.4	5.7	2.9
105 and under 110	15.3	13.2	38.6	6.9	3.4
110 and under 115	17.8	16.1	43.0	8.4	4.2
115 and under 120	20.0	18.6	46.6	9.8	4.9
120 and under 125	22.4	21.4	50.0	11.5	6.3
125 and over	77.4	78.6	50.0	88.5	93.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of workers	12,590,000	4,498,000	2,564,000	4,378,000	1,150,000
Average hourly earnings [1]	$1.68	$1.67	$1.36	$1.80	$1.94

[1] Excludes premium pay for overtime and for work on weekends, holidays, and late shifts.
[2] The regions used in this study include: Northeast: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont; South: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia; Middle West: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin; Far West: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.
[3] Less than 500 workers or 0.05 percent.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington 25, D. C., February 1955.

Average hourly rates in manufacturing disclose similar wide differentials. Bureau of Labor Statistics data reveal that average hourly earnings for production workers in manufacturing was $1.85 in February 1955. The average hourly rates for States ranged, however, from a high of $2.22 per hour in Oregon to $1.20 in Mississippi. The comparable rate in Connecticut was $1.85, New York $1.88, and in Pennsylvania $1.86. The average hourly rates in the New England States ranged from $1.44 in Maine to $1.85 in Connecticut. Representative rates in the Southern States were $1.20 in Mississippi, $1.27 in North Carolina, $1.31 in Georgia, and $1.44 in Virginia.

The average hourly wage differential in manufacturing between the average rate for the United States, and most of the Southern States ranged between $0.40 and $0.60. The hourly rate in Connecticut whose average rate was the same as for the country at large, was more than 50 percent higher than in Mississippi.

The average rates may, however, be misleading. The industrial mix in the several regions differs widely and low average in the South is due mostly to the concentration of low-wage industries in that area. Studies by the Department of Labor comparing wage rates in similar occupations and industries disclose a much lesser differential. To illustrate, in 1952 wage rates for maintenance workers—7 selected skilled jobs—in Hartford, Conn., were higher than 5 out of 10 communities surveyed in the South, but lower or equal to the rates paid in the other 5 communities. Rates for unskilled warehouse workers, however, were lower in every southern city surveyed than in Hartford. The differential ranged between 10 and 35 percent.

IMPACT OF WIDE REGIONAL WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

The migration of industry to low-wage regions has created the anomalous situation of the existence of depressed areas in the midst of national prosperity and plenty. The low wage areas, in order to perpetuate their economic advantages, have also pursued a consistent policy of keeping out unions in order to retain their low labor cost advantages. A recent Wall Street study (February 17, 1955) surveying the growth of industry in the South, quoted a spokesman for the South Carolina Development Board:

"We don't encourage any company to come into the State if it's going to bring a union with it. Our people don't want unions. They are individualistic and don't want outsiders telling them what to do."

Joseph A. Fox of the Washington Star reached a similar conclusion in a series of articles (March 31 to April 4, 1955) on migration of industry to the South. He seems to agree with the conclusions of a leader in Gaston County, Alabama: "Unless there is a radical change in sentiment, the mills down here will not be unionized in 20 years."

The insidious influence of competition among regions and localities is clearly illustrated by a letter from a mayor in a small southern town to a New England manufacturer: "Then our wonderful labor, 98 percent native born, mostly high school graduates, with lower average hourly industrial wage rates, 6 to 49 cents below other Southern States, and from 50 cents to 95 cents below Northern States." It shows that competition for new industry is not limited between low and high wage areas, but that some communities resort to undercutting neighboring towns, which already are victims of low-wage rates and substandard living conditions.

NEED FOR HIGHER MINIMUM-WAGE LEGISLATION

The need for higher minimum wages is brought into sharper focus by the recent district court decision barring the Secretary of Labor from setting minimum wages on a nationwide basis, under the Walsh-Healy Act. This law requires contractors on Government jobs to pay minimum wages prevailing in the locality for the type of work involved. The Secretary of Labor determined that a single minimum wage would prevail for the cotton textile industry. Separate wage minima for each labor-market area would result in systmatic discrimination against high-wage areas. Wide wage differentials in the same industry among the several regions would tend to concentrate all Government contracts in one area, and indirectly make the Government a party in encouraging substandard wages.

It should be stressed that increasing the minimum wage would not effectively limit the competitive forces within the economy. Labor costs account only for about a third of total manufacturing cost and the substandard rates form only a minute fraction of total costs in American industry. Substandard wages do not appear to be a proper factor in a dynamic, free, and competitive American enterprise system.

All people of good will welcome the economic opportunities that new industry is bringing to the people of the South. Defense needs make industrial dispersion desirable. National welfare would, however, require that industrial dispersion should bring with it the blessings of our high standards of living to all the sections of the country. Sound economic growth for the Nation as a whole cannot depend upon "runaway" industry from high-wage areas which reestablish the same business on a substandard wage level elsewhere.

The Congress in the Fair Labor Standards Act has established the policy of Federal responsibility to help eliminate substandard wages. The President in his last economic report endorsed this concept when he declared that minimum-wage laws can assist the comparatively small number of workers who are at the fringes of competitive labor markets. Our experience with minimum-wage legislation would seem to bear out the contention that this type of legislation can be an effective means of raising substandard wages. Six years ago when Congress was debating the increase in the minimum-wage law from 40 to 75 cents an hour, opponents of the increase claimed that this would mean an end to the economic and industrial growth in the newly developing areas. Obviously, these dire predictions did not materialize. The contrary was the fact. The areas that were most sharply affected by the minimum-wage increase enjoyed a greater growth in manufacturing employment than the rest of the country.

IMPACT OF 1950 MINIMUM WAGES

The Department of Labor conducted a number of studies on the economic effects of the 75-cent minimum-wage legislation. A summary of these studies was published in the March 1955 issue of the Monthly Labor Review. The studies disclose that any dire consequences that the opponents of minimum-wage legislation anticipated in 1949 did not materialize. The formal release of the Department of Labor (January 12, 1955) stated categorically the increase in the minimum wages to 75 cents an hour in January 1950 had only minor effects on employment.

The survey concentrated in studying the effects of the minimum wage increase on five low-wage industries: Southern sawmilling, fertilizer, men's dress shirts and nightwear, men's seamless hosiery, and wood furniture. In each of these industries substantial proportions of the employees were receiving less than 75 cents an hour in 1949. The immediate increases in average hourly earnings exceeded the statutory requirements, because some increases were given to employees whose hourly rates were above 75 cents in order to retain historical differentials, though the higher minimum did cause a market narrowing in occupational differentials. It is, however, significant that the minimum wage legislation affected some employees to whom the minimum wage did not apply. A considerable proportion of the fertilizer producers were engaged in intrastate commerce only, and were, therefore, exempt from the new minimum wage law. About half of the employees in the intrastate plants were receiving less than 75 cents an hour in 1949. By 1950 the proportion of those receiving less than 75 cents dropped to 29 percent. "This suggests," according to the Department of Labor study, "a significant, indirect effect of the minimum wage on the employees in plants when the minimum did not apply in an industry predominantly subject to the law." The wage increase had no effect upon employment, which remained stable. The study concludes that industry displayed a very high degree of adjustment to the increased minimum wage.

The Department of Labor asserts that the overall effect of our minimum wage legislation has been "to improve the position of the employees involved by increasing earnings in the affected industries, and that the relative improvement was substantially maintained." But in the absence of minimum wage pressure the relative earning position of the low-paid industries has tended to worsen. The experience during the last few years seems to further support this conclusion. Wages in the above-mentioned 5 low-paid industries has tended to cluster just above the 75 cents minimum. During the same period average wages in manufacturing have increased by about 30 percent.

It would be fair to conclude from these facts that in the absence of a new higher minimum wage the earnings of employees at the bottom of the economic ladder will tend to stagnate.

DETERMINATION OF A PROPER NEW MINIMUM WAGE

Granted that a new Federal minimum wage is desirable, there remains the question what a proper and equitable minimum wage would be at this time. The President recommended a 90-cent minimum as appropriate and consistent with overall economic considerations at this time. In arriving at this conclusion the President apparently considered only the increase in cost of living since the 75-cent minimum was enacted. It appears, however, that current economic conditions could support a higher minimum wage.

The brief review of the impact of the 75 cents minimum wage in 1950 indicated that even the lowest paying industries could absorb that minimum 5 years ago.

The determination of a new minimum wage to become effective probably in 1956, would have to consider not only the increases in cost of living, but the rise in productivity during the 6 years since the last minimum wage became effective. Furthermore, the economy in general is now in a much stronger position than it was 6 years ago.

An equitable minimum wage law, which would take into consideration increases in cost of living and rise in productivity (at an annual rate of 3 percent), would justify an immediate minimum hourly wage rate of about $1.05. Adoption of this minimum would require wage increases to about 10 percent of the manufacturing production workers in the United States. Adequate data for other groups are unavailable. The Department of Labor data indicate that 1,656,000 workers in manufacturing, or 13.2 percent, were actually receiving rates below a $1.05 in April 1954. But increases granted since then (average for the country about 5 cents) would reduce the ratio of those directly affected to about 1 out of 10.

But an hourly rate of $1.05 is still insufficient to provide a family, or even a single person, with an income necessary for a minimum decent standard of living. Such a wage would also continue to exert a downward drag on the country's wage structure. Most union contracts call for a higher starting rate. The minimum wage should therefore not be allowed to stagnate at $1.05 an hour. Increased wages should stimulate management and labor to increased efficiency and production. The minimum wage might accordingly be increased to $1.15 effective 1 year after the $1.05 becomes effective. The Secretary of Labor should be allowed sufficient funds to study closely the impacts of the new wage minima and report the findings to Congress. If no serious difficulties are encountered, the minimum wage would go up to $1.25 by January 1958.

Ample support seems to exist which would justify the belief that American industry would be able to absorb the higher minima. Prof. Lloyd G. Reynolds, of Yale, averred that available data support the conclusion that economic adjustments necessitated by minimum-wage increases, can be made through increases in the efficiency of workers, management, and equipment:

"Indeed, it was mainly the effects of minimum-wage legislation which caused economists to realize the higher wages need not mean higher costs and prices, but might mean increased efficiency instead. Before the enactment of minimum-wage legislation there have usually been dire predictions of ruin by employers in low-wage industries, prophecies of closed plants, and mass unemployment. These predictions seem never to be realized; one comes along a few years later and finds these industries flourishing as well as before. Investigation usually reveals that the answer is a general overhaul of equipment and methods which enables employers to carry on profitably at the higher wage levels."

CURRENT COVERAGE

Some 24 million wage and salary workers out of a total of about 44 million (excluding Government employees, Government, executive and professional employees) are covered by the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Almost two-thirds of those covered are in manufacturing. Transportation, communication, and utilities accounts for about 3.5 million persons. The balance are engaged in mining, wholesale trade, finance, construction and selected retail trade and services.

About 20 million wage and salary workers are not protected by the minimum wage provisions of FLSA. Almost a third of these are engaged in industries which are normally considered interstate commerce, but are exempted by specific provisions of the act (section 13). Farm workers, employees in retail trade and outside salesmen account for 5 out of 6 of those specifically exempted from coverage. Some 14 million wage and salary workers are not engaged in interstate commerce, as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act, and are subsequently not covered by their Fair Labor Standards Act. Persons engaged in retail and wholesale trade account for almost half of this group. Domestics and construction workers each account for about an additional 2 million. Services and related industries for some 3 million. A detailed breakdown by industry group of the present coverage of the FLSA and those employees who are exempt from the provisions of the act are presented in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Coverage and exemptions under the Fair Labor Standards Act, employment as of September 1953* [1]

[Thousands]

Industry classification	Total employment	Employees not covered (intrastate activities)	Employees covered		
			Total	Exempt from minimum wage and overtime provisions	Subject to minimum wage provisions
Total, all industries	43,954	13,609	30,345	6,369	23,976
Manufacturing, total	16,131	86	16,045	597	15,448
Food and tobacco products	1,777	50	1,727	197	1,530
Textile, apparel, and leather products	2,696	7	2,689	35	2,654
Lumber, furniture, and wood products	1,127	20	1,107	120	987
Paper, printing, publishing, and allied industries	1,242	----	1,242	72	1,170
Chemicals, rubber, and related products	1,171	1	1,170	42	1,128
Stone, clay, and glass products	503	7	496	7	489
Metal and related products	7,184	----	7,184	109	7,075
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries	431	1	430	15	415
Mining	768	19	749	2	747
Construction	2,565	1,867	698	84	614
Wholesale trade	2,539	262	2,277	584	1,693
Retail trade	6,928	5,558	1,370	1,140	230
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1,792	414	1,378	330	1,048
Transportation, communications, and utilities	3,956	286	3,670	229	3,441
Miscellaneous industries, n. e. c.	4,188	2,995	1,193	452	741
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	3,066	101	2,965	2,951	14
Domestic service	2,021	2,021	----	----	----

[1] Proprietors, self-employed persons, and unpaid family labor totaling approximately 12 million persons, 6 million Government employees, and 4 million executive, administrative, and professional employees are excluded. Personnel of the Armed Forces are also excluded.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor.

DETERMINATION OF NEW COVERAGE

It is assumed that the present provision to pay wages below the required minimum to handicapped workers and learners will continue in effect.

In addition, the present act leaves some 20 million (nonexecutive, administrative, or professional) employees in private industry outside the scope of the present minimum-wage legislation. Almost a third of these are offered some protection by State laws, though in some cases the applicable minimum is below 50 cents an hour. Undoubtedly a considerable proportion of those now exempt from coverage are most in need for minimum-wage protection. For example, average hourly earnings of employees in general merchandise stores in September 1953 was $1.12, in laundries the average was 99 cents. Undoubtedly these groups will benefit indirectly from an increase in the Federal minimum-wage law, though the "trickle down" effects may not be sufficiently effective to raise the standard of living of those employed in the low-wage industries. It is, however, highly improbably that some of these groups could withstand the impact of a minimum wage of the magnitude discussed earlier. Sound policy would apparently require a lower minimum for some of these groups should Congress determine to broaden the coverage language to encompass all "industries affecting commerce."

Data on wage distribution in the industries currently exempt from Federal minimum wage legislation are inadequate. The determination of an equitable minimum wage for the currently exempt groups as well as the extent to which it is desirable to broaden coverage, require further study before any recommendation can be made in this area.

Pennsylvania National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Pentagon conducted a large scale atomic attack trial alert, in which National Guard units participated. Every Pennsylvanian may be proud that it was our Guard which was the first to check in with a message that the alert had gone out to all indicated organizations and that they were either at their assigned stations or en route to them.

As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the April 22 issue of the Harrisburg Patriot in praise of General Biddle and the Pennsylvania National Guard.

I wish to add my own endorsement of this deserved praise.

GUARD ON ALERT

While only a portion of Pennsylvania's National Guard personnel participated in Wednesday night's national trial alert, those called upon responded to the call with efficient enthusiasm and were at their posts of duty within an amazingly short time.

And Pennsylvania, the Pentagon reports, was the first of all the States to check in with a message that the alert had gone out to all indicated organizations and that they were either at their assigned stations or en route to them.

This demonstration of the State of readiness in which the country's first line of semiprofessional military men finds itself in these uneasy times is a matter of great satisfaction to all of us, including the men participating.

From earliest national history, the Pennsylvania National Guard has been properly proud of the part it has played in the country's military picture, and the very fact that this Commonwealth led the alert this week proves once again the high state of morale and the determination to maintain our units in readiness.

Pennsylvania's part in the alert was mainly that of its airmen and antiaircraft artillerymen, and the manner in which both aviation and ground elements responded to the orders brought satisfied smiles to the faces of the commanding officers.

Adjutant General Biddle, who only this week took over the command of the Pennsylvania Department of Military Affairs, was highly pleased with the results, and commented that the outfits are really on their toes.

One can but pray that we shall never see the time when a real alert will be flashed.

Doctors Strike a Telling Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the front-page publicity over the Salk polio vaccine shots, I wish to call attention to the actions taken by the Marion Academy of Medicine, of Marion, Ohio, which is in the district I represent. The following editorial from the Marion Star tells more vividly than I can the beneficial effects which the action of the Marion doctors will have on the community and the desirability of its pointing the way to similar actions by other groups all over the Nation. I commend the action of the physicians of Marion and recommend the editorial analysis which the Marion Star has devoted to this new and all-important experiment in the field of medicine.

DOCTORS STRIKE A TELLING BLOW

The Marion Academy of Medicine has taken a forthright and enlightened step in its decision to give Salk polio vaccine shots, for an emergency period of approximately 6 months, at a charge covering only the actual cost of the vaccine.

This move, coupled with the offer of the academy to provide the vaccine free to those unable to pay for it, is almost unprecedented and is of far-reaching importance.

Locally, the benefits will be tremendous. In effect, the physicians' decision means that every child in Marion County in the age groups most susceptible to polio will be able to obtain protection from the disease. The plan of the private physician, of course, supplements the school program being directed by public health officials.

Beyond the beneficial results locally, however, the action has statewide and national implications. In the midst of dire forebodings and cries from the political issuemakers for Federal intervention in the problem of vaccine distribution, the step by 51 Marion County doctors strikes a telling blow for the American citizenry.

The issue that is being stirred up nationally is the familiar one of an authoritarian government that would run everything versus a supervisory government that would give its citizens the right to manage their own affairs until they asked for help.

The cry being raised for Federal intervention on Salk polio vaccine is the same one that has been raised for Federal intervention in many other fields.

It has not yet been proved that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the

medical profession, the drug manufacturers licensed to produce the vaccine, the retail drugstores and the people of the United States are incapable of solving the problem of distributing the vaccine. But already the authoritarians are making the welkin ring with strident demands for Federal intervention. They never miss a trick.

On judgment day, they will be demanding that the Federal Government take charge of everything, under the authoritarian credo that only politicians are to be trusted and everybody else is a fool, a crook or someone trying to make a profit.

The Marion County doctors have driven a sharp and powerful wedge into that theory.

Efforts Successful in Finding Polio Vaccine, Yet We Are Doing Nothing in Research To End War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Stanly News and Press, Albemarle, N. C., Tuesday, April 19, 1955, which asks some very pertinent and timely questions in regard to research and the solution to the banishment of war.

Personally, I am very much interested in the question of world peace and feel that the editorial which follows is thought-provoking and that some serious study should be given to the questions it brings up:

The Nation is rejoicing this week over the discovery of a vaccine that is calculated to banish fear of infantile paralysis as well as the disease itself. To Dr. Jonas E. Salk and those who worked with him, the Nation owes a debt of gratitude. And there is also cause for satisfaction since the money that made Dr. Salk's research possible came from the March of Dimes, to which the people of this country have contributed a quarter of a billion dollars during the past 20 years.

Millions are also being given to heart and cancer funds, and there is reason to believe that in the years to come research will develop a cure or preventive for cancer, and a vast amount of information that will help prevent heart disease and perhaps effect cures of certain phases of ailments affecting this vital organ.

Yet there is one other disease that cripples and kills millions. It is war. We are contributing millions through heavy taxes to be ready for war, but very few dollars are being spent in research to prevent war. And yet we feel there is a tremendous opportunity for research to do for war what has been done for infantile paralysis.

While a few leaders may know exactly what causes war, the people, as a whole, are not conscious of the conditions which provoke conflict. What is the real basis for tension between Red China and the United States? Is it the island of Formosa and Chiang Ki-shek, or does it lie in trade opportunities in the Far East?

Will the Christian religion, if properly applied over a period of years, serve to reduce tension and thus the possibility of war?

Do programs of relief win friends for us, or do they promote hate and jealousy?

The right answers to these and thousands of other questions hold the solution to the banishment of war, and yet we do not know of a single dollar being spent in research to determine the actual cause of war.

What will it profit us to discover the cures for polio, cancer, and heart ailments, and yet allow the world to be destroyed in an atomic war?

Plea to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a news item from Labor's Daily of April 23. This news item sets forth very forcefully the need for an adequate pay raise for postal—and classified, too—employees. It should be a telling argument against the reported veto, about which we heard too much last week when the House considered this legislation.

MR. PRESIDENT: LAY DOWN THAT VETO PEN—TYPICAL LETTER CARRIER HAS TO DO ODD JOBS TO MAKE ENDS MEET

DETROIT.—While the President brandishes a veto against a pay raise for postal employees, thousands of American families are suffering undue hardship, trying to make ends meet on paychecks that are years behind the times.

The last pay raise approved by Congress was passed in 1951. That raise was wholly inadequate at the time, and the cost of living has zoomed upward since then. Workers in other industries have had at least four rounds of increases during the same period.

One of the Nation's 103,000 letter carriers, Paul Shay, can tell you what it means to carry on under these circumstances.

Shay, married and father of 2 children—Dian, 8, and Joyce, 1 year—entered the postal service as a carrier in 1946. He is a member of Branch 1, National Association of Letter Carries, AFL.

Living in nearby Birmingham, Mich., Shay had a 1941 Dodge until it no longer would give him service to and from his assignment at the Fenkell branch of the Detroit Post Office. He had to buy a 1947 De Soto so he could get around to his odd jobs—like wall washing, landscape worker, and anything else his neighbors will let him do—to augment his small income.

NEW HOME DRAWS SACRIFICE

After living many years in a small, crowded apartment and after the arrival of their baby a year ago, the Shay family had to find larger quarters, and moved into a new modest home in Birmingham, which has only 4½ rooms. But it was necessary to cash in both his and his wife's insurance policy to get the down payment on the $7,400 home. It has no basement, but Paul hopes to convert the attic into living quarters when he can take time away from his part-time jobs.

Mrs. Shay works in a local department store whenever emergency needs come up, such as doctor's bills—which means Shay must babysit part of the time.

Adding to their burden, Shay was victim of a postal ruling in 1948, which forced him to pay back several hundred dollars erroneously paid him due to a misinterpretation of postal legislation.

His pay is $4,070 annually. Six percent is deducted for pension funds, which he can get only after he has reached the age of 60. His take-home pay, after almost 10 years of service, is still less than $300 monthly.

RAISE WON'T BRING MUCH

Married 15 years, Shay spent 33 months in the Armed Forces. Even with the 8.3 percent increase under discussion in Congress, the Shay family will still have to go without the planned-for gas furnace to replace their present circulator heat, for an 8.3 percent increase will mean less than $10 weekly more in his pay check—or just about enough to cut out one night of part-time work.

"Shay is just about the average lettercarrier in Detroit," said James H. Rademacher, Jr., president of Branch 1, NALC. "No man should be forced to work extra to have the mere necessities of life, yet under present postal pay structure there seems to be no alternative."

Rademacher mentioned that last year the Detroit Postal Employees Credit Union granted 4,020 loans, aggregating $2,860,391, another indication of the wage squeeze on postal workers.

Michigan Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS (Democrat) in congressional testimony pointed to another striking way that the low wages have hit postal families. Due to economic circumstances, the size of the average postal family numbers 2.8 persons, compared with the national average family of 3.53 persons, she said.

Better Never Forget This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a constituent of mine, calling attention to a recent article in the New York Daily News, seems to me very worth of our consideration.

Let us not be lulled to sleep by the apparent change in the Kremlin and Peiping lines, and let us keep our guard up and our powder dry.

HANCOCK, N. Y., *April 24, 1955.*
Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Member of Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: The enclosure, taken from today's editorial section of the New York Daily News certainly is prophetic, and I am sure you will agree with the old quotation, "Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom." I am sure you will do everything within your power to guard it.

We have a wild bunch of Red haters here in Delaware County, myself included, who would rather die to the last man than see the Communists get a foothold in this country.

HERB VOSBURGH.

BETTER NEVER FORGET THIS

In connection with the peaceful coexistence, let's-be-pals chitchat now coming from all quarters of the Red slave empire, we quote from a speech made 24 years ago in Moscow to the students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare by Dimitry Z. Manuilsky, a big-shot Communist then and, to our best information, now:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we

shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Annual Message of the President of the Greater Hazleton (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following annual message of Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, president, Greater Hazleton (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce. Dr. Dessen's report, made at the 63d annual meeting of the chamber, April 21, 1955, is an outstanding example of a communitywide endeavor that has paid off handsomely in increasing and advancing its economy and industrial potential. It is certainly a program that bears further observation and study by communities that presently find themselves in economic straits. It features foresight, cooperation, and optimism—prime ingredients for any worthwhile enterprise. I am proud of Hazleton, my hometown, for its fine, patient work.

The message follows:

My message will be brief. Blessed is the man, who, having little to say, abstains from giving us wordy evidence of the fact.

First, as my friends, let me warn you about the inexorable nature of events in a large public organization such as the chamber of commerce. Several years ago I was asked to serve as second vice president of this organization, with the firm assurance that the position was a nominal one and in no way meant ascendance to the presidency. One assurance followed another, and here I am starting my third year as president of the chamber of commerce. Before I wear out my welcome, let me hasten to assure you that it is also definitely my last. Thank you for your confidence and trust. And don't think I am not aware of the fact that a halo has only to fall a few inches to become a noose.

This is not meant to infer that the experience has not been edifying and satisfying. These 2 years have been a liberal education in community problems, and what makes them problems. It is an experience that every citizen interested in his community should have at one time or another. In chamber of commerce activities, as in all others, we have again found that those criticize the loudest who participate the least.

In retrospect, we are justifiably proud of the road we have traveled and the success we have attained. Some of the successes were not easily won, which makes them still more satisfying and more important.

Our chief function, of course, has been and will be industrial development. Here we have not done too badly. In the past year, the following new industries have begun operations in the Hazleton area: Superior Sleeprite Corp.; Art Crayon Co., Inc.; Mira Sue Sportswear, Inc.; Diamond Dress Co.; G & M Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Neil-Jay Manufacturing; Hazle Products Finishing Corp.; Arthur Manufacturing Co.; Bloss Glass Co.; Hour Bakery; and a branch of the Cloverleaf-Freeland Corp.

Some of these are large, others quite small. Together, as of this present date, they are employing over 500 people, divided almost exactly into 50 percent male and 50 percent female. Most of this increased employment has been brought about by the direct and specific efforts of your chamber; furthermore, it is safe to say that all of it is here because the community has been made attractive to industry economically, and in all other ways, by the chamber's efforts.

This is new employment, and it is on a scale that is sometimes overlooked in the shadow of more publicized efforts. For instance, our new employment compared to our population percentagewise in this last year is quite comparable to that achieved by the well-known and well-heeled Scranton Life plan. In view of our limited finances, that is an achievement indeed.

I am also happy to report that there should be more good news shortly—another predominantly male-employing industry that should soon be ready to announce their entrance into our Hazleton industrial family.

In addition to this new employment, this last year also saw the resurrection and restitution of an old and valued friend, the Shirtcraft Co., Inc. Beset and battered by the pressures of rising costs and the inefficiency of an old plant, they were saved at the very brink of shipwreck by the energetic action of your chamber of commerce, the generosity and public-spiritedness of several of the leading Hazleton banks, and the wholehearted cooperation of their union. That saved nearly 500 more employees for Hazleton. Adding all this together, we are, therefore, about plus 1,000 for this last year. You can readily understand why we are so proud of our industrial efforts. But even though industrial development is the heart of our corporate body, we must not forget the other vital organs.

Members and money represent our circulating blood. Last year saw us stay near the highest total membership in the history of the chamber that we had achieved the year before, thanks to the persistent efforts of our membership committee. In addition, as a result of the badly needed and long overdue dues reevaluation, we raised our total income to a new record high.

We needed every cent of it, and we need still more. You can't operate a 1955 Cadillac with a 1935 motor and low octane fuel. The high level of activity of your chamber makes a high level of income essential.

This last year has also seen our unique dime-a-week program successfully launched. Our goal for this first year is $25,000, and our present total is $16,000, meaning that our goal is within sight. In addition to the financial help, this is also fine and convincing evidence that Mr. and Mrs. Man on the Street stand foursquare behind their chamber of commerce. Let me here reemphasize that these funds are not for general chamber activities, but are earmarked solely for new industry.

The Operation Trees project was also initiated in this past year. This is a most ambitious project that envisions backfilling of strippings wherever possible, planting of trees on our large denuded areas, and planting of trees along the main highways entering our city and in the city itself. Conferences have already been held with representatives of the forestry department and the highway department. We expect to use paid professional help to plan our procedures wisely and well. This is another endeavor for which we have high hopes. Feed it funds and watch it grow.

Still another new project has been the active and spirited solicitation of conventions for Hazleton. This has resulted in the scheduling of 10 conventions, large and small, for the remainder of 1955 and the beginning of 1956. As far as can be determined, this is still another record, considerably above the total of conventions ever held in 1 year before.

Another innovation in this last year was the first Business-Industry-Education Day, or B-I-E Day, in our history, which was a huge and electrifying success. Not only was it wholeheartedly received in this community, but we have been and are receiving requests from all over the eastern part of the country for information on just how it was conceived and promoted. We intend to make B-I-E Day an annual occurrence.

We have time to strike only the highlights of our many other activities. Your Retail Merchants' Council has functioned efficiently all through the year in handling the promotions and plans of the retailers. The meetings committee has arranged several excellent gatherings, notably the congressional meeting, the dinner honoring James G. Shennan during Pennsylvania Week, and this annual dinner meeting itself. The Employment of the Physically Handicapped Committee has continued its efficient help to the physically handicapped people of our community. One of their projects has culminated in the awards given at this dinner tonight. The airport committee has met regularly concerning the trials and tribulations of our beautiful new airport, and is now making preparations for a tremendous dedication program on May 22. The plant visitations committee has added incalculable goodwill in the community by their friendly visits to existing industries. We have given annual awards to existing industries. You have seen us honor Barrett, Haentjens & Co. and the I. Janov Shirt Co. tonight. The transportation and parking improvements committee has been active and effective. They have not only helped solve local problems, but have promoted such projects as the through-way with notable success. And so on down the line. It is unfair to single out individuals for thanks and commendation, because the members of the board of directors and the various committee members have done a uniformly fine and exceptional job. But I'm sure no one will mind if I mention just a few.

Our vice presidents, John Williamson and Charlie Eidam, have been invaluable in the progress of this organization. We are pleased beyond measure that John Williamson will maintain his position for another year. Charlie Eidam leaves his vice presidency with the heartfelt thanks of all for his outstanding work. He, of course, still remains with us as chairman of our important airport committee, where he has already done so much. Our new vice president is Wilbur Evans, a well-known public servant who has often been tested and has never been found wanting. Our treasurer, of course, is John Hohman, without whose wise financial counsel and wealth of knowledge we would feel very desolate.

To our outgoing director, Fred Correale, Conrad Falvello, Donald Mason, and John Reinhart, hail and farewell. The sincere gratitude of a grateful community goes with you. And the hand of warm welcome to our new directors, as likely a lot of able people as ever took on responsibilities in our chamber. Welcome to Clarence G. Baker, Charles T. Butler, Harry Lentz, Robert C. Long, and Arthur J. Whitaker, who were elected in extremely close balloting among all our 15 candidates. It's good to have you aboard.

The community and the chamber of commerce are indebted beyond measure to:

Frank Jedlicka for his continued masterful and diligent work as chairman of the industrial development committee.

Pat Bangor and Ken Bayles, the cochairmen of the dime-a-week campaign, for their really hard and exacting—and highly successful—fund-raising efforts.

Allen Holman, president of the Hazleton Industrial Development Corp., who has worked so diligently and efficiently, and has cooperated with the chamber of commerce activities so well.

John Reinhart, who, as usual, has continued his yeoman work as chairman of the executive committee of the Retail Merchants' Council.

Llewellyn Dryfoos, for his dedication to the task of getting the operation trees project well underway.

Bill Deisroth, who has performed the onerous and thankless duties of chairman of the membership committee with admirable aplomb and excellent results.

To Fred Correale, who has given unstintingly of his own time and that of members of his firm, as chairman of the anthracite committee and in other capacities.

To Bob Wright, who has lent his own winning personality to the task of winning friends for the chamber of commerce as chairman of the plant visitations committee.

To George Snyder, for his persistent and productive efforts as chairman of the transportation and parking improvements committee.

To Paul Becker, for his outstandnig contribution as chairman of the industrial public relations committee.

These men particularly, and all of the working members in general, have served their community well. They do their work unquestioningly, and with a minimum of fuss or trouble. We have found that trouble is usually produced by somebody who doesn't produce much of anything else.

Now just a word about your executive director, Tom Stainback. You will notice him referred to in our annual report as the eyes, ears, nose, and throat specialist. He is our eyes, ears, nose, and throat. His ability to use these senses, his innate intelligence and know-how, his devotion to our cause, and his capacity for hard work that knows no limitations—all of these together have made him the most vital of cogs in our machinery; and, unfortunately, have caused too many chambers of commerce elsewhere in the country to cast covetous eyes in our direction. We could find no finer executive director anywhere.

So much for the bouqets, all deserved. But our organization must be something like Napolean's. When Napolean's military leaders came to him to tell produly of some feat accomplished, the little Corsican had one stock question: "And what," he would ask, "did you do the next day?"

Now briefly, what can we expect in the next days, or, more exactly, in the coming year? First and foremost, there will be a persistence and expansion of our industrial development activity. Althought not spectacular, our new industrial employment has been solid and steady. We can tell you with assurance that there will be more and more of it.

There will be a new membership drive in the near future, with a new record in total membership as our goal. We do not intend to rest on our oars. In the past year or two, our expenses have been swelled by such items as new industrial and convention brochures, new office equipment, new promotions, vastly increased printing and mailing expenses, and expenses incident to industrial development—not to mention the usual expenses incident to higher living costs. The future financing of such activities can only be continued with a still greater membership and a still greater income.

My friends, money is not all. It is not money that will mend a broken heart or reassemble the fragments of a dream. Money cannot brighten the hearth nor solve all the problems of a community. Money cannot do everything. I refer, of course, to Confederate money.

Our industrial fund raising will also be intensified. The dime-a-week program will be perpetuated and expanded. This project gives everyone a chance to contribute to the community's economy, instead of a chosen few. We must also come back to this chosen few for larger contributions when the time is ripe and when the occasion demands.

All of the far-reaching work done by your many committees will be carried still further. They are all important, but particular emphasis in the next year will be placed on expansion of work done by the operation trees committee, the national affairs committee, and the airport committee. There is much to be done.

Another new project for the coming year is the formation of a women's division of the Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce. As we men have so often discovered, the so-called weaker sex can do most things better than we can. We want and need their help, and look forward to having them with us. This may be another shot heard round the entire Hazleton area.

These frontiers for the coming year are vital. There exist limitless opportunities in every direction. Where there is an active and open mind, there will always be a frontier. But basic to all of this further progress is the maintenance of a proper community spirit, a proper enthusiasm and optimism that will not be submerged by fear or adversity. That is the vital gear in the entire community machinery. It is a part of Hazleton's heritage.

All this reminds me of the small girl who said, "Mother, you know that beautiful jug you said had been handed down to us from generation to generation?"

Mother replied, "Yes, Ann, what of it?"

And Ann answered solemnly, "This generation dropped it."

We don't intend to drop our jug of community spirit. We are living in a highly competitive world today. We must attack our community problems with the utmost zeal and enthusiasm. We must be swift and strong.

It may be that the race is not always to the swiftest, nor the battle to the strong. But that's the way to bet.

Need for Helping Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Fairbanks (Alaska) News-Miner, farthest north daily published in the United States, on April 4 editorially called attention to the serious situation which is being created by the steadily diminishing appropriations for needed Alaska activities. I present the editorial here:

BUDGET SLASHES

The Interior Department budget, which was recently approved by a House committee, is a big disappointment to many Alaskans. Appropriations for highway maintenance, the Alaska Railroad, and road construction have been cut 39 percent from the original budget figure of $20,400,000.

Road maintenance is allotted $3,500,000, the Alaska Railroad gets $4,100,000, and road construction is given $4,100,000. The grand total for road construction and maintenance in Alaska is $8,300,000. Four years ago, a total of approximately $20 million was appropriated for this item alone. Thus we see, appropriations for Alaska are being steadily slashed.

Our Government is spending billions for foreign aid. We are appropriating millions of dollars to build highways in South America. But Alaska is getting little or nothing; not even sufficient funds to properly maintain the few highways that now exist in the Territory.

In petitioning for statehood, Alaskans have been told that our Territory is too vast and undeveloped to support itself. That was the opinion of Interior Secretary McKay. But the Federal Government is doing very little to correct this condition. At the rate money is being appropriated to build roads in the Territory, we are going to remain undeveloped for many years to come.

Alaska is getting very few breaks from the present administration. Our appropriations are being slashed, and our statehood petitions are rudely tossed aside for reasons which sound neither sincere nor valid.

Tuna Situation is Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the special committee on the tuna industry by the San Diego Chamber of Commerce:

The tuna fishery and the tuna canning industry are of major importance to the economy of San Diego.

These are activities which began in southern California. Since the earliest days of the development of the tuna market of the United States, San Diego has played a most prominent part. It was in San Diego that the tuna clipper was developed to take its place among the finest fishing vessels in the world.

A vigorous, growing, competitive industry developed, despite declines which occur from time to time in any business activity. Severe reverses have been felt by the local tuna industry and my much of the industry of southern California.

It is the purpose of this report to set forth some measurements of these reverses, comment on the problems involved, and suggest some solutions.

I. THE SAN DIEGO SITUATION

1. Employment

A. Processing plants: In 1949–1950 there were approximately 3,000 persons employed in San Diego canneries.

In 1955, at the time of this report, there are approximately 650 persons so employed.

This represents a decline of approximately 2,350 persons employed.

B. Fishing fleet: In 1949–1950 there were approximately 2,500 full time jobs for fishermen, engineers, radio operators, navigators, and other skilled seamen. This number rose to above 2,700 in 1951.

In 1955, at the time of this report, there were approximately 2,100 such jobs.

This represents a decline of approximately 600 full time berths in the high seas clipper fleet.

Employment declines are also felt by the local albacore fleet which has largely lost its auxiliary commercial fisheries.

C. Related activities: Employment in local shipyards on maintenance, repair, and construction of large and small fishing vessels has proportionately declined. Service and supply establishments report similar experience.

The loss of work in smaller establishments is difficult to measure accurately in the short time available to the committee. Its effect upon the individual family and the business community is, nevertheless, exceedingly important.

D. Other comments: San Diego has been described by State of California Department of Employment as an area of substantial labor surplus. This indicates minimum absorption of those displaced by the reverses encountered by the tuna industry.

2. Facilities

A. Processing plants: In 1949–50 there were six canneries operating in San Diego.

In 1955 there are 3 canneries, of which 1 is operating, a second closed with a probability of return to small-scale operations within 6 weeks, and a third closed with little prospect of operating on more than a standby basis in the predictable future.

Of the 3 cannery sites and buildings lost, 1 has been sold to an aircraft firm, 1 to a trucking firm, and 1 is leased as a warehouse.

B. Fishing fleet: The major supplier of frozen tuna to the United States is the high seas tuna clipper fleet of San Diego.

At the end of 1949 this fleet totaled 193 vessels, increasing to 210 by the end of 1951.

In 1955, at the time of this report, this fleet totaled 165 vessels.

This is a decrease of 45 vessels in the last 3 to 4 years.

C. Shipbuilding and repair: Local facilities are operating far below capacity.

At recent hearings of the House of Representatives, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, the need for maintenance of ship repair and construction facilities was made evident. In San Diego the record shows that such facilities can be maintained best if the tuna fleet can be kept active.

3. Other local considerations

A. Credit and collections: Local businesses directly and indirectly concerned with the fishing fleet and cannery production workers report severe credit situations, which have worsened steadily for some months.

The local fishermen's and cannery workers' union established a welfare fund to loan sums to needy members. Because of delays in unloading, often meaning 6 months between paydays, this fund is at present entirely committed.

B. San Diego's position as a port: In 1949 San Diego ranked first in the Nation in the value of fishery products (almost entirely tuna) landed and fourth in the volume of such products.

San Diego has lost this position, with the value of its fishery landings in 1954 (almost entirely tuna) declining over $10 million below 1949.

Tuna landings are an important source of new wealth to the community. The city of San Diego is now making a strong effort to increase the flow of new wealth through a bond issue to increase port facilities. A continuation of the downtrend in tuna landings would act to nullify the effect of this effort.

II. THE TUNA INDUSTRY SITUATION

1. Domestic tuna market

The canned tuna market of the United States is the only mass market for canned tuna in the world. This market was created, developed, and continues to be broadened almost exclusively by United States canners, principally in San Pedro and San Diego.

Measured in terms of domestic production of canned goods, plus importations of foreign canned goods, there has been a steady growth in apparent consumption (apparent consumption represents production plus imports without giving effect to inventory fluctuations). In 1949 the total was 7,900,000 cases of tuna and tuna-like fish. For the 2 years 1949 and 1950 the average was 9,600,000 cases. In 1953 the total was 11,800,000 cases. For the 2 years 1953 and 1954 the average was 12,350,000 cases.

2. Supply for the market

In 1949 domestic fishermen supplied tuna which represented 91.4 percent of the total United States market. For the 2 years 1949 and 1950 the average was 88.4 percent.

In 1953 domestic fishermen supplied 66 percent, with the average dropping to 60.5 percent for the 2 years 1953 and 1954. In 1954 the percentage is estimated to be 55 percent.

It is evident that the continuance of the United States tuna canning industry depends largely on whether or not there is a domestic fishery supplying a major part of the raw material requirements.

It is also evident that United States fishermen have not participated, either relatively or absolutely, in the increase in the domestic market.

3. The domestic supplier

Domestic production was originally supplemented by imports. The situation has changed to the extent that much domestic production has been supplanted by imports.

The two major evidences of this are:

(1) Long periods of enforced idleness for the domestic fleet (at times with fish cargoes aboard for long periods).

(2) Lack of construction of new vessels to replace losses. (In contrast to record levels of construction in Japan.)

The future of the domestic supplier, and, in turn, the domestic processor, is seriously threatened unless both trends are reversed.

It is reasonable to expect the United States fisherman to participate in an expanding market. This has not happened.

4. The domestic fleet

Despite an expanding market, the domestic tuna-clipper fleet operating from southern California has declined in size from a fleet totaling 44,300 capacity tons at the end of 1951 to one of about 37,500 capacity tons at the date of this report.

Despite an expanding market, the domestic purse-seine fleet operating from southern California has declined. The number of vessels taking fishing permits for tuna has declined from 110 vessels to 67 in the last 5 years.

There have been only 2 bait boats started and finished to enter the fleet since 1951. There have been no additions to the purse-seine fleet or local albacore fleets.

III. PROBABLE CAUSES

The committee has reviewed the situation and concluded that the basic cause of decline of the local and southern California tuna industry has been an excess of imports, principally from Japan.

1. Frozen tuna imports have risen from 20,600,000 pounds in 1949 to 123,400,000 pounds in 1954.

2. Frozen tuna imports from Japan have risen from 2,800,000 pounds in 1949 to 98 million pounds in 1954.

3. Canned tuna imports (oil and brine) have risen from 4,600,000 pounds in 1949 to 31,600,000 pounds in 1954.

4. Canned tuna-like imports have risen from 8,100,000 pounds in 1949 to 15,400,000 pounds in 1954.

5. Tuna purchased by Southern California canners for the period January-March totaled approximately 34,000 tons in 1954 and 33,000 tons in 1955.

Imports totaled approximately 5,800 tons, or 17 percent, in 1954. In 1955 imports totaled approximately 13,500 tons, or 41 percent.

These imports have risen faster than the capacity of the United States market to absorb them. They have caused distress in the United States industry, manifested by the facts set forth in the preceding parts of this report.

An aggravating factor now present is the probability that the United States Government will negotiate drastic concessions to Japan on tuna products within the next few weeks.

IV. SUGGESTED ACTIONS

1. It is the recommendation of the committee that the present negotiations with Japan should not result in additional concessions.

The President is authorized to grant duty reductions and make other concessions to reduce barriers to trade.

The 5-year increase in canned tuna imports of almost 700 percent does not indicate that present tariff rates are in fact barriers to trade.

The committee cannot comprehend the proposed action of the United States Government which may bind the present duty-free rate on frozen tuna. Frozen tuna imports from Japan have increased 3500 percent in the last 5 years. The Government has never made it clear why this step will do anything other than place the Japanese supplier in a preferred position. The present zero duty can in no sense be termed a barrier to trade.

The committee believes that the United States Government should state clearly what it intends to accomplish by these concessions which, if made, will have a fatal effect on the local industry's fight to recover from past and present reverses.

2. It is the recommendation of the committee that the Governments of the United States and Japan discuss a businesslike settlement of the tuna problem.

There is ample precedent for this in actions which the United States Government has approved and endorsed, as in the case of agricultural commodities where special treatment is accorded them under the GATT agreement, and in the recent tung-nut and tung-oil announcement by the President.

There is clear evidence of serious injury to the domestic tuna industry to warrant this action. A study of imports from Japan also shows evidence of need for action (for example, while frozen tuna imports for the 3-month period ending February 28, 1955, exceeded the comparable period for a year earlier by 75 percent, the dollar value increased only 34 percent—a loss of over $900,000 in potential dollar exchange).

3. It is the recommendation of this Committee that the President, Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of the Interior, California Senators, and members of the California congressional delegation be informed of this situation.

The present administration and preceding administrations have repeated the promise that serious injury to a domestic industry would not result from the operation of the Trade Agreements program.

Advice from this organization to the administration and to the Congress may very well assure more careful consideration in the proposed negotiations involving this local industry, where serious injury has occurred.

Advice from this organization may also bring needed explanation as to why this particular industry has been selected for possible elimination through trade agreement negotiations.

Roads, Not Drivers, Cause 4 of 10 Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Bluebook magazine for April 1955:

ROADS, NOT DRIVERS, CAUSE 4 OF 10 DEATHS
(By Lester David)

I passed the spot shortly after it happened. The car had ripped through the guardrail, hurtled across 50 feet of field, and climbed halfway up the thick trunk of of an old maple. The State cops were there and the ambulance had just pulled up.

A man and his wife, I heard someone say. Both mangled. Both dead. I didn't linger at the scene. I've been a reporter for 20 years and written about too many of these car-meets-tree deals to be entranced by the sight of gore or a smashed piece of machinery.

But I did see a cop pulling out his notebook to make his report, and I'd lay long, long odds I could predict how the ultimate official cause of accident would read. Excessive speed around turn, or going too fast for road conditions, or something like that.

At first glance you'd say that just about covered it. There was, I noticed, a mercilessly sharp, almost 90° curve at the spot where the car had shot off the highway. The driver had unquestionably been pushing his buggy much too fast for the curve.

But look at it another way, the way some of the Nation's most eminent traffic safety experts are now starting to study our miserable record of slaughter on the highways.

If that curve had not been so sharp, would there have been an accident? If that curve had not been there at all, if that skinny little two-lane road had been a wide, modern highway, wouldn't a guy and his wife still be alive?

The big point is that our inefficient, obsolete, and defective highway system is threatening your life and mine every time we get behind the wheel.

I mean those obstacle-course roadways with the built-in death traps; I mean those narrow traffic arteries that were just dandy for the Stutz Bearcat but are ridiculously inadequate today; I mean the criminally insufficient illumination on our roads and streets; I mean our crazy, mixed-up system of trafic laws which makes it O. K. to pass on the right on one highway and illegal on another road a few hundred feet away.

Not that this article intends to exonerate the driver. That would be just as inaccurate as insisting that the driver is at fault all the time. There are reckless nuts behind the wheel as you danged well know from personal brushes with them. There are ginned-up drivers, sick drivers, careless drivers, and knuckle-headed drivers who take their lives and yours in their hands every time those hands grip the steering wheel.

But inescapable evidence now reveals that there are other drivers, sane and sensible and careful ones, who are only too likely to wind up as accident statistics because they just couldn't compete with all the hazards put before them.

I spoke to dozens of experts, examined hundreds of reports, and everywhere I went the Nation's highway system was damned from hell to breakfast.

Dr. Bruce D. Greenshields, former research engineer of the Ohio Highway Department's Traffic Bureau and a nationally famous authority on traffic and safety, says: "We've emphasized the driver's deficiencies for a long time. Now it's time to place more emphasis on better highways. If you could figure the accident chances on some roads, the odds against the driver would be so great I doubt that a professional gambler would risk his life on them."

Sallie J. Fletcher wouldn't risk hers and she's not even an amateur gambler. It was only a little while ago that Sallie up and resigned her job with the Hunterdon County Welfare Board in New Jersey. Her significant reason: Route 69, which she had to drive to get to work, was piling up a death list as long as your arm, and Sallie wasn't taking any more chances. "It's a long ride on what is becoming a dangerous highway," she said as she quit.

Not long ago James Cope, vice president of the Chrysler Corp., told Congress that 15,000 lives might be saved every year if we had better highways. Since we snuff out roughly 38,000 lives on the roads annually, the manpower saving would be about 40 percent.

That's certainly an eye-bugging prediction, but what's the evidence for it? Well, here's one nugget:

The United States Bureau of Public Roads recently conducted an intensive study of interstate rural highways, which total some 32,000 miles. It discovered that one 1 year, 3,460 persons met death on these roads. Now, the statistics start crackling with drama: On the best 1,900 miles of road, the fatality rate was fully 40.8 percent lower than on the remaining 29,931 miles.

Concludes the Bureau: "If the rural sections of the system had been improved as proposed, 1,400 lives lost in traffic might have been saved."

The national average of car fatalities is 7.1 deaths for every 100 million miles driven. Well, little Connecticut and bigger Ohio, to cite just two States, built some new, modern roads. On these roads the average has nose-dived from 7 to about 3 for Connecticut and less than 1 for Ohio.

Roy E. Jorgensen of the National Highway Users Conference, who used to be Connecticut's chief highway engineer, figures that if every rural road in the State was up to the level of the best ones, there would have been 7,700 fewer accidents within a 4-year period.

And Mr. Jorgensen comes up with this startling equation which you can paste in your memory:

Five miles of new highway constructed equals one more life saved every single year.

He points out that if only 250 miles of main highways were modernized, in 5 years alone there would be 8,000 fewer crashes, 4,750 less injuries. And 230 men, women and children would be flesh and blood instead of corpses.

Lives and whole bodies are important, but let's not belittle money. What does all this mean in terms of your own pocketbook?

William J. Cronin, managing director of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, says AMA studies show that at least $3 billion is being wasted each year in excessive fuel consumption, tire and brake wear, needless traffic accidents and time losses for paid commercial drivers—all because of inadequate and unsafe roads.

Your own family budget, according to one estimate, is at least $100 a year higher because of transportation delays, property damage and high insurance rates caused by bad roads.

O. K. Let's move in now for a close-up and find out what's so wrong with our highways. Why is the whole thing being called "America's domestic problem No. 1"?

Well, take a pair of junior's pants, 4-year-old size, and try squeezing your own maturely upholstered rump into them. Something like this is happening on a nationwide scale these days.

We're trying to squeeze 1955's 100-horsepower automobiles onto 1920's 10-horsepower highways. We're trying to put 55 million motor vehicles onto highways that are too few, too narrow, and too old to carry so many so far.

It just won't work. Something's got to give. Look:

In Arizona, not long ago, a truck was carrying 23 Indians to a celebration at Papago Indian Reservation. The truck passed over a narrow bridge at the same time as a 36,000-pound bulldozer, coming from the opposite direction. The bulldozer had a 3-foot-high blade sticking out a foot and a half, and it sliced through the truck bearing the Indians.

They laid the dead out on the roadside—8 women and a man.

Newspaper accounts quoted police as saying that the bridge was 20 feet wide. But the American Association of State Highway Officials has set 24 feet as the standard recommended width for a 2-lane road, plus adequate shoulders. Bridges should be as wide as roadways.

So why this tragedy in Arizona? Was it because the bulldozer blade protruded an extra foot and a half? Well, if it hadn't, police pointed out, there would have been enough room for the 2 vehicles to pass each other safely. But if the width of the bridge had been standard instead of substandard there would have been sufficient clearance, blade or no blade, and there would have been no accident that day.

O. K., we'll admit that one narrow bridge is nothing to get excited about. But see how the thing builds:

According to the Automotive Safety Foundation, of 10,050 bridges in the rural interstate highway system, 8,187 or 81 percent are below standard width.

But that's only the beginning. The vast majority of our highways, the roads on which you take the wife and kids on weekends, are booby-trapped by dozens of perils. Here are some crisp figures:

Two out of every three of the Nation's 3,366,000 miles of streets and highways are "inadequate" and at least 1,700,000 miles are unsafe for drivers. So says Ralph Thomas, former president of the American Automobile Association.

Of these 3,366,000 miles of roads, only 919,000 miles—or one-fourth—are paved. Half of the paved roads are poorly surfaced with low-type tar or asphalt. So says the United States Bureau of Public Roads in its latest report.

In New York State alone, nine-tenths of the State roads still have only 2 lanes and less than half measure even 20 feet in width. A joint study by State and Federal bureaus recently uncovered this frightening situation for New Yorkers: 6,224 miles of the State's 15,462 miles of State roads—nearly half—are "deficient on the basis of safety" and 5,405 miles give inadequate service. Nor is New York unusual in this respect.

On interstate rural roadways throughout the United States, 15,115 curves are sharper than standard, 560 grades exceed the absolute maximum, and 916 other grades are too steep for prevailing traffic conditions. So says the Automobile Safety Foundation.

Because of these and other items, practically every State and every area has its own private deathtrap where the cars keep bouncing off each other with terrifying regularity and the meat wagons keep carting off the human wreckage.

Let's pinpoint just a few of these traps:

Route 17 in New York and New Jersey is affectionately known to a couple of generations of vacationers as old Butcher Boulevard. It winds its way up to the immensely popular Catskill Mountains resort area, and gets jammed up beyond the grasp of the human imagination. Even this might be tolerable if it were a reasonably safe road. But it's not. As Paul H. Blaisdell, traffic safety director of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, puts it: "Old Butcher

Boulevard has got nearly every engineering flaw known to man built into it."

What does he mean? He means that the road drops from a 6-lane affair at an island—and the driver emerges on a 4-lane highway with no warning. He means that it skips back and forth from 4 lanes to 3, some with a center division and some without.

He means the booby traps built into the artery, such as the mile and a quarter stretch from Waldwick to Mahwah in New Jersey, where there are no less than 45 cut-throughs. He means the intolerably steep and winding hills, such as the one at Liberty, N. Y., where a truck loaded with 3,000 gallons of milk went out of control last July, hit 13 cars, and caused 3 deaths.

A quarter of a century ago, the Hutchinson River Parkway in New York was being loudly proclaimed as the highway of tomorrow—and it no doubt was. But tomorrow is already yesterday for this route, which is one of the deadliest in the East.

Why? Take it from Wilbur Smith & Associates, of New Haven, Conn., specialists on traffic problems, who made a thorough study of the road, and from Westchester County officials who accepted their findings. The parkway was indicted by the engineers because of its curves (too sharp), its grades (too steep), and its capacity (woefully lacking). The engineers found that 48 percent of the parkway's entire length had too many twists and turns, while 100 percent lacked good shoulders, proper access roads, and efficient center islands.

They noted that in 24 places a motorist traveling in either direction wouldn't be able to see far enough ahead for safe driving, because of the curves, humps or dips; that in 30 places curves were excessive in each direction. One almost continuous succession of reverse and compound curves was especially condemned.

It all adds up to the finding that a safe speed on the parkway is only 25 miles an hour, but 40 is permitted and cars generally go a good deal faster. And one more point, the payoff one: The Smith survey showed that while the Hutchinson constitutes only 25 percent of the Westchester County parkway system, it racks up more than 55 percent of the fatalities.

For years the Guilford curve on the Baltimore-Washington boulevard took the black ribbon for the worst accident record in Maryland. A new Baltimore-Washington expressway has just been opened, and for that, loud huzzahs. The old curve, however, is stil there, for anyone who wants to try a perfect example of an obstacle course highway—first a dip, then an intersection, then a hill, and finally a sharp curve.

Relatives of 11 persons killed there in one crash in recent years won't forget the trap so readily; neither will relatives of the folks in the two cars which met head-on the first day of January 2 years ago. One of the cars contained a minister who was coming back from Florida with his family. The other contained two women and a man.

You read about it in the newspapers. Seven dead; no survivors.

Route C-1 in Massachusetts is the main route from downtown Boston to Revere Beach. One traffic report recently pointed out that about 20,000 cars use that 5-mile strip of road each day and, the report continued, "It's the easiest place in Massachusetts to get into an auto accident." Route C-1 is a 4-lane highway divided by a center strip, but accidents keep piling up because of the terrific number of cars funneling into it.

The 50-mile stretch of United States Route 31W between Louisville and Elizabethtown, Ky., has now claimed dozens of lives. Fort Knox soldiers, who have to use it going on leave or returning to base, have a pet name for it. They call it the Dixie Dieway.

So much for roads and highways. Consider, now, the confused and conflicting traffic laws and regulations. These differ not only from State to State as you tootle along, but from city to city. It's a babble of tongues, as the traffic institute of Northwestern University has called it, which makes no sense whatever.

In New York State, it has just become perfectly legal to pass another car on the right under specified conditions. But despite the fact that New York says it's okay, and despite the fact that Westchester County is in New York State, don't try passing on the right on any of the parkways of the Westchester system. It's illegal. The Westchester County Parkway Commission has the right to make its own traffic regulations and has declined to amend them to conform with the new law for the rest of the State.

It gets screwier. There's a major parkway in Westchester that permits passing on the right. It's called the Taconic State Parkway, and it's governed by State law. Now the Taconic State and one of the Westchester Parkway Commission's roads intersect and share several hundred feet of roadway at a spot called Hawthorne Circle. So apparently it's legal as well as illegal to pass on the right on the same stretch of road.

The farce still isn't over. New York approves passing on the right (with the exceptions heretofore noted) but Connecticut does not. The latter's motor-vehicle commissioner recently issued a warning to New York motorists, saying in effect: It may be O. K. where you live, but that cuts no ice with us up here. Try it and it might cost you 50 bucks.

Mixed up? Whew. You can pass on the right in Maine but once you hit New Hampshire it's illegal. You can in California but you can't in Nevada across the border. You take a six-State trip and you find: Yes in New Jersey, no in Delaware, yes in Maryland and Virginia, no in North Carolina, and yes in South Carolina.

And this is just one maneuver. You can go down the list and find literally dozens of others and no uniformity from place to place. In one area, the proper way to make a left turn is to cross on the left side of the center of the intersection. In others, left turns must be made on the right-hand side of the center of the intersection. In one area, the law requires drivers to stop when meeting a school bus that is picking up or letting off kids. But other areas don't have this law—so kids may go walking into the path of a car driven by a visiting motorist whose local laws don't require him to stop.

There is no uniformity, either, in signs, signals, and markings. How many times have you driven through an unfamiliar section and found trouble locating the traffic lights? In one town, they may appear overhead; in another, they may be on high posts at the side. Points out Alfred J. Starger, travel manager of the Automobile Club of New York: "These discrepancies not only cause confusion and irritation, but also a definite safety hazard."

Well, what's the answer? Are we going to continue building more miles of cars than miles of highways, as we actually have been doing the past few years? Are the roads going to get worse and worse until the entire country bogs down in one immense traffic jam?

Luckily, there are some answers.

For one, President Eisenhower's highway program shines like a beacon for the poor, harassed motorist. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, whom the President named as chairman of an advisory committee on a national highway program, has just come up with a plan. It calls for spending $101 billion over 10 years, the money coming in varying amounts from Federal, State, and local governments. It calls for highway construction and modernization on an unprecedented scale and, the elimination of bottlenecks and death traps.

But there are things your community can do while the plan is being worked out. They needn't cost too much, either. Some examples:

There was a dangerous railroad overpass in Buffalo on Bailey Avenue between East Ferry and Kearns Avenues. In 2 years 13 accidents had occurred there and police found that cars were banging into the piers that supported the overpass. The piers were marked only with 2 small red reflectors placed 4 feet above the pavement. Motorists were mistaking them for taillights of moving cars.

The solution: Three amber lights were installed on the center pier, two of them flashing, the third constant. The piers were painted black with luminous white stripes, 6 inches wide. And the pavement was marked to guide drivers away from the piers.

In the 2 years following the improvements, police noted a 92-percent reduction in accidents. What did it all cost? A big $266.

The intersection of U. S. Highway 40 and California Route 24 in Berkeley, Calif., averaged 10 accidents per year over an 8-year period. Police noted that there were only single traffic lights on each of the four corners and that large trucks and buses in right-hand lanes frequently blocked the signal from the view of motorists in the center lanes. So what happened? They installed four additional signal heads on the corners. And in the year following, there was a 75-percent reduction in accidents. The cost? $300.

In Los Angeles, skidding on wet pavement and slippery streetcar tracks caused 88 accidents in one 2-year period on 9 streets. Traffic engineers solved the problem by cutting grooves into the pavement to make them skidproof with a special apparatus developed by a local firm. The total cost of the treatment was $5,840—and there were nearly 60 percent fewer accidents and a 75 percent cut in the number of persons injured.

Other communities have redesigned intersections, installed flashing beacons, put up reflectorized warnings at strategic spots, relocated bus loading zones, done a dozen different things at small cost and cut accidents way down. If you have a problem in your own home town, your local officials can get expert traffic engineering help from the accident-prevention department of the Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York 38, N. Y.

Is there a solution for the other major dilemma, the lack of uniformity of traffic laws?

There is. Three decades ago, a uniform motor vehicle code was drafted by some farsighted safety experts. The code, which has been revised and brought up to date a number of times, has sections providing for driver licensing, rules of the road, periodic vehicle inspection and the like. Several States have already adopted entire sections of it. But, points out the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, "inertia and sometimes local pride are serious obstacles."

Can anything make better sense than having the same rules of the road from city to city and State to State? Because of the continuous flow of traffic across city and State lines these days, can anything make less sense than a hundred different rules in as many municipalities?

Uniform traffic laws may come to pass some day. So may the President's highway program. And death traps may be thoroughly rooted out on the local level, through traffic engineering.

Perhaps then cars won't come barreling toward you from around a blind curve. Perhaps then your automobile won't literally buck like a bronco over long stretches of warped and twisted pavement. Perhaps then you wan't go into a terrifying skid on poorly drained roads.

Death can be engineered from our highways. It's time we tackled the job.

A Cowboy Invitation to Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the capital city in my native State of Oklahome has been selected as the future site of the national Cowboy Hall of Fame. Representatives of 17 Western States meeting recently in Denver chose Oklahoma City as the location for this permanent monument to commemorate western heroes of past and present.

Reports indicate that this memorial may become one of the greatest tourist attractions in America. This would be fitting, indeed, since the contributions of the cowboys who conquered America's last frontier were dramatic and great, and their intrepid spirit constitutes a rich national asset. Symbols of these pioneers should be enshrined in a place of honor, while their spirit should be preserved within our hearts.

It is most appropriate that Oklahoma should be chosen as the center for this Cowboy Hall of Fame. The series of spectacular "runs" at the end of last century, which were immortalized in Edna Ferber's Cimarron, and made familiar to every American through the motion picture based on her book, helped to establish the wide renown of Oklahoma's cowboys at an early date in our history.

Further, Oklahoma is well along the way toward becoming the vacation center of America. Figures released 3 weeks ago by the Defense Department show that 4 of the 14 most popular recreational areas within Army engineer projects over the entire Nation are located in Oklahoma.

Lake Texoma, which we share with our neighboring State of Texas—although Oklahoma rivers supply most of the water—continues to lead all others in general public use. Wister Reservoir—located in the congressional district of my esteemed colleague, the majority whip of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]—ranked 10th in the Nation. In my own district in northeastern Oklahoma, Fort Gibson Reservoir ranked 7th nationally, while Tenkiller Reservoir held 13th place.

Let me take this opportunity to extend a cordial invitation to every American to visit my native State. Friendly hands of welcome will greet you when you visit our lovely lakes and hills, attend our rodeos or Indian pow-wows, tour our oilfields or mines of lead and zinc, or seek out the historical sites which abound in Oklahoma.

As an indication of what we have to offer every guest, let me mention but a few of the points of interest within my own Second District. We have the famous Will Rogers Memorial at Claremore, dedicated to America's Good-Will Ambassador who claimed he was "just an old cowhand with a little luck." We have, near Sallisaw, the log cabin home built by Sequoyah, the Cherokee Indian who was one of the 12 people in the history of the world to invent an alphabet for his people. His was so simple that it could be mastered within 3 days, and is one of the intellectual triumphs of any age. Statues of both these men now stand in the Hall of Fame in our Capitol.

Tourists can visit the reconstructed stockade at Fort Gibson, a military post established in 1824, where Robert E. Lee, Zachary Taylor, Jefferson Davis, and many other famous men served as soldiers in their younger days. Washington Irving visited there, and Sam Houston in 1829 established himself 3 miles northwest at his Wigwam Neosho, where he lived with his Cherokee Indian wife until 1832 when he left for Texas to win eternal fame.

The Union Agency for the Nations of the Five Civilized Tribes was established in Muskogee in 1873, and the affairs of these noted tribes are still administered from this city. On Agency Hill is located the old Union Creek Agency, soon to be the site of one of the Nation's outstanding Indian museums.

The permanent capitol of the Greek Indian Nation still stands in Okmulgee, while in Tahlequah the capitol of the Cherokee Nation now serves as the county courthouse for Cherokee County, and the old Cherokee penitentiary is the present county jail.

Prehistoric Indian mounds, some of them recently excavated under supervision of the Smithsonian Institute, dot the district. The fabled Texas Road and the famed Osage Trace crossed the area. The grave of Stand Watie, last Confederate general to surrender at the end of the Civil War, the lead and zinc mines first unearthed in a legendary Spanish mine dating back to Coronado's time, the Sacred-Fire ceremonies of the Kee-Too-Wahs, and the magnificent dogwood and redbud tours, are merely samples of the thrilling and inspiring sights available to guests of Oklahoma within the Second District alone.

Then we have our roundup clubs and rodeos in almost every town. They have continued the cowboy tradition in its fullest glory. This is clearly shown by the fact that both the all-around champion rodeo cowboy of the United States for 1954, and the runner-up as well, are from my district. Buck Rutherford from Lenapah is national champion, and Jim Shoulders of Henryetta won second place. Shoat Webster, who also hails from Lenapah, is the United States champion steer-roper, while Bennie Combs of Checotah, according to a recent report, is now top bulldogger of the world.

So I invite, and urge with pride, my fellow Americans to vacation in Oklahoma. Its lovely and historic sights will add substantially to your appreciation of the beauty, the vastness, and the inherent greatness of our Nation.

The addition of the national cowboy hall of fame will add another luminous star in the crown of glory that rests upon my native State.

Prosperity Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an editorial from the Muscatine, Iowa, Journal of April 16, 1955:

PROSPERITY PICTURE

This may well turn out to be the best busiess year in America's history. The first 3 months of 1955 were the best of all time. Only major labor strife presumably could spoil the prospect.

The record shows that from the end of 1954 up to April 1, 1955, every major activity bounced back from last year's lows. In key fields like steel, construction, automobiles, and retail sales, new highs were established. Even problem industries such as textiles and coal showed considerable improvement.

Barring a crippling strike in steel or automobiles, or a veritable rash of work stoppages in less crucial areas, most observers except the new boom to roll on unchecked, at least through the first half of the year.

Even Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, roundly damned by Republicans in 1954 as a "gloom monger," says that real recovery is here, though he considers "recovery" a stage below "prosperity." And he throws in a warning that there are still dangerous soft spots in the economy.

Just a few of the hardier optimists will say flatly that 1955 will be our best year. Most prefer to hedge somewhat. They worry about the galloping production in automobiles and housing, voicing doubt that the pace can be kept. Indeed, not even the brightest estimates for these fields match the present record rate of output.

Concern is felt, too, because agriculture is not participating in the boom. Farm income is still off.

Yet these are relatively light, fluffy clouds on the horizon. The real thunderhead is the prospect of industrial strife.

The United Automobile Workers currently are engaged in important new contract talks with General Motors. The UAW bid for a guaranteed annual wage could stop bustling GM cold.

Strikes already have tripled in the past month and a half. And more than 75 major labor contracts come up for renewal between now and July—affording many more opportunities for crippling disputes.

Labor must be free to prosecute its demands by all reasonable and legal means, including the strike. But for the good of labor itself, and the whole Nation, we must hope that union leaders will employ this weapon of last resort sparingly and judiciously in the days of test that lie ahead.

Clearly, whether the boom is to reach the heights envisaged by the optimists or whether it is to be of more modest proportions, it is to the advantage of all Americans to have

the economy move along steadily without shattering interruption.

The men on both sides of the contract negotiating table should bear that in mind as they grapple with the workingman's bread-and-butter issues.

Archbishop Cushing Dedicates College Chapel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in this age of confusion and anxiety, I commend to your thoughtful attention the following address. It was delivered by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, D. D., at the dedication of the Collegiate Chapel of Christ the Divine Teacher, Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass., on April 25, 1955.

The archbishop, who has earned the respect and affection of all Americans by his many benefactions, his sincerity, and his devotion, guides us through the problems of our times with his steadfast faith and his inspiring integrity.

His address should bring comfort and confidence to all and help us to find the way to God that is our only salvation.

OVER 1,000 ATTEND CHAPEL DEDICATION

A congregation that taxed the 1,000 seating capacity of the new chapel saw Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, D. D., dedicate the Collegiate Chapel of Christ the Divine Teacher at a solemn pontifical mass Monday morning, during which he gave the beautiful edifice to the students of Merrimack College as an inspiration to make their faith count in every sphere of their individual lives, in every group, and government act in which they have a due part.

Monsignori and clergy from near and far, students of the college, knights of religious orders and invited guests, crowded the church for the inspiring event despite the inclement weather.

CORNERSTONE LAID

In preparation for the dedication of the $500,000 church, the archbishop first laid the cornerstone to the church in a niche left open on the left corner of the entrance. Inside the cornerstone went a sealed copper container including mementoes of the period. Following the brief ceremony, which he insisted on performing regardless of the rain, the prelate returned through the front of the church and was accompanied by his assisting priests to the sanctuary where he took his place on a throne. As he entered the church the full student body sang Ecce Sacerdos Magnus.

The officiating dignitary was assisted in the ceremony by Very Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, O. S. A., Ph. D., president of the college, as archpriest; Very Rev. James M. Hurley, O. S. A., pastor of St. Mary's parish, as deacon, and Rev. Joseph J. Gildea, O. S. A., college dean of men, as subdeacon.

Knights of Malta and Knights of the Holy Sepulchre occupied seats immediately to the front of the church, while visiting monsignori were seated within the sanctuary. Clergy in large number occupied pews at the right front and the student body was seated in a reserved section to the left. Invited guests occupied pews behind the clergy and students.

A choir of the Men of Marrimack under the direction of Rev. Thomas F. Walsh, O. S. A., sang Ave Maria. At the communion the choir sang Panis Angelicus and at the recessional, Regina Celli Jubila. The students sang the Gregorian Mass.

The congregation was blessed by Archbishop Cushing at the conclusion of the Mass. Following his sermon he also gave the students of the college the remainder of the day and Tuesday off as a gesture of his visit.

First master of ceremonies was Monsignor Francis S. Rossiter, D. D. S. S. L., of St. John's Seminary, Brighton; second master of ceremonies, Rev. Joseph P. Murray, O. S. A., dean of business administration; first deacon of honor, Very Rev. Henry E. Greenlee, O. S. A., provincial; second deacon of honor, Very Rev. Patrick J. Campbell, O. S. A., pastor of St. Augustine's Church, Andover. The processional cross bearer was Rev. William G. Cullen, O. S. A., dean of men; metropolitan cross bearer, Very Rev. John B. Martin, O. S. A., pastor of St. Augustine's Church, Tower Hill.

College students have been designated as minor ministers as follows: Train bearer, Eugene Mercier; mitre bearer, George Riley; crozier bearer, Joseph Maney; book bearer, John McDaid; candle bearer, Bartholomew Cahill; gremial bearer, Phillip Doyle; acolytes, Normand Martin and Joseph Sheehan; thurifer, John J. Lee.

Altar boys were torch bearers: George Adyns, Leighton DeTora, George Schruender, Mark Henry, Philip Henry, Francis McNulty, Edward Donahue, and Robert Shann.

College students serving as ushers were Joseph Bachorowski, Gerald Coughlin, John Fleming, William Foley, Arthur Godin, Daniel Hayes, Arthur Johnson, William Kealy, Henry Leyland, John McGeoghegan, Harry Petros, and Thomas Tivnan.

Knights of Malta participating were: Homer W. Bourgeois, Lowell; Wallace Falvey, Boston; Michael F. Flynn, Beverly; Louis H. Hamel, Haverhill; Doran S. Lyons, Lowell; Patrick F. McDonald, Brookline; Raymond McNamara, Haverhill; Joseph Sullivan, Lowell; Francis W. White, Andover; Edward Williams, Boston.

Knights of the Holy Sepulchre: Homer W. Bourgeois, William R. Brennan, Joseph T. Brennan, William H. Daly, Joseph DeMambro, John J. Drummey, Hon. John E. Fenton, John J. Flannery, Louis Julian, George C. MacDonald, Arthur Turcotte, and Alfred C. Wasilauskas.

CLERGY IN ATTENDANCE

Clergy in attendance at the mass for the dedication were:

Rev. Henry E. Greenlee, O. S. A., Augustinian provincial; Rt. Rev. Peter Abouzeid, St. Joseph's, Lawrence; Rt. Rev. Michael J. Coffey, Salem; Rt. Rev. William E. Drapeau, Lynn; Rt. Rev. A. S. Hargedon, Marblehead; Very Rev. Francis M. Juras, St. Francis', Lawrence; Rt. Rev. Ladislaus A. Sikora, St. John's, Salem; Rt. Rev. Michael F. Madden, Bradford; Very Rev. John J. Murray, Cardinal O'Connell Seminary, Jamaica Plain; Rt. Rev. Timothy F. O'Leary, Boston Archdiocesan superintendent of schools; Rt. Rev. William F. Riley, St. John's Seminary; Very Rev. Lawrence J. Riley, secretary to Archbishop Cushing; Very Rev. Francis S. Rossiter, master of ceremonies to Archbishop Cushing; Rt. Rev. Robert J. Sennott, chancellor, Archdiocese of Boston; Rt. Rev. Francis L. Shea, St. Michael's North Andover; Rev. Charles F. Bergstrom, O. M. I., Lowell; Rev. L. J. Boissonneault, S. M., St. Anne's, Lawrence; Rev. Francis J. Boland, president, Stonehill College; Rev. Leopold Brunnelle, S. M., St. Theresa's, Methuen; Very Rev. Patrick J. Campbell, O. S. A., Andover; Rev. C. J. Costello, O. M. I., Tewksbury; Rev. William E. Culhane, Saugus; Rev. William J. Dauphin, S. M., Mt. Carmel, Methuen; Rev. Willima J. Deacy, O. S. O., Carthage, N. Y.; Rev. Armand H. Desautels, president, Assumption College; Rev. James V. Donovan, Lowell; Rev. George Walker, O. S. A., Greenwich, N. Y.; Rev. John Feeley, Dedham.

MERRIMACK COLLEGE

Rev. William E. Fitzgerald, S. J., provincial; Rev. Walter L. Flaherty, archdiocesan director of television; Rev. John L. Gallagher, O. S. A., Drexel Hall, Pa.; Rev. J. Fernand Gallant, O. M. I., Lowell; Rev. Charles F. Glennon, Malden; Rev. John A. Daly, O. S. A., St. Lawrence's, Lawrence; Rev. Edward J. Farrell, M. S., Ipswich; Rev. M. A. Hopkins, O. S. A., Staten Island, N. Y.; Very Rev. James M. Hurley, O. S. A., St. Mary's, Lawrence; Rev. George P. Gallivan, St. Patrick's, Lawrence; Rev. William L. Keville, St. Patrick's, Lowell; Rev. Eugene L. Labrie, O. M. I.; Lowell; Rev. John J. Lane, North Reading; Rev. Paul K. Lynch, Assumption, Lawrence; Rev. Peter J. McDonough, Swampscott; Very Rev. John B. Martin, O. S. A., St. Augustine's, Lawrence; Rev. Gerald F. McCarthy, O. S. B., St. Anselm's College, Manchester, N. H.; Rev. Joseph R. N. Maxwell, S. J., president, Boston College; Rev. Lionel F. Beaudoin, Sacred Heart, Lawrence; Rev. J. A. McCartin, O. M. I., Tewksbury; Rev. George M. Murphy, S. J., Bradford; Rev. Joseph F. O'Connor, O. S. A., Flint, Mich.; Rev. Leo P. O'Keefe, S. J., Campion Hall, North Andover; Rev. James Reilly, O. S. A., Ardmore, Pa.; Rev. Thomas Roland, O. S. A., provincial's secretary at Villanova; Rev. Henry B. Smith, O. S. A., St. Augustine's, Andover; Rev. Raymond J. Stengel, O. S. A., Bronx, N. Y.; Rev. John J. Twiss, St. Peter's, Lowell; Rev. Dennis Walsh, St. Gabriel's Monastery, Brighton; Rev. Henry A. Caffrey, O. S. A., New Hamburg, N. Y.; Rev. Edmund W. Croke, St. Thomas', Wilmington; Very Rev. Lorenzo Andolfi, Holy Rosary, Lawrence.

ARCHBISHOP'S ADDRESS

The address by Archbishop Cushing follows:

"As often as we witness an occasion such as this, when we gather to make open profession of our faith, we have reason to thank God for the innumerable graces by which He has sanctified us, and for the assurance afforded by our loyalty to the church that we will continue to be a force for good in the human society in which we live and move. For it is of the very essence of our Catholic faith that it serves to bring God from heaven to earth and to prepare with men's souls the dispositions through which God may transform the world into a replica of His heavenly kingdom.

"No one has really penetrated the meaning of Christianity unless he has understood its mission in relation to the ever-changing problems of the present as well as its ultimate purpose of directing us to the world to come. Those who would erect a barrier between the church and the world are either lukewarm Catholics who resist the diffusive energy of God's love, or dedicated advocates of a worldly kingdom, bent on destroying religion as the only obstacle in the way of the triumph of an irreligious humanism. The enemies of the church know well that the best way to crush it is to drive it out of the market place and confine it within the limits of the sanctuary. Catholics who yield to the persuasions of their worldly associates that religion should be kept out of their education, business, and social life are not only false to the demands of their faith, but active cooperators in a campaign to substitute a man-made code of morality for the Ten Commandments and to raise man himself to the dignity of supreme lord of the universe."

IMPORTANT PLACE IN WORLD

"It is clear, therefore, that Catholics have an important place in the modern world and must always be mindful of the demands of their faith, even while they discharge the

duties which make them useful members of the civil community.

"It is not enough to carry one's share of the economic prosperity of the Nation, though this is one of man's important functions. It is not enough to be, as head of a household, a generous provider. The position of husband and father involves man's share in the development of the ideas and character of his children. But there is more still. There remains man's position in society, his obligation as a citizen of a municipality, a state, a nation, and his duty as a human being to be interested in and make what efforts he can toward the peace and happiness of the world.

"In all these phases of his life, he must act in accordance with the laws of God and the catholic way of life. We need not stress the obvious fact that it is becoming increasingly difficult to be successful in the world while remaining close to God, nor that being close to God is really our only source of happiness here as well as hereafter. Only by living his religion completely can man keep the unity of his personality that is essential to happiness. There are many Catholics in America who bluster around trying to convince themselves, as well as their neighbors, that they are big wheels in the social structure of American life, who really don't count at all, and precisely for that reason that their ambitions, purposes, and efforts are at variance with the religious teachings in which they have been raised. Believers in God, they act as they who have no faith.

"But now I am concerned more with the practicing Catholic of today and tomorrow, honest in business, devoted husband and father, forthright citizen, who weighs the qualifications of candidates, reads the press, listens to commentators, and holds himself in agreement or disagreement by drawing, consciously or unconsciously, upon his moral principles, as well as upon his political views and general information. Most of his fellow citizens call him a fine American. I agree with them. But I could call him a great American except for the limitations he sets up for himself. What limitations you ask? A limitation of action and of influence. When in disagreement with a policy, trend, act—either political or social—he leaves his armor on the wall, and, with a lack of confidence in the extent of an individual's influence, he fails to see that in our country the individual can influence opinion, can act. How, I ask you, is real public opinion made except by a concert of individuals?"

LABOR WAS EXPLOITED

"Let us look back for a moment upon the industrial conditions rampant in the 19th century; child labor, slave labor, inhumanity springing from greed, exercised against the toiler. Eventually—after nearly 100 years—these conditions were remedied by organizing those who were exploited and who refused to contemplate their children stepping into their indefensible shoes. Eventually, after nearly 100 years, a situation that had obtained on two continents, in half a dozen or more countries, was remedied. Against men whose moral and business codes discountenanced any slight advantage for a competitor, the revolution was effected. But for nearly 100 years, children died at tender ages, mothers obliged to work wasted the strength that belonged to offspring, fathers went prematurely to their graves, while fortunes were made at the expense of their very lives; 100 wasted years because western man did not compel the implementing of his principles through force of public opinion.

"The 20th century has witnessed wars which even prior to Nagasaki, were in magnitude beyond the imagination of former centuries. Few believe that the cause of these wars was so narrowly a problem of injustice, insoluble through any other means, that the wars were justifiable and unavoidable. You will say: we were in a position where we had to choose to fight or go down into a sort of vicarious defeat. This I grant. You will say that these wars had to be won by antitotalitatianism or the freedom won by 20 centuries of Christian thought must be lost. This also I am willing to accept.

"But what if western man had built up public opinion—not just in one country, but in all Europe and America—outlawing war until every other remedy had been tried? What if there had been a world conscience operative that would have prevented these wars, working not on their eve but in the generations when their causes were brewing?

"Then came Nagasaki. Great discoveries, great new techniques diverted from the arts of peace. Slaughter of the innocent. Bomb or be bombed, you say. Perhaps. But what if the world—composed ultimately, as it is, not of groups, nor of states, but of individuals, had made such slaughter literally unthinkable?

"What, I ask you, of the present?"

THREAT TO WORLD

"The great problem that faces us today is to prevent the tremendous power of the American Nation from plunging the whole world into ruin. It is impossible to deny that the scientific progress of the last century has brought the idea of the end of the world, hitherto seriously discussed only by theologians, into the deliberation of hardheaded statesmen, and has revealed possibilities of widespread destruction that previous generations could not have known even by conjecture. I do not propose to discuss the morality of the newly devised methods of warfare. Let me simply point out that their very existence makes it possible for them to be used, and that unfortunately we have no assurance that they will not be used, whether by our own Nation against others or by other nations against ourselves."

SOVIET ANSWER BETTER

"Let me now propose the question: Can any organization of society afford effective protection against this very real and imminent danger? Must we assume, as we are confronted by it, an attitude of defeatism that would regard a third world war as inevitable, or have we any hope that the planning of our economic experts and the interent vitality of our democratic way of life will save us from destruction?

"I am drawn to the conclusion that the rulers of the Soviet Union have a better immediate answer to the problem than we have. With danger threatening from without, they are taking every possible precaution against possible treachery from within. An efficiently policed state, a totalitarian regimentation of society, a rigidly supervised system of relations with foreign nations and their subjects—these measures represent a cold and realistic effort to meet force with force, and to provide for the nation itself, if not for its individual subjects, a safeguard against destruction, which the so-called free nations of the world have not been able to develop.

"The Soviet policy has at least the merit of being consistent. If whole nations threaten to annihilate one another, the nation's resistance should be organized from top to bottom, and the influence of partisan factions should be ruthlessly suppressed. If no question is raised as to the morality of the new methods of making war, no question should be raised as to the morality of meeting the danger in the only way which affords any hope of success.

"To the argument that tyrannical governments violate human rights, the answer is given by the Communists that the only source of human rights is the power of the state, and that the state must not be questioned in relation to any measures which it deems necessary to assure its continuance in existence. To the argument that the despotic state violates the principles of democracy according to which freemen must be governed, Russia answers that democracy in capitalistic nations has become an instrument for the suppression of the masses, and that the freedom of future generations can be assured only by violent elimination of those forms of government that guarantee freedom only to the ruling classes."

UNITED STATES POLICIES

"If we admit the promise that the relations of nations are not subject to restrictions based on moral principles, the logic of the Soviet point of view is hard to escape. In any event, it brings us face to face with a serious question relating to the policies of our Nation. Can we consistently bolster up our national prestige to the use of force, and at the same time remain faithful to the constitutional principles upon which the Nation was founded? Can we commit ourselves to the use of newly invented weapons of mass destruction without adopting the Russian policy of meeting force with force, and protecting ourselves from enemies within and without by gradually transforming our Government from democracy to dictatorship?

"There are not merely academic questions. They are imposed upon us by the facts of contemporary history. Betrayal of our national interests by unscrupulous private groups can be prevented only by farflung system of secret police. Organization of our national resources for worldwide military expeditions can be effected only by whittling away, bit by bit, the charter of liberties by which our Nation has prospered in the past and substituting for our present constitutional government a single-party state that will relentlessly crush all opposition to its policies."

INCOMPATIBLE PHILOSOPHIES

"In short, it seems that we are at present following two completely incompatible philosophies of government. On the one hand, we are not only preparing to meet force with force; we are working furiously to create the crude, irresistible military power against which other nations will be driven to defend themselves. On the other hand, we are making plans for the future of our country which contemplate the continuance of forms of government which can survive only in a peaceful world, in which nations concentrate their efforts upon the improvement of the human condition of their subjects. Sooner or later these conflicting tendencies must clash. If we choose to be a military power, and strive to reduce the rest of the world to subjection by force, we must be prepared to let loose the fierce human passions which make war successful and which find vicious gratification in the moral degeneration which follows upon war. If we have any thought of remaining a peace-loving people, and of maintaining the human dignity which our forefathers have bequeathed to us, we must learn to control military power by moral restraint than by governmental pressure, and we must to this end revise drastically the philosophical principles upon which our national life is being organized at the present time."

LEARN TO LIVE IN NEW WORLD

"Here is the fundamental problem with which we must now come to grips; to learn to live in the new world which science is creating for us without turning its power to our own destruction. The answer to the problem is to be found in the development of the sciences of man which will parallel that of the sciences of the material world. By the sciences of man I mean not those which consider his relation to the material world and his reactions on a purely material level, but those which draw out the implications of the obvious fact that man knows both the world and himself through the eternal light of intelligence as well as through the changing images of sense. To be intelligent, to be educated, means first of all to be

something essentially superior to the food one eats and to the body which responds to an externally observable environment. To be intelligent means to be possessed of a soul—to be spiritually alive—to be able to discover the causes of our experience in realities which cannot be measured with yardsticks or clocks or scales—realities which share in the changeless reality of an infinitely perfect Being who is the ultimate cause of everything else."

MUST RETURN TO THEOLOGY

"These sciences of man, capable of elaboration by reason alone, comprise what we know as philosophy. When the conclusions of philosophy are fortified and elevated by the revealed word of God, they constitute the noblest subject of investigation with which the mind of man can be concerned, and they open up a vision of human dignity which transcends the fondest hopes of human speculation. Theology, the study of God and of God's creation, as God Himself has revealed it—this is the proper study of mankind. Modern science has rejected theology, in a vain effort to substitute man for God. Only by returning to the study of theology in strictest sense can man hope to conquer the threat of force which scientific progress has made so ominously real. And that, my friends, is the significance of this chapel. It symbolizes the integration of religion, of theology, of the teachings of Christ, the Teacher, in the training of students of the present and leaders of the future at Merrimack College."

MUST RECOGNIZE GOD

"The real danger that threatens our Nation today is not the possibility of war but the growth in men's minds of the kind of thinking that makes war first possible and then inevitable. No two men who respect the human dignity in which they both share will settle their grievance by resorting to weapons. Wars among nations give evidence that men are still wolves to one another, and that both those who rule and those who are ruled, have failed to learn the lesson of men's inherent value as the noblest creature of God below the angels. This is the lesson that philosophy and theology teaches here at Merrimack College. It is to these sciences that we must look for the inspiration that will move men to revolt against the horrors of war. Individual men, autonomous and independent in relation to one another, can be kept together only by a power that transcends them all. Only when God is universally recognized and God's law universally obeyed can there be agreement among men on the principles of social organization and the policies of human statesmanship."

CATHOLIC FAITH LIVING REALITY

"My dear Catholic students, this is the reason why you mean so much to the modern world. You are being taught to restore all things to God. You are Catholics by conviction; your membership in the church is more than an expression of loyalty to your ecclesiastical superiors. Your whole life reflects the beauty of God's grace which makes you adopted brethren of Christ our Lord; your every relation with your fellow men is governed by principles of morality which God Himself has imposed and which His church has infallibly applied. You have tremendous power for good, among the members of our own church who are indifferent and faithless; among religious men and women of other denominations, who need the support of your example as perchance they waver in their religious beliefs; among the millions of those for whom God is either a myth or a meaningless symbol, and who yield readily to the specious arguments of materialistic philosophies merely because they have not experienced the persuasive reasonableness of faith in God. The cause is not yet lost. Precious time is being gained simply because the next war threatens to be so devastating, so completely beyond control that even warlike nations shrink from provoking it. Let us use these next few years to make our Catholic faith a living reality in the world, which is so sorely in need of God and the redeeming grace of Christ our Lord. Let us make our faith count in every sphere of our individual lives, in every group and government act in which we have a due part. Now is the acceptable time—tomorrow may be too late. For your inspiration I give you this Collegiate Chapel of Christ the Divine Teacher."

Marshall, Warren, and the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following very interesting article, written by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in his column Washington, in the April 24, 1955, issue of the New York Herald Tribune, is deserving of our attention:

WASHINGTON
(By Roscoe Drummond)

MARSHALL, WARREN, AND THE PRESIDENCY

Within the decade, two great Americans have deliberately, decisively, and patriotically put the Presidency outside their reach. They are General of Army George C. Marshall and Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren. They did it because each was convinced that he could only perform the high national service to which he had been called if he put elective politics irrevocably aside. Such an act takes great character and dedication.

It was in 1947, with the menacing storm of the cold war gathering its full force around the world, that President Truman appointed General Marshall Secretary of State. General Marshall told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that he wished to be confirmed only on the unshatterable understanding that he was intent upon serving the Nation, not a party, and would never enter upon a political career. He took this decision because he wanted his service to be free from all partisan implication, and himself free from any possible partisan motive. It was his first civil appointment in a long and distinguished military record. He began his Army career at the bottom; he began his civil career at the top—and did equally well in both. The time will come when his great stature will be more popularly appreciated.

Earl Warren is a man of the same mettle.

It came as no surprise to those who know him that last week he served notice, unequivocally, that he intended to live out his years in service to the Supreme Court.

No Chief Justice has ever laid aside his robe to step into or to step back into the arena of party politics. No Chief Justice has ever had a presidential nomination so temptingly within his possible reach.

Chief Justice Warren said no.

He said no for three resplendent reasons: (1) Because he cherishes the Supreme Court as an independent branch of the Federal Government; (2) because he wants to keep the Court untouched by partisan politics; (3) because he wants to keep the Chief Justice totally removed from partisan controversy in light of the Court's historic, follow-up decisions on desegregation which will soon be forthcoming.

There is nothing wrong in having the ambition to be President. I suspect that General Marshall never did wish elective office at any time under any circumstances. I think he believed that military leaders should stick to the military.

Earl Warren did have presidential ambitions and he might well have been elected if he had been the presidential, instead of the vice presidential nominee in 1948. To put aside all political ambition obviously takes greater moral stamina than to acquire it. This is why the present Chief Justice emerges as one of our great public servants.

From the purely partisan standpoint, Mr. Warren's withdrawal comes at a particularly interesting juncture in Republican Party affairs. It comes at a paradoxical moment. The paradox is that while the record of the Eisenhower administration continues to win overwhelming public approval, the Republican Party is a minority party.

No more than about 40 percent of the Nation's voters record themselves as Republicans, but fully 70 percent of the Nation's voters record themselves as Eisenhower supporters. There is no evidence yet that the Republican Party is repairing this disparity.

The evidence is to the contrary. The elections last November showed that the party could not hold for more than 2 years the extra voters who were drawn to it in 1952 because of General Eisenhower's monumental popularity.

And now the Gallup poll shows that Republican voters by substantial margin, and independent voters even more so, would like to nominate Mr. Warren if President Eisenhower does not run.

But every political writer knows that the senior Republican professionals would fight a Warren nomination to the last ditch. He's too liberal. He's too much like Eisenhower. The party's dilemma is that the senior Republican leaders are out of step with the Republican voters.

If the United States Were To Run Out on Nationalist China, Its Proved Ally, Who Anywhere Will Trust Us Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the final article in a series on the Far East by Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, former military governor of Berlin, who has just completed the 6 weeks' observation tour of Formosa and the Far East. General Howley is the present vice chancellor of New York University. His observations and judgments are especially valuable because based not on wishful thinking but on long experience in dealing with Communists:

EXPECTANT AIR GRIPS CHIANG'S LITTLE ISLAND
(By Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, U. S. Army (retired))

NEW YORK, April 4.—Time is running out on Quemoy, the little Asian island with the hourglass shape.

You can feel the air of expectancy as steel-helmeted, camouflaged Chinese Nationalists soldiers sight down their automatic weapons across the 2,000 yards of quiet water to the island next door and the rugged coastline beyond.

Over there are Chinese of another hue—Red. They are the enemy. They keep reminding you with occasional bursts of light artillery fire.

Nationalist foxholes and Communist shells have honeycombed most of the 70 square miles of this ugly, brown clay island at the entrance to Red-held Amoy Harbor. Only the airfield has escaped. It nestles conveniently behind a ridge of giant boulders—just where the Red guns can't reach it.

Quemoy is the southern anchor of Chiang Kai-shek's 200-mile chain of islands blockading the Red China coast across the 100-mile strait from Formosa.

It is defended by 50,000 of Chiang's crack Nationalist troops against that oft-threatened Red invasion from the mainland only 5 miles away.

The northern anchor is tiny Matsu and its 7 satellite islands defended by another 20,000 Nationalists. It is against Matsu that the Communists are believed to be preparing their first assault.

OUT OF OBSCURITY

Like Iwo Jima and Tarawa and the other pinpoints that flared from obscurity during World War II, Quemoy and Matsu seem destined to make history.

For it is on these offshore islands flush against the Red coast that the United States must halt its retreat from communism and make a stand.

Here, on the Red Chinese doorstep, the destruction of communism must begin before it can destroy us.

To guard Formosa and the nearby Pescadores is no longer enough. We have announced to the world that Chiang Kai-shek is our friend and ally in our common fight against the Communist menace.

His Nationalists troops on Quemoy and Matsu wear the same Nationalist uniforms as those on Formosa. They, too, are friends and allies.

A six-week personal observation tour of the Far East has convinced me that this is the turning point in our relations with the rest of the world.

If we Americans now allow Chiang Kai-shek's troops—our allies—to be annihilated on Quemoy and Matsu, we won't have a friend left in Asia. All of Asia, I am convinced, would go Communist.

Until my visit to the Far East, I was not aware of the terrible blow our prestige suffered throughout Asia through our appeasement of the Communist enemy in Korea.

SEEDS OF CYNICISM

The Korean disaster gave our morale at home a terrible blow as well. It planted many dangerous seeds of national cynicism.

In the interests of our relations with our allies and our faith in ourselves, we cannot afford another withdrawal. We cannot give respectability again to men with blood on their hands. We cannot endure their insults around another propaganda table.

If we do not now live up to our obligations with the only powerful anti-Communist military forces in Asia, how can we ask other countries to be our trusted allies?

We must say to the Chinese Reds and to their masters in the Kremlin:

"Chiang Kai-shek is our ally. If you strike him you have struck us—on Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa or anywhere else."

Do we have a choice? If we didn't want to help defend Quemoy and Matsu, if we were not ready to oppose the world Communist conspiracy anywhere and everywhere, then we should not have signed a mutual defense pact with Chiang.

WITHDRAW DEFENSE

We should have pulled off Formosa and withdrawn our Asian defense line to Pearl Harbor, or even San Francisco.

Since my return, I have been asked many times if I agree with the personal views and beliefs of Chiang Kai-shek. This is beside the point.

I do not consider Chiang's personal views to be any of my business. I do not care whether he is a Methodist instead of a Buddhist, or whether he eats with chopsticks instead of knife and fork.

The views and beliefs of Chiang Kai-shek should be judged today only insofar as they affect our foremost and gravest responsibility: to get rid of the military threat that aims to destroy us from the outside and the subversive threat that aims to weaken us from within. That threat is communism.

There is further evidence that Moscow is not prepared to back Mao in a shooting war, any more than the Red army did in Korea. The Soviets, we know, work according to a long-range timetable. They are cunning and realistic in their planning. They may even anticipate an occasional reversal.

Nothing we do to Mao would make the Soviets change this long-range plan. Of all the enemies we have ever faced, this one cares the least about what we say or think or even do. The Kremlin has its own special pattern for our destruction and intends to follow it.

What, then, are the practical steps? What should we do?

STEPS TO FOLLOW

We must supply encouragement, training, and all available weapons, including our tactical atomic weapons, to our allies who are struggling against Soviet threats and domination. The place to begin is Formosa, with a dedicated leader and a powerful fighting force.

The Sabrejets we have just delivered to Chiang should be only the beginning. We should provide him with more planes, more ships, more of our top military instructors, more military supplies and equipment.

We should support the organization of volunteer air units and equip them with our newest planes, just as we fought the Japanese with the famed Flying Tigers before Pearl Harbor.

TERMS FOR MAO

The surest way to settle this matter is to announce to the world the absolute minimum conditions under which we could recognize the Red regime. Those terms should be:

1. That Mao resign as head of the government.

2. That the Peiping regime agree to free elections throughout China under international supervision.

3. That the Communists free immediately all United States prisoners and that they pay in full for the thousands of lives and the billions of dollars damage their volunteers cost us in Korea.

4. That the Chinese Reds turn over to international tribunals all war criminals guilty of atrocities and acts against humanity, particularly in Korea.

TIME IS NOW

Now is the time to hasten the destruction of the Communist regime in China, while it is still too weak and internally rotten to rally support.

I am convinced that the fall of Mao would set the pattern for the collapse of other flimsy Communist regimes, in North Korea, Indochina, the Balkans, and the Baltic.

The Communist house of cards can collapse all the way back to the Soviet borders, and even within Russia itself.

This is not just wishful thinking; it is feasible and possible; if we recognize our great opportunity and seize it. But if we permit the Communists to gain equality with us, there will be no peace on earth.

NEED NOT DESTROY

In that event, we may find ourselves confronted with the situation described by a retiring American ambassador who predicted gloomily:

"We will give up our way of life because we will not be willing to destroy the world and the Soviet Union will be willing to destroy it."

I don't buy that. There is still time for us to win without the world being destroyed.

Formosa can be our great opportunity for peace. But we must stop confusing those who sincerely would be our allies. We must recognize them and help them.

We must above all, lead with strength and determination, not weakness and vacillation.

Israel Asks Urgent Security Council Meeting — Intolerable Situation on Egyptian Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following news item which appeared in the April 6, 1955, issue of Israel Digest:

ISRAEL ASKS URGENT SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING—INTOLERABLE SITUATION ON EGYPTIAN BORDER

UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK.—Israel this week requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to discuss the mounting toll of attacks by Egyptian regular and irregular forces in the border area.

Ambassador Abba Eban, Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, addressed the following letter to the President of the Security Council on April 4:

"I have the honor, on instructions from my government, to submit the following complaint for consideration by the Security Council at an urgent meeting:

"Complaint by Israel against Egypt concerning:

"Repeated attacks by Egyptian regular and irregular armed forces and by armed marauders from Egyptian-controlled territory against Israel armed forces and civilian lives and property in Israel, to the danger of the peace and security of the area and in violation of the general armistice agreement and the resolutions of the Security Council, with special reference to:

"1. The armed assault at Patish on March 24, 1955 (S/3376);

"2. Repeated attacks by mining and gunfire on Israel Army units patrolling the Israel-Egyptian border at the Gaza strip between March 26 and April 3, 1955.

"In the 10 days which have elapsed since the assault by armed Egyptian marauders on a wedding party at Patish on March 24, which was condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission on March 27 as a brutal and murderous act of aggression, another 15 incidents of a particularly serious nature have occurred on the border between Israel and the Egyptian-controled Gaza strip. Most of these have taken the character of well-planned attacks on mobile Israel patrols by means of land mines laid in Israel territory followed by fire from fixed Egyptian army positions. Two such attacks in the neighborhood of Kisufim, on March 12 and March 19, were subsequently condemned in strong terms by the Mixed Armistice Commission, which noted the aggravation of the situation caused by Egypt's continued noncompliance with her obligations under the

armistice agreement. The rulings of the Mixed Armistice Commission, however, have had no effect whatsoever on the Egyptian authorities, with the result that the last week has witnessed a mounting tide of such attacks culminating in a violent assault on an Israel army patrol near Nahal Oz and on the village of Nahal Oz itself on April 3, in which 2 Israeli soldiers were killed and 16 wounded.

"A list of the attacks since March 26 follows:

"1. On March 26 an Israel patrol northwest of Nirim was attacked by automatic and rifle fire from Egyptian positions. The patrol returned the fire. The exchange of fire continued for 1½ hours.

"2. On March 26 Egyptian marauders attacked an Israel patrol southeast of the demilitarized zone of Nitzana. In the exchange of fire 1 soldier was wounded.

"3. On March 27 4 Egyptian soldiers from the Gaza strip penetrated into Israel territory north of Sheikh Nabhan. An Israel patrol drove them back across the border.

"4. On March 27 an Israel patrol in the vicinity of Nitzana was attacked by a group of armed infiltrators. When the patrol returned fire, fire was opened upon it from an Egyptian position across the border.

"5. On March 27 an Israeli soldier was wounded in a clash with an armed group of marauders near Be'eri.

"6. On March 28 an Israeli army command car was blown up by a land mine west of Nirim. Two Israeli soldiers were wounded, one of whom died later. Egypt was condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission on March 31. The Commission noted with great concern that, despite Egypt's obligations under the general armistice agreement and previous Mixed Armistice Commission decisions the reported Egyptian attacks against Israel had not ceased. The Armistice Commission called upon Egypt to terminate such attacks.

"7. On March 28, at noon, an Israel patrol in the vicinity of Kissufim was attacked by fire from an Egyptian position across the demarcation line.

"8. On March 28, in the afternoon, Egyptian positions attacked with automatic fire an Israel patrol southwest of Kissufim in Israel territory. The patrol did not return the fire.

"9. One March 30 an Israel patrol in the vicinity of Bikeat Abu Arif encountered armed marauders preparing to place a land mine under cover of armed Egyptians across the demarcation line. The marauders opened fire on the patrol. At the same time an Egyptian Army position opened mortar fire. The Israeli patrol returned fire and forced the marauders to retreat across the border.

"10. On March 31 an Israel Army command car was blown up by Egyptian raiders north of Sheikh Nabhan.

"11. On March 31 an Israel command car struck a demolition nail placed by marauders on the road near Nahal Oz.

"12. On April 1 an Asrael Army command car was blown up and damaged by a land mine north of Kissufim. One Israeli soldier was injured. Following the explosion an Egyptian Army position opened fire on the Israel patrol.

"13. On April 1 an Israel patrol chased away an Egyptian marauder digging a placement for a land mine on a road west of Nir Yitzhak.

"14. On April 2 an Israel command car was blown up by a land mine near Nahal Oz. Five Israeli soldiers were injured. After the explosion three Egyptian Army positions directed mortar, machinegun and rifle fire at the wreckage wounding another Israel soldier. Only after returning fire were the Israelies able to reach the wounded and administer first aid.

"15. On April 3, at approximately 1730 hours, machinegun fire was opened on an Israel patrol consisting of 3 command cars in Israel territroy, from 2 Egyptian Army positions, at MR 10431016 and MR 10131013. Israel reinforceemnts, sent to extricate the patrol, were subjected to heavy Egyptian fire. The Egyptians directed mortar fire against the Israel units and against the village of Nahal Oz. As the heavy Egyptian shelling made withdrawal impossible, and casualties on the open ground were mounting, the Israel unit commander was forced to advance upon the Egyptian post with armored cars. The exchange of fire lasted till 1905 hours. Israeli casualties were 2 soldiers killed and 16 wounded, 4 of them seriously.

"My Government has instructed me to lay the details of these incidents before the Security Council, and to seek relief from the intolerable situation created by this continued and purposeful Egyptian aggression against Israel.

"I have the honor to request that this letter be circulated to all the members of the Security Council."

Delaware River Channel Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article relative to the deepening of the Delaware River Channel from Philadelphia to Trenton:

[From the Marine News of April 1955]

AS THE DELAWARE GOES

The last Congress authorized the deepening of the existing channel in the Delaware River from Philadelphia, Pa., to Trenton, N. J. In authorizing this channel improvement, the Congress turned down the specific request of the Bureau of the Budget that local interests should be required to contribute to the cost of the project.

However, contrary to the expressed wishes of the Congress, the current Budget message proposes only a supplemental request for funds to start the deepening of this channel after local interests agree to a contribution of at least $18 million.

At a press conference on January 19, the President endorsed the proposal that local interests should share the cost of major Federal waterway improvements—such as the Delaware River—as a new national policy. The President emphasized that he would not specify whether the new policy should be achieved through tolls on shipping, by direct local contribution, or some other method.

As every reader of Marine News knows, any toll or share-the-cost program would reverse the historic policy established in the founding days of our country: That the Federal Government assumes full responsibility for developing and maintaining our major navigable waterways and that our waterways should be free to the use of all commerce.

It is along these lines that the Delaware River port area's campaign for an improved channel has developed into a national issue, a fight in behalf of all waterway interests to sustain the historic policy of Federal responsibility for the development and improvement of our Nation's navigable waterways.

This campaign centers today on legislation introduced in Congress to appropriate $25 million for the first year of work on this project recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

In support of this legislation, the Joint Executive Committee for the Improvement and Development of the Philadelphia Port Area through its chairman, Harry G. Schad, has called on all waterways interests to support the Delaware River Channel fight before the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate to assure the continuance of full Federal responsibility for the improvement and development of the Nation's navigable waterways.

The Marine News supports this call for concerted action in the belief that all who maintain an interest in the future of the Nation's waterways owe unqualified support to the principles for which those of the Delaware River area are fighting.

True, the battle is being waged over the Delaware, but the results will have far-reaching effects on all our waterways.

Because of the overall implications, this, then, ceases to exist as a local issue, for on the outcome rests the future of big and little waterway projects across the length and breadth of this Nation.

Should the false doctrine of user tolls or local participation prevail on the Delaware, it could—and make no mistake, would—then be applied on all our waterways, in all our harbors, from the Great Lakes to the gulf, and the Atlantic to the Pacific.

It is because of this that all waterways interests must pick up the challenge, for, in this instance—

As the Delaware goes, so go the Nation's waterways.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1955]

HARBOR IMPROVEMENT IS ONE FEDERAL JOB THAT HAS PAID OFF

The administration has declined to include in this year's budget an appropriation for a deep-water channel in the Delaware River above Philadelphia as far as Trenton, N. J., unless the project includes a stipulation that "local interests" must assume part of the cost.

The total sum involved in dredging the channel to 40 feet as far as Morrisville, Pa., and 35 feet from there to Trenton, is about $91 million. It is estimated that $18 million of this amount represents half the difference between a 35-foot channel and one that would permit large ocean-going ships to unload ore at dockside. Therefore, the Army Engineers argue, this is a "local benefit" and should not be a charge on the Federal budget. Although the "local interests" are not specifically mentioned, various statements by administration spokesmen indicate that United States Steel Corp., whose huge new Fairless plant is located on the river just below Trenton, is meant.

In his press conference of January 19, the President supported this position, adding, if it was a new policy, he thought it should have been considered long ago.

Although the principle of local participation in large public improvements involving Federal expenditures is a sound one, harbor maintenance and improvement are not a happy place to apply it. Unlike programs for road or hospital or school construction, the maintenance and improvement of navigable rivers and harbors have been an exclusively Federal concern since the foundation of the Republic.

It was precisely the question of foreign commerce and navigation—over which the original Confederation had no control—that led to the movement for the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In the end, the States renounced the right to collect import duties, ceding that source of revenue to the new Federal Government, which in turn was forbidden (art. I, sec. 9, par. 6) to discriminate among the ports of the several States.

Maintenance and improvement of harbors, under control of the War Department, have normally been carried out at Federal expense, insofar as deep-water channels are concerned. That would be no reason for continuing the policy, if it were wrong or financially burdensome. But the reverse is true. Adequate ports and channels are not a liability but a gilt-edged investment. In the case of harbors along the Delaware, the Federal Government, during the last 15 years, has collected over $14 for every dollar spent on development.

It is true that, for the moment, a 40-foot channel may be represented as a benefit to United States Steel, although other plants along the river would benefit, too. But that argument could have been advanced at any time in the past 168 years against any of the industries that line the shores of our great ports. The record of American enterprise indicates that opportunities to locate on an improved waterway are seldom neglected. It is hardly fair to impose the cost of creating them on the first user.

The responsibility of the Federal Government, in any case, does not go beyond the cost of deepening and clearing channels. A productive harbor, obviously, is much more than just a waterway. Local interests provide and always have provided piers, rail connections, loading and unloading facilities, truck highways, police, and all the other necessities that go into the complex of services that make a port. Without them the huge Federal revenues from customs could never have been available.

Sympathy is due residents of the upper Delaware who view with alarm the inevitable transformation of river bank from charming residence and recreation areas into grim industrial and commercial areas. We are not debating the issue of whether this particular project is necessary but, if the channel or any similar one is to be deepened, there would seem to be no valid reason to change the policy, buttressed by specific constitutional mention, which makes channel costs a Federal concern.

THE DELAWARE PORT AREA: ITS ECONOMY AND THE CONGRESSIONALLY AUTHORIZED IMPROVEMENT OF ITS SHIPPING CHANNEL

The Delaware is one of the world's great estuarial harbors. Already it is the leading port of the United States in the handling of import tonnage. And it stands second only to New York in total waterborne commerce.

As a harbor, the Delaware reaches from the open sea at Cape May, N. J.-Cape Henlopen, Del., north to Morrisville, Pa.-Trenton, N. J., a distance of 132 protected miles. But, as a first-class international seaport capable of handling all types of cargo vessels, the harbor's vast potential has been only partly realized, because its 40-foot channel ends abruptly at the southern edge of Philadelphia.

This leaves 37 miles at the upper end of the harbor in urgent need of modernization and improvement. (Seventeen of these miles pass through Philadelphia.)

The Congress of the United States, in August 1954, recognized the urgency of this need when it passed legislation authorizing the deepening of the upper Delaware. And it further recognized that this harbor improvement should be the full responsibility of the Federal Government in the national interest and in keeping with long-prevailing national policy. The bill carrying the authorization was signed into law on September 3, 1954.

Legislation is now before the 84th Congress to appropriate funds to begin the channel deepening. The ratio of benefits from this project to the cost of it will be almost 2 to 1 (1.93 to 1.00).

STRONGLY RECOMMENDED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The deepening of the upper Delaware has been strongly recommended by the Corps of Engineers and has been endorsed at every level of the Federal Government concerned with responsibility for such an improvement.

The present Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., has officially appraised the improvement of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor this way:

"The present impetus of the national defense program, the accelerated demands of defense and civilian needs, and the strategic location of the Trenton-Philadelphia-Camden area with respect to sources of materials and labor and markets for processed goods, together with the definite possibility of increasing the national wealth in this highly industrialized area, now combine to require further modernization of the waterway."

The United States Bureau of the Budget has described the projected 40-foot channel as "the only satisfactory solution" and has advocated that the project be carried out as a single undertaking in the interest of construction and transportation economies.

Similar endorsements have come from the immediate past Chief of Engineers, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the North Atlantic Division engineer, three successive Philadelphia district engineers, State and local officials, civic groups, labor unions, newspapers, and the citizenry of the Delaware Port area.

DETAILS OF THE AUTHORIZED IMPROVEMENT

As recommended by the Corps of Engineers and authorized by the 84th Congress, the Delaware shipping channel would be dredged to 40 feet for 32 miles upstream from the southern limits of Philadelphia to Newbold Island and to a depth of 35 feet from there to Trenton Marine Terminal, a distance of 5.5 miles. (Depths of 25 to 37 feet were provided by past authorizations.)

In authorizing this channel improvement, the last session of Congress debated and rejected an unprecedented administrative proposal that local interests make a large cash contribution (of at least $18 million) to the cost of improving a seaport of established and long-proven national and international importance.

That same proposal, however, has been advanced again by the executive branch of the Federal Government, contrary to the clearly expressed wishes of Congress. Again, the Joint Executive Committee is asking Congress to uphold the historic congressional position that the development and maintenance of our waterways of demonstrable economic and military importance is, and should remain, a Federal responsibility.

A BULWARK OF NATIONAL SECURITY

The diversified industrial power of the Delaware port area—and the highly visible potential for greater industrial and maritime activity—constitute an important bulwark of the Nation's security. That is so because much of this well-balanced industrial capacity is equipped for military production.

The Delaware Harbor is protected by a bastion of land extending for as much as 60 miles back from the coast line. It is a natural fortress for protected loading of supplies and embarkation of military personnel in the event of a national emergency. The Delaware breakwater where the bay meets the Atlantic Ocean, plus almost 100 miles of deep water to Philadelphia, and the projected deep channel to Trenton are impediments against penetration by enemy warships and underseas craft. During World War II, the port facilities of greater Philadelphia alone handled 15 to 20 percent of all the goods shipped in and out of the United States.

The Delaware offers, in fact, a higher guaranty of security than any other port in the Nation.

Another great advantage to national security offered by the Delaware port area is the dispersed industrial construction that has taken place—and will take place to an even greater extent when the channel is deepened to 40 feet over the upper reaches of tidewater.

In a report on the bill that became part of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the 79th Congress wrote: "We should prepare now for the probable trend of the postwar era to decentralize major national activities by making available innumerable sites for the dispersal of industrial expansion along the banks of our important waterways and ship channels."

In keeping with this policy, one of the larger steel works in the United States has been built on the upper reaches of the harbor—away from the traditional areas of concentration of steel production. Other industries, attracted by the easy availability of steel, will be installed along the upper harbor in sections reserved for industrial usage. Others will be drawn by deep-water shipping just as soon as the 40-foot channel is assured.

The deepening of the Delaware Channel to facilitate efficient, low-cost transportation of imported raw materials for industry is in accordance with national defense policy calling for the conservation of those materials against time of emergency. The President's Materials Policy Committee put it this way in mid-1952: "The overall objective of a national materials policy for the United States should be to insure an adequate and dependable flow of materials at the lowest cost consistent with national security and with the welfare of friendly nations."

THE ECONOMIC PICTURE IN BROAD STROKES

The Delaware has constituted an important seaport for domestic and foreign commerce for more than 300 years. Along its shores have grown dozens of important cities—such as Philadelphia, Wilmington, Camden, Trenton, and Chester—and hundreds of thriving enterprises representing 87 percent of all the official categories of American business and industry.

The 14 counties in 3 States (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) that form the Delaware port area will yield the Federal Government in taxes during the next fiscal year more than any of 40 whole States. Federal tax revenues from those 14 counties for fiscal 1956 will total an estimated $2,100,000,000. That supplies a new and graphic measure of the economic importance and potency of the area flanking the harbor.

In this same compact area, 88,000 business and industrial establishments are situated. And business is growing in the area faster than in almost any other section of the country. This is attested by the fact that industrial construction in Philadelphia and seven adjacent counties of Pennsylvania and New Jersey ran 12 percent above the nationwide average in 1954.

Three-quarters of the way through 1954, the Delaware port area surpassed New York in tonnage of imports—22.4 million tons for this port area in the first 9 months of last year to 21.01 million tons for New York.

The value of imports and exports handled in the Greater Philadelphia port area was recently calculated at more than $1 billion a year. It was estimated that more than 14,000 workers in just Philadelphia and 4 peripheral counties of Pennsylvania were directly dependent on export sales for their livelihoods. And a total of 341,000 workers were found to be employed in firms engaged wholly or partly in import-export trade.

Customs collections in this area (totaling over $2 billion since 1874) have averaged $45.75 million annually for the last 5 years. While it has never been suggested, nor will it be, that customs revenues be committed to waterway improvements within the port area where they are collected, the plain fact is that the total estimated cost of deepening the Delaware (approximately $91.4 million) is the equivalent of less than 2 years' cus-

toms collections in the Philadelphia district.

In all the growth that has taken place along the Delaware Harbor, there is a striking contrast which is directly tied to channel depth. Below Philadelphia, where a 40-foot channel project has existed for many years, industries of all types and sizes have located at the water's edge. Desirable sites for further expansion are steadily diminishing.

To the north of Philadelphia, however, where the previously authorized channel depth has been only 25 feet, the economy has remained predominantly agricultural. Yet this section of the Delaware Harbor offers as fine an area of opportunity as the Nation possesses for creating more commerce, more industry, more jobs—more production of goods and services to help carry the American people to the goal of healthy economic expansion—and higher standard of living—envisioned by the President of the United States.

Jerusalem's University Is Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following article written by Harry Gilroy, correspondent for the New York Times in Israel, is of universal interest. Mr. Gilroy has watched the rebuilding of the University of Jerusalem. The American Friends of the Hebrew University has done much to bring this worthwhile project to fruition.

The article follows:

JERUSALEM'S UNIVERSITY IS REBORN

(By Harry Gilroy)

JERUSALEM.—Thirty years ago on Friday the Right Honorable Earl of Balfour spoke to 7,000 persons on Mount Scopus. A little stooped with his 76 years, silver-haired, robed in Cambridge scarlet, the former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom seemed to many like an Old Testament prophet. Ending his address, he paused, looked over his quietly attentive audience, then announced:

"With supreme confidence in its future, I now declare the University of Jerusalem to be open."

During the next 22 years the building of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem continued along the sharp crest of Scopus. The buildings were beautiful, spacious and well equipped, and there was an invaluable library of 500,000 volumes. From every window the view was world famous—eastward to the purple mountains of Moab and to Gilgal, where the Israelis crossed the Jordan into the country 3,400 years ago, westward to Jerusalem from which they were scattered in 70 A. D.

Then in 1948 came a terrible blow. The conflict that swelled into the Arab-Israeli war raged for months around Scopus. Students guarded the ramparts on the ridge and faculty members steadfastly traveled through hostile quarters to their classrooms. On one April day a Scopus-bound bus convoy was halted, set afire, and raked with bullets. Seventy-seven teachers and staff members of the university and the affiliated Rothschild Hadassah Hospital were slaughtered. Thereafter the United Nations established a demilitarized zone around the university to save it from destruction by Arab guns.

Ever since then the great buildings have stood on the northeast skyline of Jerusalem like ghost castles. Israeli police and a caretaker force occupy them. But they are denied to the university community. It is a sight that stabs the heart, especially for those men and women only a mile away who toiled on the heights in the name of universal knowledge.

Yet nothing could have so justified Lord Balfour's supreme confidence as the way in which the university bore the blow. It has lived in makeshift halls within the new Jerusalem. Now, on a stony little ridge inside the Israeli sector of the city, the first lecture hall of a new campus is almost completed. Seven other buildings are going up as the nucleus of a new academic city. This week the board of governors will visit the new campus and briefly mark the university's second beginning.

Foreign observers are impressed by this tenacious vitality. After the convoy slaughter there was heavy pressure to move to the safer locale of the Mediterranean shore. Yet the university has stayed in Jerusalem and expanded despite its cramped quarters. Something spiritual, it seems to outsiders, must be the force within this vitality.

The university seems to thrive on dislocation and compression. When it came down from Scopus it had an enrollment of 870, and 190 teachers. There were two faculties, which gave degrees in the humanities and in science. This year there are 3,200 students, more than 300 research workers, 500 teachers, and 6 faculties. The new faculties are a whole university in themselves—social sciences, medicine, agriculture, and law—and there are also new schools of education, dentistry, and pharmacy.

Apart from engineering, which is left in the capable hands of the Israeli Institute of Technology in Haifa, the university now provides the fields of study offered at other big centers of learning. In one way it is unique; it conducts its education in Hebrew. "There is a great difference between Isaiah and microbiology," Balfour observed, in speculating whether the language of poetry could cope with terms of modern scholarship. Yet professors who 30 years ago had to learn Hebrew before they could begin to teach here have turned the biblical language into a felicitous medium of modern thought.

There are students at the university from 40 countries. Nearly every land that has contributed its victims of religious prejudices to Israel's growth is represented. There are blondes and brunettes, the pale faces of Northern Europe and the coffee-colored faces of the Middle East. But there is no splitting into groups of origin—they impart a wonderful feeling of one healthy family. The basic factor is the linguistic feat that has given them from the Bible a common voice in place of the babel of tongues which marked the coming of their parents to this country a few years ago.

The life the students lead is, nevertheless, all confusion and rush. Its basic purpose is to educate the largest possilbe number of young Israelis to be the future intellectual leaders of the nation. The circumstances under which this is done strike the onlooker as bizarre.

The present campus (not the new one being developed) is all over new Jerusalem—a community mostly built in the last 50 years that has an air of age because it is made of stone. Facades are handsome, but some of the interiors are as cheerless as tombs. The one proper instruction building rented by the university is Terra Sancta College. Here the Franciscan order formerly ran a preparatory school for Arab boys, so on the roof of this Hebrew university center is a silvered, haloed statute of the Virgin Mary.

In the medical building, close to the Jordanian old city, Prof. Saul Adler, a world-renowned parasitologist, is asked if some vital research is going on in his laboratory. He smiles—"This is a time for teaching." White-gowned students are crowded so closely in the laboratory that it is a miracle they do not bowl over all the test tubes. Out on the streets students hurry to classes. On inquiry one learns that they are trying to get to class ahead of time because there are not enough seats to go around.

The student dormitories are in Allenby Barracks, former quarters of British troops. They look out over the adjacent no-man's land, and they have few amenities.

Many of the students are married. Talk with the student's wife about the life they lead. He is away all the time, either at the university or working at odd jobs to support the 2 of them and their small daughter. She has a joke to fit the occasion about the student whose wife says she might as well get a divorce since she never sees him. She is entitled to a divorce, he agrees, but he's sorry that he simply can't take the time to go with her to the rabbinical court.

These students look quite like American undergraduates and they dress somewhat the same. One difference is that the clothes they wear are not designed to look like old clothes—when they look that way they are old clothes. Another difference is that a small percentage wear the skull cap of orthodoxy. The girls rarely use make-up, and glamour is as rare about the university as Cadillac station wagons. Most of the young people are at the university by great personal sacrifices of their parents, and they must pinch every pruta.

Student life is completely unlike the American collegiate scene in the absence of flirtations. A girl sits down next to a man in the library and he never lifts his head, let alone proposes a date. A girl's books are carried by the girl. There is no such thing as couples strolling arm in arm.

The only general social club the students have is the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation House, run by Rabbi Maurice Pekarsky of Chicago. There students hear record concerts and lectures. (The majority prefer classical music.) Recently Rabbi Pekarsky staged 4 lectures on the philosophy of Judaism—against the advice of those who thought that no one would attend a lecture on religion—and 150 students and professors came each time.

Student social life, otherwise, is organized mostly on a political basis. Each Israeli political party—ranging from religious through bourgeois to labor and then to the extreme left wing—puts up a list of candidates for the students' organization, which handles scholarships, jobs, housing and the usual campus activities. Undergraduates seek social relaxation in their party clubs—not quite as if a Columbia boy were to spend his evenings playing chess in Tammany Hall, but something like it.

Each year the students organization stages a strike against the university. One administrative official describes it as a ritual. It serves to draw the student community together. This year the students stayed away from the first week of the term in protest against fees. There was much dissatisfaction after the strike; the medical students voted to leave the student organization, and there are signs the party system may be on the way out.

It might be thought that the students would be tense because they are on the edge of the Arab world. If they are they do not reveal this to their elders. Most of them, for one thing, have done military service. The boys have known the tensions of border patrols and the girls have toiled with immigrants over problems of settlement life. Another factor is that Jerusalem—because of the presence of the Government, the character of the people and the nearness of the border—is the calmest town in Israel.

What is the essential spirit of the university? It comes from many things, but two

elements can best be identified by going back to the utterances of the inaugural day 30 years ago.

In the opening prayer the Palestinian Chief Rabbi Abraham I. Kook voiced a hope that was in the minds of many in the audience. He prayed that at last would come true the prophecy of Isaiah: "Out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Chaim Bialik, chief poet of Zionism, voiced another aspiration. He said: "Knowing that true wisdom draws from all people, we shall open wide the gates and windows of this institute in all directions to admit all the good and sublime thought which has ever been and is being created by the mind of man."

Potentially, there existed a conflict between these two conceptions. Could a university devoted to Judaism also apply itself to universal knowledge? In a measure, a conflict over these ideas did develop between the two men who shaped the university. They were Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the Russian-born chemist and leader of World Zionism who became Israel's first President, and Dr. Judah L. Magnes, the American-born rabbi.

Dr. Weizmann, who had influenced Lord Balfour to issue the Jewish homeland declaration, gave the university a symbolic start by laying foundation stones in 1918, soon after the British troops took Jerusalem from the Turks. But until the inaugural in 1925 this was only a gesture. Dr. Magnes, a native of Oakland, Calif., came to Palestine in 1922 after making the hard choice of giving up an American career that included such distinctions as being the senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El in New York. In Jerusalem he plunged into the work of creating the university. His first great service was raising much of the money for its buildings.

Dr. Weizmann became the president of the university's board of governors. Dr. Magnes became its chancellor, the actual administrator. "Weizmann would have established a great research center of science," a member of the university family said recently. "Magnes would have done the same for religion and the humanities. Together, they made a university."

But in the university today has the harmonious fusion been achieved? A professor who has watched the whole development of the university says it has not. The university has not attained a harmony, as he sees it, but rather tolerance. No one inquires into a professor's belief in Judaism nor asks where he stands on the claims of religion and science.

The two architects of the university clashed in another way. Dr. Weizmann saw it as an essential part of the "Nationalist Renaissance." The Magnes view was, to use Dr. Weizmann's expression, a romantic notion about "a great center of Hebrew learning and literature." Fortunately, both views fused when it came to raising money for the university.

Dr. Magnes took the American, Felix Warburg, to Mount Scopus. They spoke of the fresh wisdom that could arise if Judiasm were studied in such surroundings. Mr. and Mrs. Warburg started off the Institute of Jewish Studies with $500,000. The American Jewish Physicians Committee began the Institutes of Chemistry and Microbiology and lated contributed money and skill to the Faculty of Medicine. The members of Hadassah, the American women's Zionist group, put up a beautiful hospital and nurses' training school. From 1925 onward the American Friends of Hebrew University have channeled such a flow of gifts that for many years more than 60 percent of the university's budget was covered by American funds.

Americans may ask just why this struggling university should be regarded as a source of enrichment for Judaism and humanity. They may know that anyone who stands awhile on the austere, theatrically lighted Judean hills becomes full of poetic imaginings. But there is something more real than that, something connected with studying the Bible and the Talmud in the Hebrew language, in the land from which these rich cultural growths took their substance.

The university's president, Prof. Benjamin Mazar (formerly Maisler) speaks of this from experience. Born in Russia, he studied at the Universities of Berlin and Giessin, and came to Palestine in 1928. He is a noted archaeologist and historian.

"I studied the history and languages of this region in Germany," he said recently. "Also the Bible at a theological institute. But it was all a study of an ancient language without the light which comes from familiarity with the language and the land and the stories of the past that we learn here every day from archeology and other sciences."

As an example of what is accomplished, he showed the first two volumes which he and other scholars have produced of the Encyclopoedia Biblica. Every reference in the Bible is treated by the full concentration of the university's scholarship. The work of the Institute of Jewish Studies, Professor Mazar said, is the pride of the university. There is also great satisfaction about the leading part which the university plays in solving such practical problems of the country as where to find more water or how to make the basic fuel of an atomic pile from the Negev phosphates.

Next fall part of the university will move to the new campus. A year later, when the library will be ready, the university proper can move. Students' quarters will go up and social gathering places, as well as all the needed academic structures for a university population of 10,000.

"We have the right students for the future," Professor Mazar said. "I see them as not so interested in politics as their predecessors were, more devoted to books. I believe they're the best students in the history of the university." And he added, "They have a sense of creating. That is the most important of all—the sense of creating."

Here, it suddenly becomes plain, is the ultimate explanation of the tenacious vitality that has so impressed foreign observers, and that has resulted in the second beginning after the Mount Scopus catastrophe. The university—its administrators, professors, students, and the friends who support it—has been and continues to be imbued with the spirit of creating.

Page 10 of the New York Times, a Study in Contrasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, page 10 of the Monday, April 25, issue of the New York Times carries 6 stories. They deal with forces that affect our behavior as human beings—economic, religious, and engineering.

The question is, in the days ahead, which of the forces will do more to promote harmony? Or will it take a strong share of all three—economic, religion, and engineering—to keep the peace and promote progress?

In story No. 1, reading from left to right, on page 10 of the Times, authorities are concerned over possible permanent split in West world economy. Pound sterling and dollar countries appear headed for a rift. Dollar competing countries like West Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands have struggled for years to hoist themselves to the level of economic strength that enables them to participate freely in trade competition with the dollar. Will they be pulled into the antidollar system despite dislike of everything it implies? The story concludes that "there is a strong feeling here"—Bonn, Germany—"and in other West European capitals that very few of the consequences of an American failure to join the free world trading system embodied in GATT"—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—"are understood in congressional circles in Washington."

Or will effective peace and progress best come as story No. 2 would indicate, "Not by great political sermons from the pulpit, nor by religious speeches by our governors. It will be accomplished when you and I as individuals assume this responsibility in our own lives."

Or will it come, as story No. 3 might indicate, from a spark ignited by any one of 100,000 hydrogen-filled balloons carrying bibles behind the Iron Curtain?

Or does story No. 4 carry the key? Satisfy demands for higher pay to meet the needs of life?

Or will it take a new philosophy yet to be gleaned from the book of nature that might enable us to discover better the intentions of God, as Pope Pius appears to indicate in story No. 5 when he asserts that man is confused and science needs a philosophy to explain its discoveries.

Or should we be content, as story No. 6 might indicate, to clip more and more time from our labors? Canadian trains speed up; 12 to 14 hours to be cut from cross-continent trip?

For possible interest to the House, under unanimous consent, page 10 of the New York Times follows:

EUROPE PONDERS UNITED STATES TRADE STAND—AUTHORITIES CONCERNED OVER POSSIBLE PERMANENT SPLIT OF WESTERN WORLD ECONOMY

(By Michael Hoffman)

BONN, Germany, April 24.—The possibility of a permanent split of western world economy into 2 rival trade and monetary systems is beginning to be taken seriously by the highest European trade and monetary authorities.

Failure of the United States Congress to approve President Eisenhower's program for continuing to fix tariff duties by international negotiation and for United States adherence to the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation would make such development almost inevitable, in the opinion of many continental and British experts in such matters.

There has long been powerful advocacy of a European regional monetary trade system, whose essential characteristic would be legalization of permanent discrimination against United States trade and against the dollar in all international transactions.

Such a system would encompass a substantial part of the world, including India, the Middle East and most of Africa, where currencies are tied to the British pound, French or Belgian franc.

SCOPE OF SYSTEM

Such a system would cover at least two-thirds of all the free world's trade and nearly

all of the trade between the free world and the Communist world.

This vision of a trading system without the dollar has always been very attractive to European Socialists on one hand and owners and managers of Europe's most highly protected industries on the other.

It has been a nightmare to central bankers and most ministers responsible for direction of the economic and monetary policy of Western European governments, who see in the permanent split of the dollar from the nondollar world a sure recipe for an economic decline of Europe in the long run.

But to hold the dikes against tide of sentiment favoring permanent discrimination against the dollar, forces of conservatism in Western Europe have had to assume and argue that the United States itself wanted a "one-world" economy in the West.

They have been successful up to now largely because they have been able to point to the United States adherence to two sets of international rules designed to maintain order in world trade and monetary relationships and based on the principle of ultimate all-around acceptance of nondiscrimination.

One of these rule systems is embodied in articles of agreement of the International Monetary Fund and the other in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). They are twin systems and neither is either meaningful or enforceable without the other because of interconnections between national trade policies and national policies affecting interchange of different major currencies.

The United States is in the fund system, but only half in the GATT system because Congress has never approved the latter. Congressional approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which is the organization to administer GATT, would put it fully in the latter. Congressional rejection of OTC would mean that the GATT system would never be firmly established. This would knock flat the vital argument of those European forces opposing economic and monetary regionalism.

These are the terms in which West German monetary authorities are discussing the future of trade and monetary developments in the West. No country in Western Europe has more dislike for the notion of a trading system that excludes the dollar than Western Germany.

MINISTERS DIVIDED

Within that Government there is a struggle between ministers who want to abide by GATT rules that prohibit discrimination against American farm products and ministers who want such discrimination. The dominant opinion now is that Germany's interest lies in supporting GATT rules.

But the Germans are realists. Recent contacts with the British convince people here that the failure of the United States to join OTC would force any British Government to abandon resistance to forces favoring permanent antidollar discrimination.

The pound sterling would inevitably become the currency around which European regional trade and the payments system would be built. Other countries, like West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands that have struggled for years to pull themselves up to the level of economic strength that enables them to participate freely in trade competition with the dollar, would be pulled into the antidollar system despite dislike of everything it implies.

There is a strong feeling here and in other west European capitals that very few of the consequences of an American failure to join the free world trading system embodied in GATT are understood in congressional circles in Washington.

CELEBRANTS OF ST. GEORGE'S DAY MARCH TO CATHEDRAL

A special service in celebration of St. George's Day was held yesterday in the New York Cathedral (St. John the Divine). Bishop Horace W. B. Donegan of the New York Protestant Episcopal Diocese presided. The attendance was 5,000.

The service was arranged by the American Order, Sons of St. George, Independent Daughters and Daughters of St. George.

A parade of 40 organizations and patriotic societies with American and British banners was curtailed by rain. They were led by the Yonkers Kiltie Band in a re-formed procession inside the cathedral.

Bishop Donegan welcomed the congregation. The sermon was by Canon Edward N. West. F. B. A. Rundall, British consul general, took part in the devotions.

The doxology was followed by a color guard salute. The national anthems of the United States and Great Britain were played by the cathedral organist. A message from Queen Elizabeth was read.

Canon West said in his sermon:

"The world that is to be will be just as Christian and just as effective as is its ability to draw the best from the old and from the new.

"This won't be accomplished by great political sermons from the pulpit nor by religious speeches by our governors. It will be accomplished when you and I as individuals assume this responsibility in our own lives."

BALLOONS TO CARRY BIBLES TO REDS

STUTTGART, GERMANY, April 24.—A United States evangelist said today the first of 100,000 hydrogen-filled balloons to carry Bible pamphlets to Iron Curtain countries would be launched tomorrow. Billy James Hargis, of Tulsa, Okla., said here the project sponsored by the International Council of Christian Churches would take 4 or 5 months.

ITALIAN TEACHERS MAY STRIKE

ROME, April 24.—About 50,000 teachers of Italy's state secondary schools today threatened to begin a 4-day strike on Wednesday unless their demands for higher pay were met.

POPE PIUS ASSERTS MAN IS CONFUSED—SCIENCE NEEDS A PHILOSOPHY TO EXPLAIN ITS DISCOVERIES, PONTIFF TELLS ACADEMY

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME, April 24.—Pope Pius XII said today that present-day man lived in an age of monumental scientific development but also in one of intellectual confusion and anguish. He addressed the Pontifical Academy of Sciences.

What is needed, he said, is that philosophy step into the breach and evolve an overall theory of the universe capable of interpreting and explaining all the facts that science discovers.

The occasion for the Pope's speech was afforded by the seating of 14 new academicians appointed by the Pope. With this addition, the membership of the academy, which is limited to 70, was brought up to 66. The Pope spoke in French. Official translations of his address into the principal languages of the world were made available by the Vatican press service. Summaries of the speech in many languages were broadcast by the Vatican radio.

DOZEN CARDINALS ATTEND

The meeting addressed by the Pope was held in the comparatively small hall of the Consistory in the Vatican. About 100 persons were present. They included a dozen cardinals, members of the diplomatic corps accredited to the Holy See, all the academicians present in Rome and a score of biologists and botanists who are to participate in a scientific symposium in the Vatican tomorrow.

The Pope spoke for more than a half hour. It was the longest speech he has delivered since his severe illness at the end of last year. Members of his household said he stood the strain well and was not excessively fatigued when he returned to his private apartment.

Throughout his speech the Pope spoke in high praise of scientists and found eloquent words to describe their mission. "The mission confided to you," he said, "ranks among the most noble, for you should be in a sense the discoverers of the intentions of God. It pertains to you to interpret the book of nature, to describe its contents and to draw the consequences therefrom for the good of all."

DISCUSSES SCIENTISTS' ROLE

Near the end of his speech the Pope addressed the scientists with the following words: "Teach others to behold, to understand and to love the created world so that the admiration of splendors so sublime may cause the knee to bend and invite the minds of men to adoration. Never betray these aspirations, this trust. Woe to them who make use of falsely taught science to make men leave the right path. They are likened to stones placed out of malice on the road of the human race; they are obstacles whereon men stumble in their search for truth."

In the body of his speech the Pope said that in any synthesis of all knowledge it is philosophy which with its broad concepts states precisely the distinctive traits of vital factors, the necessary character of the underlying principles of unification, the internal source of action, of growth, of multiplication, the true unity of the living being.

He deplored that science and philosophy had become separated and described this development as detrimental.

CANADA TRAINS SPEED UP—TWELVE TO FOURTEEN HOURS TO BE CUT FROM CROSS-CONTINENT TRIP

OTTAWA, April 24.—Two new trains designed to cut the surface distance between the Canadian east and west coasts left here today for Vancouver.

They represent a $100 million investment by the Government-owned Canadian National and the privately owned Canadian Pacific railroads.

Both trains started for the west coast within hours of each other. With their diesel locomotives they are expected to cut the running time between Montreal and Vancouver by 12 to 14 hours.

In other words, passengers who left Montreal this afternoon are scheduled to arrive in Vancouver Wednesday morning. This cuts a whole night off the old schedule.

Back in 1886 it took 5½ days to reach Port Moody, then the western terminus. Now a round trip will take only a few hours more time than the 1-way journey 69 years ago.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Economic Consultant Sees Dixon-Yates Profit of 100 to 200 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter I have received from Mr. Walter von Tresckow, 400 East 52d Street, New York, who sets forth an analysis of the Dixon-Yates contract and comparison of Dixon-Yates and Von Tresckow proposal. Particularly interesting and startling is Mr. von Tresckow's assertion that Dixon-Yates will earn 100 to 200 percent on their invested capital instead of 9 percent as claimed.

Mr. von Tresckow's letter follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 8, 1955.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: Only since the publication of the record of the hearings before your committee on November 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1954, have all the amendments and pertinent facts of the Dixon-Yates contract become available for public examination.

A detailed analysis of the contract, entered into by the AEC at the direction of the President, brings to light some startling facts which are widely at variance with statements made by Dixon-Yates, the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget.

A detailed examination of the record shows:

1. Dixon-Yates indicated that the cost of power would be 3.990 mills per kilowatt-hour. The actual cost of power will be 5.352 mills per kilowatt-hour, or 34 percent higher than the indicated figure.

2. Dixon-Yates claimed that their profit would be limited to a maximum of $600,000 per year. The actual profit will be a minimum of $5 million more per year than the claimed minimum and may reach as much as $12 million more.

Dixon-Yates claimed that they would receive no more than a 9-return on their investment; whereas, they will actually receive from 100 to 200 percent per year return on their investment.

This sum is $125 million more for the minimum period of the contract (25 years) than claimed by them.

3. The statement was made by the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget that power costs under the Dixon-Yates proposal would probably be cheaper than under the Von Tresckow proposal.

The actual facts are that the von Tresckow proposal would cost $125 million less and that, in addition, Dixon-Yates would make a profit of $125 million more. The difference between the two proposals is actually a minimum of $250 million (and could be as much as $400 million) for a contract period of 25 years.

4. Memphis has announced that it will build its own generating station if the Dixon-Yates plant is built. Under those circumstances there would be no market for Dixon-Yates power in the western Tennessee area of the TVA system. To meet the needs of this area is the specific purpose of the Dixon-Yates plant.

Even though not 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity is delivered by Dixon-Yates to the TVA, the AEC will be required to pay $11,058,800 per year to Dixon-Yates. This amount pays for the cost of the plant and a profit to the Mississippi Valley Generating Co.

Before proceeding to give you the evidence in the record to prove the above statements, we would like to illustrate the great importance of small things in this contract.

Electricity is measured in kilowatt-hours, which is a very small unit of measurement. Costs per kilowatt-hour are stated in mills, which are one-thousandth part of a dollar, and fractions of mills. The Dixon-Yates costs per kilowatt-hour are stated in the customary millionths of a dollar—$0.003900. These are also very small units of measurements.

However, when these small units of costs are used in connection with enormous quantities of electricity—5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year—as in the Dixon-Yates contract, they come to mean large amounts of money.

In the Dixon-Yates contract each one-thousandth of a dollar (one mill) becomes $5 million per year and $125 million for the minimum contract period of 25 years. Each one-millionth of a dollar becomes $125,000.

This is rather startling, but is easily verified on pages 688–9 of the record. In this tabulation, Dixon-Yates estimates the total cost of power to the AEC to be a little more than $20 million per year. For 25 years this would amount to $500 million.

For ease of calculation, let us call the cost figure of 3.990 mills per kilowatt-hour 4 mills. Four divided into $500 million is $125 million; this is 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for 25 years. One mill per kilowatt-hour for 1 year would be 25 divided into $125 million, or $5 million.

1. DIXON-YATES POWER COSTS WILL BE 34 PERCENT HIGHER THAN STATED

Dixon-Yates, the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget have deliberately misrepresented the cost of the power to be delivered by Dixon-Yates to the TVA. The claim has been made that the cost of power would be 3.990 mills per kilowatt-hour. The actual cost will be at least 5.352 mills per kilowatt-hour.

This is verified simply and easily from the set of estimates provided by Dixon-Yates on page 688 of the record of the hearings Annual Estimated Cost of Power to AEC Over Term of Contract, column 3, under plant cost of $107,250,000.

The total cost of power under the Dixon-Yates contract is made up of the fixed items under the—

Capacity charge, which amounts to	$9,052,050
Tax costs in Arkansas, which amounts to	1,455,150
And replacement costs of	551,600
For a total of	11,058,800

Of a cost per kilowatt-hour of 2.126 mills.

These amounts are payable regardless of the number of kilowatt-hours produced.

In addition, there are the amounts payable under the energy charge for fuel and variable maintenance, which are $9,688,000 per year.

Here the rate per kilowatt-hour is fixed at 1.863 mills, but the total amounts under this heading vary according to the number of kilowatt-hours produced.

In the estimates on page 688, immediately under the headline, it is stated that the estimates of Dixon-Yates are based on a production of 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year. This is a use of 98 percent of 600,000 kilowatts of capacity.

It is known to Dixon-Yates, as well as the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget, that the western Tennessee area can only use about 60 percent of the capacity of the plant, or about 3.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year.

Under the Dixon-Yates contract, however, the capacity charge, tax costs, and replacement costs always remain the same, regardless of the number of kilowatt-hours used. The only thing that varies are the two items under the energy charge (fuel and variable maintenance), which amount to 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour produced.

The fixed charges to the AEC under the Dixon-Yates contract per year are	$11,058,800
The energy charges are 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour for 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours, or	9,688,000
For a total of	20,746,800

This sum divided by 5.2 billion gives a cost of 3.990 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The energy charge for 3.2 billion kilowatt-hours would be:

3.2 billion times 1.863, or	$5,961,600
Plus fixed charges of	11,058,800
For a total of	17,020,400

This sum divided by 3.2 billion gives a cost of 5.352 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is 34 percent more than the 3.990 figure.

What can be said about this is that Dixon-Yates misrepresented the facts and that the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget did not disclose all of the pertinent factors to the Congress.

2. DIXON-YATES WILL EARN 100 PERCENT TO 200 PERCENT ON THEIR INVESTED CAPITAL INSTEAD OF 9 PERCENT AS CLAIMED

Dixon-Yates did not accurately state the facts about the profits they would make under the contract. Their claim is that they are limited to a maximum profit of $600,000 per year.

They conveniently do not draw attention to the fact that the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. may be limited to $600,000 per year in profits, but that this does not apply to the Dixon-Yates combine as a whole. Actually, the Dixon-Yates combine will make a profit of $5 million to $12 million per year in addition to the $600,000 which their wholly-owned subsidiary, the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., will make.

The AEC and the Bureau of the Budget must have known this and therefore aided and abetted in the misrepresentation of the facts to Congress and the country.

Since the western Tennessee area of TVA can only use 60 percent of the capacity of the Dixon-Yates plant, there remains 40 percent of the capacity which can be sold to their own, also wholly owned, subsidiaries at 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour. These wholly owned subsidiaries are Arkansas Power &

Light Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Louisiana Power & Light, New Orleans Public Service Corp., Alabama Power Co., and Georgia Power & Light Co.

This sale, at this rate, is specifically permitted under section 2.02 of the Dixon-Yates contract, in the last five lines of this section, and can be found on page 981 of the record of the hearings of the joint committee.

This 1.863 mills per killowatt-hour rate would permit the subsidiaries to make a profit of about 5 mills for every kilowatt-hour bought at that rate. Forty percent of the capacity of a 600,000-kilowatt plant is about 2 billion kilowatt-hours. Actually, however, the Government is paying for the construction of a 650,000 kilowatt plant, and Dixon-Yates has about 2.5 billion kilowatt-hours available for the subsidiaries at the very low rate of 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The profit is made by shutting down the generating plants of the Dixon-Yates subsidiaries, whose production costs are between 6 and 8 mills per kilowatt-hour, and using instead this cheap Government-subsidized power. This power is bought at less than half the actual cost of production—purchase price 1.863 mills—cost of production 3.990 mills.

If the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget were not aware of these facts, they are not fit to make power contracts in behalf of the Government. If they were aware of them, it raises much more serious questions.

3. THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE VON TRESCKOW PROPOSAL AND THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT IS ACTUALLY $250 MILLION

The TVA asked for 600,000 kilowatt of additional capacity. The AEC and the Bureau of the Budget worked out and signed a contract with Dixon-Yates for 600,000 kilowatts of firm power. The TVA did not need, nor did it ask for or want, 600,000 kilowatts of firm capacity. They already have enough generators in the system so that, in case one broke down, they themselves could replace the temporary loss of power due to any breakdown, instead of purchasing this service from Dixon-Yates. TVA can, with its present equipment, "firm up" the 600,000 of capacity they asked for.

This change, on part of the administration, will cost the AEC a minimum of $125 million more than is necessary to pay for power. Under the von Tresckow proposal to supply 600,000 kilowatts of added capacity, the cost of power would be a minimum of $125 million less than under the Dixon-Yates contract. (See the attached cost comparisons.)

In the past these savings have been estimated to be much smaller; however, now that the complete Dixon-Yates figures are available, the savings under the von Tresckow proposal can be determined quite accurately.

The AEC and the Bureau of the Budget have advocated as the best and cheapest the Dixon-Yates contract, which will cost $125 million more. Furthermore, as the western Tennessee area of TVA can only use 60 percent of the capacity of the Dixon-Yates plant, the balance of 40 percent, not needed by TVA, will be sold by Dixon-Yates to their other subsidiaries at a rate which will result in a minimum of $125 million in profits in these subsidiaries This giveaway is startling and unbelievable.

In view of these huge benefits to Dixon-Yates, it is not surprising that the Senate Antimonopoly Committee, in its investigation of the Dixon-Yates contract, comes to the conclusion that: "* * * the testimony before this committee shows that every obstacle within and without the Government was placed in the way of the von Tresckow group and it was finally brushed off unceremoniously * * *." Dixon-Yates and their adherents were fighting for $250 million.

Under the Von Tresckow proposal all excess power profits would be retained by the Government.

So the real difference between the two proposals is a minimum of $250 million.

This huge sum, which Dixon-Yates will receive over a period of years, will be paid for by not only the consumers of electricity in the TVA area, but by taxpayers all over the United States.

What is happening here is that the favored friends of the administration, Dixon-Yates, are being subsidized to the tune of over $200 million under the guise of a power contract, which is not even required any more because Memphis will build its own plant.

4. DIXON-YATES WILL MAKE A HUGE PROFIT EVEN THOUGH NOT ONE KILOWATT-HOUR OF ELECTRICITY IS DELIVERED TO THE AEC OR TVA

The Dixon-Yates plant is specifically designed to meet the needs of the western Tennessee area of the TVA system.

Memphis has decided that it will build its own generating station, if the Dixon-Yates plant is built.

Therefore, the need for the Dixon-Yates plant will not exist and the market for the power to be produced has vanished.

Under these circumstances the Government (AEC) will pay for the cost of the plant and pay Dixon-Yates a guaranteed profit, even though Dixon-Yates does not produce a single kilowatt-hour of electricity for the Government. Dixon-Yates can sell all the power—5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year—to its subsidiaries at 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour. This would mean a profit of $26 million per year to Dixon-Yates, or $650 million for the minimum contract period of 25 years.

Specifically, in the contract, the Government has agreed to pay Dixon-Yates $11,058,000 per year, regardless of whether Dixon-Yates ever furnishes a single kilowatt-hour of electricity to the Government.

The items involved are:

1. A capacity charge of	$9,052,050
2. Tax costs of	1,455,150
3. Replacement costs of	551,600
Total	11,058,800

This can be verified simply and easily, without any technical assistance whatsoever, by looking at the record of the hearings of the joint committee, page 688, "Annual estimated cost of power to AEC over term of contract," column 3, under plant cost of $107,250,000. These figures were furnished by Dixon-Yates.

The payment of these items is covered in the contract as follows:

Capacity charge, section 4.01, page 984.

Tax costs, section 5.08, page 986, paragraph 1.

Replacement costs, section 4.11, page 988, first 6 lines.

Due to the carefully planned lack of information publicly available before the contract was signed, none of the above facts were brought to the attention of Congress and the country as a whole.

Now that the facts are available, it is the belief of our group that the best interests of the country would be served if the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy gave the whole matter a thorough airing.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER VON TRESCKOW.

WHY CAN THE CITY OF MEMPHIS AND THE WESTERN TENNESSEE AREA ONLY USE 60 PERCENT OF THE CAPACITY OF THE DIXON-YATES OR ANY OTHER GENERATING STATION?

If a generating station of 600,000-kilowatt capacity is used at its full capacity, day and night and every hour of the year, there would be 100-percent use. This is the way the AEC uses a powerplant. They are working 3 shifts—24 hours a day—to produce fissionable material for the defense of the country.

That, however, is not the normal demand on a powerplant in any community. The whole 600,000 kilowatts, or 100 percent of the capacity of the plant, would only be used during the hour from 5 to 6 in the afternoon. At that time lights go on in the factories, offices, stores, homes, and on the streets, traffic is at its evening peak, radios and television sets are turned on, and things are cooking on the stove. It is the peak hour of electricity use.

A generating station has to be large enough to be able to supply the peak demand, even though only 80 percent of its total capacity is used during the remainder of the daylight hours and perhaps only 30 percent of its capacity is used from 12 midnight to 6 a. m.

Therefore, the station has to have a capacity of 600,000 kilowatts to meet the peak demand, even though that is needed for but 1 hour during the day, and the average use for the 24-hour period is but 60 percent of its total capacity. This is the normal condition all over the country.

Comparison of Dixon-Yates and Von Tresckow proposals

[Basis for figures: Dixon-Yates estimate of their costs, p. 688, Report of Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy Hearings, Nov. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1954]

[Figures in thousands]

	98 percent load factor, 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year		75 percent load factor, 3,942 million kilowatt-hours per year		67 percent load factor, 3,169 million kilowatt-hours per year	
	Dixon-Yates	Von Tresckow	Dixon-Yates	Von Tresckow	Dixon-Yates	Von Tresckow
1. Capital requirements	$107,250	$90,000				
2. Capacity charges:						
3. Interest and amortization	5,532	4,893				
4. Return on equity	495					
5. Operating labor	700	700				
6. Fixed maintenance and miscellaneous	600	600				
7. No load fuel	800					
8. Insurance	176	150				
9. Power department expense	20	20				
10. Transmission operation and maintenance	40					
11. Replacement of facilities of associated companies	2.8					
12. Administrative and general	150	250				
13. Federal income taxes	536					
14. Total capacity charges	9,052	6,613	$9,052	$6,613	$9,052	$6,613
15. Mills per kilowatt-hour	1.741	1.272	1.741	1.272	1.741	1.272
16. Energy charges:						
17. Variable maintenance	$780	$780	$591	$591	$475	$475
18. Fuel cost, 19 cents	8,908		6,754		5,429	

Comparison of Dixon-Yates and Von Tresckow proposals—Continued

[Basis for figures: Dixon-Yates estimate of their costs, p. 688, Report of Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy Hearings, Nov. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1954]

[Figures in thousands]

	98 percent load factor, 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year		75 percent load factor, 3,942 million kilowatt-hours per year		67 percent load factor, 3,169 million kilowatt-hours per year	
	Dixon-Yates	Von Tresckow	Dixon-Yates	Von Tresckow	Dixon-Yates	Von Tresckow
Energy charges—Continued						
19. Fuel cost, 18.4 cents		$8,627		$6,540		$5,257
20. Total energy charge	$9,688	9,407	$7,345	7,131	$5,904	5,732
21. Mills per kilowatt-hour	1.863	1.81	1.863	1.81		
22. Tax costs:						
23. Total State, local and State income	$1,455	$150	$1,455	$150	$1,455	$150
24. Mills per kilowatt-hour	0.279	0.028	0.279	0.028		
25. Replacements, total	$551	$262	$551	$262	$551	$262
26. Mills per kilowatt-hour	0.106	0.050				
27. Total payments	$20,747	$16,432	$18,403	$14,156	$16,962	$12,757
28. Mills per kilowatt-hour	3.999	3.16	4.67	3.59	5.35	4.025
29. Mississippi crossing:						
30. Capital cost, $6,500,000						
31. Operating cost total (Bureau of Budget estimate)	$832		$832		$832	
32. Total cost	$21,579	$16,432	$19,235	$14,156	$17,794	$12,757
33. Mills per kilowatt-hour	4.15	3.16	4.88	3.59	5.62	4.025
34. Von Tresckow profit		$133		$133		$133
35. Total Von Tresckow costs		$16,565		$14,289		$12,880
36. Mills per kilowatt-hour		3.185		3,624		4.06
37. Difference in favor of Von Tresckow proposal		$5,014		$4,946		$4,914
38. Mills per kilowatt-hour		0.964		1.254		1.55

[1] Actual experience shows that these figures are practical and realistic.

[4] There are no Federal income taxes under Von Tresckow plan because there are no profits.

[5] This item would come out of depreciation funds in private utility operation.

[6] At this point, under Von Tresckow plan, plant has been depreciated 100 percent; all debt has been repaid; this eliminates all depreciation and interest charges.

Total cost of power

	Von Tresckow plan	Private utility	Private utility costs more by—
	Millions	*Millions*	*Percent*
30 years	$456	$787	73
35 years	505	918	82
40 years	553	1,050	90

Comparison between Dixon-Yates and Von Tresckow proposals in terms of the total amount to be paid by U. S. Government for power

[Figures in millions]

	Total cost of power in—	Von Tresckow proposal	Dixon-Yates contract	Dixon-Yates increase
				Percent
98 percent load factor, 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours purchased annually.	25 years	$414	$539	30
	30 years	497	647	30
	35 years	555	755	36
	40 years	614	863	41
	45 years	672	971	44
75 percent load factor, 3,942 million kilowatt-hours purchased annually.	25 years	357	481	35
	30 years	429	577	35
	35 years	476	673	41
	40 years	523	769	47
	45 years	570	866	52
67 percent load factor, 3,169 million kilowatt-hours purchased annually.	25 years	322	445	38
	30 years	386	534	38
	35 years	426	623	46
	40 years	466	712	53
	45 years	506	801	58

Comparison of power costs under the Von Tresckow plan as against normal private utility company operation

Plant capacity (kilowatts)	600,000
Cost	$100,000,000
Cost per kilowatt	$166
Load factor (percent)	75
Annual output (billion kilowatt hours)	3.9
Write off (years)	30

Source of figures: Data developed by Von Tresckow group and Dixon-Yates for plant in Memphis, Tenn., area which has been published in CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

[Figures in thousands]

	Von Tresckow plan	Private utility
Operating expenses:		
Fuel (3.9 billion kilowatt-hour, 19 cents fuel, 9,017 B. t. u. per kilowatt-hour)	$6,754	$6,754
Operating labor	700	700
Maintenance and miscellaneous	600	600
Variable maintenance and miscellaneous supplies	720	720
Power department expense	20	20
Administrative and general	[1] 250	150
Depreciation	[2] 3,333	3,333

[Figures in thousands]

	Von Tresckow plan	Private utility
Operating expenses—Continued		
Taxes (other than Federal income)	[3] $150	$1,300
Taxes, Federal income	(4)	6,500
Insurance	165	165
Replacements and renewals	262	(5)
Total operating expenses	12,954	20,242
Interest:		
3¼ percent on $50 million		
3½ percent ($100 million, 30 years, level debt service)	2,104	
Total, operating expense and interest	15,058	20,242
Profit:		
6 percent on invested capital of $100 million		6,000
Limited to (paid as fee)	133	
Total cost of production	15,191	26,242
Cost per kilowatt-hour (3.9 billion) in mills	3.90	6.73
Total cost of production after 30th year	[6] $0,754	$26,242
Cost in mills	2.50	6.73

[1] We estimate these costs to be $100,000 more per year under our plan.

[2] Under Von Tresckow plan, depreciation must be used to retire debt.

Pennsylvania Electric Co.

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the 38th annual report of the Pennsylvania Electric Co. in my district, a report which I consider worth your time to read. Here is a company that in the past 10 years has spent $188 million in expansion programs. They recognized the needs for increased power requirements in the area in which they are located, and they immediately proceeded to develop a program to produce it. They didn't come to the government to ask that it subsidize their program; they did not request to be exempt from taxes; they raised their own money to finance and to carry out their expansion program to meet increased demands.

One significant matter I wish to call to your attention is that this company's operating revenue increase 1.9 percent in 1953—to $56,219,000; while at the same time the company's total tax bill went up 8.8 percent—to $12,485,000 in 1954, which was higher than the 1953 taxes by $1,010,000. Taxes for the company in 1954 took 22 cents of every dollar received by the company. Net income was $11,012,518, or 11.8 percent less than the tax bill.

So one can readily recognize why Pennsylvania is losing its industries—a State where companies such as the Pennsylvania Electric Co. have to compete with the Tennessee Valley's federally subsidized, tax-exempt, steam powerplants, having also the additional advantages of the low-paid labor and advantageous freight rates. It is not difficult to see why, in this highly competitive situation, that an industry will prefer to go to the TVA to locate rather than in Pennsylvania. Certainly I say to the Members of the House, we must be fair and equitable to all sections of the country. Why one section of the country should be subsidized with steam powerplants which are tax exempt, in competition with the rest of the Nation, is beyond my powers of comprehension. How the TVA ever got away with this program at the expense of every American taxpayer I am unable to say. For

the past number of years I have been calling to the attention of the House this situation that has given the Tennessee Valley advantages over the other parts of the Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to compliment the administration for the very firm and determined stand that it has taken regarding further subsidization of steam powerplants in the Tennessee Valley. The TVA has now grown into a lusty giant from an infant child of 20 years ago. It is about time it stands on its own feet and not be given preferred consideration over any other competing utility company.

All we have been doing in my State, Pennsylvania, has been paying the money in taxes into the Federal Government to have it siphoned off into projects such as the TVA. Or in other words, we are sharpening the razor that cuts our economic and industrial throats.

If they want to build steam powerplants in the Tennessee Valley, let them build steam powerplants in the same manner in which we build them in Pennsylvania. Certainly we have no objection to their financing and developing their own steam power projects to meet their industrial requirements, provided they use their own money the same as any other section of the country. If they need steam powerplants in the Tennessee Valley, let them go out and raise their own finances and build them, and discontinue asking the American taxpayer to put the cash on the barrelhead to build steam powerplants, federally subsidized, tax exempt, in the Tennessee Valley.

The TVA started as a flood-control project. When they found that in the summertime that they did not have sufficient water to generate the power necessary, they had to supplement water power with steam power. So they conceived the idea to let the Government build them—and a generous Government certainly has made a great contribution in this respect. Also being tax exempt, they could produce cheap power, which naturally attracted industry to the valley.

One would think, after the generosity of the American taxpayer over a period of years, that they would be content, but no, they are not. New ideas are being developed—new programs to involve the Government in their financing plans.

We have coal in Pennsylvania, and we have just as much right as the TVA to ask the Government to subsidize steam-power plants, tax exempt, adjacent to a coal mine where we could feed the coal into the boilers and produce cheap power. This arrangement would not only be helpful to Pennsylvania's coal industry and its thousands of unemployed coal miners, but at the same time, cheap power would attract industries to our State the same as it does down in the Tennessee Valley.

This report of the Pennsylvania Electric Co., of Pennsylvania, is worth your reading. It will give you an idea of how other companies have to compete with the TVA to stay in business.

PENELEC SPENDS $16 MILLION IN IMPROVEMENTS—GREATER RESIDENTIAL USE OF ELECTRICITY IS REFLECTED IN REPORT

The 36th annual report of Pennsylvania Electric Co., released today, indicates that 1954 was a record sales year for the utility.

Signed by President O. Titus, the report also carriers the prediction that the company's 340,000 customers in 24 counties of western and south-central Pennsylvania will use even more electricity in 1955.

Penelec customers used 2,495,195,000 kilowatt-hours in 1954, an increase of 29,470,000 over the previous year's 2,465,725,000 kilowatt-hours. The number of customers Penelec serves increased by 3,950 during 1954.

To meet increasing demands for power, the utility is spending $16 million this year to improve and expand its facilities. Penelec's generating capacity was increased by nearly 50 percent last year with the completion of the 276,000-kilowatt Shawville generating station near Clearfield, built at a cost of $40 million. Because engineering studies indicate that still more capacity will be needed in the near future, construction will start this year on a 137,500-kilowatt addition to Seward generating station near Johnstown, which will be completed in 1957 at a total cost of $20,600,000. The new unit will increase Seward's capacity to 2,295,000 kilowatts and bring the company's total capacity to almost 1 million kilowatts.

SPEND $188 MILLION IN 10 YEARS

By the end of 1955, Penelec will have spent $188 million for expansion since January 1, 1946. To continue its construction program, the utility sold $12 million in first-mortgage bonds and $6,235,000 in common stock in 1954, and plans call for the sale of an additional $17,500,000 in securities this year.

The company's average residential customer used 2,331 kilowatt-hours in 1954, for which he paid $77.44. The year before, the average residential use was 2,177 kilowatt-hours. The average rate per kilowatt-hour to residential customers last year was 3.3 cents, 1 mill lower than the 1953 rate.

Greater residential use of electricity helped to offset a 9.6-percent decline in sales to industrial customers in the past year. Metals and metal products industries accounted for the largest single share of Penelec's industrial sales, taking 15.4 percent of the total. Coal mining was second at 13.8 percent and machinery industries third with 9.5 percent. An improvement in industrial sales has been noted since the end of the year.

OPERATING REVENUE INCREASES

Penelec's total operating revenue increased by 1.9 percent over 1953 to $56,219,000, while at the same time the company's total tax bill went up 8.8 percent to $12,485,000, higher than 1953 taxes by $1,010,000. Taxes in 1954 took 22 cents of every dollar received by the company. Net income was $11,012,518, or 11.8 percent less than the tax bill.

Penelec's operating expenses dropped by 10.1 percent in 1954 to $22,735,000, mainly because of operating economies resulting from the improvement of generating facilities. For 1954, the total wages and cost of welfare benefits for all employees, including those engaged in construction, amounted to $15,480,000. Of this amount, $2,852,000 represented costs of employees' benefits such as pensions, insurance, hospitalization, paid vacations, holidays, etc. The number of employees at year end, including 22 in military service, was 2,902 or 41 less than the previous year. The total of all fringe benefits in 1954 was equivalent to $1,000 for the average employee. At the end of 1954, the average Penelec employee had about 15 years of service with the company, and for each employee's job Penelec had an investment of $93,000.

FUEL BILL HIGHER

Fuel was another major expense item, although the total fuel bill decreased by 1.9 percent to $9,485,000. A total of 1,842,437 tons of coal was used last year as compared with 1,713,084 in 1953.

In addition to the Shawville project, Penelec last year completed a number of installations important in maintaining good service to its customers. Early in 1954, the last section of the company's first 230,000-volt transmission line was energized. The line extends 87 miles from Shawville station to Montebello, Pa. The line and accompanying substation at Lewistown cost $6 million. Another line, a 115,000-volt installation connecting Penelec and Northern Pennsylvania Power Co., was completed in June of last year. This 50-mile line is now supplying about 30,000 kilowatts or two-thirds of North Penn's electrical needs and will be supplying practically all of its requirements by the end of 1955. An application is pending before the Securities and Exchange Commission to merge North Penn into Penelec. Both are subsidiaries of General Public Utilities Corp.

Late in 1954, work was completed on a new northwestern division service center at Erie. The modern building, erected at a cost of $2,300,000, replaces six separate buildings formerly occupied in downtown Erie and will bring about greater operating efficiency in the division. Also, remodeling of the utility's office building in Oil City was completed last year.

SUBSTATIONS IMPROVED

Along with the Seward expansion, numerous improvements in transmission distribution and headquarters facilities are planned for this year. Transmission lines from Geistown to Hooversville, Philipsburg to Westfall, and Warren to the border of New York State are being built or improved, and major substation improvements will be started or continued in or near Johnstown, Altoona, Oil City, Erie, Corry, and Punxsutawney.

Penelec employees established the best safety record in the company's history in 1954, winning several honors for their accident prevention achievements. Employees worked a total of 6,057,288 man-hours with 16 lost-time accidents, for an accident frequency rate of 2.64 accidents per million man-hours. That was the third-best record among the 21 largest electric utilities in the Nation, and earned a certificate from the National Safety Council. The average frequency rate for the 21 companies was 5.53.

Penelec had the best safety record of all the major electric companies in the State for the year ended June 30, 1954, and won a Pennsylvania Electric Association award for that accomplishment.

Seward and Warren generating stations won General Public Utilities president's award plaques for their record of no lost-time accidents in 1954, and Seward won additional recognition for having amassed more than a million consecutive man-hours without a lost-time accident in the form of certificates from GPU an Edison Electric Institute.

The southern division, with headquarters in Johnstown, had the best record among Penelec's four divisions last year, winning the Penelec president's award plaque for the second time in 3 years.

Management changes in the past year included the appointment of F. W. Womer, vice president formerly in charge of the northwestern division, to the position of vice president in charge of division operations for the entire company. Mr. Womer was succeeded as northwestern division manager by K. H. Ishler, former northwestern division operating superintendent.

Penelec continued its participation in GPU site-service, a program to attract new in-

dustries into the area the company serves, and also continued to take part in a 33-company group known as Atomic Power Development Associates, which is studying the use of atomic fuels in generation of electricity. The latter is a long-range program, since it is not expected that atomic power will be commercially feasible for several years.

Concluding the report, President Titus says that Penelec is well equipped to supply all anticipated power needs of industry and other customers and to meet the increasing use of electricity throughout its territory. He said Penelec's expansion program assures continued good service to all customers and observed that present trends indicate that 1955 will be another good year for Penelec.

[From the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., of April 21, 1955]

NEW FINANCING PROPOSAL FOR TVA WOULD PUT SOCIALISM IN FOREFRONT

(By Walter Chamblin)

WASHINGTON.—The Tennessee Valley Authority can kick up a fuss on Capitol Hill at any time, but it appears to have outdone itself with its proposed new financing plan.

Critical Members of Congress now accuse TVA of a grandiose empire-building scheme. Charges are made that TVA now seeks to change its original purpose into an unblushing socialistic electric-power business far bigger than had generally been foreseen.

The new power-financing scheme seems likely to overshadow the Dixon-Yates controversy. Critics say that TVA plans now make President Eisenhower's reference to it as "creeping socialism" a gross understatement.

Under the new financing plan, TVA would cling to the Federal Treasury. It would continually seek Federal appropriations for the billion-dollar project.

But in addition it would have authority to issue its own bonds. Critics say there is another catch here. While the bonds would not be guaranteed by the Federal Government, they would be issued by a Government agency and the Federal Government would be said to have a moral obligation to make them good if TVA defaulted. Further, TVA wants the Treasury to be authorized to buy its bonds, presumably if there is difficulty in selling to private investors.

Still nother gimmick favors TVA. It wants authority to lease new electric steam plants. These could be built by counties, cities, or public-power districts. Thus, TVA would get the advantage of the tax exemption accorded these governmental units.

One reason for the proposed new financing plan is that Congress has been growing more reluctant to appropriate money to provide electric powerplants for TVA with taxpayers money when in most parts of the country private utilities or local governmental units provide for needed expansion of electric power.

Representative GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan contends that TVA has departed from its original purpose. It was claimed in the early thirties that TVA would be a yardstick by which the country outside its area could decide whether or not electric utility rates were too high.

But TVA, he pointed out, has now become a billion-dollar utility empire, which is a far cry from a yardstick project. It has also declined to put itself on a tax basis identical with that of public utilities and thus the yardstick is again abandoned. And one of the early acts of TVA was to force private utilities out of business in its area so that there could be no yardstick competition.

Originally, TVA was authorized as a navigation and flood-control project, with hydro-electric power being produced and sold. However, the navigation and flood-control program was finished long ago, and TVA has tended to become more and more a Government power-producing project.

In 1938, hydro-electric power produced 85.5 percent of the total power output. But within a few months from now hydro-electric power will be but 33.5 percent, with 66.5 percent produced by steam plants.

TVA critics say that if the new financing plan goes into effect, there will be no limit on TVA expansion and that eventually at least 90 percent of its power would be produced by steam.

Federal taxpayers have spent more than a billion dollars on it, but TVA wants to continue to expand at the rate of $150 million a year.

The Farm Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a notable editorial by Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association and one of the outstanding agricultural leaders of the Nation.

The editorial appears in the May issue of the Missouri Farmer and is particularly pertinent at a time when the income of Missouri farmers has dropped to the lowest point in many years, and the Committee on Agriculture, of the House, under the leadership of Chairman COOLEY and the ranking minority member, former Chairman HOPE, are supporting a bill just reported out by the committee for the alleviation of this pressing situation.

The editorial follows:

MUST HALT FARM DEPRESSION

(By Fred V. Heinkel, president, the Missouri Farmers Association)

The terrible farm depression seems to grow worse every day. In the 3½ months that the new Congress has been in session nothing has been done about it, and there is little prospect of anything being done.

The parity ratio for March hit a 15-year low of 86 percent. The index of prices paid by farmers for living and operating expenses was fractionally higher than both a month and a year ago. Since 1951 farm prices have declined 25 percent, and farmers have lost millions in the decline of inventory values.

Officials in USDA now predict that 100,000 farm families, most of them young people just getting started, will lose their farms this year. They will be uprooted from the land and forced into urban areas where conditions are strange. Handicapped through lack of skill and training in the trades, they will be compelled to try to take city workers' jobs away from them, or else join the growing ranks of the unemployed.

We learn from Washington that USDA officials are worried about the farm situation, and well they might be, because it is frightening.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS NOT THE ANSWER

They are beginning to see that the flexible farm plan is not going to work. Lower flexed support prices were supposed to curtail farm production and bring supply into line with consumer demand. They were also supposed to cause prices to consumers to become lower, and thereby increase consumption.

But, to the consternation of USDA officials, farmers indicate that they intend to plant 3.2 million acres more in crops this year than last. Milk production has steadily increased since Secretary Benson, on April 1 a year ago, reduced prices from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. Production of practically every other farm product has increased. Weather and insects have been the only influences to have any deterring effect whatsoever on the volume of good things to eat and wear.

USDA officials shared the belief of many economists that a high level of business activity would keep farm prices up, and that so long as business in general remained good farmers need not worry.

This belief is not substantiated by the record. In a recent article in Successful Farming, Jim Roe had this to say about it: "In 1947, the gross national product in this country was $232 billion. Farmers' net income was $16.7 billion. In 1953, the gross national product had climbed $132 billion to $364 billion. But farmers' net had dropped over $4 billion to $12.5 billion. Thus, while the general level of prosperity went up 57 percent, farmers' dropped 25 percent."

But farmers are well aware of this simple fact, without having statistics quoted to them. All they have to do is read the daily newspapers to see that business in general is prosperous; then feel their own pocketbooks, look at their own books, or ask their bankers for a loan to realize the financial status of farmers.

PREDICTED FAILURE OF FLEXIBLE PRICE PLAN

In my statement on the farm question, before the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, in March a year ago, I predicted that the flexible price plan would not bring about the results Mr. Benson and his friends claimed it would. We have never seen proof that this theory would work, but we did see a good example of its failure during the depression years of the 1930's, when farmers greatly increased production in the face of ruinous prices.

As prices go down, if farmers are to hang on to their farms, they have no choice but to produce more. The volume of production must be proportionately greater in order for total income to be sufficient to pay fixed costs and to maintain the living standards of their families.

Although officially denied by Secretary Benson, it has been the thinking among his friends and people in his Department that the best way to curtail our so-called farm surpluses is to get rid of some 2 million farm families.

In fact, this very topic was discussed last year by the President's Advisory Committee on agricultural matters. The Advisory Committee applied the term "marginal farmers" to operators of family size farms, and said that they live mostly in the Ozarks and the Appalachian regions. It is these marginal farmers, the committee contended, who produce the surpluses. Theoretically, the troublesome farm problem would be solved by forcing these farmers off the land and into the cities, thereby reducing production proportionately.

CONTROL THROUGH BANKRUPTCY

We are struck with the cruelty of thinking which might well be termed crop control through bankruptcy. The conception by some people that our small farmers constitute merely a seven-digit figure on an economist's work sheet is completely at variance with the Christian and American belief in the worth and dignity of each human individual.

This thinking is as fallacious as it is cruel and un-American. In the first place, the surpluses are not being produced by the small farmers. They are produced by the big, so-called efficient farmers. Furthermore, curtailment of production would be only temporary. The land from which the small farmers were up-rooted would grad-

ually be taken over by large factory-like farms. Prices might rise some during the period of adjustment while production was being reduced. But then the big farms would rapidly increase production again.

And while that plan is proving itself a failure, what is happening to the hundreds of thousands of persons who are forced from their small farms? Their prospects are not pleasant to contemplate.

Neither is it pleasant to imagine what America would be like if the great farm population, which has traditionally been a strong anchor for democracy, should in time be reduced to few in numbers and in the place of farm life as we have always known it, were substituted factory-like farms, owned by wealthy residents of big cities, whose sole interest in the land is the profits they can make from it.

DON'T THEY KNOW WHAT TO DO?

If USDA officials are worried about the deepening depression in agriculture and the probable political and social consequences of the policies they have been advocating, they show no evidence of doing anything about it. The truth probably is that they don't know what to do.

There are men in the Congress (both Republicans and Democrats) who understand the farm problem and who know how it should be solved. But they have been hampered by Mr. Benson, who is upheld by President Eisenhower.

The hour is getting late. Next year several hundred thousand more farm families will follow the 100,000 who are leaving the land this year. Meantime, all the businesses and workers in our towns and cities are losing the benefits that could be had from rural purchasing power if the farm problem were solved.

Congress and the administration had better face this blight upon the economy squarely and take action this year. Farmers cannot hold on and keep solvent for long under circumstances so adverse to their welfare as those existing at present.

Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in behalf of the postal workers of the United States for the benefit of whom the legislation we are considering has been introduced.

It is my firm conviction that a postal pay increase is long overdue. As the cost of living has gone up, salaries of postal workers have remained comparatively static. The net effect has been that as the standard of living of other work groups has been raised, that of the employees of the Post Office Department has dropped to a level not in keeping with the American way of life. Indeed, many families of postal workers in my district would find it impossible to subsist were it not for the fact that the wives in the households are working, too. In many cases postal employees hold outside jobs, in addition to their regular full-time postal duties, in order to maintain a living family wage. Such conditions are a breeding ground for disharmony in the home as well as for juvenile delinquency. Surely, we have a duty to do our utmost to alleviate this situation, and it lies within our power to do it.

I am sorry that the bill reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not contain provisions for a 10-percent salary increase. However, I feel that an equitable and satisfactory adjustment between the Senate bill and this bill will come out of committee. Having waited so many years for a pay raise, the postal workers must not be disappointed again.

Let me call to mind here and now that the postal employees serve us, one and all. We help ourselves when we help them. We are assuring ourselves of more efficient mail service by making every effort to see that this legislation becomes law.

Seventh Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the thoughtful attention of Members and citizens, the address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House, delivered last night at the second national dinner of the American-Israel Society at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D. C.

The occasion was held on the eve of Israel Independence Day and marked the observance of the seventh anniversary of Israel's independence, which falls on this date, April 27. Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, president of the American-Israel Society, was master of ceremonies and introduced Speaker MARTIN.

His address bespeaks the friendly interest of Americans in the State of Israel and its people. He spoke as follows:

Governor McKeldin, Mr. Ambassador, Dean Pike, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to appear before you tonight, for this is an unusually important occasion, the eve of the seventh anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

Four years ago, on July 19, 1951, I appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in support of my bill, H. R. 3483, to provide a grant of $150 million to the State of Israel.

You will bear with me, I know, if I recall part of what I said to the committee at that time:

"The devotion of the people of Israel to liberty is one of the bright spots in the Old World today. We have seen how the gallant young people of that country bravely fought through a war of independence, a struggle which stirred the American people, for it recalled the epic chapters of our own history."

At that time, I also said:

"The Israelis have not relaxed their vigilance. They live in a tense and troubled area; they know that they are on the frontier of danger. They are prepared for any eventuality. The young army of Israel, with more than 200,000 men and women, is one of the strongest forces for the survival of freedom in the Near East."

In concluding my statement before the House committee, I said:

"The expanding industrial plant in Israel, steadily growing in quantity and diversity of output, can make that country the industrial workshop of the Near East. By word and by deed, the young State of Israel has demonstrated its willingness to stand firmly and resolutely against the forces of tyranny and despotism. It can be an outpost of American strength and influence in the Middle East. There is no doubt in my mind that to help Israel is to make America more secure."

Nothing has happened since then to alter my estimate of the importance of the State of Israel to the United States of America and to the entire free world. On the contrary, much that has taken place since has not only confirmed my conviction but deepened it.

The development of the agriculture and the industry of Israel has exceeded my fondest expectations. The devotion of the people of Israel to democratic institutions and to the protections of the rights of her citizens without regard to race, color, or creed has been steadfast.

But what seems to me to be equally remarkable is that the people of Israel, pressed on every side by economic stress and constant dangers, have found time and energy to evolve a flourishing and, in some respects, an original culture.

It is true that Israel has the resources of an ancient Hebrew tradition and is the inheritor of the experience of the Jews in more than threescore countries.

Yet it is well-nigh amazing that, in the midst of irrigating the desert, draining the swamps, building new cities, and establishing factories, the Israelis still have a flood of energy to release in a surge of painting, sculpture, music, literature, drama, and all the sciences, including archeology, the science that gives us insight into our own origins.

Many of you may have attended the Land of the Bible exhibition when it came to the Smithsonian Institution not long ago here in Washington, and I know you were as thrilled as I was by the many reminders of the sources of our religions.

The Israel Symphony Orchestra has visited Washington and toured the major cities of our country. It has been acclaimed widely by our critics. Soon Americans will have an opportunity to see the Inbal dancers. Not long ago an exhibit of paintings by Israeli artists was shown in leading museums of art across our country. At least one Israeli play has been produced in English on Broadway.

Unfortunately, not all Americans can read Hebrew or, as I believe it is now called in Israel, Ivreet. For that reason, I cannot speak with personal knowledge of the literature of Israel. Yet, when I visited the bookshops of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa 3 years ago, the shelves were full. Hundreds of American classics, translated into Hebrew, were there—books by Walt Whitman, James Melville, Mark Twain, and many others. Lately, I am told, a Hebrew edition of the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin has been having a lively sale.

Soon, I predict, translation of original works by Israeli authors into English will become a commonplace. I believe the little State of Israel has so much to say that its mark will be as great in modern as it was in ancient times.

It is admiration for this creative spirit of the people of Israel that has brought us together—Americans of all faiths—to dine on the eve of Israel's Independence Day. As an American, I am proud to pay my tribute.

It is one of the privileges of being an American. In fact, encouragement of other peoples and nations with similar ideals and aspirations is the highest expression of loyalty to ourselves.

The people of Israel, in the first 7 years of the existence of their state, have set an example of industry, energy, devotion to the principles of genuine democracy, and creative effort from which any nation in the world could take inspiration.

True, there have been many incidents of stress and strain. However, I have learned over a lifetime in public affairs that one should not judge a man or a nation by what is exceptional, nor what happens under abnormal conditions.

The abnormal condition that makes the achievements of the people of Israel almost unbelievable is absence of peace in the Middle East. This state of uneasy armistice is a heavy burden. It is damaging not only to Israel but to the surrounding Arab States.

The Middle East is one of the most underdeveloped areas in the world, but it has enormous resources as a region. These resources, without genuine peace, can be developed only in a patchwork fashion. With peace, they can be developed on a wide scale.

Arid acres can be blessed with the fertilizing gift of water—water now runnig to waste in flash floods or evaporating on salt-hard ground. The ribs of mountains can be fleshed with forests as in the old days. Empty lands can provide livelihood and homes for the hungry and the destitute. The Middle East has been the place of miracles. It can be so again.

This may sound like a dream, but it is a dream based on the solid, hard-eyed estimates of engineers, geologists, and agronomists. It is a dream that has been realized to an unexpected extent already in Israel. It is a dream that can become reality throughout the whole region.

Israel is showing the way. This young nation has demonstrated its capacity to survive. It has had help from individual American citizens and from the Government of the United States. The promise that we would help to establish the Jewish State was made by a Republican Congress; and the fulfillment of that promise, in a Democrat Congress, was supported by our party at every crucial moment over the years.

If ever the Congress of the United States truly reflected the wish of the American people, it has done so in keeping its pledge to the people of Israel. The people of the United States have had the satisfaction of playing a large part in bringing comfort and peace to those once living in the displaced persons camps of Europe—in bringing them to our shores. The people of Israel, with utter selflessness, have kept open their doors for all who knocked upon them. No greater act of sacrifice and love has ever been recorded in the history of the world.

The expressions of the creative spirit that we honor here tonight have come not only from the pioneers but also from the new immigrants from the oriental lands. Just as the United States has built its own culture from the resources of many lands, so it is in Israel. The result is good. Israelis have a right to be proud. We should be thankful for the opportunity we have had to help.

Israel has proved itself. In its reception of the stateless, it has put the world in its debt. In its initiative and determination, it has shown that it has the ability to be not only a stable entity but a nation which has much to give to the society of free nations.

Seven short years after the establishment of the State of Israel, it is hard to recall the dark events before its birth and the misery to which it gave relief. What American would tolerate a return to that darkness?

One thing is certain: The State of Israel has proved its permanence and its value. I can tell you that the overwhelming majority of the Congress of the United States, in my opinion, is determined to see to it that the people of Israel shall have the opportunity to build their homes and evolve their culture in peace and safety.

In saying this, I do not mean that I have conducted any poll to ascertain sentiment. But I have been in Washington long enough to sense the sentiments of my colleagues at the Capitol. The support of the ideals that gave birth to the State of Israel by the people of the United States is rooted in our history.

Now, as much and perhaps more than at any other time, Israel should be a concern of all Americans. On other occasions before and since the statement I made before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have stressed the value to the United States of having in the Middle East a vigorous, genuine democracy linked by spiritual heritage to us and to the freedoms for which we stand.

This struggle to maintain a free world is not an easy one. Great forces seek to destroy freedom and progress. In this struggle, we must all work together for a common cause. And it is gratifying to know that in this fight, Israel and the United States will be on the side of freedom.

Within the last few days, Communist threats have been made against Israel, voiced by those who have been holding American airmen in illegal imprisonment. These are threats of further restriction or even dismemberment of Israel's territories. It is clear that the Communist menace is worldwide. They would destroy the free countries one by one.

Israel faces the same threat as we do. We shall not yield in the face of this threat and neither will Israel. We have the same common foe, and we will be united in our defense against world communism.

Peace is the great need of the hour. Peace that will permit nations to consolidate economic gains and achieve greater spiritual and material blessings for all. Peace and a better understanding among the different peoples of the world will banish the black clouds of doubt and fear, and usher in a golden era of progress.

We, in the United States, have no malice toward any people. We wish all, in their own way, to have the kind of life they desire. At the moment, we are spending billions upon billions for peace. We know that only the strong can be free, and only the free can be strong. And it is only a strong free world that can preserve the freedoms gained through hundreds of years of sacrifice.

Here tonight, I emphasize the common tradition of the United States and Israel again. Material strength is vitally important in preventing the spread of Communist aggression. Also important is spiritual strength. It is upon mutual understanding of ways of living, upon mutual standards, upon mutual modes of thought, upon mutual aspirations, that mutual good faith must rest.

That good faith exists between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Israel. I congratulate Governor McKeldin, the founders, sponsors, and members of the American-Israel Society upon their efforts to deepen and strengthen it, here and in Israel.

Mayor Wagner and the Jewish Tercentenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, April 21, 1955, I had the very great pleasure of joining in a celebration honoring Rabbi David de Sola Poole on his 70th birthday and commemorating the establishment, 300 years ago, of his congregation, Shearith Israel, as the first Jewish congregation in America. Robert F. Wagner, the inspired and dedicated mayor of New York City, made some brief remarks there. Mr. Speaker, I wish that you and all my colleagues here could have heard Mayor Wagner speak. He simply and directly and with heartfelt and moving conviction told the American story.

In discussing the immigration of those first 23 Jewish refugees and Peter Stuyvesant's attitude toward them and other minority groups, the mayor made a very timely and telling point when he said:

History has passed severe judgment on Peter Stuyvesant. Actually, of course, he fell into the common error of officials since time began; he interpreted his mandate too severely. Responsible administration calls not merely for the enforcement of law; it requires intelligent and judicious application of human principles.

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I include here the full text of Mayor Wagner's masterful speech:

Mr. Chairman, Rabbi Poole, distinguished guests, and fellow citizens, as mayor of the city of New York, it is my pleasure to bring you formal greetings on this happy occasion when you are celebrating the 300th anniversary of the founding of the first Jewish settlement in the United States and, at the same time, of the establishment of congregation Shearith Israel on the shores of Manhattan Island.

As a private citizen, it is a privilege to break bread with you at such a time of joy. As a fellow American who is a member of another faith than yours, I find it heartwarming to be able to congratulate you on having remained steadfast in your own faith and in continuing to revere and worship the God of your fathers, and in following the ethical precepts of your great teachers. Where else but in the United States of America, a Nation predominantly Protestant, could a mayor, whose personal faith is Catholic, extend, officially and as a good neighbor, the hand of fellowship to the leaders of the Jewish community, and do it with a free heart and a mind clear of every feeling except admiration and good will?

There is another and, to me, most appealing reason why I consider it a privilege to be with you this evening. For this is also the occasion when you are honoring Rabbi David de Sola Poole on the attainment of his 70th birthday. For 48 years, Rabbi David de Sola Poole has been the rabbi of Congregation Shearith Israel, the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue of New York. For these nearly five decades, he has not merely been one of the outstanding spiritual leaders of the American Jewish community but his dignity, his quiet wisdom, and his profound scholarship have helped to enrich all of us who dwell in this vast community.

The city of New York is, of course, one of the most astonishing material creations that the hands of man have fashioned on this planet. But it would be a dull wilderness of steel and stone were it not for the humanity, and the attention to human problems that it increasingly pays. Nor could it be so vital and exciting were it not for the spiritual forces that constantly stimulate that humanity. To these spiritual forces, the man we honor tonight has contributed earnestly and devotedly. He has not merely been a leader in Jewish welfare affairs and a worker in war relief and reconstruction work in Israel as long ago as the time of the Balfour Declaration; he has also been a valued adviser in national youth

problems and a national director of USO. The honors that have come to him have been his due, and he has accepted them humbly.

While we in New York join in these felicitations, we recognize that his contribution has been indeed to humanity at large.

I confess that the American Jewish Tercentenary celebration has stimulated me personally to look back at the history of that earliest of New York known then as New Amsterdam. You are, no doubt, familiar with the facts. When that first band of 23 Jewish refugees landed at Fort Amsterdam in September of 1654, they were not entirely welcome. There was no immigration legislation in those days—happily for them, perhaps. There is no record that the Dutch burghers were unfriendly; far from that. It seems that the deacons of the Dutch Reformed Church extended alms to those newcomers to enable them to endure that first hard winter.

The greatest obstacle was the Director-General of New Netherlands, His Excellency Peter Stuyvesant himself. It was he, a narrow though God-fearing man, who wished the newcomers to leave at once. It is of record, however, that when this Jewish band petitioned the Dutch West India Company, Stuyvesant was instructed that the Jewish people might reside in and trade in New Netherland. That instruction was dated April 26, 1655—just 300 years ago.

History has passed severe judgment on Peter Stuyvesant. Actually, of course, he fell into the common error of officials since time began: he interpreted his mandate too severely. Responsible administration calls not merely for enforcement of law; it requires intelligent and judicious application of human principles. Peter Stuyvesant was hampered less by ill will than by personal narrowness. The Jewish people were not the only ones against whom he tried to discriminate. He did not like the English who were pressing down from New England. He feared the Swedes who were dwelling in their new Sweden on the Delaware River. He persecuted the Quakers, often in a most cruel and inhuman fashion. He would not permit the Lutherans to have a minister or a house of worship. As for Catholics—he would not have them at all.

When the English captured New Amsterdam and renamed the settlement and the colony New York, after the Duke of York, Stuyvesant went back to Holland to report to his superiors. I find it significant that he did not choose to remain there. A year or so later, he returned to these shores and lived out the rest of his life here. His remains lie buried in a vault at St. Mark's. Evidently, his own love of the community and the new land was so great that it exceeded his feelings against the English and the others among whom he would have to reside.

I do not know whether Peter Stuyvesant ever changed his mind about any of his neighbors. I would like to think so, but I doubt it. Yet even in his day, New Amsterdam had been a melting pot of the nations. In addition to the Dutch, the Swedes, the English and the Germans, there were Frenchmen and even Bohemians, and the proverbial seven languages could be heard in the public houses where seamen and travelers gathered.

There must have been something especially inviting about New York to continue to attract so many minorities; and all prospered. All had their trials, all their tribulations. In the story of the Jewish twenty-three, however, there are certain elements which I like particularly. When the Dutch West India Co. finally granted them permission to remain, they suggested that the Jewish settlers dwell in a quarter of their own, as was the custom in the Old World. That suggestion was apparently never implemented. The Jewish families resided wherever they could find homes. And no regulation was ever passed to require them to do otherwise. In short, there never was a ghetto imposed by law in the city of New York. The atmosphere was free, the people were free.

One cannot deny that, in later years, economic circumstances caused people to crowd together in certain areas, but the law itself permitted men full freedom in that respect. It remained, of course, for our times to see to it that the general welfare should be so improved that even economics should not restrain and narrow the living horizons of Americans, of whatever race, religion, or, indeed, color. We know how much remains to be done, but officially as well as privately we strive to keep the American atmosphere clear and free.

Another element in that story of the first Jewish settlers concerned the right of a free citizen to bear arms in the common defense. Stuyvesant denied Asser Levy and Jacob Barsimson and the others the right, even in times of trouble, to stand watch with the burghers. Their guilders were acceptable for the common defense fund, their services were not. Again, they were invited to leave if they did not like it. But they persisted and they remained. In time their services were accepted as freely as their guilders had been.

Their greatest victory came when they petitioned for the right to be burghers or citizens. Of course, they were rebuffed at first. But on April 20, 1657, Stuyvesant yielded and authorized the burgomasters of the city to admit the Jewish residents to the burgher right. Technically then, Asser Levy was the first Jewish man to be a citizen of what later became the city of New York.

That is the beginning of the story of the Jewish tercentenary. But, in effect, it is also an important part of the American story. It is certainly the New York story. For no metropolis is so teeming a melting pot of races, nationalities and creeds, and nowhere has it been more important that men should have the freedom to worship apart from one another in their religious devotions, while still enjoying the privileges of mingling together freely in trade, employment, and education.

Reflect what old Peter Stuyvesant might think if he could see our New York City today: Jews, Catholics, Lutherans, Quakers, and the many other great Protestant denominations, and, yes, Moslems and Buddhists, and the followers of the other great faiths of the East and the West, worshipping as they please, living privately, mingling publicly, enjoying the common American freedom to the fullest extent.

Every people that has reached these shores has made a unique contribution to the enrichment of American life. The Jewish settlers brought not only their own stamina and vitality but also those tenets of faith to which all western civilization is historically indebted to them. In these 300 years they gave even more than the lives of their young men who died in the common defense, or the incredibly vast sums that they have poured out so generously for every good cause. I say that they, at least, gave equally in merely living among us, and in remaining loyal to those spiritual truths without which man's life can have no meaning.

That is why I call it a privilege to welcome you to a new tercentenary; to hail Congregation Shearith Israel as a citadel of the spirit; to you, Rabbi David de Sola Poole, to say, "Happy Birthday!" and to wish you many more years of fruitful service to our community.

John Day Dam on the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Dalles Chronicle of April 24, 1955. This editorial concerns H. R. 5789, legislation for construction of the John Day multi-purpose dam on the Columbia River, which I introduced in the House on April 21, 1955. The writer of this editorial shows a clear and concise understanding of the legislation and a sound knowledge of the need which this bill proposes to correct, and I want to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the analysis which he has made.

The Dalles Chronicle published at The Dalles, Oreg., has for many years been one of the leading newspapers in the community in which this dam will be built, and its editorials are widely read and highly respected. The part that our American journalists have taken in the development of this country and its resources is well established and therefore it is with pride that, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A SOUND PROPOSAL

Representative SAM COON's new bill for construction of the John Day Dam is the most attractive proposal yet for Federal-partnership financing and construction of the multi-purpose Columbia River project.

The public interest in comprehensive development of the site is protected and the means are provided for early construction of the dam by the Army engineers.

A close reading of the 10-page bill reveals that the sponsor has included provisions that should prove acceptable to Congress and the people of the power-short Pacific Northwest.

Equally important, the bill goes far to meet the objections raised by those who opposed the original John Day partnership bill introduced in Congress last year.

Opponents of the original bill contended that the partners would receive the benefits from the revenue features of the dam, while the Government would bear the cost of the nonreimbursable items such as the navigation lock.

They noted that the partners would advance $164 million, or little more than half the estimated $310 million cost. The new bill raises the partnership contribution to $273 million or more. That means the Government is to receive $109 million more than under the 1954 bill.

Reports from Portland indicate that the $273 million would include 97½ percent of the cost of the fishways and most, if not all, of the nonrevenue spillway portion of the dam.

In addition, the partners would pay for operation and maintenance of the dam chargeable to power production.

All that Congress would appropriate is an estimated $37 million—12 percent of the entire project. This $37 million would finance the navigation lock and any other features considered of general public benefit.

It can be argued that the Government would be stuck with the navigation lock and flood-control features of the dam. But these

features, benefiting the entire Nation, are nearly always considered nonreimbursable. That is why the Government pays for the navigation and flood-control portion of Bonneville and other Federal dams, without expecting to have the cost repaid.

Another objection to the original partnership bill was that it represented a departure from the Army engineer plan for a comprehensive development of the Columbia River. This objection has been met by requiring the dam to be built as an Army engineer multipurpose project making maximum, comprehensive use of the dam site.

The fear that power rates from a partnership dam would be higher than present Bonneville rates has been another objection. The proposed partners, however, believe they could sell John Day power at competitive rates. Advent of natural gas in the region would do much to keep those rates competitive.

Construction of the John Day Dam without the partnership angle would be preferable. But it must be remembered that Congress is reluctant to provide funds to start new Columbia River dams. Last year the House eliminated a Senate-adopted planning fund for the John Day Dam.

Congress may this year again reject John Day planning funds unless the dam is made a partnership project. But the region still needs new power-generating capacity to meet growth and industrial expectations.

Despite this demonstrated need, however, only one major Pacific Northwest dam is to be started in the near future. It is the Priest Rapids Dam, which the Grant County Public Utilities District is to start building next year as a partnership project.

The Dalles Dam was the last major dam started in the Pacific Northwest and that was nearly 4 years ago. Since then, the only major dam to be given the green light is the Priest Rapids partnership project.

The moral appears clear—a partnership proposal is the best means of obtaining an early start on a multipurpose project needed to meet the needs of a power-short Pacific Northwest.

Sugar Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the domestic sugar producers of this country are the victims of an extremely unfair set of circumstances. Our Nation is growing by leaps and bounds and is consuming more sugar each year. And yet our domestic sugar producers are denied the right to grow and sell one single pound of this increased consumption. I have introduced a bill which will correct this situation.

Under the 1948 Sugar Act, domestic sugar producers can market no more than 2,300,000 tons in 1 year, while Cuba was given the right to market 95 percent of the amount by which the war-damaged Philippine industry would fall short of its quota while rebuilding. At the same time, Cuba continued to share with domestic areas in making up deficits. Thus Cuba has marketed some 5,250,000 extra tons of sugar in the United States, almost 30 percent more than its basic quota.

The domestic producers relinquished their own just rights to give Cuba an opportunity to reduce production. What has happened? Cuba not only did not reduce but increased production, and in 1952 it produced 8 million tons, one-third more than could be marketed anywhere in the world.

Here at home, due to improved technology and better farming methods, sugar beet tonnage yield per acre has increased 20 percent since 1948. Last year sugar beet acreage was 10 percent less than before the first Sugar Act went into effect, but production was 14 percent more. The fixed quota of 2,300,000 tons is forcing further acreage cuts of 10 to 15 percent by established growers. Hardly any other farmer will be permitted to plant sugarbeets at all, and many of the latter are war veterans on newly opened reclamation projects of the West, where sugarbeets are vitally needed in the crop rotation.

If we now increase the 1955 marketing quotas for domestic beet and mainland cane areas, as I have proposed, we do no more than to restore a just and basic right to a domestic farmer, that of sharing in the economic growth of his own country. Right now, in spite of the acreage cuts, production is exceeding marketing quotas, although the markets exist. The prime beneficiary, Cuba, has had ample opportunity to comply with the spirit of the 1948 Sugar Act by reducing production from wartime levels. In contravention of this spirit, Cuba has increased production. We now feel that the right to share in our own growth, which we temporarily relinquished, should be restored to our growers.

Passage of this bill will not be a repudiation of the historic rights of Cuba to market sugar in this country. It will only restore what has been the historic right of the American producer.

Transmission Line From Fort Randall to Grand Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON B. CHASE
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. CHASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 230,000-VOLT TRANSMISSION LINE FROM FORT RANDALL TO GRAND ISLAND

Whereas the economy of the State of Nebraska is dependent primarily on the production of foods and fiber products from its lands; and

Whereas Nebraska is blessed with the priceless asset of an abundant underground water supply in much of its area; and

Whereas the productivity of much of Nebraska has already been materially increased by means of pump irrigation; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has recently initiated a special rate for electric power used for irrigation pumping, by which large quantities of surplus power available during the summer months from the Missouri River Basin project can be put to beneficial use for irrigation and reclamation purposes; and

Whereas there will also be blocks of low-cost firm power available from the hydroelectric developments on the Missouri River; and

Whereas there is and will be definite need for such blocks of firm power as they become available for agricultural, industrial, and defense-plant purposes in Nebraska; and

Whereas to effect delivery of such low-cost power from the hydroelectric plants on the Missouri River to areas of Nebraska where it can be most effectively used requires the construction of a 230,000-volt transmission line capable of carrying some 150,000 kilowatts of power from the Fort Randall hydroelectric powerplant site to the vicinity of Grand Island, Nebr.; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has built many similar transmission lines in other States in the Missouri Basin, and being interested in all programs which further expand the economy of the State, is vitally interested in the development of additional pump irrigation, rural electrification, and industrial and agricultural development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Platte United Chambers of Commerce of Nebraska endorses and supports construction of the proposed 230,000-volt Fort Randall-Grand Island transmission line; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to give support to this line and appropriate the necessary funds for the construction and completion of this line in 1956 fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our Members of Congress requesting their support of this important project.

Resolution adopted at the regular April meeting at Superior, Nebr., on April 14, 1955.

THE SOUTH PLATTE UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,
ORAN KING, *President, Superior.*
CLETUS NELSON,
Secretary-Manager, Holdrege.

Must the Farmer Always Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appearing in the Rural New Yorker of April 16 points up the involved problems of the dairy farmer in the Empire State.

Mr. Speaker, too many people seem to believe that the dairy farmer is at the receiving end of the line. This is very far from the truth and the question is well worth asking again and again: Must the farmer always pay?

MUST THE FARMER ALWAYS PAY?

Hearings are now held in Washington to consider programs designed to handle the alleged dairy surpluses.

Briefly, the two ideas receiving the most consideration propose the establishment of boards to spend farmers' money. One contemplates a $40 million fund, contributed by farmers out of their milk checks at the rate of 4 cents a hundred pounds, to promote the sale of dairy products. It is offered by the cheese and butter manufacturers to supplement the program of the American Dairy Association. The second measure sets up a

dairy stabilization board, financed at the start by a Government subsidy of $500 million, which would buy surplus dairy products in order to guarantee a stabilized milk price to producers. The cost of operating such a stabilization program shall be paid wholly by producers.

Why it is that farmers are always supposed to pay—assuming they can pay at all—to bale someone else out of a situation for which that someone else, not they, is responsible, has always been difficult to comprehend. It is the milk dealers, not the producers, who elect to manufacture milk products, and it is the dealers who are constantly encouraging producers to supply them with as much milk as possible. Why, therefore, should producers be asked to guarantee a profit to those who divert milk from its most logical and most nutritional channels—fluid sales—into the manufacturing channels that are already overloaded because the dealers choose to overload them?

It must never be forgotten that the dairy farmer is barred from the field of milk distribution by those who want that field for themselves alone, and that therefore the farmer is in no way responsible for an oversupply of certain types of milk products. Why, then, would it not be more logical to penalize the dealers for the sins of their own making, instead of placing a further load on the shoulders of innocent parties?

Indochina Presents Problem for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the ill-fated Geneva Conference to which the United States was a party is plagued now with a situation that seems hopeless. The partition of Indochina was a sad affair. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. James E. Roper, which appeared in the Washington Star on April 18. He points out the refugee problem which involves Indochina. I am sure the American people are shocked by this problem.

The article follows:

VIETNAM REFUGEE FLOOD BECOMES UNITED STATES PROBLEM

(By James E. Roper)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The human flood of refugees fleeing from communism in North Vietnam is turning into an economic commitment and a diplomatic trap for the United States.

The United States, having helped encourage 550,000 refugees to move to South Vietnam, now faces the moral responsibility of seeing that they get settled properly, regardless of the expense in the years to come.

The United States also faces the problem of what to do about the refugees if the Reds move to take over South Vietnam. The United States can hardly abandon them to the Reds even though otherwise we might want to quit South Vietnam.

GAVE MORAL SUPPORT

The first American involvement was innocent enough. We gave our moral support to the refugee clause in the Geneva agreements of last July 21 that in theory ended the Indochina war.

The agreement which provided for sorting out of Communist and non-Communist forces stated that until May 19 any civilians residing in a district controlled by one party who wish to go and live in the zone assigned to the other party shall be permitted and helped to do so by the authorities in that district."

Under that clause, tens of thousands of North Vietnamese immediately asked to go south. The Vietnamese Government was overwhelmed. It asked the United States to help. On humanitarian grounds, we responded.

During the current fiscal year, the Foreign Operations Administration is spending $45 million for this emergency refugee program. But FOA officials concede that the hardest year for the refugees is about to begin.

About 165,000 refugees still haven't reached the areas of resettlement. Many of the 385,000 refugees who in theory are nicely taken care of probably won't be able to earn a living for a year or longer.

SEEK $35 MILLION

FOA officials here disclose they are asking that the budget for the next fiscal year include about $35 million for these refugees. One idea is to give each farmer a cash grant of 2,000 Vietnamese piastres, or nearly $60.

The proposed program also would have FOA supply hand tools, fertilizers, seeds, and fishing equipment. Another proposal is to supply credit so the refugees could buy and import from Cambodia and India water buffalos as beasts of burden.

FOA officials here suggest the United States spend up to $1,000 per village to build churches for the refugees in order to help them cling together and remain settled.

"Congress may scream at that one," an American official said, "but it's the best morale-builder we can think of. So far, the refugees have kept up their spirits because of the adventure of moving, but I don't know how long it will last."

NEED TO DIMINISH

Even after the next fiscal year the refugees probably will need economic help in diminishing amounts.

The American financial involvement, however, is infinitesimal compared to the diplomatic influence that the refugees may have.

The United States and other allied powers have made a great propaganda show of the exodus from the Communist-run north. Indeed, the spectacle must have impressed millions of Orientals who are wavering between Western democracy and communism nominally led by orientals.

Because of this spectacle, however, the United States seems morally committed not to abandon the refugees once again to Communist rule. To do so would produce another of those loss-of-face situations. It presumably would shock Orientals in direct proportion to the way they were impressed in the first place.

ONE MORE SHACKLE

The United States is not committed to fight to save Vietnam unless our allies join the struggle. But the unilateral refugee problem has the diplomats worried. It adds one more shackle to American policy in the Far East. It also raises the question of why the United States actively encouraged the exodus from the north.

On humanitarian grounds, of course, the civilized world is obligated to help fellow humans in distress. The United States, and South Viet Nam, however, have actively propagandized the peoples of North Viet Nam—not only to tell them about the choice they were entitled to make, but also to persuade them to come south.

The refugees came from an area where food is short and where they were an economic and political burden to the Red regime. Now they are an economic burden to the south, which doesn't need the extra manpower.

Some cold-blooded diplomats feel the south has gained nothing but propaganda from the refugee movement, the likes of which are not encouraged elsewhere along the Iron Curtain—in Eastern Europe, for instance.

The refugees eventually may have an impact on domestic politics in South Viet Nam. Premier Ngo Dinh Diem is known politically as a northerner and as a Catholic. The refugees are from the north and 90 percent are Catholic. Once they get their own personal lives settled, they may become consistent supporters of Premier Diem.

Over the Great Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, some of our distinguished colleagues in the California delegation have recently petitioned President Eisenhower to authorize Pan American Airways to operate to the Orient from Los Angeles and San Francisco through Seattle over the great circle route. As of the present Pan American is forced to fly to Tokyo and beyond by way of Honolulu and Wake Island, which puts this great carrier at a considerable disadvantage in its competition with Northwest Airlines, which now enjoys exclusive rights to fly the great circle route.

Pan American Airways was the Pacific pioneer, having first flown the route in 1935. Since then, both Pan American and Northwest have acquired long-range equipment which makes nonstop service from Seattle to Tokyo possible.

Our country's progress has been possible because the spirit of free enterprise has prevailed. It seems to me that an inconsistency exists when one carrier, which did the Pacific pioneering, is deprived of an equal opportunity to compete with another.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 19 carried an editorial which points up this philosophy and in which I heartily concur.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

OVER THE GREAT CIRCLE

Passengers who wish to fly via Pan American World Airways from the west coast to Tokyo, are forced to make a detour of some 1,000 miles to Hawaii, instead of using the great circle air tracks which is the shortest distance between the two points. Pan American says two-thirds of its passengers between the United States and the Orient do not wish to make the Hawaiian stop. Hence, they are inconvenienced and the airline is put to unnecessary expense which is paid by the taxpayers because of the Federal subsidy under which it operates, as do other lines. The more plane-miles flown, the greater the cost. Pan American says the waste flying costs the taxpayers $220,000 per weekly round trip per year.

At present the great circle route is used by a competitor, the Northwest Airlines, and

President Eisenhower has been requested to lift the restriction against Pan American and permit it to operate on the short line. He has the appeal under consideration. The request seems logical because both airlines serve the same markets in the Orient and there is no issue over serving additional markets.

Pan American has set out several reasons in addition to wasted operation costs, why its request should be granted. GI mail to the Orient is delayed and there are additional costs to the Defense Department, one estimate being $1 million a year. Further, the restriction is actually an aid to foreign airlines which are expected to start service soon. Over all looms the possibility of discrimination in diverting passengers in the Orient from Pan American.

Certainly Pan American has a case. Its giant Clippers go around the world, and in 1931 the great circle was surveyed for the line by Colonel Lindbergh. Had landing rights been available in Japan, it would have operated over the route before World War II. Hence, it may claim pioneer rights.

Competition among the airlines is so keen that any hint of monopoly must be carefully considered by the President.

Israel's Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the seventh birthday of the new nation of Israel is being observed today by addresses of congratulation and good wishes by members of this body. This reflects the close ties between our country and Israel.

I am extending my remarks to include some observations additional to those in my remarks earlier in the well of the House and which time did not suffice for their utterance then.

Our interest in the Near East is in the importance of the area in defending and strengthening the free world. Our faith in democracy impels us to see Israel as a center of creative civilizations and the cultural enrichment of the world community.

We support Israel in her struggle to attain cultural freedom for dispossessed and persecuted Jews. We hail Israel's advances in founding a democratic society and in reclaiming a neglected land.

The Near East is emerging from its ancient patterns and seems destined to secure a greater measure of good life for all the people in the Mediterranean.

The Jewish people throughout the world have provided immediate relief for the 750,000 Israel newcomers—350,000 of them from the Arab and the Moslem lands of the Near East and Africa—and are helping to settle them on farms and in factories with a reasonable standard of living for all, Jews and Arabs alike.

We applaud Israel's acts of friendship and good faith—

First. In releasing Arab-blocked bank accounts of former Palestinian Arabs despite the failure of the Arab states, notably Iraq, to release the blocked accounts of their former Jewish residents;

Second. In offering to pay for Arab lands abandoned in Israel as part of a peace settlement, taking into account the lands and property abandoned by Jews in Arab lands;

Third. In offering Jordan the use of a free port in the newly constructed Kishon River Harbor in Haifa Bay;

Fourth. In accepting as citizens some 28,000 Arabs who have illegally returned to Israel since hostilities in 1948;

Fifth. In voting for the admission of the Arab State of Libya into the United Nations; and

Sixth. In offering to redraw the Israel-Jordan boundary lines in major trouble areas, so that farm homes might be reunited with farmlands, and so that the constant human pressures to break across artificial and arbitrary boundaries will not continue to be the cause of daily depredations from both sides.

We applaud Israel for seeking to establish a democratic society with full civil, religious, cultural, and political freedom for all its citizens.

First. Eight Arabs are members of the Israel Parliament.

Second. There is in Israel universal education, universal franchise, equal wages for equal work.

We applaud the Zionists and the friends of zionism throughout the world who have long sought to provide a homeland so that Jews who felt the sting of discrimination and the lash of persecution might live in freedom and dignity.

Like their Nazi predecessors, the Communists portray Israel as an agent of British and American expansion because they recognize that the stability, trade, and mutual help flowing from an Israel-Arab peace would forever doom Russian imperialist designs on this strategic and oil-rich area.

The future of the free world hangs in the balance in the Near East. Israel is the light in the darkness.

There are many citizens of Israel who are Christians, Mohammedans, and agnostics. It is a nation of predominantly Jewish population that practices no discrimination and accords complete freedom of religion.

Illinois Audubon Society Opposes Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the letter of Raymond Mostek, conservation committee of the Illinois Audubon Society, Chicago Natural History Museum, Roosevelt Road and Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill., relating to the construction of Echo Park Dam. The letter follows:

ILLINOIS AUDUBON SOCIETY,
CHICAGO NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: The Illinois Audubon Society strongly opposes the construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument in the Utah-Colorado area. This proposed dam is part of the upper Colorado River project supported by Secretary McKay and President Eisenhower.

We feel that this is being kicked around as a political issue. Ever since the National Park System was adopted and under the tenure of Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman, no dam has been built in any national park or monument. Congress has vigilantly protected our National Park System, which has often been called the greatest in the world.

To gain cheap political ends, propopents of Echo Park Dam have advanced many distorted arguments. For example, Secretary McKay, who has never been a friend of the conservation movement, declared that but 1,200 people visit the area. Actually over 70,000 came here in 1954. The National Park Service, before it was gagged by Secretary McKay, declared that the effect of the dam on the park would be deplorable.

We feel that should a dam be built at Echo Park, other grand areas, such as Yellowstone, Yosemite, and the Grand Canyon, will also be invaded. Lest such a protest be ignored, one has only to recall that engineers planned to build a dam at Mammoth Cave, Ky., only a few years ago. This would have destroyed forever that grand park as one of the scenic wonders of our Nation. We have also not forgotten that engineers once planned to invade Grand Teton National Park. We have learned long ago that their words cannot be honored.

Furthermore, we condemn the tactics that proponents have used to push this unnecessary project. They have declared that the dam at Echo Park will not destroy any dinosaur remains. That is not now, nor ever was the issue. The main issue is whether a scenic canyon shall forever be destroyed, or a superior national park system, gutted by men who cannot or will not understand why it was created in the first place.

Time and again at previous hearings the Reclamation Bureau has had to revise their figures because they were in error.

So desperate have the dam proponents become that they now declare that unless the dam is built the national defense will suffer. As an added deception, they no longer use the name Echo Park, but refer to the area as Yampa-Lodore.

Our national park system has always been above cheap and petty politics. We urge you to carry on the noble tradition of Congress and vote against Echo Park Dam.

Truly,

RAYMOND MOSTEK,
Conservation Committee, Illinois Audubon Society.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report

of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 81st Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 1st sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 3	Election of Speaker	Martin.
3	Jan. 3	H. Res. 5, calling for adoption of an amendment to the rules of the House permitting chairmen of committees which have favorably reported legislation to move for the adoption of a resolution providing for the consideration of such legislation if the Committee on Rules has adversely reported or failed to report within 21 calendar days such a resolution for consideration. On adoption. (275–142).	Yea.
4	Feb. 7	H. Con. Res. 22, postponing consideration of a legislative budget until May 1, 1949. On adoption. (230–142.)	Nay.
5	Feb. 7	H. R. 2361, authorizing President to reorganize executive departments in line with Hoover Commission report. On passage. (356–9.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 9	H. Res. 78, providing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities. On adoption. (353–29.)	Yea.
	Feb. 9	H. R. 1211 reciprocal trade agreements, repealing Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 and extending until June 12, 1951, the authority of the President to negotiate trade agreements:	
7	Feb. 9	On recommittal with instructions to provide that Tariff Commission shall make findings as to limit to which modification in duties may be made without causing serious injury to domestic industry. (Rejected, 151–241.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 9	On passage. (319–69.)	Yea.
9	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 15	H. Res. 99, providing rule for consideration of H. R. 2632, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which waived point of order against provision for rehiring certain persons discharged from Reclamation Service because of incompetence. On adoption. (242–121.)	Nay.
11	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
12	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949:	
14	Feb. 16	On recommittal with instructions to increase to $14,000,000 the amount for grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment-service administration. (Rejected, 148–237.)	Yea.
15	Feb. 16	On passage. (367–19.)	Yea.
16	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1661, providing for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports:	
17	Feb. 17	On recommittal with instructions to provide for a 1-year extension of the present controls with an amendment prohibiting control over commodities in surplus supply. (Rejected, 139–222.)	Yea.
18	Feb. 17	On passage. (259–139.)	Nay.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	Feb. 21	H. Res. 75, authorizing Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. On adoption. (331–4.)	Yea.
21	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 199, providing privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, and to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples:	
22	Mar. 1	On recommittal with instructions to report the bill forthwith, with amendment "except those in West Indies Archipelago." (Rejected, 39–336.)	Nay.
23	Mar. 7	H. R. 2663, granting Central Intelligence Agency the authority necessary for its proper administration. On passage. (348–4.)	Yea.
24	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3347, providing additional revenue for the District of Columbia:	
27	Mar. 14	On recommittal for further study (Rejected, 163–181.)	Yea.
28	Mar. 14	On passage. (Rejected, 166–176)	Nay.
29	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 1731, providing extension of Federal control over rents:	
30	Mar. 15	Amendment providing for decontrolling areas when requested by a resolution from the duly-elected local representatives of any State, county, or city. (Adopted, 227–188.)	Yea.
31	Mar. 15	Amendment deleting from the bill authority to recontrol hotels which have heretofore been decontrolled. (Adopted, 237–175.)	Yea.
32	Mar. 15	On recommittal with instructions to report bill back with a 90-day extension. (Rejected, 260–154.)	Yea.
33	Mar. 15	On passage. (260–153)	Nay.
34	Mar. 16	H. Res. 148, providing for consideration of H. R. 1437, authorizing the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States. (Adopted, 368–1.)	Yea.
35	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 21	H. R. 1757, extending rent control in the District of Columbia. On passage. (247–117.)	Nay.
38	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
39	Mar. 22	H. R. 1437, authorizing the composition of the Army of the United States and Air Force of United States and other purposes. On passage. (395–4.)	Yea.
	Mar. 22	H. R. 2681, providing pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II based on attained age (First Rankin pension bill):	
40	Mar. 22	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 187–223.)	Yea.
41	Mar. 22	On move to strike out enacting clause. (Rejected, 120–291.)	Yea.
42	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
43	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
44	Mar. 24	H. R. 2681, providing pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II based on attained age:	
		On recommittal for further study. (Adopted, 208–207.)	Yea.
45	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
46	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
47	Mar. 28	S. 135, authorizing the District of Columbia Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District. (On passage, 223–130.)	Nay.
48	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
49	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3734, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950 and for other purposes:	
50	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment barring use of funds for acquiring additional land in connection with Garrison Dam in North Dakota. (Rejected, 194–203.)	Yea.
51	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment providing that of the amount appropriated $800,000 shall be used for the Red Run-Clinton River, Mich., project. (Adopted, 256–138.)	Yea.
52	Mar. 29	On adoption of amendment changing amount from $57,000,000 to $63,000,000. (Adopted, 277–177.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3704, providing additional revenue for the District of Columbia:	
53	Mar. 29	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 177–218.)	Nay.
54	Mar. 29	On passage. (216–180)	Yea.
		H. R. 1731, extending rent control:	
55	Mar. 29	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 263–143.)	Nay.
56	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
57	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
58	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
59	Mar. 31	H. Res. 168, providing for consideration of H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and repealing certain taxes relating to oleomargarine. (Adopted 383–9.)	Yea.
60	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
61	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and repealing certain taxes relating to oleomargarine:	
62	Apr. 1	On adoption of amendment inserting provisions of H. R. 3, permitting shipment of oleo across State lines and removing all taxes upon its sale. (Adopted, 242–137.)	Nay.
63	Apr. 1	On passage. (287–89)	Yea.
		H. R. 1823, establishing a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve:	
64	Apr. 4	On adoption of Marcantonio antisegregation amendment. (Adopted, 193–153.)	Yea.
65	Apr. 4	H. R. 3830, amending the China Aid Act of 1948 and authorizing reappropriation of $54,000,000 of funds already appropriated but not obligated and an interim advance up to $50,000,000 of such funds by the RFC pending action on the appropriation bill. (Passed, 279–70.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4016, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:	
66	Apr. 7	On adoption of H. Res. 180, making in order consideration of H. R. 4016 and waiving of points of order that might be raised. (Adopted, 246–137.)	Nay.
67	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
68	Apr. 7	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 145–212.)	Yea.
69	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4046, second deficiency appropriation, appropriating $671,047.84 to supply general deficiencies in various branches of Government departments:	
70	Apr. 8	On recommittal with instructions to provide funds for War Claims Commission and relief of American citizen internees and prisoners of war of the Japanese. (Rejected, 149–190.)	Yea.
71	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
72	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
73	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
74	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
75	Apr. 12	H. R. 3748, amending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and continuing the European recovery program until June 1950. (Passed, 354–49.)	Yea.
76	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
78	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
	Apr. 26	H. R. 2032, repealing the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and reenacting the National Labor Relations Act of 1935:	
79	Apr. 26	On adoption of H. Res. 191, providing for 8 hours of general debate and waiving points of order. (Adopted, 369–6.)	Yea.
80	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
81	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
82	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
83	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
84	May 3	On adoption of amendment substituting provisions of H. R. 4290 (Wood bill), as amended, for H. R. 2032. (Adopted, 217–203.)	Yea.
85	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 4	H. R. 2032. On recommittal. (Recommitted, 212–209.)	Nay.
87	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 5	H. R. 2989, creating Virgin Islands Corporation under Federal law to succeed the Virgin Islands Company. (Passed, 273–62.)	Yea.
89	May 9	H. R. 2203, providing for a decennial census of housing. (Passed, 223–51.)	Yea.
90	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4392, authorizing payment of not to exceed $16,000,000 for compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by U. S. Armed Forces:	
91	May 10	On adoption of amendment to prevent payment of interest on Swiss war-damage claims. (Rejected, 172–191.)	Yea.
92	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 11	H. R. 2682, amending the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act by providing acquisition of storage facilities and providing exchange of surplus United States agricultural commodities for stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad. (Passed, 326–52.)	Nay.
95	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949:	
96	May 16	On adoption of conference report. (292–17)	Yea.
97	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
98	May 17	H. Res. 190, providing for consideration of H. R. 195 to assist States in collecting sales and use tax on cigarettes. (Adopted, (322–24.)	Yea.
99	May 18	H. R. 1036, paying $8,437.98 to R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen, of Gallatin, Tenn., which sum represents the amount they paid to the United States for internal-revenue tobacco stamps which were completely destroyed by fire. On passage notwithstanding President's veto. (Passed, 318–48.)	Yea.
100	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
101	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
102	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
103	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4591, providing increased pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the uniformed services:	
104	May 24	On recommittal for further study. (227–163)	Nay.
		H. R. 3704, providing additional revenue for District of Columbia:	
105	May 26	On adoption of conference report. (184–152.)	Yea.
106	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 1	H. R. 4617, providing pensions for veterans without regard to service-connected injuries or unemployability at attained age. (Second Rankin pension bill.) (Passed, 365–27.)	Yea.
108	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4963, providing for appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges:	
109	June 16	On recommittal with instructions to include language barring appointment of more than ⅗ of new appointments from same political party. (Defeated, 195–135.)	Yea.
110	June 21	H. R. 4332, amending the National Bank Act and the Bretton Woods Agreements Act so as to permit national and State banks to deal in securities of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (Passed, 253–55.)	Yea.
111	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
114	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4009, the Housing Act of 1949:	
117	June 29	On amendment, deleting title II, providing for public housing. (Rejected, 204–209.)	Yea.
118	June 29	On amendment, barring payment of salary to any employees who fail to sign an affidavit stating they are not members of a subversive party and do not belong to an organization that may strike against the Government of the United States. (Adopted, 283–129.)	Yea.
119	June 29	On recommittal with instructions to report revised bill eliminating public housing:	
	1949	H. R. 4009—Continued	
120	June 29	On passage. (228–185)	Yea.
121	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4406, establishing an International Claims Commission appointed by Secretary of State and providing for settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments:	
122	July 6	On recommittal for further study. (Rejected, 151–177.)	Yea.
123	July 6	H. Res. 277, providing for consideration of S. 1008, legalizing basing-point price system when not in conflict with antitrust laws. (Adopted, 305–22.)	Yea.
124	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 937, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of four claims against the United States in behalf of foreign claimants:	
125	July 11	On amendment deleting from the bill 1 claim amounting to $3,024.38. (Adopted, 167–142.)	Yea.
126	July 13	H. R. 2960, amending the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones. (Passed, 282–109.)	Nay.
127	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
129	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
130	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
	July 21	H. R. 5345, the Agricultural Act of 1949:	
132		On amendment, extending for 1 year the present farm program. (Adopted 239–170.)	Yea.
133	July 21	On passage. (383–25.)	Yea.
134	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 102–243.)	Nay.
135	July 25	On motion that Journal as read stand approved and motion moving the previous question. (Previous question ordered, 259–88.)	Yea.
136	July 25	On motion approving Journal of last day's proceedings. (Adopted, 285–54.)	Yea.
137	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 113–243.)	Nay.
138	July 25	On ordering previous question, making in order rule for consideration of H. R. 3199, antipoll tax bill. (Adopted, 262–100.)	Yea.
139	July 25	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 110–252)	Nay.
140	July 25	H. Res. 276, rule providing for consideration of H. R. 3199, antipoll tax bill. (Adopted, 265–100.)	Yea.
141	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3199, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers:	
143	July 26	On recommittal. (Rejected, 123–267.)	Nay.
144	July 26	On passage. (273–116.)	Yea.
		S. 1184, encouraging private construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to military installations:	
145	July 27	On recommital of conference report. (Rejected, 52–289.)	Not voting.
146	July 27	Quorum call	Absent.
147	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3282, repealing Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota and Wisconsin:	
148	Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (Defeated, 131–168.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5602, authorizing an allocation of $4,000,000 of China's ECA funds for relief of Chinese students:	
149	Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (254–46.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5798, increasing compensation for World War I presumptive service-connected cases, providing minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis, increasing certain disability and death compensation rates, liberalizing requirement for dependency allowances, and redefining the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct":	
150	Aug. 2	On suspension of rules and passage. (354–0.)	Yea.
151	Aug. 2	H. R. 5632, military reorganization and unification bill. On adoption of conference report. (356–7.)	Yea.
152	Aug. 2	H. Res. 289, providing for consideration of H. R. 29, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide parity for tung nuts and honey. (Adopted, 335–21.)	Yea.
153	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
155	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
156	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
157	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
158	Aug. 4	H. Res. 310, providing for consideration of, and 3 hours of debate on, H. R. 1758, to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938. (Adopted, 233–113.)	Yea.
159	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
160	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
161	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Absent.
162	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 1758, clarifying the Natural Gas Act to exempt independent producers and gatherers from regulation by Federal Power Commission:	
163	Aug. 5	On recommittal. (Rejected, 124–187)	NVA.
164	Aug. 5	On passage. (183–131)	NVF.
165	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 183, rule providing for consideration of H. R. 3910, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act by expanding its coverage and increasing the minimum wage:	
166	Aug. 8	On adoption of committee amendment making rule applicable to H. R. 5856, a modified version of H. R. 3910, and ruling out consideration of H. R. 3910. (Adopted, 249–124.)	Nay.
167	Aug. 8	On adoption of H. Res. 183, as amended. (351–17.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1949		
168	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4830, making appropriation for foreign aid for fiscal year 1950:	
170	Aug. 9	On motion to instruct the conferees to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment providing for continuation of watchdog committee. (Passed, 210–164.)	Nay.
171	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5856, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act:	
172	Aug. 10	On adoption of amendment, substituting the provisions of H. R. 5894, as amended, for the text of H. R. 5856. (Adopted, 225–181.)	Yea.
172	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
174	Aug. 11	H. R. 5856, providing for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. (Passed, 361–35.)	Yea.
175	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
176	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
177	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5526, authorizing the President to provide for the performance of certain executive functions by other officers of the Government:	
178	Aug. 12	On amendment limiting authority to administrative duties. (Rejected, 114–162.)	Yea.
179	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. J. Res. 339, extending indefinitely the time in which temporary appropriations may be used for certain governmental functions pending approval of regular appropriation bills.	
180	Aug. 15	On suspension of rules and adoption (176–145.) (⅔ majority vote required.)	Nay.
		H. R. 2734, amending the Clayton Act, relative to acquisition by one commercial corporation of the assets of another corporation:	
181	Aug. 15	On suspension of rules and passage. (223–92)	Yea.
182	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
184	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
185	Aug. 17	H. J. Res. 339, extending until Sept. 15 the time in which temporary appropriations may be used for certain governmental functions pending approval of regular appropriation bills. (Adopted, 213–114.)	Yea.
186	Aug. 17	H. Res. 327, providing for consideration of H. R. 5895, to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations. (Adopted, 275–47.)	Yea.
187	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5895, promoting the foreign policy and providing for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations:	
188	Aug. 18	On adoption of amendment to reduce the amount provided for rearming the North Atlantic countries from $1,160,990,000 to $580,495,000. (209–151.)	Yea.
189	Aug. 18	On passage. (238–122)	Yea.
190	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Absent.
191	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Absent.
	Aug. 19	H. R. 6008, making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:	
192	Aug. 19	On amendment deleting $3,000,000 for expenses of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. Adopted. (150–129.)	NVF.
193	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
196	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6070 to amend the National Housing Act:	
197	Aug. 24	Motion to adjourn. (Adopted, 186–132)	Nay.
198	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
199	Aug. 25	H. Res. 342, providing tha motions to suspend the rules may be in order on Aug. 25, 1949. (Adopted, 270–1.)	Yea.
200	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
201	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
202	Sept. 27	H. R. 4498, providing additional benefits for certain postal-service employees with respect to annual and sick leave, longevity pay, and promotion. (Passed, 332–2.)	Yea.
203	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5895, providing military assistance to foreign nations:	
204	Sept. 28	On recommittal of conference report. (Rejected, 113–213.)	Yea.
205	Sept. 28	H. R. 5895—Continued On adoption of conference report. (224–109)	Yea.
206	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4830, foreign-aid appropriations for 1950:	
207	Sept. 29	On amendment providing that the Administrator of ECA be authorized to issue $150,000,000 of notes for purchase by Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of providing loans. (Passed, 177–124.)	Nay.
208	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5903, amending the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, to extend its duration and to provide double amount Federal financial aid for assistance in the construction of hospitals:	
209	Oct. 3	On suspension of rules and passage. (236–43)	Yea.
		H. R. 5739, providing for advance planning of public works by providing for Federal loans to States to aid in surveys and plans for State and municipal public works:	
210	Oct. 3	On suspension of rules and passage. (210–69)	Yea.
211	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3734, the Army civil-functions appropriation bill:	
212	Oct. 3	On motion to instruct conferees to insist on disagreement to an allocation of any funds for flood control for Gavins Point Dam on the Missouri River. (Rejected, 101–153.)	Nay.
213	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. R. 6000, the Social Security Act, under closed rule prohibiting amendments:	
214	Oct. 4	On adoption of motion ordering previous question on resolution. (175–154.)	Nay.
215	Oct. 4	On adoption of resolution. (189–135)	Nay.
216	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act:	
217	Oct. 5	On recommittal with instructions to report provisions of bill H. R. 6297. (Rejected, 112–232.)	Yea.
218	Oct. 5	On passage. (333–14)	Yea.
		H. R. 3734, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for 1950:	
219	Oct. 6	On adoption of conference report. (269–18)	Yea.
220	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
221	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4146, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950:	
222	Oct. 10	On disagreeing to Senate amendments providing for 48 air groups instead of 58 air groups as passed by the House. (Adopted, 305–1.)	Yea.
223	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4146, the National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950:	
224	Oct. 10	On disagreeing to Senate amendment rescinding $275,000,000 previously approved by Congress for stock-piling strategic materials and banning long-range contracts for the purchase of critical or strategic materials abroad. (Adopted, 305–0.)	Yea.
225	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
226	Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6008, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1950:	
227	Oct. 11	On recommital of conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to amendment relative to $3,000,000 for National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. (Rejected, 158–165.)	Yea.
		H. R. 1370, authorizing the appointment of 3 additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribing the qualifications of appointees:	
288	Oct. 13	On recommital. (Rejected, 30–286)	Yea.
		H. Res. 390, for consideration of S. J. Res. 134, to extend certain provisions of the National Housing Act under a rule prohibiting amendments:	
229	Oct. 13	On adoption. (290–34)	Nay.
230	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1008, legalizing basing-point system when not in conflict with antitrust laws:	
231	Oct. 14	On recommital to conferees. (Rejected, 138–178)	Nay.
232	Oct. 14	On adoption of conference report. (200–104)	Yea.
233	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2105, authorizing an appropriation of $240,000,000 to stimulate the exploration for strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals:	
234	Oct. 17	On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Rejected, 176–118.) (⅔ majority required.)	Yea.
235	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
236	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.

The IMUA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from the Hawaii Residents' Association, also known as IMUA. This association consists of a group of patriotic citizens in Hawaii dedicated to combating the extensive communistic influences in that Territory. They deserve our highest commendation and our encouragement for their effective efforts to promote Americanism and to expose the foreign subversive infiltrations in Hawaii.

The letter follows:

HAWAII RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 25, 1955.

Representative JOHN R. PILLION,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PILLION: This letter is in confirmation of our long-distance telephone conversation as of this date.

As per your request, several items of material available from this office are being sent to you via air mail, special delivery, under separate cover.

We wish to reiterate with emphasis that IMUA, as an organization, is 100 percent

strictly neutral on the question of statehood for Hawaii.

We conduct our fulltime, Territory-wide program strictly on the basis of the three principles listed at the bottom of this page.

Individuals joining IMUA do so for the purpose of carrying out our three point program; and we know that among our membership, are those who are in favor of statehood as well as others who are personally opposed.

In order to keep the record straight, IMUA will appreciate this letter being officially entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. JENKINS,
Executive Vice President.

(Program: 1. Combat communism and all un-American subversive activities. 2. Live and work together in racial harmony. 3. Demonstrate and maintain the American way of life.)

The Screen as a Free Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important mediums for mass communication of our ideals and ideas both in the United States and throughout the world is, without question, the motion-picture industry. Because it is so important, it is vitally necessary to keep it free of censorship of a type which could only lead to its deterioration. The industry has long prided itself on its ability to set its own standards on the highest level and to serve the public in manifold ways and in many fields.

That it is an important cultural medium is shown by listing a few of the outstanding pictures of 1954: The Barefoot Contessa, The Caine Mutiny, Carmen Jones, Carnival Story, the Country Girl, Deep in My Heart, Dial M for Murder, The Egyptian, The Glenn Miller Story, Hansel and Gretel, The High and the Mighty, Johnny Guitar, The Last Time I Saw Paris, The Magnificent Obsession, Riot in Cell Block 11, Sabrina, Miss Sadie Thompson, Rear Window, Romeo and Juliet, Seven Brides for Seven Brothers, The Silver Chalice, Susan Slept Here, Three Coins in the Fountain, Vera Cruz, A Star Is Born, There's No Business Like Show Business, 20,000 Leagues Under the Sea, and White Christmas.

I should like to commend to the attention of the Congress two editorials by the President of the Motion Picture Association of America, Eric Johnston, and some short articles discussing various activities of the film industry. These appear in the annual report for 1954 of the association:

THE SCREEN AS A FREE INSTITUTION—A STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

As a medium of international communication, motion pictures are exhibited to a worldwide audience of some 12 billion persons each year. Covering a variety of themes and activities, ranging from history to musical comedy, the primary objective of theatrical films is to furnish entertainment to the public.

In the course of entertaining, motion pictures also portray the cultures, customs, traditions, and values of many lands. By so doing, they make enduring impressions on the hearts and minds of vast audiences the world over.

Whether motion pictures appeal to base taste or high standards, whether they are a force for good or evil; whether they are an instrument generating international understanding or spawning national frictions and distrust—all this depends on the motivations and ideals of those who make films and of those who view them.

Public rejection of unwholesome presentations makes itself strongly felt at the box office, so that movie patrons vote on the kind of entertainment they want and do not want.

To gain public favor, the film need not pander to cheapness, to the lower levels of public taste. Popularity is not in conflict with creativeness and craftsmanship.

FILM INDUSTRY SERVES PUBLIC

To win public acceptance, film industries must serve the public. To flourish in modern society, motion pictures must be true to their function as a mass art. They must heed public need and demand.

If the film industry is to be a force for good, a promoter of the interests of men of good will, it must stand as a free institution. Freedom of the screen must be as zealously guarded and as jealously preserved as freedom of the press.

Freedom of the screen is frequently impaired seriously by governmental interference—even by democratic governments. This interference usually takes three forms—crippling taxation, import quotas, and censorship.

Unreasonable taxes hurt a film industry in its own homeland, but even if there were no such domestic burdens, there is no free film industry in the world that could pay its way on an adequate scale without foreign markets.

Import quotas and taxes may be designed to protect local film enterprises, but in fact they damage them. Discriminations against foreign films only invite arbitrary barriers against the local industry abroad. Even if motion pictures did not require foreign markets, they would not be able to carry out their function as a medium of international exchange were the flow of films around the world to be impeded.

FREE SCREEN VITAL IN OUR SOCIETY

As for censorship, there is no more justification for the governments of freemen to bridle the screen than there is to curb the press. The excuse that motion pictures make a more dramatic impact on people and must therefore be policed by bureaucrats is only further tribute to the importance of films as a medium of communication, of information, and of entertainment. There are adequate and democratic laws to protect the public from unwholesome films, just as there are to protect society from unwholesome books. Prior restraint on movies is neither needed nor welcome. It can only do a disservice to integrity and to understanding.

Responsible film industries recognize their obligations to the public. Our motion picture production code, which is a quarter-century old in 1955, is striking evidence of that.

It takes no special nobility of aim and purpose for film-makers to dedicate themselves to wholesome public interest, to reflect good taste and good judgment. It is in their self-interest to do so.

FILM INDUSTRY LOOKS FORWARD WITH CONFIDENCE

It is not smart to pander to low taste, for though cheap standards would draw audiences for a while, in the long run movies would fall into general disfavor and freedom of the screen would vanish—and so would audiences.

It is not smart to run to the Government for protection. This leads to further official interference and to retaliation by other governments.

It is not smart to seek subsidies, for then filmdom invites invasion by special interests, and loss of patronage and respect.

Nor is it smart for governments and pressure groups to censor, unfairly tax, or pressure their film industries. The price is too high. Then, motion pictures could have a dangerous influence. Then, motion pictures as a free institution would disappear—and free institutions, under attack everywhere in the world today, are too precious to be undermined.

As a free institution, the screen should be supported and defended. The principle is clear. Freemen can remain free only so long as their institutions are free, and the screen is one of them.

It is in this spirit of freedom that the American motion-picture industry has completed another year and looks confidently forward to the future.

Early signs point to economic gains in 1955 which should top the notable progress made the preceding year.

Several factors, first noted in 1953, developed more forcefully through the year and contributed importantly to the brighter prospects for the coming 12 months.

These included significant gains in technological developments and their wider acceptance by the public; increased output of high quality pictures, and record earning for American pictures in overseas markets.

These advances were reflected at the theater boxoffices and there is cause for continuing confidence in the outlook for 1955.

As always there are causes for caution in the industry's future. The costs of picture making have risen. In many spots there are indications that the important foreign market may be tightening up.

Another dampening influence is the continuing high volume of antitrust suits which plague our industry.

As the new year began, however, new efforts to come up with a workable arbitration system seemed to be bearing fruit. While it is still too early for certainty in this area, there is good reason to believe that the industry for the first time is on the threshhold of an arbitration forum where many of its family problems and tensions can be thrashed out in reasonable and friendly fashion.

All in all, I believe the industry will continue to turn out the finest kind of entertainment—and the public will continue to show its appreciation by increasing the totals at the world boxoffice.

ERIC JOHNSTON.

FREE FLOW OF FILMS VITAL TO ALL NATIONS—A STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The leading position of the American film industry in the field of international entertainment was reinforced over the past year as boxoffice response in other countries continued to be substantial.

The growing volume of paid admissions abroad to American motion pictures is eloquent evidence of the worldwide appeal of our films. The attendance figures also reflect the importance of foreign markets from which our members now derive a revenue that has been substantially beyond 40 percent of their total rentals.

Comforting and complimentary as international popularity may be, it is not without its mixed blessings. In its wake have come mounting problems of exchange, taxation, import restrictions and other forms of discrimination against the American film industry.

To meet such problems or to prevent new ones from arising, the Motion Picture Export Association must enter into continuing negotiations with the governments of many countries and must establish an understanding relationship with the leaders of other film industries.

It is essential that such negotiations and consultations be carried on adequately in future. Countries which think they are protecting local film enterprises by erecting barriers against outside competition, are in fact, damaging their own industries, and this must be made clear to them.

The reason is clear. No nation's film industry can continue to operate independently and on an adequate scale without foreign markets. Nobody's domestic patronage is big enough to permit the industry to flourish as it should. Hence the free flow of films around the world must be of mutual concern to all responsible film producers.

In this regard, despite the fact that a considerable portion of the world's screen playing time is devoted to American motion pictures, our industry has taken the lead. We have a real interest in the welfare of other filmmakers and we have shown this interest in most concrete terms.

There are no restrictions against the import and presentation of foreign films in the United States and whenever barriers have been proposed, our industry has taken a firm stand against them.

What is more, as many of our colleagues abroad can confirm, we have given genuine support and no little assistance to the circulation and exhibition of foreign films in the United States. To demonstrate this point, last year about 190 foreign films were theatrically exhibited in the United States. Many of these were screened by our association for leading American distributors. Other forms of practical assistance were likewise offered to foreign producers.

This is a healthy stimulus which aids the industry to perform its functions as a mass art medium, meeting and helping to elevate public entertainment standards, reflecting the values, customs and practices of society, and serving as an instrumentality of understanding among the peoples of the world.

ERIC JOHNSTON.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The community relations department's activities constitute another facet in the association's program of self-regulation. It provides the opportunity for interested national organizations to appraise the result of the earlier steps in the program to the end that they may give their support to approved pictures. It interprets the operation of the program to public groups and the public's reaction to pictures. The result is a continually growing national recognition of motion pictures as an essential medium of entertainment.

Over the past 20 years local organizations, concerned exclusively with the influences of films, have grown up in small as well as large cities. They have called themselves Motion Picture Councils, Cinema Clubs, Endorsers of Photoplays, Film Forums, depending upon the accent of their interest in general culture, art, entertainment, or education.

At a conference in New York in March 1954, they voted to federate and are now incorporated as a national organization known as the Federation of Motion Picture Councils. They have in common an antipathy to legal censorship, and the desire to further the constructive influence of the commercial theater in the community.

PREVIEWING ACTIVITIES

An integral part of the association's community relations program is the dissemination of Joint Estimates of Current Entertainment Films. This bulletin is produced every 2 weeks by the film estimate board of national organizations (FEBNO), made up of the motion picture chairmen of the following 13 organizations: American Association of University Women, American Jewish Committee, American Library Association, Children's Film Library Committee, National Council of Women, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, National Federation of Music Clubs, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, Protestant Motion Picture Council, United Church Women, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and Schools Motion Picture Committee.

By providing previewing facilities for films in advance of release dates, MPAA enables this board to appraise and rate movies for the guidance of their 40 million members, as well as many more community groups, schools, churches, and other institutions. This work on the part of FEBNO is entirely voluntary and provides American families with an objective, unbiased guide to moviegoing.

In summarizing their motion picture appraisals for 1954, FEBNO noted that there was a higher percentage of outstanding pictures than in any year since 1947. Thirty-two films, 14 percent of the 232 subjects reviewed, received starred ratings. These films, according to the board, represent a consistently greater degree of artistic perfection than those starred in previous years.

It was noted that the year showed a trend toward more mature treatment of stories in films, but at the same time almost half of the pictures were rated suitable for all theater patrons 13 years and over.

CHILDREN'S FILM LIBRARY

The Children's Film Library offers a permanent reservoir of top entertainment films for children from the ages of 8 to 12. These pictures, which are made available for Saturday matinee showings, are drawn from the theatrical pictures that have completed their regular runs and have been recommended by the Children's Film Library Committee.

This technique of selecting films for children on the basis of suitability plus entertainment value as demonstrated by the "wiggle test" was devised by MPAA and has been utilized for the past 8 years. The "wiggle test" consists of a series of special test previews in which reactions of the children viewing films under regular theater conditions are carefully observed and charted.

In Canada, the Children's Film Library, a sister group to our own, has extended its activities to include the recommendation of family films. As a result of cooperative work, carried on by the United States-Canadian groups, an expanded organization, the Canadian Consultants on Entertainment Films was formed by our neighbor to the north.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

The growing use of motion pictures in the Nation's schools and colleges has increased the significance of the MPAA's educational services program.

Under this program, carefully-selected short subjects and special-purpose films excerpted from feature pictures after their theatrical runs have been made available to education. Success of the program is seen in the growing recognition by the educational world of the motion picture as a close and effective ally.

Education's acceptance of the value of the theatrical film through the association's affiliate, Teaching Film Custodians, also has opened the doors to a greater flow of special films from the 16-mm. departments of the member companies to the classrooms of the Nation.

Due to the helpful cooperation of the cataloging division of the Library of Congress, a standard printed card catalogue has been developed in which information about the industry subjects is recorded for distribution to schools and to the 2,700 film libraries throughout the country.

Films for the TFC program are selected by special committee of teachers who are chosen through the cooperation of several national educational organizations. These committees provide technical advice on picture selection and on excerpting pictures in their specialized fields.

The association's educational services department is actively extending and improving the use of the motion picture and is bringing to the attention of the educational public the prestige, content and usefulness of the industry's product and service.

Two examples of the association's activities in 1954 are these:

A statewide conference was held in Iowa to which were invited top executives from State-supported and private colleges, the diocesan schools systems, the State department of public instruction, the County Superintendents' Association and from the State audio-visual group. After 4 days of planning and discussion, a permanent committee was formed to administer a program for improving classroom instruction through the use of motion pictures.

A similar conference was held in joint sponsorship with the Conference of Presidents of Negro Land Grant Colleges in May 1954. Negro educators from 41 colleges were in attendance—presidents, deans, librarians, audio-visual executives—to discuss program development and administration in this educational motion picture field. The colleges represented train most of the Negro teachers. The permanent committee which was set up at the conference is planning activities which it feels will bring many improvements in meeting educational responsibilities.

Veto Threats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the within editorial Veto Threats and opposing a Presidential veto of the postal pay raise bill, appearing in the Boston Post of April 23, 1955, is a sound and logical one:

VETO THREATS

Threats of Presidential veto of the postal-raise bill passed by the House 224 to 189, which provides a raise of 8.2 percent at a cost of $171 million, must be ignored by the Congress. The postal workers deserve and should be given the higher increase proposed by the House.

While the vote adhered fairly closely to party lines, the fact that 22 Republicans and 17 Democrats voted in opposition to the party position shows that there is some irresolution.

In simple justice to the postal workers, who are notoriously underpaid and overworked, the Congress must not on this issue be intimidated by White House veto threats. If the Senate-House compromise, which will probably be somewhere in the vicinity of 8.5 percent, is vetoed, the Congress is urged to have the courage to pass the postal pay-raise bill over the veto.

The President made a partisan issue of the postal pay raise by setting an arbitrary figure which he would approve. The issue should have been decided by the Congress on its merits, and its merits are such that the postal workers would have been given an equitable increase.

Educating the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take the liberty of including the following speech delivered by Dr. G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, before the governors of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms. As a Representative from the city of New York, I deem it my pleasurable duty to inform the country of the importance to our economy of the continued healthful existence of the New York Stock Exchange.

The speech follows:

I welcome the opportunity to talk with you about the stock exchange and some of our most important work.

Today in Washington the curtain rolled down on the first phase of a Senate committee study which I suspect you have been following with interest.

From the start, the exchange approached this hearing in a spirit of full cooperation and with feelings of hope. It was a wonderful opportunity to furnish the committee—and the public—with a detailed picture of what the exchange is, how it operates, and how vital is its role. This educational story is, after all, one we are striving hard to tell day after day. The hearings provided for viewing on a much wider stage than ever before the essential facts about the stock market. We think that the study will result in greatly increased public understanding and in creating a more informed investment climate.

It is, of course, too early to assess the impact or results of the hearings. But already one thing is apparent: the need for public education—to protect the public against emotional and uninformed actions—is even greater than we thought. For the hearings have made clear that through laws and regulations safeguards can be set up to protect investors against many things, but not against the hazards of their own lack of knowledge or imprudence. This means that if we are going to achieve a more enlightened economic democracy more education is essential.

GOAL—AN INFORMED PEOPLE

Now education is a painstaking process. Knowledge cannot be legislated or shot into the bloodstream. All of this puts a correspondingly greater burden on the exchange's educational program. In undertaking it we have for many years been as proud of its development as we are aware of our responsibilities. Our long-term goal is a nation of financially able shareowners—an informed people able to exercise a greater and greater role in the country's economic growth—guarding their economic democracy as jealously as their political democracy.

We hope that some day shareowners will regard their right to a corporate vote as an obligation to vote.

It is with this view in mind that the exchange insists that all common stocks listed thereon carry the right to vote. It also explains why we urge that proxies be solicited so that the right to vote can be exercised conveniently. Getting out the corporate vote is very much a part of our program.

UNDERSTANDING SHARE OWNERSHIP

As a result of our efforts, well over 90 percent of our listed domestic companies regularly solicit proxies. To give impetus to this program, just a few days ago the board of governors of the exchange authorized a new listing requirement bearing on this subject. Effective June 1, 1955, any corporation which seeks initial listing on the exchange must agree to solicit proxies for all stockholder meetings. Companies whose stock is now traded and who desire to list additional securities will be expected to conform to this new standard unless there is good reason for exception.

The exchange's educational work is significantly different from the merchandising efforts of our member firms and from their activities in buying and selling securities for their customers. It should be clear the exchange is not, never has been, and never will be, in the business of recommending the purchase or sale of any specific stock, or the timing of any market transaction.

The exchange's educational program is institutional, designed to encourage every American to understand the meaning of bonds and common stock, to know what the stock exchange represents, to realize the part shareownership can play in our economy and even perhaps in one's own investment program.

We think that with such understanding will come a wholesome and perfectly healthy desire on the part of millions of people to invest some of their funds, directly and with an intelligent appreciation of the risk, in our great businesses. We think this is necessary if American business is to obtain the huge amounts of equity capital which it will need to bring about full employment and a continuing rise in the standard of living.

INSEPARABLE RESPONSIBILITIES

Our educational program arises from our basic responsibilities to member firms, listed companies, the individual investor, and the Nation at large.

These responsibilities are: First, to operate a market place, and second, to maintain a healthy market. As a practical matter the two are inseparable. Through our facilities millions of Americans can carry out their investment decisions quickly, conveniently, and at low cost. Without these facilities industry's task of raising new capital would be enormously complicated and frequently impossible.

MAINTAINING A HEALTHY MARKET

But this is only part of the story. Our physical market place is only as good—or only as effective—as it is efficient in meeting investors' needs. For investors need a liquid market—a place where the number of buy-and-sell orders, executed by open outcry, are present in large enough numbers to keep price fluctuations at a minimum.

A healthy, liquid market just doesn't happen. Probably the least understood of the exchange's functions are the self-imposed standards, rigidly enforced, that enable the exchange to do its part in keeping the market healthy. I think these standards are unique and we have a right to be proud of them: we require listed companies to meet and maintain exacting standards; we urge investors to seek sound advice, recognizing risks as well as rewards; we concern ourselves vigorously with problems of taxation, regulation, and economic developments, as they are reflected in our market place; and we insist that member firms adhere to a bookful of stringent regulations.

The exchange is more than a large hall enclosing a mechanism where shares are bought and sold. It is a living thing—the heart of an economic system that is modern, workable, and free—an instrument vested with broad public interest.

BROAD PROGRAM DEVELOPED

Not many people realize that the New York Stock Exchange, usually thought of as the essence of bigness, is really a voluntary association of small businesses which provide professional services. We estimate that about 40 percent of our member firms dealing with the public have fewer than 50 employees. With their limited personnel and resources they must concentrate on research and selling activities. In an effort to do collectively that which could not be done individually, the exchange, representing all its member firms, properly began a broad educational program on a national basis, devoted to explaining the fundamentals of security ownership.

Today, the exchange's educational story is centered on the theme, "Own your share of American business." This story has reached more people, more effectively than ever before. Many persons, freshly aware of it, assume this effort is a new one.

REWARDS AND RISKS

Actually, it traces back to the close of World War II. Then, studying the Nation's enormous industrial expansion, the exchange along with many others saw very clearly industry's need for more and more equity capital.

Where was it to come from? What better or healthier place than the accumulated savings of millions of Americans—providing always that they understood in broad terms the values of wider share ownership, and recognized in bread-and-butter terms its risks as well as rewards. In 1945 my predecessor, Emil Schram, introducing a new long-range advertising program, authorized by the board of governors, commented: "We shall discuss the risks and responsibilities inherent in all forms of ownership, including securities. We shall preach against reckless use of our facilities, and for the use of available facts."

The exchange's program is drafted for the millions of people unfamiliar with the share ownership story. We departed from the drab economic phraseology that mystifies most people and discourages many. We are exploring new channels of communication. We are asking for help in spreading this story, particularly from organizations and companies like yours who share our general objectives. That help is frequently and generously forthcoming.

PIONEERING RESEARCH UNDERTAKEN

We have embarked on pioneering research that provided the first full-length portrait of the United States shareholder. Incredible as it may seem now, until the 1952 Brookings report neither the exchange community nor the Nation knew how many people owned our public companies, or where they lived, or what their incomes were.

As part of our efforts to expand the services of member firms to broader segments of the public, the monthly investment plan was developed in 1954. It enables people to buy shares of American business regularly in small cash amounts on a sound basis. Also late in 1954—and with the governors of this very association of Stock Exchange firms carrying the ball—the first steps were taken to seek legislation facilitating gifts of stock to children. It promises wonderful results—the State of Georgia has already adopted the recommended uniform State law.

As the exchange's program developed it rested on the basic premise that broader ownership of our public corporations would move the United States closer to a true economic democracy, and this would inevitably strengthen the belief in our free enterprise system here and abroad. We believe that every American has a right to own stock and that this right should be made achievable and not merely be theoretical.

It is our conviction that in a Nation of 160 million people the privilege of owning our industrial might should be drectly exercised by more than the 7½ million people—who presently are shareowners in public corporations.

WHAT NYSE EMPHASIZES

The only restaints on this ownership which I would suggest, are those emphasized in our educational program, but which the investor must, in the final analysis, impose on himself: Does he have adequate knowledge about the risks and the rewards of common-stock investments; does he obtain sound advice and information; does he assume no greater risks than his financial capacity to bear them?

The exchange is presenting these facts fully and completely. Because we place such over riding importance on informed investors, and because we fully recognize the hazards to the public itself of intemperate action, all our educational efforts focus on these long-established themes: Stock ownership has its risks as well as rewards; sound investment programs need cash reserves and life insurance; any investment should be based on facts, reliable advice, periodic review.

HUNCH-PLAYERS NOT WANTED

We don't want hunch-players in the market, or people who heard a hot tip in the elevator, or those who can't afford the risk of owning common stock. Their presence will only hurt themselves, the exchange, the securities business, and the economy in general.

While we stress these themes we also make very clear the two facts I mentioned earlier: The exchange never recommends the purchase or sale of any specific securities. It has no knowledge or opinion as to whether the market in general is too high or too low at any given time. I emphasized this in my testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and added: "The best that anyone can do is to assess whether the price asked for a particular stock is too high in relation to its apparent value." Such guidance is obviously in the province of our member firms. They deal with each investor's personal problems and requirements.

PROGRAM STRESSES FUNDAMENTALS

Market studies form a continuing part of our program. By revealing public knowledge and attitudes, research points the direction in which educational efforts move. We have built our program, guided not so much by what we would have liked to tell, but by what we learned needed to be told. Much of our work still must be devoted to the ABC's of stock ownership, dividends, the need for increased equity capital, and the work of the exchange.

As these fundamentals are better grasped, risk-taking is seen as one of the things that developed the country * * * people understand that today progress and expansion grow out of the pooled savings of millions. In this light, the role the exchange performs takes on new significance, as do the services and facilities offered by our member firms.

I'm pleased that the exchange has broadened its efforts without materially increasing costs. Advertising expenditures since 1946 have remained about the same—at approximately $500,000 a year. This is indeed a modest budget weighed against the impressive $1,480,000 spent in 1953 for advertising by the Institute of Life Insurance, the $1,375,000 spent by the American Petroleum Institute, and the $1,400,000 spent by the Association of American Railroads.

You may wonder, can results be measured?

I think they can, though I grant the difficulty of trying to pin a precise measurement on an educational effort.

Over the years we have noted improved public understanding of the essential functions of the exchange. Similarly, people's knowledge of bonds and common stock is slowly but surely increasing. Testimony before the Senate committee, and editorial comment in the Nation's press, lead me to believe that today more people appreciate the vital contribution of the exchange than ever before.

What we have learned in our surveys about new shareowners, also provides us with encouraging data on the success of our educational efforts.

First, shareowners are interested primarily in long-term investment. There was dramatic evidence of this in a study made on 2 selected days last December, during a period of high market activity. Some 80 percent of shares purchased for new accounts, it was found, were for long-term investment. Long-term transactions for both old and new accounts were, in fact, the most important single source of volume.

THE NEW SHAREOWNERS

Of the million new shareowners which we estimate have been added in the past 3 years, a sizable portion are accounted for by company stock purchase plans. Since the Brookings survey was made available, American Telephone & Telegraph will have added, by the end of this month, an estimated 100,000 employees to its stockholder list; General Electric another 45,000. Certainly many of these represent "first-time" stockholders and I think you would agree they are for the long pull.

Second, few new investors are buying on margin. Our December public transaction study revealed less than 12 percent of new investors were opening margin accounts. This suggests new investors are not adding significantly to the amount of credit outstanding.

A profile of monthly investment plan participants adds to the picture. These people are buying well-established stocks for the long term. Eighty-one percent of them are also making regular purchases of life insurance and 55 percent are banking savings regularly. Moreover, a sample cross-section of MIP investors shows they are convinced of the soundness of their programs—95 percent say they would recommend similar plans to friends; 90 percent stated they would continue their plans should prices drop. They recognize, perhaps in a nontechnical way, the principle of dollar cost averaging.

FINE STOCKS—QUALIFIED INVESTORS

The weight of evidence as it relates to securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange, and transactions by our members and member firms, shows shareownership today generally attracting qualified investors for the right reasons.

As a rule new investors are seeking good dividends and long-term growth. They are buying fine stocks, using credit sparingly. They seem to understand the risks as well as the rewards of stock ownership. And they are contributing to the market's liquidity.

Despite this, there is nothing to suggest we can relax our efforts. The job ahead is enormous.

We recently completed three major research projects assembled in a new report called "The Public Speaks to the Exchange Community." Summarized, these studies show the great need for public education—and a great desire for it as well.

WHAT THE PUBLIC THINKS

We found only 23 percent of the adult population know what common stock is, and only 24 percent can describe correctly the exchange's functions. Only 10 percent indicated they would even consider common stock as a way to invest extra money.

We were struck as we examined the survey results with two findings that seem to belie each other: some 40 million adults favor wider shareownership, yet only about 23 million can adequately define common stock. We see in these two findings an evidence of a need for much greater education. But more than that, we see that the concept of ownership sets up a healthy and attractive image. People are biased, favorably, toward the idea of ownership even when they are unable to define it adequately. This underlines the importance of assisting them, through education, to achieve the right kind of ownership in the right way.

Education, of course, is an evolutionary process. Because some 40 million Americans believe in the principle of broader shareownership, it doesn't follow that they will, or should, invest in common stocks. But we believe everyone ought to be encouraged to find out about stock ownership, to get the facts, and to seek competent advice before deciding to buy or to sell.

TOMORROW'S SHAREHOLDERS

As the ownership base is broadened—as I think it must be if industry is to obtain the funds to expand—greater participation is most apt to come from the high and middle income groups.

For example, 4 out of 5 professional men, executives, engineers, merchants, and salesmen—5½ million strong—own no stock in public companies. Their accumulated savings are large.

How many people will choose to invest in stocks? I wouldn't hazard a guess. A decision to own shares should be the last of a series of steps, preceded by information and deliberation. We know that 4 million nonshareowning families actually considered stock purchases last year. Half of this group earned over $5,000, and this may suggest the size of our immediate, interested audience. It also underscores our educational responsibilities.

These responsibilities take many forms. Last year the increased activity of phony Canadian and United States stock brokers dealing in unlisted mining shares prompted us to denonuce these rackets. The public response was an illustration, more dramatic than most, that we must discourage tips, hunches and flights of fancy, and substitute for them a solid educational program.

AN EXCITING PROSPECT

We are under no illusions about the size of the job ahead, or the responsibility we share with member firms, listed companies, educational and civic organizations to see it carried out. It is big enough to keep us all occupied for many years; important enough to warrant a steadily greater effort.

Through education we have the chance to help people everywhere evaluate the shareownership story.

This is an exciting prospect. We are happy to dedicate ourselves to it.

Grand Rapids Learns About the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there is wide concern in our country relative to the sociological and personal problems of our senior citizens. Senator CHARLES E. POTTER, senior Senator from my State, has asked that a special commission be established to study these problems of the aged.

I was pleased, therefore, to read in the May 1954 issue of Adult Leadership, a story about what is being done in Grand Rapids, Mich.—which I have the privilege

of representing—to meet certain aspects of the problems of our older citizens.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article written by Wilma Donahue and entitled "Grand Rapids Learns About the Aging":

GRAND RAPIDS LEARNS ABOUT THE AGING

(By Wilma Donahue)

The community of Grand Rapids, Mich., has a population of 175,000, of which more than average are 65 years and over. These older people have helped build the community; they have worked in its furniture factories which have brought fame to their city; they have built its churches and its schools, and have helped establish its local traditions; they have raised their families who have, in turn, continued to reside in the community.

The older people of Grand Rapids do not want to leave their city. Yet they, like older people in almost every other community, have a number of serious unmet needs. They need jobs but find it hard to get employment because of their age; they need housing better suited in size and design to their changing family size and diminishing energies; they need companionship because they have lost spouses and friends and have met social rejections; they need special health and housekeeping services but find that the community has little awareness of the importance of these services to their well-being; but most of all, they need to have their community and fellow citizens know, appreciate, and use their skills.

In 1952 a group who had been meeting together in an adult education class on education for maturity decided that they were ready to do something to create more opportunities for older people like themselves to meet their own needs and show the community that its older people were still an asset. They asked for a course in which they could learn the techniques needed for developing programs to serve the needs of the older people in the community. Accordingly, an 8-week course entitled "Learning for Longer Living: Practice in Community Service for the Aging" was scheduled.

The first step in arranging for the course was taken by Miss Helen Gleason, director of the Grand Rapids Extension Center, University of Michigan. She appointed an advisory committee of interested citizens to review plans for the total project and to offer continuing counsel and guidance in the identification and utilization of community resources.

The next step was to secure the services of the staff of the division of gerontology of the university as teachers of the skills needed and as supervisors of field projects. Working within the framework of an established university extension program, this staff and the advisory committee developed this fourfold plan of action:

1. The student body would work in project groups, with each group under the immediate supervision of one of the university staff. Students would choose the type of project they wanted and select their group.

2. Each of the project groups would analyze the community in order to make recommendations for community programs for older people. These students would later constitute a source of trained leadership for future work.

3. Each project group would appoint its own consultant committee composed of people in the community having concern and responsibility in their project area.

4. Each project would cooperate with existing community plans and organizations. Every effort would be made to integrate the project with the community's planning for its older people and not let it be simply a superimposed laboratory exercise.

In consultation with a group of the prospective students, the staff and advisory committee developed the meeting plan which follows. The class convened at 5:30 p. m. At this time the students and staff had a box supper. The boxes were supplied by one of the churches at 50 cents each. The university provided free coffee. Following the meal there were a few minutes' recreation under the supervision of a weekly student committee. At 6:30 a 15-minute general session of the class gave time for a discussion of matters of concern to all project groups. Individual groups then met to plan their work for the ensuing week. Shortly before the close of the class period at 8 p. m., the entire group reconvened to hear progress reports and future plans.

Most of the 25 men and women who enrolled had been members of previous courses dealing with adjustment to later maturity, and thus had already acquired considerable knowledge about the problems of the aging. Although the average age of the student group was slightly more than 60 years, the range extended from the late thirty's through the seventies.

At the first session the class reviewed census data for Grand Rapids, and a study of available community programs and facilities for older people.

For example, the Council of Social Agencies had established a committee on aging more than 2 years before to make studies of the needs of old people and make recommendations to the council. The recreation department had sponsored several community parties for older people and had established a number of "over-sixty clubs" to provide social outlets.

General concern about living arrangements and shelter had led to the building of a generous number of old-age homes under the auspices of churches and other private groups. Many nursing homes were established to fill the need for sheltered care of the chronically ill. The museum and public libraries were offering programs suitable to the interests of older people, such as special exhibits, hobby classes, and great books courses. The public schools had a rich program in which adults could learn new skills and could keep mentally alert through participation in discussion. The University of Michigan extension service had for a number of years offered preparation for retirement through its courses in living in the later years.

Although it appeared from the listing of programs and services that much had already been done for the older people in Grand Rapids, the students declared there was too little being done in the areas which had already received attention, there were other important problems which had been overlooked altogether, and there had been too little education of the community about the existing programs and about the unmet needs of older people.

The students selected three projects which they felt would make a definite contribution to the community and be within the range of their abilities to execute. The three projects were: (1) employment opportunities for older people; (2) friendly visiting for older people; and (3) education of the community about the values of older citizens.

How did the working groups set about obtaining their goals and what did they accomplish? Let us illustrate by describing in some detail the education project.

Seven people selected the education project. At the first meeting they elected a student as chairman and decided that the faculty supervisor should serve in the role of adviser and resource person. They also defined four goals for their project: (1) To inform the community about the problems arising from the aging of the population; (2) to call attention to older citizens as assets to the community; (3) to demonstrate the contribution which older people make to the work and culture of the community; and (4) to illustrate the persistence of skills and abilities of older people and to show the relationship to health and happiness of the use of such skills in purposeful activity.

With these goals established, the students considered ways of attaining them. They decided to issue a weekly bulletin describing the work of all three project groups. Because they considered it imperative to use the regular channels of mass communication, the students planned as part of their first assignment to interview representatives of the press, radio, television, library, museum, and advertising agencies to invite them to serve on their consultant committee.

Each student assumed responsibility for at least one project and agreed to serve also as a member of the planning committee for one or more of the other activities undertaken by the education group. Some of the projects were to be carried out during the 8-week period in which the class was meeting; others were to be planned during this time but were to be carried out in the several months following the official close of the course.

At subsequent class meetings the students reported their progress, and developed plans for the next week's activities. The consultant committee met with the group upon several occasions; and the group also kept a liaison with the other project groups in order to represent their work adequately in the programs and news presented to the community.

Here is what this project group of seven people did:

Publications: Two local newspapers ran a total of 10 stories about various phases of the class projects. A full-page spread of pictures appeared of older people at work in community service. The University of Michigan Extension News, reaching thousands of people throughout the country, carried a detailed report of the course.

One of the most important efforts of the group was the publication of the weekly Bulletin, which was distributed to all members of the class, to all consultant committees, and to other people who requested it. The circulation reached a peak of 150 copies per week. The Bulletin contained weekly progress reports and pertinent items of information about the problems of the aging.

A directory of recreational opportunities for older people in Grand Rapids was published with the following sections: social recreation; arts, crafts, music, and literature, museums, art galleries, and zoo; education; radio and television; local tours. The Grand Rapids recreation department, city library, and other community agencies distributed copies of the directory widely.

Radio: The class arranged with the local radio station for a series of six 15-minute broadcasts. The students selected the topics, developed the content of the programs, and took part in the broadcasts. The following topics were discussed: friendly visiting; occupational opportunities for older people; homes for old people; what churches can do to serve the aging; recreation for older people; cultural interests as a source of enjoyment for older people. The students managed to secure the dinner hour for these broadcasts, although to give them this time, the station had to cancel the time of a popular radio news commentator.

Television: The students used the theme of the persistence of skills learned in early life for a 30-minute telecast. Two older people demonstrated skills which they had learned early in life, and 3 members of the

class held a discussion about the importance of engaging in constructive activities throughout life.

Exhibits and demonstrations: A hobby a week library program was carried out after the close of the class. A committee from the library worked with the education project committee in the planning and presentation of this activity. The class members assumed responsibility for identifying the craft to be exhibited, for collecting the items to be shown, and for a live demonstration by an older craftsman at least twice during each week. The library displayed books describing the craft on exhibit and served punch during the afternoons on which the demonstrations were held. Some of the students served as hostesses. This project lasted for 16 weeks.

Another project which was planned during the class but which was carried out several months later was the Grand Rapids senior skill show. Working with the local museum, the class held a 2-week exhibit, displaying the work of over 100 senior citizens. The students planned the show, collected the items to be exhibited, and made arrangements for all types of publicity. The museum staff arranged the exhibit, which over 8,000 people viewed during the 2-week period. The senior skills show has since become an annual event in the community.

Community conference on aging: As a final effort, the Education Group decided to hold a 1-day Grand Rapids Conference on Aging, at which each of the three project groups would report its finding and make suggestions for further community action.

For the first time during the work of the class, the faculty advisers became somewhat anxious and suggested that the group might want to invite some of the so-called experts in fields of employment, friendly visiting, and education to take part in the conference program along with the students. This suggestion was a mistake because the students quite stole the show from the experts.

At this conference, the community learned that the social agencies had reported at least 829 older people in need of friendly visitors. The students recommended, and the Council of Social Agencies subsequently established, a friendly visiting service through the Volunteer Service Bureau of the Council.

The group surveying occupational opportunities for older people reported that 50 percent of the large Grand Rapids industrial companies surveyed would not employ workers 65 and over under any circumstances. The survey also revealed, however, that the older workers currently employed were considered by their employers to have better attendance records and to show less job turnover than younger workers; and in no single work characteristic were the older workers generally inferior.

The students recommended that special counselors be appointed in private and public employment agencies whose duty it would be to advise older job applicants and to develop job opportunities for them.

There can be little doubt that the older people who participated in this course felt needed, not because they were made to feel needed, but because they found that they were needed. They had discovered that there were important tasks to be done which they, more appropriately than any other group, could undertake and carry through successfully. They had pointed out needs; they had initiated community action; and they had acquired the cooperation of important organizations and individuals in carrying forward their plans. And most importantly, they had played a role familiar to them in the past, one in which they had responsibility and opportunity for exercising personal initiative and individual choice.

Hostile Neighbors Still Ring State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on this, the seventh anniversary of Israel's independence, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Miss Ruth Gruber, which appeared in the April 24, 1955, issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

ISRAEL'S SEVENTH BIRTHDAY—HOSTILE NEIGHBORS STILL RING STATE

(By Ruth Gruber)

Seven years have passed since Israel was born—the proud first child of the United Nations. And once again, as on that warm Friday afternoon when David Ben-Gurion proclaimed the new state, the people of Israel are set to celebrate the miracle of freedom—surrounded by hostile neighbors.

This year the birthday—always the fifth of Iyar in the Hebrew calendar—falls on April 27. So on Wednesday, 1,500,000 Israelis will parade, or cheer paraders, down the sun-drenched streets of Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, and Haifa.

TEMPERED ENTHUSIASM

From the Galilee, in the north, to the Negev, Israel's wild south, pioneers will lay down their shovels and divining rods, put on their best clothes and dance, sing and orate, much like the pioneers who opened America's wild West, danced, sang, and shot off firecrackers on July 4.

But the celebrations will be tempered. For Israel, caught in the ring of Arab hostility, is more acutely aware than any other nation on the globe, that she is part of a world shrunken by jet planes and electronically tapped by radar.

Israel's tensions are not only military—they are political, too. Israel was the only nation in the Middle East not invited to the Asian-African conference at Bandung, Indonesia. Those who called the conference were unwilling to resist Arab pressure to keep Israel out.

THE GAZA STRIP

There have been many military incidents on Israel's borders in the years since its founding. But those of the last 6 months have been largely pinpointed on the Egyptian frontier near the Gaza strip. Thus Gaza, a Bible memory since Samson, blinded and shorn of his strength, pulled down the pillars of the Temple of Dagon, killing himself and the Philistines, has become front-page news.

Gaza, a 28-mile strip of land directly south of Tel Aviv, has been Egyptian only 6 years, being part of the Palestine mainland prior to the 1949 armistic agreement, which left it under Egyptian control.

Today, Gaza mirrors the tensions in the Middle East—political and human. Here are the two sides of the refugee coin.

ARAB AND JEW

On the Egyptian side, still idle and fed by the U. N., live some 200,000 Arab refugees, the victims of the invasion of Israel 7 years ago. On the Israel side are Jewish refugees from the Arab states, changing the face of the desert and making their own homes. Joining others from Africa and Europe, they are building, drilling for water, prospecting for minerals.

Two weeks ago, the 72d settlement in this area, with the name Eshbol, was founded by a group from Iran. They found shelters, a hospital clinic, a store, school, and kindergarten waiting for them.

Arab raids, infiltration, and reprisals have been marking life along the Gaza strip. Most U. N. nations agree there will be no peace in Gaza—or in the Middle East—until the Arab States sit down at a conference table with Israel to talk peace, and a settlement of the refugee problem. This the Arabs have consistently refused to do.

Just a few months ago, Egypt's Minister of National Guidance declared: "Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestine war. Even if Israel should fulfill the U. N. resolutions, we will not sign a peace with her. Even if Israel should consist only of Tel Aviv, we will not put up with that."

NEW DEFENSE LINE

America and Britain, though eager for peace in the area, are now attempting to fortify the northern tier of states in the Middle East against Communist expansion. The line runs from Turkey to Pakistan.

The Israelis have no quarrel with this policy, but if there is an alliance, they want to be included. Meanwhile, they contend, American arms for Iraq, and British equipment for Egypt, can have a sinister meaning for Israel in another Arab war against the young state.

The Israeli man in the street has a western outlook, and feels that his country is pro-American because democracy, too, is the new state's way of life. But he fears Israel may be the victim of its own virtue. She is already on the western side; it is the Arabs who must be wooed.

He feels that Israel's only recourse is to strengthen its own army—second in strength only to Turkey's—tighten its border patrols, and go ahead with the job of national housekeeping.

FANTASTIC GROWTH

Seven years in the life of a nation are short, and often quickly forgotten. But the first 7 years can be as fateful as in the life of a child. This period has seen fantastic growth and incredible changes in Israel. Israel took in more than 750,000 new immigrants, doubling her population. It was one of the largest mass rescues of people in history.

There still isn't one cohesive Israel, but it is gradually being formed. The early "pressure-cooker" method of absorbing newcomers, getting them to discard their costumes and forget their past, has been replaced by the "slow-broil" process. Under this theory, each native group keeps its own flavor, but the juices of all groups are merged.

Thus cave dwellers from Tripoli continue to weave magnificent rugs, but they learn new skills, too. Yemenites, innocent of the mysteries of electricity and flush-plumbing, now navigate ships.

It is a startling experience to enter a plant in Yuval Gad, for example, and see the welders wearing face shields as protection against the arc, then see them lift the shields and reveal faces with side curls—faces from the pages of Genesis and Exodus.

UNEXPECTED SKILLS

Many immigrants have revealed badly needed skills. Iraqui Jews largely operate the railroad; Moroccans and Iraquis are in the post and telegraph system; doctors, nurses, and attendants from Baghdad, trained in British hospitals, run the Health Ministry.

For skilled people, there is no unemployment. There is some seasonal unemployment, but those affected are unskilled workers.

Israel could not have done this job without help. It came from America, through the United Jewish Appeal, through the sale of Israel bonds; medical help from Hadassah and other women's organizations. Grants-in-aid helped, and money and experts through America's point 4. So did German reparations for the property of 6 million Jews plundered by Titler. All of this helped Israel to reclaim a once broken people and a once broken land.

JULY ELECTIONS

This year, Israel faces the greatest responsibility of a democracy—free elections. They will be held at the end of July for the third Knesset (Parliament). In a spectacle all too rare in the Middle East, the country's citizens—Jews, Christians, Moslems—men, and women, too, veiled and unveiled, will go to the polls to choose their representatives as a free people.

There are no all-embracing blueprints in nation building. Nations, like people, grow by trial and error. Israel has made its own quota of errors. But they have always been open to the scrutiny of a free press and a freely elected Parliament.

Israel now looks to its eighth year of independence with pride—and with more wisdom and experience. There is a new spirit of the first 7 years.

This new nation fervently hopes, too, that the Western World will understand that in Israel it possesses its most dependable ally in the Middle East.

The Issue Before Idahoans on Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows the editorial comment of the Jerome North Side News under date of April 21, 1955. The North Side News is published at Jerome, Idaho, in the heart of the irrigated acreages along the Snake River in Idaho.

THE ISSUE BEFORE IDAHOANS ON WATER

"The snow and from that snow, the water, belong first under the Federal as well as State law to the residents of the State of Idaho and should be first used by them as the drops of water traverse the State. By controlling the speed of that travel they can first be used during their journey across the State and later used after they pass beyond our State," said Representative HAMER BUDGE in a recent address at Idaho Falls.

Representative BUDGE set the issue well for Idaho in those words. On the sloping prairies east of King Hill are 869,000 acres of new land and 746,000 acres in need of supplemental water. In the lower basin, west of King Hill, there are 763,000 acres of new land which can be irrigated by gravity flow and 557,000 acres by pumping. These, with other potential irrigation tracts, aggregate well over 2 million acres of new land which can be watered from the inexhaustible flow of the mighty Snake River.

A great number of new storage reservoirs can wellup the tremendous supply of water which passes through Idaho and is the greatest heritage the people have, endowed by constitutional right of our State charter.

Upstream reservoirs on the Owyhee, Payette, Boise, Bruneau, Weiser, Big and Little Wood Rivers, and the upper reaches of the Snake at the Narrows, Johnny Counts, Hoback, and others offer nearly 3 million acre-feet of additional storage for the people of Idaho with which to develop these fertile and virgin plains.

These reservoirs and these lands are the ones Representative BUDGE had in mind when he said we should "control the speed" of the water across the State.

In the meantime, Idahoans should never falter in their effort to thwart the downstream grab of storage rights. Hells Canyon Dam would be the first major inroad which could bar the future development of our plains with the bounteous water which Idaho possesses. Basically, this is the whole argument against Hells Canyon. And basically, it is the alarm signal for the people of Idaho.

Israel's Seventh Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Israel is today celebrating its seventh anniversary as an independent and sovereign state. Seven years are but a fleeting moment in the annals of human history, but in this instance the rebirth of the State of Israel after a period of 2,000 years of exile and oppression constitutes a unique event in world history. It is the realization of the prophecy of Isaiah, who said:

The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined. For Thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor.

We in the United States take note of this event with much pride because it was our country which played an important role in the creation of Israel and in helping it during these 7 years to attain a more solid economic foundation and greater political security. By now Israel has attained political maturity. Its people are possessed of an indomitable spirit to restore their ancient homeland and their long-persecuted coreligionists to an honored position in the family of nations.

The United States has found in Israel a great and devoted ally in the Middle East. It is shaping its way of life along the standards and concepts of our country. Its people believe in the same principles of freedom, democracy, and human dignity as the American people. During Israel's 7 years of independence a warm friendship has developed between the two countries.

Unfortunately, of late our State Department has embarked upon a policy in the Middle East which is endangering this relationship. In its efforts to gain Arab favor, the State Department is going all-out to appease the Arab States. Israel is being gradually isolated, its national security is threatened, and its very existence is at stake.

This is an erroneous policy. While we are anxious to gain Arab adherence to a defense pact in the Middle East, it should not be done at the expense of Israel. As we enter into alliances with the Arab States and agree to extend military assistance to them, we should do the same with Israel. The United States should grant military aid to Israel and enter into an arrangement whereby the security of Israel would be guaranteed and the integrity of its borders respected.

Freedom-loving people everywhere join with the Jews of America and their coreligionists in Israel in celebrating this memorable event—the seventh anniversary of the Jewish State. I extend my greetings to the Jews in this country for their great devotion and sacrifices in helping Israel solve many of its economic problems. I pray that the relations between Israel and the United States will continue as friendly and cordial as ever and that both countries will prove to be a great force for the good of all mankind.

Court Sets Aside Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger-Daily News on April 24, 1955:

COURT SETS ASIDE CONSTITUTION

When it decreed segregation illegal in the public schools of this Nation, the United States Supreme Court left the field of interpreting the law and entered the field of lawmaking, and thus became itself a law violator.

The Court decree dealt with what is fundamentally a social problem, not a legal problem.

It also violated that clause of the Constitution wherein it is held that the function of government shall be divided between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments. The judicial department is last named, from which it is logical to conclude that the framers of the Constitution regarded it as the least important.

Just now the Supreme Court, having perpetrated an unlawful act, seeks to establish machinery for the enforcement of that act—a function quite beyond its jurisdiction.

More bewilderingly, the Eisenhower administration, which is to say the executive branch of the Government, has seriously proposed that the Federal court system serve as a sort of glorified school board in communities all over the land to enforce the law in tailormade fashion to fit local situations.

"Bewilderingly" is not too strong a word to use—certainly not for laymen who have studied the basic plan of American Government and who have watched with increasing wonder the tendency of the Supreme Court to go further and further afield.

Perhaps lawyers find it completely logical and explainable. If so, the rest of us would like to know the reasoning by which such a conclusion is reached.

To those who stand outside the legal cloister only these circumstances can be seen:

The Supreme Court, interpreting the Constitution and the laws, said that it is unconstitutional to require white and Negro children to attend separate public schools.

The Court having ruled, it then became the obligation of the executive branch to enforce. In this case, it would logically fall to the Department of Justice to prosecute violations of the Court's interpretation of the law.

If any conference of State attorneys general, Federal attorneys, and school officials were to be held, it would seem that it would be at the call of the Attorney General of the United States.

If any agreement as to gradual or immediate enforcement were to be reached, it would presumably be worked out between those who enforce the law and those charged with compliance—State officials and school trustees.

Instead, we have the somewhat puzzling action of the Supreme Court not stopping at interpreting the law, but calling upon the States, and private individuals, and attorneys of the Government to advise it how it should enforce its own decree.

Never in its history has our Government faced such a sorry mess, such a miscarriage of justice.

Members of the Supreme Court, if they have any semblance of commonsense, should know by this time that its decree cannot be enforced in Southern States and that serious trouble will inevitably follow any effort to do so.

Oddly enough, the Solicitor General of the United States, supposedly our highest law-enforcement official, seemingly resents this effort of the Supreme Court to invade the realm of law enforcement. Last week he suggested that Federal district courts be directed by the Supreme Court to call for segregation plans to be submitted by school officials. The district court would then sit as a sort of supreme board of education to direct law enforcement.

Mississippi, of course, is not highly interested in any plan for enforcement of the Supreme Court decree that may be formulated inasmuch as this State has definitely made up its mind to continue its present segregated system, but the suggestions offered last week were quite interesting.

Tre Arkansas chief attorney ventured the thought that the making of specific segregation laws might be left to Congress, while the South Carolinian offered the idea that the passing of such rules and their subsequent enforcement seemed to be functions of the legislative and executive branches, respectively.

As the South Carolina brief voiced it, "The Supreme Court cannot constitute itself a super board of education to direct the schools according to a judicialy devised plan."

Those nine old men who constitute the Nation's highest tribunal must somehow be made to understand that they do not possess the power of a dictatorship; that they are not a lawmaking, a law-interpreting, and a law-enforcing body. It may take a long time to wrest from the tribunal the power it has usurped. That can and must be done by Congress, and the needed statutory enactment to bring this about should be made an issue in the Presidential election next year.

Chou's Peace Proposal Aimed To Cover Rebuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

CHOU'S PEACE PROPOSAL AIMED TO COVER REBUFF

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The peace proposal of Red China's Prime Minister Chou En-lai is a shrewd attempt to cover up the rebuff to Communist imperialism received at the Bandung Conference, to steal Asian leadership from India's Nehru and, most important, to achieve by negotiation that victory in the Formosa Strait which he has been unable to gain by threats.

With this move, Chou once more showed himself perhaps the cleverest of world's double-talking diplomats. His impeturbability and drawing of the latest peace rabbit from his mental hat makes Nehru's petulance look amateur.

Long before Nehru caught on, Chou at Bandung saw that he was in a tough spot. Despite India's assumption that "Nehru spoke for Asia" and that the "Asian African bloc wanted only to remain neutral," a majority of the 29 governments present lit into Communist imperialism as worse than dying western colonialism. A number defended their joining the anti-Communist bloc that gives poor Nehru nightmares. If the conference had gone on much longer, the nakedness of the Communist and neutralist champions would have been revealed.

Even as it is Nehru may never again exert the influence he had before. Certainly, the Communist-neutralist phrase that the "United States was losing all influence in Asia" was shown to be without foundation.

For in the present world situation, any country that manfully opposes communism is a friend of the United States whether it says so or not, just as any country that slants neutralism in a pro-Communist direction is an enemy of America.

This does not mean that the victory at Bandung was won by the United States. It was not. Full credit goes to those sturdy Asians from Ankara to Manila and Tokyo whose views were collectively expressed by Ambassador Romulo of the Philippines:

"I do not think we have come to where we are only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperialism, a new superpower."

The delegates knew what he was talking about. While since 1939 western colonialism has released 646 million people, communism has enslaved 740 million. There is, thanks to the U. S. S. R., more colonialism in the world than ever before.

Yet American policies in recent years have made such independence possible. By linking Turkey, Iraq, and Pakistan with Britain, Washington encouraged Lebanon to defy neutralist Egypt. By his Pacific alliances, chiefly SEATO, Secretary Dulles encouraged Far Eastern countries to speak out. By refusing to yield to Red China in the Formosa Strait, President Eisenhower emboldened all non-Communists.

As a result, sensitive Chou En-lai backed down. But only nominally. Chou—as I said above—expects to win at the council table what Red China is not big enough to seize in the Formosa Strait, namely, the disputed islands, Matsu and the Quemoys. Why should he not?

Three times as Red China's spokesman, Chou has obtained by diplomatic skill things that his country was too weak to take. (And I do not include his skill at Chungking during the war in duping American officials and newsmen into believing we could do business with Chinese communism.)

He made a monkey of General Marshall in 1946 when Red China had virtually nothing that could have stood up to a National China fully backed by the United States.

He started negotiations in Korea in 1951 at a time when his armies were on the verge of disaster—and managed after 2 years to come off with something better than a draw.

At the Geneva Conference last year he not only got North Vietnam but terms that almost surely will give him the rest of that country, leaving Laos and Cambodia in precarious independence.

Each time he did the same thing—trade verbal promises for actual occupancy of territories.

This is what he seems to be seeking in the Formosa Strait—trade a promise of not trying to take Formosa or the Pescadores by violence for the relinquishment of Matsu and Quemoy by National China. Once he gets the islands, he will, of course, decide whether or not to risk an attempt to take Formosa by force—just as though he had never made any promises.

The question is, therefore, whether Washington will be silly enough to let Chou get away with the trick a fourth time.

Our chief protection would seem to be the presence of National China at any coming negotiations. American negotiators, we may be sure, will be under pressure to "avoid war by yielding useless islands." National Chinese like stubborn Chiang and intelligent Foreign Minister George Yeh can, however, see right through Chou and one may hope that they will yield nothing.

It is even possible that Chou's latest trick could turn to our advantage. For we are on the point of offering "to beef up" Chiang enough so that he can defend Quemoy and Matsu alone. Since this, in my judgment, Chiang can never do, substituting a conference with Chou and Chiang for any veiled surrender could be a real benefit for our side.

This time Chou En-lai may have miscalculated.

Address by Hon. Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Before the National Rifle Association of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following very fine speech made by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, upon the presentation of a 19th century rifle by the National Rifle Association of America:

You have all honored me greatly this evening. Not only am I privileged to be your speaker, but you have seen fit to bestow upon me this beautiful work of the gunsmith's art in the early 19th century period.

I shall treasure this memento of our evening together—the more so because it has been presented to me by a friend and fellow Texan, Davy Crockett. I might add that I shall also respect the veiled hint its presence conveys, and accordingly shall make my speech rather shorter than longer. In all seriousness, however, let me say once again: I am honored by your invitation; I am deeply appreciative of the handsome object your kindness has bestowed upon me; and I am genuinely glad to be here with you.

In many respects, Davy Crockett and the long-barreled rifle are symbolic of a particular phase in American history deserving more attention than we tend to give it, for certain of its important elements have now returned to shape and form some of the con-

ditions of our own existence here in the 20th century. For nearly 300 years, there existed somewhere in our country a live frontier, and a considerable number of our people lived intimately and continuously with its hardships and dangers. In the beginning, the wilderness lay just behind the tidewater settlements on the Atlantic Seaboard, so that in truth every resident was a frontiersman.

Later, our forefathers resolutely pushed the boundaries of civilization into the uplands of the Atlantic plain, then over the Alleghenies into the Mississippi Valley and beyond.

They reached the Pacific Ocean and then finally closed in from all directions upon the mountains, plains, and deserts of the western plateau. And always in the van were the hardy souls, both men and women, who braved the hazards of the known and unknown, and who endured their hardships and privations. Their fortunes, and quite often their lives, literally depended upon the readiness and determination with which they were able to resist sharp and sudden attack, and upon the wisdom and stamina which they displayed in the presence of continuous danger.

Since well before the turn of this century, no American has had to contend with the historic problems of a live frontier. More than that, until a few years ago, we had little to fear from the possibility of attack by an external enemy. Thus blessed with the physical security of our homes and families in a way few other great nations had ever been, we tended to confuse a historical accident with a law of nature, and to suppose that freedom from danger was the rule, rather than an exception in human experience.

The events of the past 10 years have offered increasing proof that danger does indeed exist, that it is comprehensive and continuing, and could be virtually total in its implications. We are back again to the day of the live frontier; only today's frontier is not discernible as a ridge or a river or a tree-line.

It is as broad as the blue sky and as encircling as the sea coast, extending the length and breadth of our land. Perhaps not since 1607 could it be said that the total American community has been so eminently and equally exposed to the possible rigors of a hostile environment as it has come to be over the past few years.

So long as a few evil men have the power to threaten our security, we must in our turn learn to live under the shadow of danger, and we must prepare ourselves materially and morally to meet the exigencies which an uncertain future may present. We must retain the strength and readiness to meet any challenge, yet we must integrate our defensive preparations into our recipe for living in such a way that they do not displace the normal healthy preoccupations of a peacefully disposed people.

For us, maintaining combat readiness must not be an extraordinary adventure, but the routine response to unpleasant, but nonetheless persistent demands of possibility.

The maintenance of a people's readiness to meet the exigencies of a fluid and developing situation requires a continuing regard for certain aspects of whatever means are adopted. We must in reality be as much concerned with what things may become as we are with what they are as of a given moment. This in turn means that we must give great care to those influences which will bear importantly upon what we are able to do 1 year from now, 5 years from now, 50 years from now.

First, we are concerned, and vitally so, with the planning processes from which we are able to formulate the basic concepts for the employment of our resources to the best advantage of our defense. Policy can be no better than the planning which procedes it, and upon which it depends for its direction and meaning.

There is truth in the saying, "Who wills the end must will the means." It has no more intensive application than to the manifold processes by which the complex and massive political, military, and economic factors affecting our world situation are reduced at any given point of time to specific concepts, immediate plans, and current actions. We must maintain a continuous review of all these factors; we must constantly adjust our plans to be responsive to the inevitable changes which are sure to occur.

There is thus the need for flexible, responsive military concepts, capable of smooth and rapid adaptation to a variety of strategic situations—concepts looking constantly toward all foreseeable future developments.

Second, we are concerned with the military applications of our technology. Here we can spare no effort. The development of new weapons and techniques is a race whose stakes may be life and death. We cannot know the detailed plans of the evil few who threaten world peace, so we cannot precisely gauge their progress in weapons technology.

But we do know that they are formidable opponents, capable of scoring technological break-throughs in major weapons systems which could have dire consequences for us.

Knowing this, we have no alternative but to press forward with all possible speed on the continued development of our own weapons. Not only is this true but we are determined that the American fighting man always has for his use the finest possible products of our science, technology, and production.

There is, finally, the all-important area of personnel. The best weapon in the world contributes nothing to the national defense in the hands of a man unable ot use it.

The best conceived plan may fail for the lack of people with the capacity to execute it. Everything depends upon the man.

Our first attention must therefore be given to those measures which will insure a permanent nucleus of spirited, competent, highly trained, career military personnel in our Armed Forces. We need the best people we can get, both men and women, officer and enlisted.

Once they prove themselves worthy, we want to keep them. We want them to have a place of honor and respect in the community.

We do not want them to be unduly penalized by the personal hardships which in troubled times fall disproportionately upon them as a group.

In an effort to mitigate some of these undeserved difficulties the Department of Defense has sponsored legislation before the present Congress designed to increase the availability of medical care to dependents, provide more and better family housing, relieve some of the financial handicaps of frequent and expensive moves, and granting selective pay increases according to a carefully scaled career incentive plan. I am indeed happy to note here that the legislation adjusting the military pay scale has been passed by Congress and was signed by the President yesterday afternoon. Within the limitations set by national security considerations, we are doing what we can to relieve the handicaps of necessary separations of families and loved ones. We hope by these measures and others to adjust certain inequities and to create a more satisfactory material basis for the careers of our service people; but we must see clearly that we are in no way able to "buy" their patriotism and morale. Most of our people are in the service because in spite of the difficulties and handicaps it imposes, it represents to them a way of life and an opportunity to serve their country.

They are the ones whose acts and lives give common currency to the uncommon expression "above and beyond the call of duty." They are the ones who not only stand ready to serve but do serve, directly and indispensably, in the one undertaking upon which all others depend for their meaning and significance—the physical and military defense of the United States.

They are the ones—the only ones—who can give meaning to the billions we have allocated to our defense, for the point always comes when the efforts of the homefront can exert no further influence upon the turn of a battle or a war. At that point the issue is delivered into the hands of those who have spent their lives in preparation for just such a moment, and the very life of the Nation may owe to the foresight, the skill, and the patriotism of those who recognized this truth in the easy years of peace and who made themselves ready to meet its fateful consequences.

If everything depends upon the man, it depends particularly upon the trained man. Armed forces exist in peacetime for little more than to train and ready themselves for the hard and uncompromising test of combat. Life in the Armed Forces begins and ends with training, whether it be the simple Manual of Arms of the highly sophisticated studies pursued at the National War College.

There is individual training, unit training, technical training, training in the form of drills, exercises, maneuvers, and indoctrination. Daily thousands of aircraft rise in training flights, from the light primary trainers to the gigantic B–36's of the Strategic Air Command. The Navy relentlessly drills its crews in the tasks necessary to keep its ships at peak operating efficiency, with each able to discharge its part of the overall mission of assuring command of the sea. The Army and Marine Corps concentrate upon the multitudinous problems associated with land and amphibious warfare. Joint maneuvers and exercises among all services are regularly held and we have successfully conducted combined exercises with the forces of our allies on many occasions during the past few years.

There is a logic which sustains this incessant and burdensome routine—as clear and concise as the reality of life and death with which it is so intimately associated. In battle there is no time to rehearse the signals—to reflect back over the lessons half learned in some training base far ramoved in time and space.

The soldier can take into combat with him only that part of his experience which has become so firmly ingrained within him that it becomes second nature for him to act according to its teaching. Moments of great stress have the effect of expelling from his consciousness all but the stark objects of the battlefield within the range of what he can see and hear and feel—the enemy ahead, the man to his right, his leader, his pack, and his rifle.

In these moments his capacity to act—and hence his effectiveness as a soldier—depends upon that fraction of knowledge which has been drilled and hammered and pounded into his subconsciousness by months and years of constantly repeated training and practice. If his training has been ineffective, he becomes a cipher at a critical moment when his very life may be the forfeit of his unpreparedness. Moreover, a man in imminent peril of death can be held in place only by the strongest of moral compusions—among them a conviction of the rightness and ultimate triumph of his country's cause, a desire for the respect and approval of his comrades, an abiding faith in his leaders, and confidence in his own ability to take care of himself. Any action which contributes to any of these basic determinants of human behavior means a more effective fighting man regardless of where he may be or what uniform he may wear.

Conscience, comradeship, and confidence are the indispensables to combat morale. All depend to a greater or less extent upon what a man knows and believes. What he

knows and believes depends largely upon what he has been taught.

What I have just said relates most obviously to those who wear the uniform in our active forces. But it relates no less to our Reserves and to those who may wear it at some future time. Our Nation has in the past and will continue in the future to rely upon its civilian armed components for effective defense in periods of general emergency.

This has meant in the past, and it may mean in the future, that the young man at the corner grocery dons a uniform and takes his turn in some grim quarter where there is no second chance, and where the price of his failures and inadequacies may be exacted in flesh and bone and blood.

As you know, the President, in a special message to Congress on January 13, 1955, recommended a 5-point national reserve plan to strengthen our Reserve Forces. For the past 2 months a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, under the chairmanship of Congressman BROOKS, of Louisiana, has labored tirelessly in its study of legislative proposals in support of the President's program.

The subcommittee, deeply conscious of its responsibility to the Nation, has evolved legislation which represents a great forward stride in providing the kind of Reserve needed in these perilous times. We are hopeful of early congressional approval of the national reserve plan, with all its principal provisions, which will provide us with the means for developing effective Reserve Forces.

The national reserve plan deserves your understanding and support. It is one of the most essential parts of our effort to work toward peace from a realistic position of strength.

Never have we had a greater need for an effective, highly trained, readily available Reserve, nor was the need ever more urgent for men who, in General Pershing's laconic phrase, "can shoot and salute." There is a continuing need for the fully developed capability of all the services. Each has an indispensable place in our total military posture, as we strive to make the most out of our resources. The defense of our country is a job deserving and needful of the efforts of all our people. In an age when the price of survival may demand the total effort of the Nation, our success or failure will depend upon the willingness of our citizens to concern themselves actively with the measures for our defense, not only in the Regular Forces, but in their everyday lives as civilian members of the national community.

Here we enter an area in which the National Rifle Association has since 1871 rendered a distinctive, deeply appreciated service to our country. For our citizen soldiers to be effective in an emergency there must be a large repository of shooting skills within the civilian population. The development of these skills is the objective of your organization. Toward that objective you have patiently and consistently labored for some 84 years. I cannot express how pleased I was to learn of your newest contribution—your sponsorship with the United States Marine Corps, of a training program for the improvement of marksmanship among volunteer members of the Marine Corps Reserve.

This is but the latest of many efforts which manifest your continuing interest in the promotion and improvement of marksmanship training both within the armed services and among interested civilian groups.

On behalf of the Department of Defense, let me say that we are sincerely grateful.

In your 84 years you have contributed greatly to the safe and productive exercise of a basic right of American citizens: the right to keep and bear arms.

It is a right exclusive among free peoples. Nowhere except in a free country, where the people share a common love of liberty, could the political authority tolerate the possession and use of firearms by the citizenry.

Of its very nature, totalitarianism requires a state monopoly of all instruments of force. Organizations such as yours would be proscribed, and its members suspect.

But here in America, we have the situation in which your activity constitutes a positive force on the side of the Government, for you are directly contributing to the development and spread of one of the most basic military skills necessary to its defense.

Throughout our history, the trained rifleman has ever been a mainstay in our struggles for independence and security in a world which has not yet found its way to an orderly existence.

We must continue to rely upon him in the future, just as we must rely upon your efforts to improve his competence and readiness. As we look back upon the lives of those courageous and resourceful Americans who wrested an empire out of the wilderness, we are able to see that the efforts they made and the hardships they endured were part of the price they paid for the ultimate objective of a peaceful, stable community, in which men under just law would be free to apply their energies to a rich new land, bringing forth its fruits in ever increasing measure.

Even as we face the challenge to our own lives, we are able to see the same purpose emerge in the vastly larger context of our modern world. For we, too, pursue the ultimate objectives of peace and stability on a worldwide scale—under which men may in justice and freedom direct their marvelous creativeness into constructive channels for the betterment of mankind. The frontiers of our 20th century are the limitless frontiers of the human mind, and it is in the widening and deepening of the possibilities for man's material and spiritual well-being that our best hope lies and toward which our efforts must be dedicated.

Let us, then, look to our new frontiers, as the Davy Crocketts, the Daniel Boones, the Kit Carsons and all the others looked to theirs in days gone by: with courage and resolution, and the faith in our own capacity to prosper and grow in the face of an uncertain and seemingly hostile environment.

Let us do so with the confidence bred of the knowledge that it was the very act of surmounting the awesome challenges of the past that has made us the great Nation that we are and must continue to be if freedom is to prosper in our world.

The Sad Plight of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter which I have received from Dr. Joseph Mikus, head of the Slovak League press bureau in Washington, setting forth pertinent facts regarding the 10th anniversary of the occupation of Slovakia by the Red army. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this letter will be of interest to the membership of this House:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 20, 1955.*

The Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Aware of your deep interest for the sad destiny of the peoples of the Communist dominated Europe, I would like to draw your attention to the 10th anniversary of the occupation of Slovakia by the Red Army. Those days of April 1945 will remain ill-fated in the history of our people. At that time the Soviet Army entered the territory of the Slovak Republic and, in agreement with the prescriptions of the Czecho-Slovak-Soviet Treaty of December 12, 1943, handed over this central European country to the Marxist dominated Prague Government. When, April 3, 1945, Mr. E. Benes came to Kosice, in eastern Slovakia, he was accompanied by Mr. Zorin, the new Soviet Ambassador to Prague, and Klement Gottwald, the Vice Premier of the Czecho-Slovak Government who had been appointed some time before in Moscow and cleared by Moscow. Since that time E. Benes was a captive of these two men.

On April 5, 1945, Gottwald proclaimed the so-called Kosice agreement that the Communists and some liberals have designated as a "Magna Carta" of Slovakia. In this document many nice promises were made to the Slovak people. But there was no enthusiasm for either Mr. Benes or Mr. Gottwald. All the Slovaks were aware of the fact that they had been deprived of their national state and government. Even though the Slovak Republic may have had certain imperfections inherent to the war conditions in central Europe, it was however generally considered as a fulfillment of the Slovak aspirations to self-determination.

While on April 3, 1955, the day of the commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the liberation of Slovakia, President Zapotocky and the present Soviet Ambassador in Prague, Firjubin, were inaugurating a monument to the Soviet soldiers fallen at the pass of Dargov, in the Carpathian Mountains, all the Slovaks in the free world were mourning the lost independence of their brothers enclosed now behind the Iron Curtain, between the Tatra Mountains and the Danube and Tisa Rivers.

But one conviction is strongly rooted in the hearts of the Slovaks: that the Communist regime in their country, regime which had been imposed by force upon the Slovak people, will not be able to withstand the test of the times to come. Even the darkest night is always followed by a new sunrise.

With pleasure I avail myself of this opportunity to present you, dear Mr. SMITH, the assurances of my highest respect.

JOSEPH A. MIKUS,
Director of the Slovak League Press Bureau, Washington, D. C.

Truth Is the Persuading Ingredient of Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to include a most timely and pertinent editorial entitled "How We Subverted the Polish Reds," which appeared in the March 11 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

This splendid article, written by Mr. Albert B. Southwick of the paper's editorial staff, emphasizes, by relation of the most interesting story of Jozef Swiatlo, that the persuasiveness of propaganda derives only from the presentation of truth.

The article follows:

HOW WE SUBVERTED THE POLISH REDS

(By Albert B. Southwick)

If you think that our progapanda is a waste of time, take a look at Jozef Swiatlo. By means of a few dozen broadcasts over Radio Free Europe, he has ended the career of the powerful Polish Minister of Security and has shaken the Warsaw government with fears and suspicions.

Jozef Swiatlo fled to the West in 1953, turning himself over to allied authorities in West Berlin. He was one of more than a thousand Poles who fled their unhappy homeland in that year, but he was by far the most important. For Swiatlo was not only a high security official; he was also deputy head of the department responsible for the protection of the Communist Party leaders. He had access to the most personal and secret files in the nation. He knew all about the bloody factional fights within the Polish Communist Party itself. He was the man who had arrested Gomulka, former secretary of the party, and also Marshal Rola-Zymierski, former minister of defense, and many others.

For some months, Swiatlo was kept in hiding by allied authorities, who eagerly collected and analyzed his vast store of information. Then, late last year, Swiatlo was "surfaced" at a press conference, where he startled reporters by saying that he had personally arrested Herman Field, the American architect who had disappeared without a trace in Poland in 1949.

The Communists had long denied knowing the whereabouts of Field, but they could not ignore this. Suddenly, with abject apologies from the Polish Government, an emaciated Herman Field was released. He was given a $50,000 indemnity, rehabilitated in a sanatorium, flown to Switzerland, and is now in England.

Just as suddenly, the Czechoslovakian Government opened up one of its prisons to disgorge Mr. and Mrs. Noel Field, who had suffered the same fate. Noel Field, however, has selected to stay in Czechoslovakia. He has long been linked with the Alger Hiss espionage ring in the State Department.

This was a considerable accomplishment, but Jozef Swiatlo's work was just beginning. For the past 3 months he has been broadcasting regularly to Poland from Radio Free Europe in Munich, and his revelations have had some startling effects upon the Polish people and the Polish Government.

Truth is the one thing that Communist regimes most fear—especially the truth about the sordid personal lives and scheming ambitions of the Communist leaders themselves. But Swiatlo was loaded with just this sort of information. He started off by telling the Polish people that their Prime Minister, Boleslaw Beirut, had deserted his wife and children and was living with his mistress, Wanda Gorska. "Why don't you marry her?" Swiatlo asked contemptuously, while 4 million Poles listened.

COMPROMISED MISTRESS

That was bad enough, but much worse was the information that the Polish Security Ministry had an extensive file on Miss Gorska, whose brother had been a notorious Nazi collaborationist during the war. It must have grieved Prime Minister Beirut to learn that this file was compiled on instructions from Jacob Berman, Communist No. 2 in Poland, and the man whom Beirut had thought was his best friend. But Swiatlo assured the Prime Minister that, at least, there was no Beirut file in the Polish Security Ministry. His file was in Moscow.

And what about Mr. Berman, who played such a mean trick on Mr. Beirut, his best friend? Well, he learned that Mr. Beirut was not such a good friend after all, and that the ministry does have a file on him, Berman. What is more, the Berman file shows that Berman's brother-in-law was a big black marketeer in medicines while he was an official in Health Ministry.

Swiatlo then turned to bigger game. Beirut may be prime minister, but the man who really runs Poland is Marshal Rokossovsky, commander of the Polish Army and Moscow's gauleiter in the unhappy satellite. Swiatlo revealed that Rokossovsky's brother served in the Nazi criminal police during the war. To a Pole, there is no worse crime.

But Swiatlo's greatest triumph came when he began to analyze the sordid career of Stanislaw Radkiewicz, the Polish Minister of Security. Radkiewicz was probably the most hated man in Poland, which is saying a lot. He was the man who made Poland a police state, who sent thousands to die in the slave labor camps, and who made a bitter mockery of justice by torturing countless victims in his infamous prison cells.

CORRUPTION AND INFAMY

By revealing Radkiewicz's past, that he had collaborated with the police of the old Polish regime before the war, and by revealing further that Beirut had a copy of a document that proved it, Swiatlo exposed the utter corruption and infamy of the Warsaw regime. Such alarm and confusion was caused that Radkiewicz was dismissed from his powerful position. This event has been called by the British magazine Time and Tide, "one of the most important events to take place behind the Iron Curtain last year."

Swiatlo still is broadcasting, exposing the rottenness that is communism. Millions of poverty-stricken and fear-ridden Poles tune in every week to hear about Prime Minister Beirut's 10 palaces and his 230 servants. Public officials and secret police tremble as Swiatlo tells of wives and mistresses reporting on their husbands and lovers to the secret police. As the vast spider web of intrigue and deceit is exposed, the prestige of the regime sinks to the vanishing point.

Don't ever discount the power of propaganda—as long as it tells the truth. The Swiatlo case is an important victory for our side. The same thing could happen in other countries. Imagine the sensation that would be caused in Moscow if some powerful Kremlin figure should defect to our side and start telling what he knows.

For instance, someone like Georgi Malenkov.

Hon. Joseph S. Clark, Jr., Mayor of Philadelphia, Presents Clear and Convincing Reasons for Defeat of Bills To Exempt Field Price of Natural Gas From Federal Regulation, Stressing Need for Protection of Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., speaking both for the people of the city of Philadelphia and also for the mayors of more than 50 other major American cities, testified yesterday before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on pending natural-gas legislation.

Mayor Clark took the position that bills intended to remove the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction over the field price of natural gas would seriously harm the natural gas consumers of this country.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I serve, has been considering this legislation for many, many weeks. We have heard testimony from representatives of the oil and gas industry, from distributing firms, and other groups. I believe—and several other members of the committee concur—that Mayor Clark's statement has been one of the outstanding contributions to the committee's deliberations.

Because of the clear and convincing reasoning behind his testimony, and the excellence of the presentation, I herewith include it, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House to have it inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR BILLS TERMINATING FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER THE FIELD PRICE OF NATURAL GAS SOLD FOR RESALE IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE, TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955

I am the mayor of Philadelphia, and jointly with Mayors Robert Wagner, of New York, and David Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, have organized a mayors' committee to oppose the legislation presently before you. Fifty mayors, representing cities with a combined population of over 30 million, are now members of this committee. A list of their names and of their cities is being filed with your committee. A number of these mayors will appear before you during the next few days; others, unable to appear, have prepared statements which will be presented to you by their designated representatives. As mayors, we stand agreed that the millions of natural-gas consumers in the communities we represent have a tremendous stake in the issue now before you; and we have united in this effort to insure that the interests of these consumers are adequately expressed and protected.

It is our firm belief that Federal jurisdiction over the field price of natural gas sold for resale in interstate commerce must be continued if the consumers' interest is to be adequately protected.

In outlining my position, I would like to speak first about the situation in Philadelphia. Philadelphia has a municipally owned gasworks in which our citizens have invested over $100 million. It is operated on a fixed-fee basis by a division of the United Gas Improvement Co., a public utility corporation. Its operations are supervised by a gas commission of 5 members, 2 of whom are members of city council, 1 of whom is appointed by the mayor, and another by the city controller, an elected public official. The fifth member of the gas commission is a representative of the United Gas Improvement Co.

One hundred and fifty thousand Philadelphia householders have an average investment of $1,000 each in house heating, cooking, and water-heating appliances. Four hundred thousand additional Philadelphia householders have cooking and/or water-heating gas appliances representing an average investment of $250. The total invest-

ment in gas appliances of 550,000 Philadelphia consumers is accordingly $250 million in addition to the $100 million investment in the municipal gas works.

These figures do not include the large number of industrial and commercial users of gas in Philadelphia whose investment would run to many more millions of dollars.

Natural gas first came to Philadelphia through the pipeline of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. in 1948. Subsequently an additional supply was brought in through the pipeline of Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Co. The initial price averaged 30 cents per thousand cubic feet. By reason of rate increases secured by the pipeline companies it has now risen to 39 cents a thousand cubic feet, an increase of nearly one-third. Philadelphia is currently purchasing 40 billion cubic feet of natural gas annually from these two pipeline companies. This increase in the rates charged our municipal gasworks means that the city of Philadelphia is paying $3,500,000 a year more for its natural gas than it would have at rates which prevailed in 1948. This money is moving out of Philadelphia principally to Texas, Louisiana, and other Southwestern States. The pipeline companies, of course, have no alternative but to raise their price to our municipal gasworks when the field price of the producer is raised.

Despite this increase in the price of natural gas it has not yet been necessary for the city to raise the price of gas to the consumer. The contract between the city and UGI provides that gas shall be furnished to the consumer at cost, but broad leeway is given to permit modernization and extension of the gasworks plant on a pay-as-you-go basis, thus reducing the amount of bonded indebtedness required to pay for the capital improvements.

Efficient management, prompt installation of cost-saving equipment—such as cyclic catalytic reforming furnaces—the large increase in the number of new house-heating customers (100,000 householders since 1948) have permitted us to absorb this large price increase without passing it along to the customer.

However, the day of reckoning is close at hand. Gains in house heating are diminishing. Almost the last drop has been squeezed from the orange of savings due to efficient and economical operations. The city of Philadelphia, which as owner of the municipal gasworks is receiving $5,200,000 a year, is concerned lest this annual addition to our already inadequate municipal revenues be threatened or, in the alternative, an increase in rates to the consumer required by reason of any further increase in the field price of natural gas.

While testimony before this committee indicates that the average field price is presently 10 cents per thousand cubic feet, our pipeline suppliers are paying substantially more; and it is necessary as a practical matter to pay as much as 13 cents, 15 cents, or even 16 cents per thousand cubic feet for new supplies. Moreover, we hear alarming rumors that it is the intention of the oil companies and other large producers to push the field price to 25 cents per thousand cubic feet if this bill passes and the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate field prices is revoked.

At the current rate of consumption, every penny added to the field price of natural gas adds $400,000 to the annual gas bill of Philadelphia, and adding 10 cents would increase that bill by $4 million.

I am sure the members of this committee will appreciate from the foregoing why Philadelphia is intensely interested in the legislation now being considered by the committee.

Next, I should like to speak on the general reasons why consumer interests are opposed to this legislation. You gentlemen have listened long and attentively to the voluminous testimony presented to you both in support and in opposition to this bill. I suspect all the arguments have been covered many times. May I then summarize the consumer position, hoping that in being brief I may help clarify the real issue.

First, the issue before you is not whether the business of transporting natural gas in interstate commerce from wellhead to gas range all over the United States is affected with a public interest. That question was decided in the affirmative by this committee and by the Congress in 1938 when the Natural Gas Act was passed. The authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate such a business from start to finish has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States in a number of cases, of which Phillips Petroleum is only the latest.

Second, there is no issue before you as to whether the field price of natural gas is presently reasonable. No showing has been made by the proponents of this legislation that prices now being received by the producer are not adequately compensatory; and this indeed from the point of view of the producer must be the ultimate test of reason.

The third issue, which is not before you, is whether present retail rates for gas are fair and reasonable—or indeed whether, as the proponents of this legislation have so attractively phrased it, it is unreasonable or unfair for the producers to ask, and the consumers to pay, "but a few more cents" for their gas a day. (If we are to cite figures, we should cite aggregates; and the aggregates we are dealing with here are billions and millions of dollars, and not pennies. For every penny added to the field price of natural gas adds $2 billion to the value of present reserves owned by the producers, and millions of dollars to the total annual bills of our Nation's gas consumers.)

The real question before you is whether there is any justification for increases of this size. And the real issue raised by this regulation which we oppose is whether a group of producers, the fulcrum of whose power rests in the hands of the large oil companies in this country, should be permitted to determine the price of a commodity passing in interstate commerce and affected by the public interest, unilaterally and without policing in the consumer interest by a Federal regulatory body, the Federal Power Commission. If we can fasten our attention on that issue I would hope it would be a relatively simple decision to reject this bill on the ground that the public interest requires regulation of natural gas prices at the point where the gas reaches the pipeline as well as after. Indeed it seems almost incredible that we all should admit not only the right but the duty of Government to regulate the price at which pipeline companies may sell gas to distributors and the price at which distributing companies, be they municipally owned or not, may sell gas to the consumer, while leaving wide open and without regulation the price at which the gas is sold by the producer to the pipeline.

Much has been said about the natural operations of the law of supply and demand. I do not pretend to be an expert on so complex a question as whether free competition will keep the price of gas at the well-head at a reasonable figure. I can only state what seems to me to be a common-sense conclusion—that where an article is in short supply and where buyers are rendered relatively immobile by the huge investment required to bring gas from new fields to pipelines and on to consumers, a prima facie case has been made for, at the very least, standby powers of regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Surely this is a case where the legislative arm of our Government should not arbitrarily remove from an existing regulatory body power to protect the consumer vested in it by existing legislation as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. Is it not far wiser to leave the authority to determine the extent of regulation in the Commission, trusting to its administrative discretion to handle the matter in the public interest, and appreciating that any time this discretion is abused, the legislature retains its ultimate power to act to eliminate the abuse?

I cannot take seriously the claim of proponents of this bill that if the duty of the Federal Power Commission to regulate these prices is continued there will be in effect a sitdown strike which will result in an even shorter supply of natural gas. That the oil companies will continue to drill for oil, I would think, is obvious. That a great deal of gas will be discovered in conjunction with newly discovered oil is certainly the history of the industry today. That private capital not controlled by oil companies will continue to drill for gas found not in conjunction with oil, the record now before you seems to make clear. That despite all this the product appears to be in short supply by reason of constantly increasing demand from our cities would seem to prove the need for Federal regulation.

Two elements would seem to me to be missing from that ideal state—the utopia of advocates of laissez faire—where natural forces of demand and supply result in a reasonable price of a commodity without the necessity for governmental regulation. The first element is that there is no inexhaustible supply to produce competition between sellers. The second element which is lacking is freedom of choice on the part of the buyer. His pipeline is fixed and represents a large investment. He cannot turn away and buy from somebody else without a large additional investment. The ultimate consumer of natural gas is in the same situation. If he does not like the price of eggs at the American Store, he can go across the street to the A. & P. and all he loses is 5 minutes of his time. But if he is a new householder in Philadelphia using gas for cooking, house heating, and water heating, he must scrap a $1,000 investment in order to turn to coal or oil as a substitute.

It is important to recall the process by which this has come about. In the late thirties and after World War II, those in possession of large reserves of gas in the Southwest could find no suitable market for their gas in that region, and they organized one after another of the large pipelines, in some cases by direct ownership and in other cases through the formation of legally independent companies. These pipelines went to the market places throughout the country and said to the local distributing companies, "We have large blocks of gas which can be had at 20 cents or 25 cents. We will agree to provide you with this gas for a 20-year period at these prices. The price may change as taxes are imposed or if there is a marked increase in the general commodity index; but substantially our business is under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission and the reasonableness of our rates will be determined by the Commission." The distributing companies calculated whether or not these prices were satisfactory and would justify the expenditure of millions of dollars to ready their systems for the use of natural gas. In almost all cases, the answers were in the affirmative. The Federal Power Commission ruled the projects were economically feasible and certificated the pipelines. The lines were built and the gas turned on. Often rates to the ultimate consumers were reduced as the result of the coming of natural gas. Millions of customers were attracted by the advantages of gas and the rates which made it economical, or in some cases less costly, to use; and they spent hundreds of millions of dollars on equipment to heat their homes with gas.

The process was complete. Those in control of the reserves had found their market; and an unbreakable chain had been welded which erretrievably ties the fortunes of the consumers to the producer in the southwest. Few house-heating consumers indeed can afford to jeopardize the thousand dollars or more which they have in gas appliances. Faced with an increase in gas rates, their hands are tied by this investment; in the market place of fuels, they cannot choose as they will.

The consumers in Philadelphia are no exception. Regulatory bodies in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania cannot protect us. They must approve reasonably compensatory rates to local utilities. Local distributing companies are helpless. To get natural gas at all they have to agree to purchase from the pipeline companies for 20 years at rates considered reasonable by the Federal Power Commission. They have not authority under their contracts to reject new and higher prices. Indeed until the Phillips case the FPC considered itself helpless and reluctantly passed on hundreds of millions of dollars in field price increases in the form of higher transmission rates to distributing companies.

To summarize and conclude, I suggest the logic of the situation is clear. This is a business affected with a public interest. It is a business in interstate commerce and therefore a Federal responsibility. The Congress has established the FPC to regulate this business. This bill would tie its hands and prevent it from regulating adequately the price of the very product which all admit needs a substantial measure of regulation.

The clear conclusion I submit is that this bill should not pass and that the FPC should continue to exercise the authority given to it by the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. If the consumer interest is to be protected this regulation must include adequate control of the prices paid by producers to pipelines which carry the gas to distributing companies and to the ultimate consumer.

In Dealing With Communists the United States Must Never Again Take Words as a Substitute for Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article by Stewart Alsop. Whenever the Communists see they cannot gain an objective by force, they propose a cease-fire—not as a means of ending the struggle for that objective, but as the means of winning it. In the past they have succeeded. We must not fall for the same phony peace trick again. If we were to do so, I fear Mr. Alsop's guess would prove tragically accurate.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 27, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

GUESSING GAME IN ASIA

For those who enjoy guessing games, the following projection of events may have some interest. It may be of course, dead wrong—it might be rather bitterly entertaining to read what follows 6 months from now. Yet it does represent the best guesses of what are called informed circles in Washington.

First, the Chinese Communists will not now attack the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. The reasoning here is that, having made an ostensibly peaceful gesture in Chou En-lai's carefully imprecise offer to neogtiate on the Formosa Straits crisis, the Chinese Communists could hardly turn right around and kick off a war.

This may turn out to be a very bad guess indeed, of course. The Communist buildup opposite the offshore islands continues unabated. Yet, it is being rather confidently—perhaps much too confidently—assumed that the Communists will not soon attack.

Instead, what is now believed to be in prospect is a long feeling-out period, a time of negotiating about negotiating—very much the same sort of thing that went on after Soviet Ambassador Malik made his famous offer in the United Nations to negotiate a truce in the Korean war. The feel-out period is believed likely to continue for months, with many an alarm and excursion.

While it is going on, a rather embarrassed but nevertheless eventually effective effort will probably be made to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to pull back from the offshore islands. This, of course, could be a bad guess, too.

Chiang will certainly resist—and with excellent reason, especially as he was first persuaded by emissaries of this country to make his heavy commitment of troops in the offshore islands. But eventually, it is believed, he will agree, simply because he has no alternative—just as eventually Korean President Syngman Rhee agreed under pressure to accept the Korean truce.

The offshore islands will thus in time be turned over to the Communists, on certain conditions. Condition No. 1 is that the Communists will make some sort of vague promise not to attack Formosa, at least for the present.

No one seriously believes any more that the Communists are going to agree to any formal, permanent cease-fire in the Formosa Strait. Such a cease-fire would amount to abandonment of Chinese Communist claims to Formosa, and if anything is clear, it is clear that the Communists will not abandon these claims.

What is now hoped for, instead, is some sort of facesaving formula. The face to be saved is, of course, that of the United States, simply because the United States cannot easily agree to abandon the offshore islands to the Communists without receiving anything whatsoever in return. But a vague statement by Chou En-lai, promising to seek a peaceful solution of the Formosa question, or something of that sort, will probably suffice.

Another likely condition is the kind of British commitment on Formosa recently forecast in this space. For British domestic political reasons, no such commitment can be made before the May 26 elections. But after that, a carefully hedged British and Commonwealth promise to come to the defense of Formosa, if the island is attacked by the Communists, is more probable than possible. As one British spokesman has remarked, "It looks as though we'd have to get into the Formosa act somehow."

The purpose would not be to please Chiang Kai-shek, who would not be pleased at all, but rather to put the best possible face on the kind of settlement outlined above. The British commitment would make it possible to argue that a reasonable deal had been made, since British support would be worth more to Formosa than the small and exposed offshore islands.

All this, it should be hastily and rather nervously repeated, is strictly a guessing game. But if things do work out this way, at least war will be avoided. And at least there will be another area in the world in which the lines are firmly drawn, and both sides know where they stand. Moreover, unless the Pentagon grossly overestimates the capabilities of the Seventh Fleet, a de facto cease-fire will be imposed on the Formosa Straits, and a cease-fire has been the object of American policy in the area since the start of the crisis.

Yet there can be no disguising the cruel fact that this kind of settlement will be another big retreat in the face of Communist pressure. The extraordinary twistings and turnings of American policy in the last 6 months, moreover, will have the effect of making the retreat look even bigger than in fact it is.

For a Trained Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted hereinbelow an editorial appearing in the New York Times, on Monday, April 25, 1955, entitled "For a Trained Reserve." I feel this will be of interest to all Members of the Congress. The editorial is as follows:

FOR A TRAINED RESERVE

After some weeks of languishing the bill to provide for the training of a Military Reserve is expected to get into the status of a full committee hearing in Congress tomorrow. That in itself is a forward step, but there are others to be taken and missteps to be avoided.

In the first place it is imperative that this measure get to the floor and not be smothered in committee. It is equally important that it should not have the kiss of death of so many amendments as to make it meaningless. The tagging of this measure as a form of universal military training has evoked both political and emotional responses. This is not a time in which national security can be sacrificed to either politics or misguided sentiment. This is not the time for sloganeering.

It has been decided that there will be some numerical reduction in our regular Armed Forces. This fact, in itself, makes it more important than ever that we have an adequate reserve force. Even if we make a cut in the number of combat divisions we are required to face the simple fact of the division slice, that is, the number of men actually required to keep a combat division in combat. This can be reduced but it cannot be ignored. There must be a trained reserve to meet this manpower need. We can't maintain combat divisions in a vacuum.

This means that we are obliged to go to our so-called manpower pool. We have been able to do so in the past because our allies have held the line while we brought this pool into action. There is no reason to hope or believe that this fortuitous circumstance will recur. Our enemy, next time, will not give us time to prepare. This means, in turn, that an important part of this manpower pool must be pretrained. It must be ready for effective use at the earliest possible moment. We cannot expect to have the grace of time in which to make our preparation.

The reason for this argument is humane as well as military. We can cut losses if we put trained men into action. We are all too familiar with the other side of the picture. We have seen too many cases in which good men paid for the lack of foresight with their lives. It need not happen again if we are prudent and forthright.

Moreover, we cannot build such a reserve upon a puny base. If it is not universal it must, at the least, be comprehensive. If we could substitute in our thinking and writing the word adequate for the word universal we might get a healthier approach. We believe that common responsibilities should be shared by all and that this is the way of democracy. The present measure is designed to broaden the base of the share. It demands our full support.

A National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herein certain correspondence addressed to Mr. J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., together with his comments, relative to a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week:

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 25, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am in receipt of a letter from Herbert S. Blake, Jr., secretary, Power Crane & Shovel Association, a copy of which is enclosed.

This organization is composed of a group of manufacturers of powered cranes for all types of industrial applications. The manufacturers guarantee under the seal of P. S. C. A. that every machine meets the requirements of commercial, domestic, and export standards developed by the trade under the National Bureau of Standards and issued by the Department of Commerce of the United States.

As the varied operations of this equipment in the material-handling field is indicative of the scope of the function within industry, I would request that this letter be used for the RECORD in the effort to establish a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week.

Very truly yours,
J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS,
Westinghouse Electric Corp.,
Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

POWER CRANE AND SHOVEL ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., February 14, 1955.

Mr. J. W. HALL,
Assistant Division Staff Supervisor, National Secretary, A. M. H. S., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

DEAR MR. HALL: In response to your request of February 4, I enclose herewith material that may be in line with the request for history, aims, and purposes of this association.

Very truly yours,
HERBERT S. BLAKE, Jr.,
Secretary.

ADVANTAGES OF FREE-MOVING CRANES IN INDUSTRIAL PLANTS AND YARDS

The tremendous wartime and postwar development of our industrial plants has seen a similar expansion in outside storage and warehousing facilities.

Such expanded use of outside storage operations has been made possible largely by the increased application of free-moving cranes. These are lifting cranes which have two basic operating characteristics—(1) ability to revolve through 360° and thus to handle loads in any position of swing, and (2) a mobile mounting, of a crawler or wheel type, which is free to move at will, free of the restrictions of tracks, overhead structures, etc. Thus, they are able to reach and utilize all parts of the storage area and, further, permit revision of the storage plan at any time that improvement presents itself without interferences caused by fixed or predetermined layouts.

Free-moving cranes with lifting capacities of 5 to 60 tons lend themselves to the efficient production handling of a wide variety of materials, whether they be bulk, packaged, or unit pieces. It may be said free-moving cranes can handle as many different types of materials as there are handling attachments that may be attached to the crane hoist line.

1. They go anywhere: The free-moving crane goes wherever there is work to be done—in storage yard, on stockpiles, at loading platforms, or inside any buildings where a track crane could go. It can travel from plant to plant, servicing several separated units, either your own or those of neighboring industries. Overhead or track cranes are tied to fixed structures which limit their operating range.

2. Require no investment in fixed structures: Each free-moving crane is a complete working unit. There are no tracks to build, no foundations to lay, no overhead structures to set up. Crawler-mounted cranes move over any ground surface where a man can walk; machines on rubber go anywhere a truck can drive. There are no extra installation costs, no costly plant or yard modifications to add to initial machine cost.

3. Diversified application: The wide variety of lifting and material-handling attachments available and the short time required for change from one to the other lifting device adds to the free-moving crane's industrial versatility and diversification. The basic booms available are shovel, trench hoe, and lifting crane. The crane boom is by far the most widely used industrial attachment. Illustrations at the left represent a number of the basic lifting devices for crane booms. They are adapted for most any shape or weight object.

4. Increase work range and capacity of storage area: With a track crane, working range is measured from center line of track. The free-moving crane works independently of the track, doubles the piling area available on each side. It also can rehandle economically to the full diameter of its working range. Frequently it can save aisle and track space because of its ability to work from truck driveways, plus its long working range.

5. Outswitching service and delays: With track or overhead cranes, cars to be loaded or unloaded must be switched frequently. A free-moving crane can work a whole trainload of cars without switching, either traveling parallel with the track as it works or spotting cars as they are needed. Working independently of other units, there is no waiting time as long as you have work to be done.

6. Pooled use of cranes for small plants: Just as the free-moving crane can go anywhere there is work to be done in a single large operation, the advantages of this versatile working tool can be shared by a group of small industries in a common location by dividing time and cost of operation. Rubber-tired units are especially suitable for this type of application that involves interplant travel over public streets.

7. A safer investment for the future: With free-moving cranes a change in plans leaves no fixed structures to tear down and scrap.

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 25, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am forwarding to you the enclosed letter from Mr. Roy H. Stewart, secretary of the operations council, American Trucking Associations, Inc.

As a result of the studies made by this organization the whole concept of material handling has been revised and improved in the shipping and receiving depots of the over-the-road carriers. It has resulted in some of the finest materials handling systems to be found in the Nation, in an operation, which for complexity, has few equals.

In support of your resolution—House Joint Resolution 231—A National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week, I would request that this letter be included in the RECORD.

Very truly yours,
J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

THE OPERATIONS COUNCIL,
COUNCIL OF AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1955.

Mr. J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

DEAR MR. HALL: This is in reply to your letter of March 22, 1955, inquiring about the contribution made by the operations council of ATA towards better material handling.

One of our important functions has been to furnish advice to TOC members on new methods of handling. This has been done both at our regular annual meetings, where this has been a point of discussion, and through bulletins, letters, and other methods of disseminating information. As a result of some of the papers and panel discussions at our TOC meetings, there has been a considerable trend toward the use of four-wheel carts, both manual and dragline.

I am personally a member of the ASA Committee B69, on standardization of pallets, and as such have participated to a great extent in the work of achieving such standardization.

I hope that the above gives you some idea of what we have been doing, and will be useful in providing you with material for your program.

If we can be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Yours very truly,
ROY H. STEWART,
Secretary.

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 25, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am enclosing a letter of endorsement written by Mr. Arthur

Sanders, executive secretary of the National Association of Scale Manufacturers, Inc., which I would request be entered into the record in support of your House Joint Resolution 231 "A National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week."

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCALE MANUFACTURERS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1955.

Mr. J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

DEAR MR. HALL: The possibilities of a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week are certainly most interesting. It is good to learn that there may be such a tribute to the numerous industries encompassed in the fields of material handling and packaging.

We in the scale industry consider weighing equipment as a part of the material handling and packaging group and are certainly interested in the progress made toward the proclamation of a national week and in the ultimate success which will certainly be achieved.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR SANDERS,
Executive Secretary.

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 25, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I would like to enter, in support of your resolution, House Joint Resolution 231, "A National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week," the following letter from Mr. William H. Sardo, Jr., secretary-manager, National Wooden Pallet Manufacturers Association.

This organization and its members have made possible tremendous advances in the material-handling field through the use of pallets and the unit-load method of movement of materials.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

NATIONAL WOODEN PALLET MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1955.

Mr. J. W. HALL,
Assistant Division Staff Supervisor, Western Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

DEAR MR. HALL: This association wishes to heartily endorse the efforts which the American Material Handling Society, Congressman RODINO, and yourself are spearheading to have President Eisenhower declare a National Materials Handling Week. We shall do everything possible on our part at this end to help this drive, and trust that we will meet with success.

It is only fitting and appropriate that the Nation should salute the many people who have made possible the blessings and multitudinous savings of the modern science of materials handling.

The writer personally will call attention of Congressman DEWITT HYDE, of my native State of Maryland, to House Joint Resolution 231.

If we can be of further assistance in any way, do not hesitate to let us know.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. SARDO, Jr.,
Secretary-Manager.

Resolutions of AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Resolutions 1 and 3 of the AMVETS executive committee adopted at a meeting on April 2 and 3, 1955, in Washington, D. C., calling attention to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the opposition of AMVETS to government by commission, and expressing appreciation of the action of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in compiling information on the need for additional funds on nonbed betterments as reported in House Committee Print 27. I am sure that Members of the Congress will find both of these resolutions of interest.

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the so-called Hoover Commission has proposed to the Congress of the United States that the existing medical care benefit structure for disabled and ill veterans be seriously whittled; and

Whereas the numerous recommendations of the Hoover Commission made in the field of medical services for veterans have been built on an economy base without even passing reference to the Nation's oft-expressed and oft-demonstrated moral obligation to these defenders of our freedom; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission has in its report to Congress drawn upon a motley collection of half-truths and antiquated information on which to base its unconscionable proposals; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission starkly typifies the growing prevalence of government by commission instead of government through law—law based on just and considered thinking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That AMVETS National Executive Committee, meeting in Washington this 3d day of April 1955, do hereby officially express its repugnance at the distorted thinking which led to the recommendations; and be it further

Resolved, That AMVETS expresses its confidence that the Congress of the United States will neither abrogate its treasured right to enact wise and just legislation to a Commission bearing the name of an honored American, nor accept recommendations made under the thin guise of economy.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas the House Committee on Vterans' Affairs recently completed an extensive investigation to develop factual information on the state of maintenance and repair of Veterans' Administration hospitals (House Committee Print 27); and

Whereas the committee's investigation disclosed that there are 56 VA hospitals which require major modernization; and

Whereas it is apparent that the results of this investigation played a major part in the action of the House Appropriations Committee in increasing by $16 million the funds for renovating and repairing older VA hospitals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs be commended for their action in making this critical situation known; and be it further

Resolved, That the specific action of the House Appropriations Committee in increasing funds for the renovation and repairs program be viewed with approval, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the appropriate congressional committees and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue their efforts to accomplish the successful completion of this project at the earliest possible practical date.

Firmness and Strength Have Brought the Shift in Chinese Communist Tactics From Hard to Soft—Only Continued Firmness and Strength Can Prevent the Reds From Once More Turning a Defeat Into Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following timely and wise editorial from the Washington Star, April 24, 1955:

STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN

It still is much too early for anything but the most guarded kind of optimism over the proposal made by Premier Chou En-lai for negotiations between Red China and the United States. The hard and bitter lessons learned by the free world in past dealings with the Communists, in both Europe and Asia, should be warning enough on that score. After all, to cite the old maxim once again, the proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof, and this particular serving needs to be approached with caution because it could well be stuffed with a lot of ground glass.

Yet, with that said, the fact remains that the news from the Asian-African Conference at Bandung seems decidedly hopeful. For Mr. Chou, if his words may be taken at face value, has announced—in effect—that Peiping is ready to stage a long retreat from the policy line it has held so uncompromisingly and so belligerently for many months past. It is ready, that is, to negotiate with our Government for the purpose of "relaxing tension in the Far East," especially in the critical area of Formosa. And Mr. Chou, as if to give emphasis to the striking character of this development, has allowed himself to be quoted as saying, "I respect the political and economic systems of the United States, and China has no intention of going to war with the United States."

If words mean anything, here is a truly spectacular change of policy. Gone now is Red China's old and frequently repeated threat not only to seize the offshore Quemoy and Matsu Islands but also to liberate Formosa itself—by armed force if necessary. Gone, too, is the arrogant vow to do all this under any and all circumstances—the vow plainly and contemptuously suggesting that Peiping would never negotiate the issue with the United States, but would instead teach a lesson to that "paper tiger" if it dared to intervene with its power on the side of Chiang Kai-shek. But Mr. Chou has suddenly begun to sing a different tune. Why? What has led him to indicate that the Peiping regime may be willing, at long last, to listen to reason?

The precise answer is anybody's guess. Presumably the impressive anti-Communist sentiment at Bandung has had something to do with the change. And conceivably

Red China—which in itself is an extremely weak nation—has been told by the men of the Kremlin not to count on them for support if it gets embroiled in war with the United States. But without doubt, assuming that the Chou statement really represents a genuinely significant change in Peiping's attitude, the greatest single factor in the situation has been our Government's solemn and firm Formosa policy—a policy put in force, against the counsels of a timid minority, with powerful congressional support made virtually unanimous under the leadership of Democratic Chairman GEORGE of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This firmness must continue to govern us in whatever dealings we now may have with the Chinese Communists. Certainly, if we are to negotiate with them, if they actually are prepared to be reasonable, we must make our bargaining as hard as principle and reality demand. For Peiping, like Moscow, does not respect weakness or a soft eagerness to buy peace at almost any price, and if a sound settlement is to be achieved, we must speak and act, without wavering, from a position of strength.

Our Increasing Population Is a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a most thought-provoking editorial entitled "Babies and More Babies," which appeared in the March 13, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

This article points out with startling statistical vividness the prime necessity of the Nation to begin planning now for the economic and educational future of these citizens of tomorrow.

The article follows:

BABIES AND MORE BABIES

Since 1945 there have been 40 million babies born in the United States. This high birthrate, as Peter Drucker pointed out recently, is a factor of central importance to the future of the Nation.

Our present rate of increase is phenomenal. A baby is born every 8 seconds. This adds up to 11,000 new Americans every 24 hours, or 77,000 every week. In a year, more than 4 million arrive on the scene, outnumbering deaths by 2,700,000. By 1975, the demographers estimate that our population will be 206 million. But they freely admit their estimates could be way off. The figure might well be as high as 250 million.

What this means to the economy and culture of the country is already beginning to be felt. Hardly a community in the United States has not felt the impact of the tidal wave of youngsters since the end of World War II. But this is only the beginning. By 1960, it is estimated that the elementary-school population will be at least 20 percent higher than it is today.

Both the pessimists and the optimists are busy interpreting these figures. The pessimists fear that there won't be enough jobs, schools, houses, roads, or anything else to satisfy the wants of the myriad new Americans. The optimists see a wonderful new era, with all sorts of opportunities. They predict expanded markets, $50 billion worth of added buying power, and an age of scientific automation, with more of everything for everybody—and on a 30-hour work week.

One thing seems sure; the future is bound to be interesting. In the meantime, the schoolboards of the Nation will do well to make plans to cope with the army of youngsters now in diapers. Babies have a way of growing up—fast.

Tidelands Situation: No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith the fourth editorial in the series on the tidelands which appeared in the Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La. It has been my hope in presenting these editorials to the Congress that a clear picture of Louisiana's position would be known. The last editorial is entitled "Should Resist Bureaucrat Attempts To Fix Boundaries."

SHOULD RESIST BUREAUCRAT ATTEMPTS TO FIX BOUNDARIES

Several years ago, during the Truman administration, an agent of the United States Department of the Interior prepared a map of the coast showing where the Department believed Louisiana State jurisdiction ended and Federal jurisdiction began.

This newspaper published that map, with the comment that, by strange coincidence, the line drawn by the agent to divide State lands from Federal lands cut across the entrances of bays in which there was no oil production but drove deep into bays and coves where there were producing oil wells.

Judging by dispatches from Washington, there still are employees in the Interior Department who think that they have the power to determine where Louisiana's lands stop and where Federal lands begin.

As a matter of record, the Federal Government had little, if any, interest in the so-called tidelands until oil was discovered in submerged lands off the shores of California and Louisiana.

Also as a matter of record, the Federal Congress never has given to the Department of the Interior the power to establish State boundaries or, for that matter, to fix coast lines. Congress first made the President responsible for establishing coast lines. Later the responsibility was shifted, by law, to the Secretary of the Treasury and then to the Secretary of Commerce and, finally, in 1946 to the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

An attempt was made to legally authorize the Secretary of the Interior to define and publish lines marking areas of State jurisdiction, but this authority was taken out of the Tidelands Act of 1953 before its final passage.

Nevertheless, Washington correspondents, including this newspaper's Paul Wooton, have been informed that the Department of the Interior is having its agents make aerial pictures, draw maps, and perform other work to establish State boundaries." This apparently is being done on the theory that the Department of the Interior has authority to decide what oil belongs to the States and what oil belongs to the Federal Government when petroleum is produced from offshore lands.

This theory, we contend, has no basis in law and should be discarded, in addition, on the basis of practical considerations. The record of the Department of the Interior in handling Federal oil lands, before the adoption of the Tidelands Act of 1953 and of the companion statute which provided for the Department's leasing of mineral lands in the outer Continental Shelf, was far from brilliant. Federal oil lands were leased for 50 cents per acre when adjoining State and private lands were leased for many dollars per acre.

Just because the Federal Department received a surprising $250 million when it opened its first bids for leases on the outer Continental Shelf—after adopting bidding procedures formerly used only by the States—is no justification for it to follow bureaucratic precedent and try to take in more territory than the law allows.

The only authority which the Interior Department has to justify its recent actions is an interim agreement reached with Gov. Robert F. Kennon and members of the State mineral board.

This interim agreement was reached, dispatches reported, in an atmosphere of mutual cooperation on September 28, 1954, to prevent State and Interior Department officials from seeking bids for leases on the same tracts of land.

At that time Governor Kennon said that the State government and the Federal Government should seek some agreement on what is the shoreline of Louisiana. Since the Tidelands Act is concerned with the State's coastline, rather than its shoreline, and since the Coast Guard definitely has established the State's coastline, it is difficult for us to comprehend why officials of either the Federal Government or the State government should be bothering about a shoreline.

The Tidelands Act itself defines coastline as the seaward limit of inland waters. This is the line as defined and established by the Coast Guard and, obviously, is a definite line. In most places the Louisiana shoreline is an indefinite, shifting line—depending on tides, wave wash, accretion and other factors.

The full definition of coastline contained in the Tidelands Act is: "The term 'coastline' means the line of ordinary low water along the portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters."

As we view the situation, there is nothing vague or complicated about this definition.

Since the act of Congress which admitted Louisiana as a State in 1812 fixed its seaward boundary within 3 leagues of coast, since the Coast Guard established the State's coast line, and since the Tidelands Act restored to the States lands within their historic boundaries, there seems to us no justification for discussion of shorelines or other factors which should have no bearing on the matter.

The interim agreement reached by the State and Federal officials, we believe, should be discarded in favor of a permanent agreement, in which the Department of the Interior should recognize the realities of both the letter and spirit of the Tidelands Act of 1953.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, in an appearance before the House Appropriations Committee, recently said that 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles, applied to Louisiana as well as to Texas—in the determination of off-coast State boundaries.

The printed report of the executive hearing contained the following:

"Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask you further about the drilling off the coast of Louisiana. This is, of course, outside the limit of 3½ miles.

"Secretary MCKAY. It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. I was under the impression that the 3 leagues only applied in the case of Texas.

"Secretary McKAY. It applies both in the case of Texas and Louisiana.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. It applies in both States?

"Secretary McKAY. Yes, sir."

An attorney for the Interior Department immediately expressed belief that Secretary McKay had made a "slip of the tongue." Next day Secretary McKay wrote the committee chairman saying that the Department supports the contention that the Federal Government owns lands "3 geographical miles off the coast of Louisiana."

Secretary McKay, it seems to us, was correct when he said, "It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON."

New York State Bar Association Favors Social Security Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, at its annual meeting held in January, the New York State Bar Association adopted a resolution favoring inclusion of self-employed lawyers in social security, indicating that the recommendation is based on a poll of the local bar associations which it is believed reflects the sentiment of the great majority of lawyers in New York State. I am in favor of giving to this professional group such coverage but that does not diminish my hope that the Congress will give consideration to legislation permitting the establishment of the voluntary retirement systems for such groups as provided in the Jenkins-Keogh bills, H. R. 9 and 10. The report is as follows:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

To the Members of the New York State Bar Association:

During the last session of Congress when amendments to the social security statutes were being considered it was proposed that self-employed lawyers should be covered under the Federal old-age and surivivors insurance law on the same basis as other self-employed persons. The House bill as passed included such a provision.

The Senate, however, excluded self-employed lawyers from such coverage. When this action was taken by the Senate the members of this committee were polled and expressed themselves unanimously in favor of the inclusion of self-employed lawyers as provided in the House bill. Unfortunately, while such poll was being taken the conference committee of the House and Senate agreed upon a bill which omitted coverage for self-employed lawyers.

The question of inclusion of self-employed lawyers under the old-age and survivors insurance law has aroused considerable interest and controvery among attorneys throughout the country. The American Bar Association has in the past taken a stand against such extension of social security legislation. This year, however, a proposal to take a similar stand was defeated with the result that the American Bar Association has taken no official position.

In recent years both our association and the Association of the Bar of the City of New York approved the inclusion of self-employed lawyers under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law on a voluntary basis. Objection has been made to the voluntary feature of such proposal on the ground that group insurance cannot be actuarially sound if individuals of the group have the option of taking or refusing coverage. This objection appears valid and, accordingly, it appears proper to reexamine the problem on the basis of compulsory coverage for self-employed lawyers, thus placing them upon the same basis as other self-employed individuals now covered.

Some opposition in the past has been based upon the thesis that social security is not a satisfactory solution for the retirement problem for self-employed lawyers and that, accordingly, the efforts of the bar should be directed toward procuring the passage of legislation which would permit some form of group retirement plan for lawyers analogous to the retirement plans now in effect in most large businesses, under income tax law provisions permitting a deduction from taxable income (within stated limits) of amounts paid for future retirement. However, there is no inconsistency between social security coverage and the attempt to procure additional provision along the lines suggested. In fact, in business such retirement plans are all superimposed upon social security.

In order to obtain an expression from the body of the bar in this State this committee has asked local bar associations to ascertain the position of their members, preferably by polling them. Several local bar associations have responded to that request.

Of the replies so far received only the Tompkins County Bar Association has reported its members opposed to the compulsory coverage of self-employed lawyers under the Federal old-age and insurance law.

The following bar associations have reported their membership in favor of such inclusion: Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Bar Association of Erie County, Inc., Bronx County Bar Association, Brooklyn Women's Bar Association, Chemung County Bar Association, Chenango County Bar Association, Cortland County Bar Association, Delaware County Bar Association, Fulton County Bar Association, Livingston County Bar Association, Madison County Bar Association, New York County Lawyers Association, New York Women's Bar Association, Oneida County Bar Association, Onondaga County Bar Association, Otsego County Bar Association, Peekskill Bar Association, Rochester Bar Association, Schnectady County Bar Association, South Nassau Lawyers Association, Suffolk County Bar Association, Sullivan County Bar Association, Ulster County Bar Association, Washington County Bar Association, Wyoming County Bar Association, Yates County Bar Association.

Most of these associations reported substantial majorities in favor of such inclusion. The Seneca County Bar Association reported an even division among its members. The Erie County, Onondaga County, and Rochester Bar Associations reported their members overwhelmingly in favor of the proposed inclusion.

This committee believes that the results so far reported indicate that by far the majority of lawyers in the State favor the extension of coverage even on a compulsory basis. For younger members of the bar it is certainly true that insurance comparable to that afforded by the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law is unobtainable elsewhere, and that the cost of such coverage is considerably less than the cost of the nearest comparable insurance.

Accordingly this committee recommends the adoption by the association of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the New York State Bar Association approves and urges the adoption of legislation to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law to self-employed lawyers on the same basis as other self-employed persons are now afforded coverage under that law."

The commitee wishes to take this opportunity to thank the local bar associations which have cooperated in determining the attitude of their members on this important question.

December 15, 1954.

Respectfully submitted.

MORRELL S. LOCKHART, *Chairman.*
RICHARD J. BOOKHOUT.
WILLIAM G. COSTA.
HYMAN B. FREEMAN.
LOUIS J. MERRELL.
CHESTER A. PEARLMAN,
STUART E. POMEROY.
GEORGE W. STEDMAN, Jr.

Dallas Morning News Pats Mr. Sam on the Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Hornaday, the very capable Washington represetnative of the Dallas Morning News, wrote a fine article for his paper with regard to the recent testimonial dinner given in your behalf by the Democratic National Committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I think it only fitting that the article from a great Texas paper be included in the many tributes already appearing in your behalf:

MR. SAM KEEPS ROLLING ALONG

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

Democratic National Committee officials make plenty of mistakes, but they hit the jackpot when they decided to pay tribute to Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

The traditional $100-a-plate dinners have long honored Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

The latest affair, held in Washington Saturday night, turned to one of the latter-day figures.

SAM RAYBURN would be the last to claim rank with Jefferson and Jackson, but his admirers are not so sure that he shouldn't be placed on that pedestal even in his lifetime.

RAYBURN has been at this business of politics for a long time. To him it is an honored profession and certainly his career in his chosen field has brought credit to the profession.

Presidents come and Presidents go, Democratic and Republican, but Mr. SAM keeps rolling along. He guides the Democrats in the House with the least turmoil, in spite of the widely divergent views held by the Members.

The Rayburn dinner came at a time when there's subdued talk about peace among warring factions of the Democratic Party, particularly in Texas.

To those who know RAYBURN, it will seem strange to consider him in a role that would call for inviting back Democrats who deserted the party. Mr. SAM has some decided opinions about men who leave the party and join the enemy. On the face of things, he would appear hardly the man to try to bring back in the fold such "rebels" as Gov. Allan

Shivers of Texas and former Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina. RAYBURN probably doesn't even want them back.

RAYBURN is held in high respect by virtually all factions of the party. That is his strong point if he should choose to take the part of harmony maker. Friends and enemies know him as a man of integrity. He also has a record of acting as a peacemaker when he has considered that necessary.

He was largely responsible for preventing the 1952 National Democratic Convention from imposing a loyalty pledge on the delegates. A rollcall was practically completed on this issue and had carried when RAYBURN's boys began circulating among the delegations. State after State called to be polled to give the RAYBURN peacemaker forces time to get votes changed. Enough switches were made to prevent the pledge from being voted, and saved the party from a southern walkout. In place of the pledge southerners promised to do all they could to see that the Democratic ticket went on the State ballot under the party banner.

RAYBURN didn't step in because of any love or affection for the delegates who threatened to bolt. He undoubtedly acted for what he thought was the good of the party. This strong party feeling could induce RAYBURN to do his best again to restore unity among the Democrats.

The only result of internal strife in 1956 would be a Republican victory, and what good could that be to the Democratic Party or the country? RAYBURN could say.

The dinner could well be the start of real harmony. The fact that Democrats flocked in from all parts of the country showed they can be solid when the cause and the man appeals to them.

Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler must have had some of these thoughts in his head when he arranged the RAYBURN dinner.

It could have been in honor of Adlai Stevenson, the 1952 Presidential candidate. But a howl might have gone up from the South, and $100 donations might have been meager from that section.

Then there was former President Harry S. Truman, the only living Democratic ex-President. There might have been no harmony promoted and practically no money raised from the South if the affair had been in Mr. Truman's honor.

RAYBURN therefore was a natural. Texas responded in a big way. Some Eisenhower Democrats of 1952 got up a special train, on which the so-called Loyalists who supported Stevenson were welcomed to ride if they wished.

Resolution of General Court of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Court of New Hampshire, and passed April 12, 1955:

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Court of New Hampshire urges the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 5255, entitled "A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the construction of the New Hampshire Marine Memorial as the first memorial in the United States in honor of men and women who lost their lives at sea in all wars, which is to be erected at Hampton Beach, N. H.," now pending in the United States House of Representatives, as introduced by Representative CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives of New Hampshire in the Congress, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

Passed April 12, 1955.
Attest:

ENOCH D. FULLER,
Secretary of State.

Extending and Strengthening the Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today to strengthen and extend the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. Although this bill is similar to other measures already introduced in the House, it contains a new section to provide for incentive grants and loans to speed up the program of constructing sewage treatment plants.

In this connection, I wish to point out that the additional provision which my bill contains has the full support of the National Wildlife Federation, an organization composed of conservationists throughout the United States and in the Territory of Alaska. Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, recently testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors on S. 890, a similar bill on water pollution abatement. Mr. Callison has made a very thorough analysis of S. 890 and the proposed amendment which my bill adds to the legislation already introduced in the House and Senate. Mr. Callison's testimony follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the National Wildlife Federation is composed of State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and the Terrtory of Alaska. These State organizations and their affiliated local clubs represent some 3 million members, making the Federation the largest conservation organization in the United States. They are representative further of the more than 30 million citizens who buy hunting and fishing licenses annually, as well as many other millions who do not hunt or fish but yet depend upon clean waters in the out-of-doors for the recreation that keeps them healthy in mind and body.

Mr. Chairman, the hunters and fishermen of America have long been noted for their crusading and constructive interest in water pollution abatement. More than any other segment of our citizenry, they have worked and fought for clean waters upon which the health and economic welfare of every citizen depends.

There are several good reasons why hunters and fishermen are so keenly interested in the problem before this subcommittee. In the first place, the sportsman naturally tends to become a conservationist. He soon learns that his own sport depends upon fertile lands and clean waters.

Secondly, the sportsman gets out on the streams and lakes and along the shorelines more than the rest of the population. He gets out where he can see and smell the pollution.

Thirdly, the typical sportsman is especially endowed with the kind of energy and enterprise that makes this Nation great. He is not the kind to sit idly by and say nothing when there is a mess that needs cleaning up.

Mr. Chairman, if the organized sportsmen of America are convinced of a single fact with respect to water pollution, it is that the whole abatement program needs a drastic shot in the arm. We think it needs speeding up manyfold over its present halting pace.

I do not need to repeat the alarming evidence. The figures and charts already have been presented to you. You know about the population trends—200 million Americans expected to be needing and using water for a variety of vital purposes by 1975. The prodigious and growing demand of our new technologies and new industries for water. The increasing need for irrigation. And all of these facts set against the harsh reality that our water resources are not increasing, a reality brought shockingly home by water shortages in recent years. Water shortages are not a passing phenomenon, gentlemen. I'm afraid they are here to stay.

You know these facts. They are the same facts that have convinced the conservation-minded sportsmen of America that our present pollution-control programs—State and Federal—are like trying to fight a forest fire with a flit gun.

Some States have made a lot of progress compared to their neighbors. But not a single State—if it is looking the facts honestly in the face—can claim to be doing the job that must be done to lick the pollution menace.

The National Wildlife Federation agrees with the philosophy of the 1948 Water Pollution Control Act, a philosophy that is reaffirmed in S. 890, the bill before you. We believe that as a general proposition, the pollutor—whether he be private citizen flushing his water chamber, or Government institution, or industry—must pay for controlling his own effluent. We believe that the consumer must expect to pay slightly more for the manufactured product in order to protect the water upon which both the industry and his own personal welfare depend. We believe the public business of enforcing abatement and control is primarily a job for the States.

But we believe also, as did the Congress in passing the Taft-Barkley Act of 1948, that the Federal Government has both a stake and a responsibility in water-pollution control. It is the same responsibility which for generations has dictated the Federal programs for the conservation and development of our great river basins. And we believe that abatement of pollution in interstate waters is peculiarly a task for the Federal Government in cases where the States cannot or will not do the job.

The National Wildlife Federation does not wish to see any provision of Federal law enacted that would handicap or retard the several States in their own pollution-control programs. Spokesmen for a few States have raised, or will raise, that question with respect to certain provisions of S. 890. We do not necessarily share their fears about S. 890, but we do recommend that this subcommittee, in its wisdom and with the best legal counsel available to it, examine that question very carefully. We believe that if needed, corrective amendments can be writ-

ten that will safeguard the legal position of the States without jeopardizing the important objectives of S. 890, namely, to extend and strengthen the present Federal law, to increase the volume and efficiency of research, to meet more adequately the Federal share of the cost of pollution cleanup, to provide Federal incentives for the strengthening of State laws and programs, and to streamline the procedures in cases where it is necessary for the Federal Government to move against the pollutors of interstate waters.

I should like to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the goal of the National Wildlife Federation is to speed up the work. We want to see the laws improved and realistic appropriations made available for pollution abatement in every State. We like S. 890 because one of its main purposes is the stimulation of better State programs and better State laws.

At this point in the record, Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the subcommittee, I should like to insert a copy of a resolution adopted by the National Wildlife Federation at its recent annual convention held last March 11–13 at Montreal, Quebec.

I should like also, with your permission, to place in the record at this point our analyses of S. 890 and our section-by-section comparison of the bill with existing law, showing how the law would be revised.

ENFORCEMENT

As indicated in the Montreal resolution, the federation does not believe the enforcement provisions of Public Law 845 are adequate. Evidently this view is shared by Members of Congress. I should like to call attention to House Report 228, reporting on the Public Health Service appropriations in this session. On page 11 under caption "Sanitary Engineering Activities" for fiscal year 1956, the committee stated, "The major item disallowed was a request for an increase of $145,000 for enforcement of the Water Pollution Control Act. The committee would have looked with favor on such a request were it not for the fact that the act is, in the final analysis, almost unenforceable."

On this same page in explaining the elimination of a request for grants to States for water-pollution control, the committee stated that it was impressed with the need of enforceable legislation in this field and would be ready to review such a program and the need for funds when such legislation was provided.

It is of interest that the late Senator Taft in his testimony on Public Law 845 in 1948 stated that "The general theory has been that pollution control would be effected by the States through their own laws and through their own controls. But, as I say, there are cases where the Federal Government comes into it; there are cases where a State may not comply with its general obligations or do a good job. But there may be cases in which States do not take the action they should simply because it doesn't happen to be of particular interest to the citizens of that State. Therefore, I think we have a clear case for Federal interference. From a constitutional standpoint, as far as the Ohio River itself is concerned, there isn't any question about the Federal Government's interest. There is a constitutional question as to how far the Federal Government is interested in the pollution of upper branches of the Ohio which are entirely within one State."

Whereas the federation would prefer legislation authorizing a more active role by the Federal Government in enforcement, we are agreeable to giving S. 890 a trial, reserving our position as to its adequacy in this respect after observing its effectiveness in operation.

LOANS OR GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TREATMENT WORKS

Now for the important purpose of speeding up the program, Mr. Chairman—of getting more sewage-treatment plants constructed—we should like to recommend an amendment to S. 890 to provide for incentive grants and loans.

"SEC. 6. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized to extend financial aid in the form of grants, loans, or both to any State or municipality for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other wastes into the surface or underground waters in or adjacent to any State and for the preparation of its engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. Such grants and loans shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may prescribe, subject to the following limitations: (1) no Federal financial aid shall be made for any project unless such project shall have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 10 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Surgeon General; (3) the total amount of Federal financial aid, including both loan and grant funds, shall not be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Surgeon General; (4) all loans made under this section shall bear interest at a rate of 2 percent per annum. Bonds or other obligations evidencing any such loan must be duly authorized and issued pursuant to applicable State, local, or other law, and may, as to the security thereof and the payment of principle thereof and interest thereon, be subordinated (to the extent deemed feasible and desirable by the Surgeon General for facilitating the financing of such projects) to other bonds or obligations of the obligator issued to finance such project or that may then be outstanding."

DISCUSSION OF FOREGOING PROPOSED AMENDMENT

In the absence of widespread enforcement, financial aid as an incentive for construction is an effective Federal means to accelerate abatement progress. Financial aid is consistent with the limited exercise of Federal jurisdiction over the Nation's navigable waters, the Federal interest in pollution, and its control, the widespread benefits accruing to health and welfare through abatement, and the policy of the Congress to assist the States in abating pollution. The public at large benefits from pollution abatement.

Water supply protected by adequate pollution control is one water resource development not now subsidized by the Federal Government. As declared previously in this statement, we believe that pollution abatement is equally in the national interest with other resource development and can meet established criteria of eligibility for Federal aid. There is need for accelerating the abatement progress, and the effectiveness of Federal grants in accomplishing this result has been well demonstrated.

The need for concentrated abatement effort is attested by the increase in magnitude and complexity of pollution for over one-half century. A Federal financial incentive would be uniform throughout the country and would be an alternative to rigorous enforcement in effecting substantial progress in abatement of pollution.

Federal loans at 2 percent, which could be subordinated to private loans, would help bring down the cost of financing for cities experiencing high interest rates in the market. Thus competition for the city's tax dollar would no longer be more favorable to other, more popular public works improvements.

In order that the desired rate of progress might be made, the States need strong support in their responsibility for pollution control. We believe they have not done well in the past and that they will not succeed in the future without Federal help. This water pollution problem should be attacked now rather than delayed until conditions become so bad that a popular cry will be heard for the Federal Government to buy the solution at tremendous expense.

Mayors Clark, Wagner, and Lawrence Organize Opposition of Nation's Major Cities to Legislation Intended To Remove Consumer Protection on Natural-Gas Rates

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the mayors of more than 50 major American cities of 100,000 population or more, having a combined population of more than 30 million Americans, have joined with the mayors of Philadelphia, New York, and Pittsburgh in launching a consumers' fight against pending natural-gas legislation.

This legislation is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I have the honor to serve, in the form of bills to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the so-called field price of natural gas. If this price—the price paid by the pipelines to the producers—is removed from Federal regulatory jurisdiction, the price can, of course, shoot up drastically and be reflected in the monthly gas bills of every American consumer whose household is supplied with gas shipped in interstate commerce.

The Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, was the originator of this consumers' movement by the mayors of our major cities. He enlisted the early support of the Honorable Robert Wagner, Jr., of New York, and the Honorable David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh. The three then invited mayors of all large cities to join them in this endeavor. Following is the list of mayors who accepted their invitation, and who have joined in representations before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I think it fair to say they have been making a most convincing case on behalf of the consumer:

MEMBERS OF MAYOR'S COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS (CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OVER 100,000)

Philadelphia, Pa.: Joseph S. Clark, Jr.
Pittsburgh, Pa.: David L. Lawrence.
New York, N. Y.: Robert F. Wagner.
Akron, Ohio: Leo Berg.
Birmingham, Ala.: J. W. Morgan.
Baltimore, Md.: Thomas D'Alessandro, Jr.
Boston, Mass.: John B. Hynes.
Bridgeport, Conn.: Jasper McLevy.
Buffalo, N. Y.: Steven Pankow.
Cambridge, Mass.: John J. Foley.
Camden, N. J.: George E. Brunner.
Chicago, Ill.: Richard J. Daley.

Cincinnati, Ohio: Carl W. Rich.
Cleveland, Ohio: Anthony J. Celebrezze.
Columbus, Ohio: Maynard E. Sensenbrenner.
Denver, Colo.: Quigg Newton.
Detroit, Mich.: Albert E. Cobo.
Duluth, Minn.: George D. Johnson.
Elizabeth, N. J.: Nicholas Sylvester LaCorte.
Erie, Pa.: Arthur J. Gardner.
Fall River, Mass.: John P. Kane.
Flint, Mich.: George M. Algoe.
Gary, Ind.: Peter Mandich.
Grand Rapids, Mich.: George W. Welsh (city manager).
Kansas City, Kans.: Paul F. Mitchum.
Knoxville, Tenn.: George R. Dempster.
Louisville, Ky.: Andrew Broaddus.
Milwaukee, Wis.: Frank P. Zeidler.
Minneapolis, Minn.: Eric G. Hoyer.
Montgomery, Ala.: W. A. Gayle.
Nashville, Tenn.: Ben West.
Newark, N. J.: Leo P. Carlin.
New Bedford, Mass.: Arthur N. Harriman.
New Haven, Conn.: Richard C. Lee.
New Orleans, La.: deLesseps S. Morrison.
Paterson, N. J.: Lester F. Titus.
Portland, Oreg.: Fred L. Peterson.
Providence, R. I.: Walter H. Reynolds.
Richmond, Va.: Thomas P. Bryan.
Sacramento, Cal.: H. H. Hendren.
Springfield, Mass.: Daniel Brunton.
St. Louis, Mo.: Raymond R. Tucker.
St. Paul, Minn.: Joseph E. Dillon.
Syracuse, N. Y.: Donald H. Mead.
Tampa, Fla.: Curtis Hixon.
Toledo, Ohio: Ollie Czelusta.
Utica, N. Y.: Boyd E. Golder.
Waterbury, Conn.: Raymond E. Snyder.
Yonkers, N. Y.: Kristen Kristensen.
Youngstown, Ohio: Frank X. Kryzan.
Jersey City, N. J.: Bernard Berry.

STATEMENT BY MAYORS' GROUP ON H. R. 4560

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, a group of these mayors met with the chief city attorneys of many of our major cities to work out the details of their presentations before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in opposition to the pending natural-gas exemption bills.

Following is the statement issued that day in the name of the mayors' group by the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of Philadelphia:

[For immediate release—April 25, 1955]

STATEMENT OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE THE HARRIS BILL REMOVING POWER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO REGULATE NATURAL-GAS SALES BY PRODUCERS

On behalf of the committee, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, made the following statement at the close of an all-day conference held in the Jefferson Room of the Mayflower Hotel:

"This group here today represents most of the natural-gas consumers of the United States.

"Representatives of mayors of more than 50 cities having a total population of over 30 million people have been meeting with the chief city attorneys and representatives of mayors of many other cities, large and small. Our purpose has been to organize presentation of the consumers' case against the Harris bill and similar legislation now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The purpose of these bills is to remove the authority presently vested in the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers to pipeline companies which transmit gas to our city borders.

"Protests against this legislation are national in scope. Cities from Oregon to Alabama, from Louisiana to Massachusetts have joined our committee to oppose this legislation. The interests of all gas consumers require that it be defeated.

"Huge increases in the price of natural gas during the last few years are largely due to the fact that the Federal Power Commission has heretofore failed to exercise the powers given to it by the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case. If this legislation passes, the power of the Federal Power Commission to exercise its obvious duty in the consumer interest will be removed. Gas bills all over the country will inevitably increase in an aggregate of hundreds of millions of dollars.

"Experience has amply demonstrated that the unregulated operation of the law of supply and demand with respect to a national resource in as short supply as natural gas, whose ownership is monopolistic in character, results in one thing only: higher prices to consumers and unwarranted profits to the big oil companies of the country who control over a third of the supply of natural gas.

"It is clear that reegulation of the profits of pipeline companies and retail distributors of natural gas is not enough. The weak link in the armor of consumer protection is failure to regulate the initial sale from producer or gatherer to pipeline company.

"A priceless national resource such as natural gas affected as it is with a public interest and in increasingly short supply must be subject to effective regulation from wellhead to the tip of the burner if the interest of the average American consumer is to be adequately protected.

"We are accordingly united in our opposition to legislation which would remove this key protection to the consumer which exists in the present law."

A Bill To Amend the Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a partial tax credit for certain payments made to a public or private educational institution of higher education.

This bill is identical to the bills already introduced by the gentlemen from Louisiana and California [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. JACKSON].

Many parents have told me that they are finding it extremely difficult to afford higher educational opportunities for their children.

Educators have informed me that most of our colleges and universities have reached the limit of their scholarship possibilities.

There is no more valuable asset of this Nation than the development of the minds and characters of our young people.

This is the best proposal that I have seen because it will insure freedom of choice with respect to educational opportunities and will preserve private initiative and family interests in the educational future of our young people.

Intelligent Voters Are the Best Protectors of Our Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 15, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, a most instructive and informative article explaining the dilemma of our electoral-college system appeared in the March 12, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, which I would like to include at this time.

The precise explanation of the technical operation of this system, written by Mr. Myron M. Johnson, of the paper's editorial staff, very pointedly reminds us that "laws can't compel wisdom."

The article follows:

LAWS CAN'T COMPEL WISDOM

(By Myron M. Johnson)

At his news conference last week President Eisenhower answered a question about plans for changing the system of electing the President and Vice President. There are now two such plans.

One is sponsored by Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Representative COUDERT, of New York. It would require presidential electors to be chosen by the people of the congressional districts.

The other plan is sponsored by Senator DANIEL, of Texas, and others. It would abolish the electoral college and divide the electoral votes of each State among the different candidates in proportion to their popular votes. This is practically the same plan which Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., sponsored when he was Senator.

President Eisenhower neither endorsed nor opposed any plan for electoral changing. He did speak of the danger of splinter parties.

Under our present system, electors are chosen by popular vote in each of the 48 States, and these electors vote for President and Vice President. The electors taken together are called the Electoral College. At first the electors used their own free judgment in voting for President and Vice President. But they soon became agents of their parties. They vote for the candidates who have been nominated by their party conventions. So our presidential elections are indirect in form but direct in fact.

The Constitution says that the person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President "shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors."

It further says that if no person receives a majority of electoral votes for President, then the House of Representatives "shall choose immediately" the President; that each State shall have one vote, and that a "majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice."

In 1824 the electoral vote for President was split four ways, and nobody got an electoral majority. The House chose John Quincy Adams. But since then, third parties or splinter parties have not upset the electoral applecart.

Theodore Roosevelt and his Bull Moose Party in 1912 divided the Republicans and gave victory to the Democrats under Woodrow Wilson. In 1924 the third party under Robert M. LaFollette and Burton K. Wheeler did not prevent a Republican landslide under Calvin Coolidge. In 1948 the Dixiecrats under J. Strom Thurmond and the Progres-

sives under Henry A. Wallace failed to prevent a sizable electoral majority for the Democrats under Harry S. Truman.

The Constitution does not say that a candidate lacking an electoral majority cannot become President. It merely provides that such a candidate cannot become President unless the House of Representatives chooses him.

The Constitution does say that when the House chooses a President, its choice must be limited to 3 persons, the 3 candidates receiving the highest 3 numbers of electoral votes. Of these three men, the one with the lowest number of electoral votes might still be the winner in the House.

So the Constitution really sets up this rule: When each presidential candidate gets only a minority of the electoral votes, then one of those candidates with only an electoral minority shall become President.

Hence this is the way things stand: A person can become President without getting a majority of the electoral votes.

It could not be otherwise, under the present system or under anything similar to it. For there is no natural or easy way to compel or give a majority to any party or candidate.

Under the Lodge plan, which the Senate revised and accepted, but which the House rejected, if no presidential candidate got as much as 40 percent of the electoral votes, Congress would choose the President, from the highest two candidates.

That would not end the possibility of minority candidates becoming President. Something could be done by a runoff election, between only two candidates. Also, something might be done by a system of proportional representation, in which voters would express their first, second, and third choices for President. But there is no sign that either one of those ideas will be tried. Probably neither the existing system nor present plans for changing it can prevent the rise of splinter parties, if people should become really tired of both of the two major parties. Intelligent and patriotic voters, not laws, are the best protectors of our two-party system.

House Joint Resolution 231

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD a communication addressed to Mr. J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., by Mr. Nathaniel Warshaw of the materials handling division of the Market Forge Co., Everett, Mass., commenting on a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week, together with the comments of Mr. Hall:

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 25, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I would like to offer, in support of your resolution, House Joint Resolution 231, a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week, the following letter from Mr. Nathaniel Warshaw, manager, material handling division, Market Forge Co. Mr. Warshaw has been in the material handling field for many years and has crusaded for many years for a standardization program within industry.

In that his letter contains a message of great value to the industries and military forces of the Nation, I would request that it be entered into the RECORD as beneficial to the effort to establish a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

MARKET FORGE CO.,
Everett, Mass., April 6, 1955.

Mr. J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

DEAR MR. HALL: Thank you for your letter of April 1. I certainly appreciate the fact that you have sent me 50 copies of the excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pertaining to materials handling.

It is my opinion that there is no greater opportunity for service to the American people than in the area of materials handling. Having been in this business since 1922, when materials handling was very far from being considered an industry, I have naturally given the matter a great deal of thought.

I, therefore, feel it would be of interest to you to look over the attached copy of a talk which I delivered October 1953 under the auspices of the Society of Industrial Packaging and Materials Handling Engineers and the sponsorship of the Mechanical Engineering Department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This talk dealt with integration and standardization of materials-handling equipment and you will note that I specifically suggested that the subject is so broad and of such great importance to the American people that I feel that this particular matter of standardization must be sponsored by the Government itself.

As you know, we are an industry composed of small businesses in general. There are only 1 or 2 large companies in the industry and they, as a rule, only make certain selected items in the industry where it is necessary to provide large floor areas, expensive machinery, and service in the field.

In my opinion, there is no large leader for the industry as there is in other industries such as the automotive industry and the electrical industry.

When there is a great leader in an industry, it is usually found that they develop standards which become standard for the industry and then smaller companies adopt those standards and finally by general agreement the industry has accepted standards available.

In this industry there has been valiant attempts at standardization but progress is very slow and ponderous. There are so many small companies involved that very often their executives simply do not have the time or the financial requirements to engage in a program of standardization.

It seems very important to me, therefore, that the Government itself through the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Standards, accept the leadership in this great enterprise. Believe me when I say that I do not feel that such a situation would apply to a great many other industries or that it would be advisable in a great many other industries. It is a fact, however, that the United States Government itself is probably the largest user of materials-handling equipment in the world and, therefore, has a definite stake in such a standardization program.

I believe that almost every department of the Government such as the Quartermaster, the Air Force, the Navy, and possibly others already have divisions devoted almost exclusively to matters of material handling. I feel that a great service would be done if these different divisions and the different services were integrated together, and combined with industry to promote standardization and integration of materials-handling equipment.

I realize very much how important it is for the Federal Government to avoid duplication of the work done by industries and also how important it is to keep down the costs of Government. Nevertheless, it is my considered opinion that there are probably many other divisions of Government which could be much better dispensed with than a division composed of capable men devoted to standardization and integration of materials-handling equipment.

Let me also point out that in the consideration of materials-handling equipment it is extremely important that indoor equipment be considered along with outdoor equipment. It is all one problem and we have reached a point in our economy where tremendous savings can be made all along the line by a sensible approach to enable the outdoor machinery and the indoor machinery to be integrated whenever possible.

I know that the ASA appreciate the importance of standardization and have always been willing to help but they are usually involved in many other problems which prevents them from taking over the leadership in this particular field.

Cordially,

MARKET FORGE CO.,
NATHANIEL WARSHAW,
Manager, Materials Handling Division.

A Tribute to Mrs. Sarah Lee Fleming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure and pride in paying tribute to Mrs. Sarah Lee Fleming, of 216 Dwight Street, New Haven, Conn., who was recently the recipient of the sojourner truth scroll, an annual award for meritorious community achievement sponsored by the New Haven chapter of the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Club.

Mrs. Fleming is the founder of the Phyllis Wheatley Home for Girls. It was while she was a member of the Twentieth Century Club that she conceived the idea for a place of supervised residence for colored stranger girls those either employed or looking for a job in New Haven. To promote the enterprise she organized the Women's Civic League in 1929 and spread the idea everywhere in spite of the apathy and opposition it encountered. To arouse interest among such girls in a home where they might go for a chat and tea, Mrs. Fleming opened her own home monthly for Phyllis Wheatley days.

Various expedients were used to obtain support and contributions and eventually the league took over the annual charity ball of the Twentieth Century Club, and renamed it the Benefit Follies. Lively programs, appealing to the younger set, made money for it and

finally in 1936, a neighboring building seized by the city for taxes and repaired by national relief funds, was vacated and Mrs. Fleming, alert to the chance, obtained its grant from the city.

This is only one of her many civic and community achievements. In 1952, she was elected Connecticut Mother of the Year. Mrs. Fleming was born in Charleston, S. C., raised in Brooklyn, N. Y., and has resided in New Haven for the past 40 years. She is the wife of Dr. Richard S. Fleming, prominent New Haven dentist. They have a son, Dr. Harold Fleming, also a dentist, with a masters degree from the University of Pennsylvania, and a graduate of Harvard Dental School. Dr. Harold Fleming was the winner of a $3,000 fellowship given by the United States Public Health Service for studies in cancer, heart, mental diseases, and arthritis and metabolic ailments caused by micro-organisms and various dental disorders. The Flemings also have a daughter, Dorothy, who is a social worker and is prominent in working on problems of teenage groups.

Mrs. Fleming numbers among her many personal friends, John Lodge, former Governor of Connecticut, and former Mayor William C. Celentano, whom she has known since he was a small boy in the Dwight Street neighborhood.

A founder of the Connecticut State Union of Women's Clubs and the Women's Civic League, Mrs. Fleming is still actively engaged in her many civic undertakings. More than 400 people watched the recent presentation of the Sojourner Truth Scroll which reads:

In recognition of her meritorious community service, her deep concern for and participation in all activities advancing the status of women, her sincere effort and acceptance of responsibility to advance the brotherhood of man.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, within the last 24 hours, I have been receiving numerous telegrams and letters urging that I actively oppose H. R. 12, which will soon be before this body for consideration. I would like to insert copies of messages from the American Farm Bureau and the Utah Farm Bureau in this regard. Their pleas are similar to the ones received from farmers in my State who are hoping desperately that Congress will not take away their chance for a degree of freedom they have not enjoyed for many years.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. HENRY A. DIXON,
House of Representatives:

Voting delegates at the last annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation in December 1955 representing over 1,600,000 farm families overwhelmingly passed resolutions approving the Agricultural Act of 1954. We are strongly opposed to H. R. 12 and urge that every effort be made to carry out the wishes of farmers throughout the 48 States by defeating this bill.

FRANK K. WOOLLEY,
Legislative Counsel.

SALT LAKE CITY.

Hon. HENRY A. DIXON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Farm Bureau Board representing a direct membership of 8,000 farm families and 16 federated marketing and bargaining associations urge your continued effort against H. R. 12. This board includes president of each county and representative of each association with combined membership covering virtually every farm family in the State. Federated members include Utah Poultry and Farmers Cooperative, Weber Central Dairy, Utah Sugar Beet Growers, Utah Canning Crops Growers, Producers Livestock Association, Utah Growers Cooperative, Hi-Land Dairy Association, Cache Valley Dairy Association, Utah Horticultural Society, Utah Crop Improvement Association, Federated Milk Producers, Utah Turkey Growers Association, Superior Sugar Beet Seed Growers, Utah Beekeepers Association, and two insurance-service organizations. Over 3,000 farmers participated in 192 meetings throughout the State, resulting in resolution against high fixed supports embodied in H. R. 12. Livestock requiring supported feed constitute 71.9 percent total production, all of which is hurt by supports. Wheat producers very unhappy with support program. We urge your continued work for sound program of flexible supports.

FRANK G. SHELLEY,
Executive Secretary, Utah Farm Bureau Federation.

Machines Make Men's Work Easier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a communication addressed to me by Mr. J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., together with an article entitled "Machines Make Men's Work Easier" which appeared in the magazine Family Circle:

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 25, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am forwarding to you excerpts from an article entitled "Machines Make Men's Work Easier." It is taken from the magazine Family Circle, published by the Crouse-Hinds Co., Syracuse, N. Y., for their employees.

It is unique in that it is management pointing out to its employees the benefits derived by the installation of an integrated material handling system.

Mrs. Ellen W. Van Dusen, editor, Family Circle, writes—and I quote:

"Our thought behind this story was to point out to our people that mechanization has taken the backbreaking labor out of much of the foundry and factory work; that it has meant greater efficiency of production and greater production.

"Basically, our point was to bring home the economic facts of life to our readers."

May I point out that: This company, not a manufacturer of material handling equipment, but instead of electrical equipment has seen fit to explain to their employees through the medium of their company publication the manner in which the company has managed to remain competitive and secure their fair share of the consumers market. That they attribute it to the keeping abreast of the modern innovations and methods of material handling and its related operations is indicative of the importance they place on this function of their industry.

In support of your resolution House Joint Resolution 231, a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week, I would request that this article be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of benefit to the effort to attain that objective.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

[From Family Circle]

MACHINES MAKE MEN'S WORK EASIER—CRANES, ELEVATORS, AND CONVEYORS MOVE RAW MATERIALS IN STEADY FLOW

When today's worker goes home after a day's work in the foundry, the yard or the factory, his thoughts do not go readily to laborious methods of yesterday used on perhaps the same job he is doing.

It is only natural that he accept what is, without recalling how industry has arrived at the place where it is today.

This story is not about machines used in manufacturing products, but rather machines and machinery used to take backbreaking labor out of handling materials. Old pictures of men lifting pig iron by the piece and piling it, then lifting and carrying it again to the foundry, are in sharp contrast with what takes place today.

Today's materials handling equipment represents thousands—yes, probably hundreds of thousands—of dollars of invested capital. These were dollars made through the sale of Crouse-Hinds products that were plowed back into the business to make it a better place for workers. To stay up to date it is necessary to reinvest dollars in plant and equipment.

Efficient handling of materials, both raw and finished, has helped place the company in a position where its products can compete in markets of the world. This favorable competitive position has meant continuation of jobs for the 2,300 men and women who look to Crouse-Hinds for their families' livelihoods.

For, after all and in the final analysis, selling Condulets, floodlights, airport lighting and traffic signals is what provides those jobs.

Let's take a look at machines and machinery which, as they have been installed through the years have removed some of the hardest of men's work, and which have made Crouse-Hinds a much safer place to work.

Core sand is no longer shoveled. It is stored in the silo-type bins visible to all Crouse Hinds workers. Sand is brought in dump trucks dropped over a grated hopper, carried by conveyor to 5 great storage bins. It remains in the bins until it is fed automatically to a scale hopper on the balcony over the core room. There, in sand mixing equipment, it is mixed with oil and cereal binders to make the right consistency for cores. After mixing it is taken by small hopper buggies to openings in the floor through which the sand is fed to core makers' hoppers on the floor below.

As these skilled coremakers finish cores, they place them on racks moving slowly by their work places. These racks, suspended from a moving chain-type conveyor, are carried into ovens which bake them for final use. The cores come out of the ovens ready for piling inspection and delivery in molders throughout the foundries.

Raw materials needed in foundries are heavy and bulky. Manual labor of the hardest kind was necessary years ago to keep the foundry in operation. By comparison methods used today for handling raw materials are easier. As pig iron, scrap iron, coke, and limestone arrive in carload lots, railroad cars are emptied by a crane operating along a massive superstructure. The crane's equipment includes a clamshell bucket and a magnet. These lift the material from the cars, storing it in charging bins opening into the foundry, or, if in greater supply, piling it in the yard for later use.

Charging bins feed the charge buckets for the great cupolas which melt the pig iron, scrap steel, limestone, and coke in proper proportions to make Feraloy castings. All day men move along in front of the bins on an electric car equipped with scales, dragging down raw materials into large buckets for melting. When a bucket is filled it is lifted by crane to the top of the foundry and dumped into the cupola.

But using machinery for heavy work does not end there.

Molten metal flows from the cupola into the large reservoir ladle controlled by wheels which slowly turn the ladle emptying part of its contents into transfer ladles, sometimes called "bull" ladles. Overhead tram systems, electrically operated, allow ladlemen to push these transfer ladles to men with pouring ladles. They do not lift the transfer ladles but guide them as they are pushed on overhead trams from station to station.

Men on the pouring ladles, with help of mechanical linkage, raise and lower their smaller ladles to receive the molten metal. Guiding the pouring ladle as it is suspended from the tram, these pourers permit iron to flow into molds which move on an endless conveyor system. This system brings molds from molders' stations to the pourer and on to the shakeout. There molds are broken open, loose sand and cores shaken out. The still hot castings are conveyed on a steel belt through decoring screens to areas for sorting, cleaning, and resorting into containers called tote boxes.

Mechanized handling of materials does not end there either. Electric trucks shuttle back and forth all day moving castings from the cleaning room to Conduiet machine for tapping, threading, or other processes. There materials are handled by electric fork trucks driven by women who are adept as children on kiddie cars. Only a little effort is needed to operate these trucks. By simple operation of controls tons of castings are lifted easily. Operation is almost finger-tip controlled.

In this department recent improvements in handling acids have removed some of the hazards which accompany that operation.

Formerly muriatic acid came in 13-gallon carboys. These were emptied into pails, then lifted over a high cross bar to fill the plating tanks each time they were cleaned which is about every 3 months.

A recent installation of a 12,000-gallon tank has been made on the roof of a sand shed outside the plating room. As the acid is needed in the plating process, and by a system of valves, platers can draw the acid from the tanks.

The acid is delivered by tank car on the railroad siding and pumped into the storage tank. Therefore, this new materials handling device eliminates the dangers of burns to clothing and body as well as eliminating rehandling of the liquid and heavy lifting.

New and modern methods of handling materials make heavy work lighter, move materials with efficiency. An important by-product of modern materials handling methods are greater safety factors. Heavy lifting with its frequent resultant damage, burns from hot metal and acids are lessened by these modern methods.

Many of the original conveyors described in this article were installed more than 25 years ago. They were among the very first and largest used for materials handling by any manufacturer in this area.

A current review of the materials handling methods in effect at Crouse-Hinds indicates that we are keeping pace with modern methods for the purpose of efficiently and effectively producing quality materials that will meet competition in the market today. However, it is only through the wisest use of these methods, exercised by men and women who use their heads to help the company do the best job, that the company will be able to continue to stay in a favorable position and in the end make workers' jobs secure.

Israel's Seventh Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the April 23 issue of the East Side News entitled "Israel's Seventh Birthday":

ISRAEL'S SEVENTH BIRTHDAY
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

We will salute the state of Israel on Wednesday, April 27, on its seventh anniversary. In America we shall observe it as Israel independence day. In Israel, it will be marked with appropriate festivities. In that fair land there will be firework displays, artistic presentations, boating regattas, military parades, fairs, and many sports events.

To President Ben-Zvi, Prime Minister Moshe Sharett, Defense Minister David Ben-Gurion, and other leaders of Israel, we send our heartfelt greetings. We shout "Mazel Tov": Congratulations.

We hail the unconquerable soul of Israel. We acclaim her great leaders for human liberties. They are symbolized by the strivings and sufferings and sacrifices of such men as Herzl, Weissman, Wise, Einstein, and the other illustrious individuals who consecrated themselves to Zion's cause.

Israel's independence marks the sacrifices of the Chalutzins—the pioneers. It marks the heroism of the soldiers in the Jewish army. It marks the longing of the refugees from barbarism in Europe.

All the terrible tragedies, all the magnificent sacrifices and heroism which fill the pages of Jewish history, were crowned by the rebirth of the Jewish state in the place hallowed by the millenia of tradition Eretz Israel. In generations to come our children and our children's children will find inspiration in the story of Zion's independence.

By the establishment of the third Jewish Commonwealth in the history of mankind, the Jew—the old man of the centuries—has at last come home to the land of his fathers.

He will no longer stand in the corridors pleading for a modicum of justice. He will no longer be trampled and beaten as the sand, but will take his place among the nations of the world.

The Jews are a liberty-loving people. The Jews have unfurled the banner of light across the pages of civilization.

The Jewish state will restore the creative soul of Israel. It will seek to promote stability and independence in the Middle East. It will spread the high ideals of American democracy. It will be a great bulwark against the spread of communistic tyranny.

The youngest nation in the world—Israel—is now the 59th member of the United Nations. Her new-found freedom echoes in the hearts of freedom-loving people throughout the world. We behold her lifting her bright new spires over the hills, where long ago was born the dream of the equality of man.

Here is the strength and sinew, the heart and marrow of a new nation rising at the crossroads of civilization. It is the land of the free, yes, a home of the brave. In her short 7 years of her existence her population has grown from 759,000 to 1,718,000, her land under irrigation and cultivation has jumped from 413,000 acres to 925,000, her electric-power consumption has leaped to 820 million kilowatts. And even her income has risen higher and higher with each passing year.

So here's an all-American salute to the State of Israel, the youngest republic on earth.

May the glory which enshrines the names of her great people grow brighter as the years roll on. May the Lord again go forth out of Zion and the word from Jerusalem. May the people of the Holy Land now beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. May they, by their example, teach us to live in peace so that nations shall no longer lift the sword against other nations, neither shall they learn war any more.

May the flag of David ever hold an honored place among the banners of free nations.

Long live Israel. Sholom.

A Cow Kicked Pictures Out of the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's Cleveland Plain Dealer there appeared an editorial entitled "A Cow Kicked Pictures Out of the RECORD." The editorial follows:

A COW KICKED PICTURES OUT OF THE RECORD

We've wondered occasionally why the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD doesn't relieve some of the eyestrain of its solid pages of type by including some pictures here and there. Cartoons, as well as the articles and editorials picked up from newspapers, might enliven the Appendix section no end. An occasional photograph of a Congressman making an impassioned speech might make his text seem more palatable than it is.

These have just been random contemplations, mind you, when the sheer weight of a few hundred thousand words overpowers.

We've just been made to understand why the RECORD doesn't have pictures, through a feature story dug up by a Washington reporter for the International News Service. It seems that once the RECORD did print pictures—up to 42 years ago. A Member of Congress was permitted to insert a cartoon or other illustration to make a point.

In October 1913 a Colorado representative, George J. Kindel, an upholsterer and mattress maker by trade, made a speech in the House in which he assailed railroads for

discrimination against the West in freight rates.

He included a drawing of an allegorical cow, the 1895 brainchild of South Carolina's Senator Ben Tillman, who had opposed eastern bankers and industrialists. The cow had its feet on various parts of the country and was being milked for the benefit of Wall Street, New England, and the East generally.

The allegory pleased Kindel, but it didn't please the committee in charge of what went into the RECORD. That was the last picture in the RECORD, according to the INS.

Alas. It's too bad. One picture can save a thousand words, they say, and there are a lot of words in the RECORD that could be skipped at a saving of the $86 per page cost to the taxpayer.

The International News Service reporter who first delved into the story of Congressman Kindel and the cow, and the Cleveland Plain Dealer should be commended for bringing this incident to our attention. Now we should do something about it.

Iowa Important in Nation's Industrial Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

IOWA IMPORTANT IN NATION'S INDUSTRIAL LIFE

Iowa has long been recognized as the leading agricultural State in the Nation but few realize the extent of Iowa's industrial development, the Iowa Development Commission points out.

Hundreds of Iowa's industries are nationally known, and several rank as the biggest of their kind in the Nation. For instance, says the commission:

Iowa has the largest cereal plant, washing-machine industry, fountain pen manufacturer, door and mill work factory, fresh water pearl-button industry, popcorn-processing plant, processor of honey, plastic fiber skate-wheel plant, silvery iron factory, independent pork-processing business, wringer manufacturer, wheel tractor manufacturing plant, single operated packing plant, manufacturer of portable crushing and screening plants, aluminum plate rolling mill, warm air heating systems manufacturer, poultry equipment manufacturer, cellophane producing plant, rotary pump builders, producer of automatic valves and regulators, 2- and 4-cycle gasoline-engine manufacturer.

With 3,736 manufacturing plants located in 588 cities and towns, there is a wide and even distribution of industry throughout the State. There are 2,278 different products made in Iowa, and world trade carries the products of 539 Iowa manufacturers who are directly engaged in exporting.

Since Iowa produces 10 percent of the Nation's food supply, food manufacturing and processing leads all other industries in the State, accounting for more than half of the value of the State's manufactured products. But food is just one of the major manufacturing industries.

During the post-World War II years, nearly 900 new industries have set up shop in Iowa, the development commission tallies, affording more than 35,000 additional job opportunities and creating an additional annual payroll in excess of $120 million. Commission figures indicate that the growth and development of Iowa is going forward at a faster rate than the Nation as a whole. With the value of Iowa's manufactured products exceeding the value of her agricultural products, the State has a fine economic balance.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to examples of the correspondence I am receiving in opposition to H. R. 12, which will soon come before this body. These two selected items represent the urban and rural resentment against the proposed return to rigid price controls. The one represents the thinking of a farmer from the northern part of my State of Utah, the other a businessman from New York City. A copy of the letter from Mr. Danahy, vice president of the West Side Association of Commerce, New York, who has given me permission to insert his communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was sent to my office.

LOGAN, UTAH, *April 7, 1955.*
Representative H. ALDOUS DIXON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIXON: I notice with some concern that the House Agricultural Committee of which you are a member has reported out a bill sponsored by Chairman COOLEY to restore mandatory 90 percent price supports on the so-called basics. I am also aware that you are in opposition to this bill as it was voted upon by the committee. I wish to commend you for your stand in favor of the 1954 Agricultural Act passed by Congress last year. Mr. G. Alvin Carpenter, with whom I am well acquainted, informs me that you are doing excellent work in representing the people of Utah.

The 1954 act is basicly sound, and while I am sure that it will not solve all of the farmers' problems overnight, it represents a change in the direction that we are moving: a change toward less Government regulation to more freedom of individual planning and initiative. Such a program, that of allowing supply and demand to function somewhat in the establishment of price and placing responsibility upon the individual is what has placed this Nation in its enviable position of world leadership. I believe and am sure that the majority of farmers feel that the Government should guarantee to individuals only the right to work and produce for a profit, but should not guarantee the profit.

I view with great alarm the uniting of labor groups and a small group of organized farmers to trade votes for labor's minimum wage proposal and 90 percent mandatory supports for the basics. It will indeed be a sorry day when the farm program sheds its bipartisan approach to the problems of agriculture and becomes a political football. Then the price fixers will have gained their final prize: that of buying the votes of farmers with the golden promise of a Government handout.

I realize that there are strong organized forces trying to influence against the 1954 Agricultural Act, but I want you to know that the majority of the farm people in Cache County are in favor of the basic underlying principle of the flexible price support program now existing under the law.

Again may I commend you for the fine support which you have given to the program recommended by the American Farm Bureau Federation which represents over 75 percent of all the organized farmers in this Nation and encourage you in your work in Washington.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH R. CARDON,
Chairman, Cache County Farm Bureau Policy Development Committee.

WEST SIDE ASSOCIATION
OF COMMERCE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 13, 1955.
Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: By authority of the board of directors, I am authorized to inform you that this association is emphatically opposed to House Resolution 12 which would amend paragraph 6, section D, of section 101 of the Agricultural Act and which would restore Government subsidies on basic agricultural commodities to 90 percent of parity.

We raise no question at this time in regard to the principle of subsidies but we do express the viewpoint that the country cannot expect to get back on a sound economic base while these subsidies are kept high and on a mandatory level. We believe that the amendment adopted last year making the amount of these subsidies discretionary was of tremendous value to the consumer without being injurious to the agricultural interests. Only a percentage of our citizens are agricultural producers but everyone is a consumer. Consequently, we believe that there should be flexibility in any Government assistance; otherwise a consideration which is being given to the producer will work an injustice and a hardship on the distributor and the consumer.

We sincerely trust, therefore, that Congress will retain the existing, sliding scale of assistance and will disapprove H. R. 12.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES W. DANAHY,
Vice President, West Side Association of Commerce, Inc.

The Austrian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues are aware of my concern with regard to the part played by the United States from 1945 to 1947, in the forced repatriation of anti-Communists. We cannot sit idly by and watch this same tragedy occur to those anti-Communists now residing in Austria. I feel that it is my duty and the duty of all of us to demand that the United States not agree to the Austrian state treaty so long as it carries the language now embodied in article 16.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of April 27, 1955:

REPEAT A CRIME OF 1945?

The Big Four Ambassadors in Vienna are to meet there Monday with Austrian representatives to talk over the peace treaty to which Soviet Russia has suddenly consented after 10 years' stalling. Final drafting of the treaty will be done later by the Big Four Foreign Ministers.

All this will be fine, we think, if a certain grisly gimmick in the proposed treaty is removed.

GIMMICK IN THE AUSTRIA TREATY

The gimmick is article 16. It requires Austria to order back to Russia the 30,000 or so former Soviet citizens now living in Austria as displaced persons. Only a handful of these are reported willing to go home. The great majority, if they should go back, wound be liquidated quickly or slowly.

Article 16 further stipulates that Austria is to deny relief or help of any kind to such persons who refuse to go home; if they fought or worked against Russia in the war or are now engaged in any activities unfriendly to Russia. That means nearly all of the 30,000.

If carried out, article 16 would produce a small-scale repetition of the huge crime of 1945, when the Allies forced hordes of Russian war prisoners and deserters to return to their homeland and certain death. Many of these killed themselves rather than go back to the Red paradise.

We hope the Western Powers will insist that this article be kicked out of the treaty in its entirety.

Speaking of parleys with Russia, the Western Big Three have agreed to send their Foreign Ministers to Paris on May 8 to talk about an eventual Big Four discussion of many of the frictions between the West and the Red slave empire.

So how about the Big Three resolving right now to act their strength and size at this powwow, whenever it takes place?

TALK FROM STRENGTH

Soviet Russia now has a bad depression and a serious food shortage. Its railroads are punk. Its slave peoples—Poles, Czechs, Rumanians, and so on, hate the Kremlin gangsters' guts. The best intelligence reports put it far behind the West in atomic and hydrogen bomb stockpiles.

Russia, in short, is in bad shape to fight a war. The West is strong and growing stronger. How about our delegates to any Big Four parley acting on that fact, by talking from strength, not from imagined weakness? Reds understand that kind of talk, and this looks like the chance of a decade to give them a large and healthy barrage of it. Healthy, that is, for our side in the cold war.

Decline of the Red Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared under date of April 24, 1955, in the Il Progresso-Italo-Americano:

DECLINE OF THE RED STAR

Another clamorous defeat has put an end to Communist control of the Falck steel plant in Sesto San Giovanni, Italy. In the most recent shop-committee elections the Kremlin stooges were beaten by the free workers who gained a more decisive victory than they did in the Fiat plant several weeks ago. The Marxist debacle is growing and it is spreading to all fields of activity, from the industrial to the agricultural. It appears to be a symptomatic reawakening of labor which is anxious to vindicate its patriotic traditions, betrayed and abused by its enemies. It is a brave and impressive reassertion of a principle, which clearly indicates that the demagogic binge, which had brought about untenable situations, is now over and the defense of the betrayal and desertion shamelessly built up by the party big shots in the newspapers and in Parliament, has been disavowed. The false prophets of bolshevism are being systematically left to their fate and their isolation. The patriotic traditions of the Italian workmen, from Antonio Sciesa to Enrico Toti, have become the banner around which the free workers have rallied. These workers want to immunize class struggle from the criminal corruption of attacks on liberty and on the survival of the Nation.

THE TACTICS OF TERROR

The overwhelming successes in the shop committee elections and in the sick-benefit fund elections and the pitiful failure of the general strike in Rovigo are three concomitant aspects of the rebirth of free labor in Italy. Communism is in retreat all along the line. The courageous action of those who fight it in its greatest strongholds, by documenting its baseness, its crimes, and its shameful objectives, is showing its symptomatic results.

The Communist slave drivers are well aware of this complete reversal of the situation. The attempts to resist the storm by mobilizing the "hard core" lieutenants of Secchia, DeVittorio, Roasio and Cicalini, have brought only complete failure. The Italian people have awakened from their drugged sleep and they are resolute in their desire to make amends for themselves and for the world.

Frightened by what is happening and convinced that they will soon have to account to their Muscovite overlords, for their progressive defeats, the mercenary chiefs of Italian bolshevism have again adopted the brutal policy of terror. The massacre at Carpinati, of the farmers who had gathered to celebrate their victory over the Marxist cutthroats, is the clearest proof of this desperate and bestial decision.

A CHALLENGE TO THE OPPRESSORS

It was not humanly possible that in a nation like Italy the Kremlin fifth column empire could survive these events and survive also the sense of repentance which is one of the most celebrated virtues of the race.

From Turin, from Genoa, and from the other industrial centers of northern Italy comes the admonition that the General Confederation of Labor dominated by the Communists, is losing its power.

In all the provinces the farmers are deserting the Red cells en masse and are joining up solidly with the organization of the working farmers. This is a phantom castle breaking up. This is an instinct of revolt rising in the hearts of men to cause them to break the chains of a brutal dictatorship under whose domination man is destined to lose the best aspects of his human personality. This is a magnanimous challenge hurled by the right to liberty and to survival against the cynicism of the oppressors and the lead of hired gunmen.

The Government has decided to face the internal enemy with the legal weapons of the statutes. There is no doubt whatsoever that the rights of the State and the rights of the citizens will be protected and defended against any vacciliation.

But more than the energetic action of the Government, it will be the mobilization of the people themselves, which will finally free Italy from an insidious menace and will free the working classes from a grievous nightmare and from on unacceptable extortion.

Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, much misinformation has been circulated over the alleged "invasion" of Dinosaur National Monument by Echo Park Dam. Actually, it is the monument that is the invader. When the monument was enlarged its area encompassed 11 power and reclamation site withdrawals. These withdrawals preceded the enlargement of the monument by from 34 to 13 years. They are still in effect and the proclamation enlarging Dinosaur from 80 to over 200,000 acres makes the administration of the monument subject to these withdrawals.

It is not difficult to understand, therefore, why the people of this area are outraged by so-called conservationists who are using the existence of the monument as a means of trying to defeat the upper Colorado storage project. They were promised by representatives of their Government that the creation of this monument would not endanger their need for additional water and the projects to bring it onto the land.

For the consideration of the House, I am inserting at this point a statement of the facts by the official spokesman of the Department of Interior who held hearings in the area prior to the enlargement of Dinosaur. The article which appeared in the Deseret News-Telegram, of Salt Lake City, April 23, follows:

UTAHAN RECALLS 1937 VOW ON ECHO SITE

PROVO.—"If you residents approve the expansion of Dinosaur National Monument, your reclamation and power rights in the area will be protected.

"This was the promise I made to Utah and Colorado residents at the time the monument was expanded to take in the Echo Park Dam site."

David H. Madsen, acting supervisor of the Dinosaur National Monument at the time it was expanded, Saturday made this statement in support of the Echo Park Dam, the key unit of the Colorado River storage project.

Mr. Madsen was the National Parks Service representative who conducted hearings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., in 1937 on the expansion of the Dinosaur Monument.

INTERVIEWED AT HOME

The veteran parks service employee was located by the Deseret News and Telegram and interviewed at his Provo home, where he is now living in retirement. Although 74 years old, he remembers keenly the details of his Federal and State service. During his long and notable career he held many positions of responsibility.

"Of course we had to promise the residents that their reclamation and power filings, as well as their grazing rights, would be protected," he said. "We knew that if there was any opposition the monument could never be expanded."

"I made these promises on the express orders of the National Parks Service and the Secretary of the Interior," Mr. Madsen said. "I even received direct telegraphed orders from Secretary Ickes himself on this subject."

ENDORSES PROJECT

"Because of my connection with the monument, I think it is safe to say I am as familiar with the details of its expansion as any other living man," Mr. Madsen said.

"In view of the foregoing and of all the pertinent facts involved, I want to endorse unequivocally the building of the upper Colorado River project in its entirety without further delay."

Mr. Madsen was a land purchaser for the parks service from 1930 until 1934 and supervisor of wildlife resources from 1934 until 1941, when he resigned to enter private business.

He recalled Saturday that the parks service then was a small organization and short of manpower. He said it was necessary that many employees were assigned duties temporarily outside their regular activities.

It was in this manner that he became associated with Dinosaur National Monument as acting supervisor.

"We were not to attempt to uncover any fossils but were to clean up the area generally and remove all rock and waste material that had been left by previous expeditions. These expeditions had taken out some 8 to 10 complete fossils * * * All of the specimens had been removed and had been taken from less than one-half acre of ground."

Mr. Madsen said he had nothing to do with proposing the present boundaries of the monument.

"Had I been called on I would certainly have not included the large area now locked up within the boundaries of this monument. At least 75 percent of the area is not national park caliber. There is no interesting scenery within the monument except the canyons themselves.

NO FOSSILS LEFT

"As stated before, there are no known dinosaur remains except possibly one or more within the 80-acre original monument."

Mr. Madsen said that before the monument was expanded and following considerable discussion within the parks service, it was decided that interested persons in the area should be contacted.

"I had been used frequently in public contact work for the parks service and was assigned the duty of holding meetings to present matter to people living adjacent to the area. It was the policy of the parks service to get everything we could reasonably by way of concessions from local inhabitants.

KNEW OF DAMS

"When I approached this task I was fully aware of the engineering work which had been done with the view of establishing sites for dams and reservoirs within the area.

"I was also aware of the fact that certain filings had been made for this purpose by the Bureau of Reclamation. I was made to understand that these filings were all valid and in good standing and that it was not my duty to attempt to persuade the people that these filings could be disregarded.

"The first meeting was held at Vernal, Utah, about 1937, and 2 to 3 days later a subsequent meeting was held at Craig, Colo. Due publicity had been given and these meetings were well attended. So far as I know, every stockman in the area was present, as well as many other interested people."

Mr. Madsen emphasized that he had to speak from memory as his files were returned to Washington when he left Government service.

"It is my recollection that the question of grazing was paramount in the minds of local people and was the first topic to be discussed. This question, of course, was of vital interest to stockmen.

"It led the people to believe that since they had always enjoyed grazing privileges in the area, there was no reason to believe that any hardship would be worked upon grazing permittees in the future. To date this promise has been kept."

Mr. Madsen said area residents then turned to another matter.

"The question of dam sites and reservoirs was also discussed and I was able to tell the people that since sites for dams already had been filed upon in the regular way and since the Secretary of the Interior had indicated that no move would be made to abrogate these filings, they had no occasion for worry on that subject.

"With these representations made to the people of both Vernal and Craig, I was able to secure unanimous approval. * * *"

Mr. Madsen, who served for 7 years as Utah fish and game commissioner, said that in view of the present controversy over Echo Park, he'd like to point out that "like most Americans I love our national parks."

GOVERNMENT PROMISE

"I would not in any way knowingly violate any precedent or any regulation affecting the national parks. But I do believe that our Government should stand firmly on its promises and upon its legal, official agreements in every instance."

He said it is crystal clear that the filings for dam sites were made long before the monument was established, even before it was thought of.

"If more proof were needed that this is true, then the proclamation creating the monument as issued by the President of the United States should dispel all doubts. He specifically stated that the rights for power and irrigation, including building of dams and creation of reservoirs should remain valid."

Mr. Madsen said that every conservationist worthy of the name knows that should the Echo Park Dam be built "the area will be improved for all forms of wildlife 10,000 percent."

History of Armagh, Pa., Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the post office situated in Armagh, Indiana County, Pa., is now in its 150th year of service to the people of this community in my district, and befitting the occasion, I include, as part of my remarks, a history of that office prepared by Mr. Ralph O. Trexler, present postmaster, together with a list of postmasters who have served since its establishment on July 1, 1805, to the present date.

Mr. Trexler has served the patrons of Armagh since April 1933 and is the executive director, Pennsylvania chapter, National Association of Postmasters.

The history follows:

HISTORY OF ARMAGH, PA., POST OFFICE

(By Ralph O. Texler)

This year marks the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Armagh, Pa., post office.

The first report from this office reached Washington, D. C., on July 1, 1805. Only two Presidents, Washington and Adams, had served their terms in office prior to the establishment of this office.

Jefferson became President in 1801. Joseph Habersham, from Georgia, was Postmaster General at this time. He had served a 4-year term in the same capacity under President Adams, and a 2-year term under President Washington's last 4 years in office. Habersham was soon replaced by Gideon Granger, from Connecticut, shortly after Jefferson was elected to office, 1801, as the third President. It was during Granger's administration that Armagh was granted a post office. This was only 13 years after the town was founded in 1792.

It is a matter of record that Armagh is the oldest existing town in Indiana County. It is quite likely that Armagh has the oldest post office in the county, and is among the oldest in western Pennsylvania. It would appear that there was a need for a post office at this early date, for Armagh in a few short years had become the center of much business activity. It lasted until 1850. President Pierce was our President, and James Campbell Postmaster General. Both were from Pennsylvania. During the 50 years preceding this time, Armgh was blessed with many new business enterprises. There were two tanners, a harness shop, an iron foundry, a distillery, and 3 stores, 1 of which sold everything from pins to coffins. Buena Vista furnace operated at full blast for many years. The output of iron was so great that it often required 20 teams a day to haul the iron to the canal located 3 miles south of Armagh.

The canal provided many men with employment, who worked as mule drivers, boat builders and repairmen, dock workers, and laborers along the right of way. Six licensed hotels and 22 inns were required to house and feed these people and the thousands of those from the East, passing through on the way to the golden West, in search of lands, on which to settle their families.

Many transients headed for the newly discovered gold fields of the West, rested in Armagh. Horses were sold and traded. Horse stealing of that day was nearly as bad as auto thefts of our day.

The present post office stands on the very spot where horses were stabled and fed in connection with the operation of the stage coach. The arrival and departure of the coach was an exciting event in the lives of our early settlers.

The first postmaster was Thomas Carr or Kerr, a saddlemaker, who served until 1810. The longest term in office, of any postmaster prior to 1923, was William Hart, who served from 1861 to 1874. The present postmaster, Ralph O. Texler, has the distinction of having served the longest term of any postmaster since 1805. He was commissioned May 23, 1933, a total of 22 years to date.

It is interesting to not that Postmaster Generals were not considered Cabinet members until 1829. This change occurred during President Jackson's first term in office. William Barry from Kentucky was the Postmaster General at this time. He served 6 years but was replaced by Amos Kendall of Kentucky, who served during the last 2 years of Jackson's second term.

Pennsylvania was the home State of four Postmaster Generals. They were John Wanamaker, under President Harrison, from 1889 to 1893, Robert J. Wynne, under President Theodore Roosevelt, from 1904 to 1905, Charles Emory Smith, under President McKinley from 1898 to 1901, and James Campbell mentioned before.

The present Postmaster General is Arthur E. Summerfield. He had come into office during the greatest period of postal activity since the days of George Washington. He has surrounded himself with capable assistants and advisors, who are working hard to give the patrons the best possible service at the lowest possible rates. The rapid growth

in every line of endeavor has necessitated a complete overhauling of our postal systems. This has gone forward, under the guidance of Mr. Summerfield, who in a few short years, has already proven himself an outstanding Postmaster General. There are at this time approximately 37,665 post offices: 3,494 first class, 6,701 second class, 13,275 third class, and 14,185 fourth class, all working together for the welfare of our people, no matter where they may be.

NAMES OF POSTMASTERS AND DATES OF THEIR APPOINTMENT

Thomas Kerr or Carr, July 1, 1805.[1]
William Parker, October 1, 1810.[1]
James Elliott, June 2, 1813.
Edward B. Patton, November 19, 1818.
John Huey, August 4, 1823.
Thomas Stewart, March 13, 1826.
Fredrick Leyde, March 21, 1831.
William Rankin, February 23, 1835.
James Johnston, September 14, 1836.
John A. Elliott, June 9, 1849.
Joshua M. Barkley, September 2, 1853.
James Johnston, July 11, 1855.
William Hart, April 26, 1861.
Margaret M. Elliott, September 22, 1874.
James Bevlin, June 6, 1876.
Samuel B. Hutchison, July 3, 1882.
James W. Mack, June 15, 1883.
George W. Freed, September 7, 1885.
James J. Tinkcom, October 17, 1888.
Henry M. Elliott, April 1, 1889.
James J. Tinkcom, August 16, 1893.
George W. Freed, May 3, 1895.
David R. Mack, June 21, 1897.
Thomas C. Mack, February 3, 1900.
Howard R. Faloon, July 17, 1901.
Harry M. Elliott, March 7, 1904.
Claude L. Kinsey, August 19, 1914.
Alexander S. Elliott, March 7, 1917.
George F. McCachren, August 11, 1921.
Sylvester J. Lowther, December 22, 1922.
John E. McMullen,[2] October 1, 1928.
George R. McMullen, October 4, 1929.
George F. McCachren,[2] January 1, 1931.[3]
Sylvester J. Lowther, March 30, 1931.
Alexander S. Elliott,[2] February 1, 1933.
Ralph O. Trexler, April 20, 1933.

[1] Date of first return or report from the Deputy Postmaster to the Postmaster General.
[2] Acting postmaster.
[3] Information after 1930 was furnished by the Post Office Department.

Disposition of Surplus Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, during the January hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations under the chairmanship of my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Mississippi, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, the fact was elicited from Dr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, that there was no program for the use of rice under the various Federal programs on surplus commodities.

Indeed, at the time of the hearings, as Dr. Butz pointed out, there was no holding of rice under the Commodity Credit Corporation. However, it was known that there would be a carryover, and this surplus of rice had been responsible for the action by the Secretary in establishing rice acreage allotments and calling for a referendum on marketing quotas.

For this reason, I called on the Department to begin the formulation of a program for the disposition of these surpluses of rice under the Federal programs, calling special attention to the school-lunch program.

To indicate the actions of the Department of Agriculture in this matter, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a communication from Dr. Butz. In his letter, Dr. Butz states that the Department expects to utilize approximately 20 million pounds of rice by the end of June and that the program of the Department calls for the use of an additional 90 million pounds for distribution during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955.

Dr. Butz's letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1955.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GATHINGS: This will reply to your letter of March 23, 1955, regarding plans to encourage the greater use of rice in the school-lunch program.

Large quantities of rice are now being made available for distribution to school-lunch programs, charitable institutions, and needy persons and families. It is expected that over 11 million schoolchildren, 1 million indigent residents of institutions, and over 3 million welfare recipients will participate in this program. Shipments got underway in late February and are now being made at a rate that will permit utilization of approximately 20 million pounds of rice by June 30. It is anticipated that an additional 50 million pounds will be distributed during the fiscal year beginning July 1.

As an aid to increasing the consumption of rice, the Department has prepared informational material, for the use of schools and institutions throughout the country, on the methods of storage, preparation, and suggestions for the use of rice.

Using this information as well as material developed within the States, local school authorities and institutions are, we believe, doing an excellent job of promoting maximum use of donated rice. Some of the uses of rice actively sponsored, to mention a few, include turkey on rice, rice meat loaf, ham and rice casserole, scalloped rice and cheese, Spanish rice with meat, rice peach pudding, baked rice pudding, cinnamon rice, waffles and rice cake, rice peach loaf, and rice salmon casserole.

You may be interested to know that the Department, working through the Food Trades Branch of the Food Distribution Division, has pledged its full support of the rice industry promotion plans to increase the movement of rice through regular commercial outlets. At the present time, the Food Distribution Division also has in preparation plans for coordinating the Department's participation in the producer-industry-Government merchandising drive this fall. This participation will include the facilities and activities of many other agences in the Department such as the Federal Extension Service, Agricultural Research Service, and the Office of Information.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

I believe that this is a fine start by the Department, and I wish to commend Dr. Butz and the men in the Department on devising this program so rapidly and putting it into motion.

And, Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would like to call attention to the fine work and cooperation of all the Members of Congress representing rice-growing areas. These gentlemen, without fanfare or publicity, have been working together to endeavor to work out this present problem in rice. As you know, rice growers faced a heavy cutback in rice acreage allotments in 1955 and many of them received acreage allotments that barely give them a margin of economic living. It is evident that if we are to help these rice growers, consumption of rice must be greatly increased.

Together we have worked to aid this program. The Congress has watched closely the operations of the various programs to increase domestic consumption.

And, we have watched even more closely the endeavors of our Government under the provisions of Public Law 480 to dispose of our surplus in the world markets. We have watched the increasing action by our Department of Agriculture in this field and we have studied the work of the agricultural attaches since they have been transferred to the Department from the Department of States. We have watched the actions in connection with the Japanese negotiations, and we will continue to watch just as closely the negotiations with the Government of the Philippines. It is our understanding that our friends in the Philippines are seeking 100,000 tons of rice under the provisions of Public Law 480. Since the Philippines may be considered a part of the southeastern Asia markets, those of us who represent rice-growing areas will want to know for certain that the Department of State has no desire to withhold our rice from this market.

We were pleased last week when the Council on Foreign and Economic Policy, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph C. Dodge, cleared the way for the negotiations with the Government of Japan to continue without opposition. We are just as eager that this council approve the policy of making our commodities under the provisions of Public Law 480 available to all friendly nations anywhere on the globe.

A Toast to the South's Gallant Ladies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star has published a very interesting and informative letter concerning the women of the Confederacy, which I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include it as part of my remarks:

A TOAST TO THE SOUTH'S GALLANT LADIES

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The Sunday Star not so long ago contained an article, Women of Civil War Interest Congressman, by Isabelle Shelton. It quoted Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, as saying, "There were some great

women during the Civil War, some wonderful women, especially on the Union side. • • • Some of the southern women did very well, too. Betsy Sullivan and Mrs. Ella Trader were particularly outstanding. And there was Belle Boyd, who spied for the South. But in general the northern women did much more. The southerners were handicapped by a tradition of leisure. Their women were used to having servants do everything for them."

Since Representative SCHWENGEL is pursuing intensive research on the rights of women and their achievements, I respectfully submit the following facts relating to the achievements of the women of the South during the War Between the States:

When Gen. Robert E. Lee paraded a brigade of South Carolina troops after the battle of Fredericksburg for the adjutant general of Richmond to see, practically all of them were barefooted, without overcoats, warm clothing, and, of course, inadequately fed. The adjutant general said to General Lee: "This is the most remarkable demonstration of patriotism I have ever seen. How do you account for it?" General Lee said, "This is the influence of the Christian patriotic homes, Christian wives and mothers of these men."

William H. Seward, Federal Secretary of State, was asked, after visiting the Winchester region of northern Virginia, what he thought of Union sentiment there. "Well," he replied, "all the men were gone to war, and all the women were she devils."

The war made soldiers out of the men and thereby it affected little less the lives of the women. The restricted confines of the home over which southern women had traditionally presided in the past were by the war extended to the whole Confederacy, and women engaged in almost every activity which could aid in prosecuting the war. Their services were so useful and their support was so powerful as to be recognized by their friends and enemies alike. The newspapers recounted women's deeds, Congress and State legislatures passed resolutions of thanks and praise; and in 1863 H. W. R. Jackson wrote a book entitled "The Southern Women of the Second American Revolution." A southerner wrote in 1861 that never "in any age or country was there ever witnessed such an intense war spirit as that now prevailing among the women of the Confederate States." A Federal soldier wrote in 1864: "The South stands today quite as much indebted for a successful prolongation of this struggle to her women, as to her generals and soldiers in the field. Fully, fiercely, terribly, and malignantly have they entered into this conflict." "It is the part that woman is acting in this great cause that fires the heart and nerves the arm of our soldiery," declared a Confederate captain.

Some southern women acted as spies locally and over the entire Confederacy; among them were Ellie M. S. Poole, of West Virginia; Nora McCartney, of Missouri; Diana Smith, of Virginia; Anne and Julia Lomax, of Maryland and Virginia; and Charlotte Moon, of Tennessee.

The beautiful Mrs. Rose Greenhow, a Washington lady of high social standing, sent much valuable information to the Confederate authorities. She was credited with sending to Gen. P. G. T. Beauregard information as to the route the Federals were following, which enabled him to win the battle of First Manassas. Mrs. Greenhow lost her life by drowning while carrying dispatches for President Jefferson Davis.

Belle Boyd, another noted woman of the Confederacy, made her debut by killing a Federal soldier who entered the Boyd home in Martinsburg and mistreated her mother. She had an incredible career of spy service, arrests, imprisonments and sentences to be shot. She obtained much valuable military information from Union officers which she transmitted to Gens. Stonewall Jackson and Turner Ashby.

Southern women also achieved fame as nurses and in caring for Confederate wounded and their families. Mrs. J. Harmon Brown and Miss Matilda Saunders, of Baltimore, supplied Confederate prisoners in Fort McHenry with food, medicines, clothing, and bedding. After the battle of Sharpsburg, Mrs. Brown with funds donated by Maryland sympathizers converted a large tannery in Frederick, Md., into a hospital and spent weeks in nursing and caring for hundreds of Confederate wounded.

Mrs. Saunders persuaded General Sheridan to agree to her plan to relieve the widespread suffering in the Shenandoah Valley. The Sisters of Charity of the Archdiocese of New Orleans rode in carts, farm wagons, on horseback and muleback to care for sick and wounded Confederate soldiers who fell on the battlefields along the Mississippi River.

Sixteen-year-old Emma Sansom rode behind Gen. N. B. Forrest through gunfire to show him the ford in order that he might capture the Federal forces of General Streight.

A number of southern women disguised as men fought in Confederate regiments. During the first year of the war the women practically took over the problem of clothing Confederate armies, and in the words of a contemporary, "Heaven only knows what the soldiers of the South would have done without the exertions of the women in their behalf."

Southern women engaged in smuggling supplies of medicine, drugs, and small articles hidden under their ample skirts.

The women also provided wayside inns where forlorn and needy soldiers were given beds, food, hospital services, and entertainment.

Tradition, history, poetry, and fiction accord the southern woman beauty, grace, charm, delicacy of feeling. The way she rose to meet the emergency of the war proved her also strong, capable, intelligent, and self-reliant; only by the ignorant was she pictured as lazy, spoiled, and dependent on her black mammy.

By the grace of God, the women of the South throughout 4 years of unparalleled hardship and suffering retained the dignity, the sweetness, the charm, and the graciousness that have made the daughters of the South world famous.

We sincerely regret that Representative SCHWENGEL has drawn such an odious and historically inaccurate comparison of the women of the South with the women of the North during the War Between the States.

WILLIAM M. BEARD,
Past Commander in Chief, Sons of Confederate Veterans, Westfield, N. J.

Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of commendation presented to Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, N. Y., by the United States Navy, at a luncheon given in his honor in New York by the Bankers Club on April 19, 1955. The presentation was made by Rear Adm. H. Rusco Hillenkoetter, commandant of the Third Naval District.

Mr. Morris Goldman, former assistant district attorney, of New York, welcomed the guests and Hon. Maximilian Moss, surrogate of Kings County, acted as toastmaster and in behalf of Joe Weinstein of May's Department Store, of Brooklyn, presented Mr. Abelman with a clock-radio and from Mr. Herman Kahn an attaché's briefcase. Among those in attendance were Marvin Bergen, secretary and counsel of New York, and Mortimer Ehrmann, news editor of the New York Mirror.

I am also inserting three telegrams which Mr. Abelman received at the luncheon.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE COMMANDANT,
THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT,
New York, N. Y., April 19, 1955.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: I should like to commend you for the services performed in connection with personnel of the United States Navy during the many years that you have served in this area so meritoriously and so creditably.

I know of no person who more thoroughly deserves such a public expression than yourself. For practically 50 years you have devoted your energies and your time unstintingly for the development of your fellow men regardless of race or creed.

It is a pleasure for me to present you with this letter of commendation because of your tireless efforts, the generosity of your heart, and the spirit of unfailing good will with which you served not only your community but the Navy.

Please accept this expression of well-merited commendation, and please take my most sincere hope that you will be granted a long and blessed life for the welfare of yourself, your family, and all of those in whom you are interested.

With very cordial good wishes, believe me,
Sincerely,

R. H. HILLENKOETTER,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy;
Commandant, Third Naval District.

APRIL 19, 1955.

MAX ABELMAN,
New York, N. Y.:

Congratulations and best wishes upon receipt of this much-deserved award. Deeply regret that an important meeting of the city council prevents me from being with you on this great occasion.

ABE STARK.

APRIL 19, 1955.

EMANUEL GOLDMAN,
New York:

Regret inability to personally attend and participate in well-deserved tribute to my dear friend Max Abelman. Please extend my congratulations and best wishes to him and all assembled.

Judge GEORGE J. BELDOCK.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 19, 1955.*

Rear Adm. R. H. HILLENKOETTER,
Commandant, Third Naval District,
New York:

Delighted to learn that you are honoring our distinguished fellow citizen, Max Abelman, with a citation for meritorious service. There is no one who has rendered more patriotic and devoted service to his country, State, and borough than he. Sorry I cannot be with you.

Cordially,

NAMM LOESERS,
BENJAMIN H. NAMM.

Appendix

Our Common Mission, by James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at a luncheon meeting of the Empire Club of Canada, Inc., at Toronto, Canada, on April 21, 1955, at which Mr. Farley, in his usual excellent manner, further performs his unofficial role of our ambassador of good will to our friendly neighbor to the north, the great Dominion of Canada:

OUR COMMON MISSION

You need not be told that it is a privilege and a distinction to address this famous organization. The roster of its members and of its speakers, and the importance of its activities through the years, make it one of the great clubs of this continent. You are particularly kind in inviting me to discuss the mission of our two countries in today's world. Diplomats and scholars are discussing this subject throughout the United States and Canada alike. I can only contribute the observations of a man whose life has followed the paths of practical politics and still more practical business. Yet it is possible that politicians and businessmen as well as students can make a contribution to this, the chief problem of our time.

I think this is the best possible place to offer such a contribution. Throughout the entire world no two great, independent countries have more nearly achieved civilized international relations than have the United States and Canada. If everywhere in the world relations between peoples and governments were carried on as they are between the people and Government of Canada and the people and Government of the United States, the world's pressing dangers would be met.

Just before World War II, the German Government circulated a piece of propaganda in Washington, arguing that the Germans had a right to make war on Poland to get back the Danzig corridor. So they printed a map of the Canadian-American boundary. They added to Canada a V-shaped wedge, cutting off Maine, New Hampshire, and part of Massachusetts from the rest of the United States and giving Canada the port of Boston. Would this not, the German Government asked, necessarily cause war between the two countries? Well, the propaganda dodge fell flat. There is a Canadian wedge pushing south between Lake Huron and Lake Erie. It separates New York and Buffalo from Detroit. We are in that wedge now. Canadian and American trains go across it every night, our common commerce moves by the shortest line without interruption. Another wedge separates Alaska from the rest of America but the Alcan Highway crosses it for the mutual pleasure and profit of both of us. Our peoples, and our Governments, are far too wise to let either their friendship or their business be interrupted by the border accidents of ancient history.

We share a common resource—the electric power of the magnificent spillway of the St. Lawrence River. We have borne together the costs and the expenses of developing that splendid gift of nature according to a common plan. There are many other illustrations. It is not too much to say that our two nations have attained the highest level of foreign relations known to civilization.

One other factor makes it, I think, not presumptuous for me to claim that we have a common mission. Both our countries are the product of religion and education far more than they are of politics or war. The United States, like Canada, owes its framework chiefly to great Christian movements which have given form to its institutions. Canada, like the United States, owes an enormous debt to its universities and colleges, founded in hope and now grown great. One cannot think of Canada without thinking at once of your own University of Toronto, of Queens, the University of Montreal and McGill, just as one cannot think of the United States without thinking also of Harvard, of the University of Notre Dame, and of the University of California, and of numberless great and small colleges in between. In both our nations, pioneers built churches and schools. Now, in their maturity, both give us the strong red blood which is the life of great democracies.

So we have a common understanding of each other, and from that comes a common mission in world affairs.

I for one am not as happy about the state of world affairs as some who today are writing and speaking about them. Our free world is under pressure. In the next few years, it is quite likely to be tested as never before. In Europe there is, for the moment at least, an alliance which may serve to hold the Communist powers at bay. But in Asia we have not peace but an armistice resulting from the bloody stalemate of the Korean war and a French defeat in Viet Nam. Both in Indonesia and in Indochina, I am afraid we are slowly losing another major area to Moscow's Chinese partner. Still more disturbing, the Colombo powers with Communist China as the driving force, are holding a conference of some 30 Asiatic and African nations. The Chinese Communists, of course, paraphrase it as a league of peace. What they mean to do is to create a pro-Communist alliance of all the nonwhite races against the white races. Their propaganda agents are entirely frank about this. They are frank, too, in insisting that they consider the United States as an enemy. Perhaps you will not disagree if, as an American, I think that an enemy of the United States is necessarily an enemy of Canada just as we consider an enemy of yours to be an enemy of the United States.

And yet I am sure our two countries will come through the crisis years ahead in quiet, but unquestionable triumph. We shall, I think, make it clear to the world that creative communities of freemen make stronger nations and give more to their own people, and to all other peoples, than any other form of organization man has yet devised. We shall not do this by boasting about it, though the boasts are true. We shall not do it by threat to use atomic or other force, though we do have that force. We shall not do it by new and greater scientific discoveries, though it is clear these are already in sight. We shall do it because by successful example at home, and by cool and resolute maintenance of our rights abroad we will inspire whole peoples to follow our course. We will make membership in a free community of nations more attractive and more advantageous than servitude in any Communist empire.

It is no accident that communism has established no effective bridgehead either in Canada or the United States. The reason is simple: the people of Canada and the people of the United States have already achieved results beyond the wildest promises of Communist dogma. In the light of the achievements of Canadians and Americans, Marxism belongs not in 20th century politics but in a 19th century museum. If, throughout the world, peoples knew that they could live as our peoples do, any Communist empire would promptly begin to contract.

There is evidence that this process is already beginning on Russia's western borders. Hungarians, Poles, or Czechs look across the Iron Curtain and wish they were on the free world side. The stirrings in those captive satellite countries and in East Germany already suggest that Moscow domination there rests now only on besieged and isolated occupation forces; there is no assent of peoples; the promised revolution proved to be only a bloody conquest. To that fact, perhaps, we owe the upsurge of coexistence talk which has emanated from Moscow. Now as our two countries, both great trading nations, increase our understanding and wisdom in the ways of foreign commerce, as we find means of assuring that our trade shall benefit other countries as well as ours, we emphasize the clear advantage of the free world system, not by talking but by doing.

This is apparently beginning to be achieved in the West. I am confident it can be achieved in the Far East. The process there will be longer. The task will be larger. Whole populations there have never known freedom; to such people one master is no worse than another; the lot of the coolie is the same in either case. But if a way can be shown by which those masses of coolies can have themselves a stake, however modest, in the miracle of our 20th century American production, the picture changes. A beginning has been made along these lines in that great archipelago which is today the Philippine Republic. Canadian enterprise has made a beginning in other parts of the Pacific. Our two countries have worked together toward that end in the less favored countries of Latin America. We can, we should, and indeed we must, make it clear that liberty and prosperity go together and that prosperity is not bought at the price of freedom. After all, Russia, struggling desperately to give her own people the most modest standard of living, is not the country which can introduce to Asia the almost limitless production all Canadians and Americans take for granted.

The word "freedom" is used advisedly. In our countries we speak of democracy. Freedom will very likely find different forms in different countries. Here we are devoted to our own democratic form. We will gladly teach it to any who wish to learn from us. But we cannot impose it and have no business to try. What we can do is to make clear that the chief end of any government

is the development of free men in a system by which they work together. Each people has its own wisdom about its own affairs. Probably even the most backward people can teach us something. Their ways are not our ways. But we will be well advised to work with them within the forms which they themselves know and understand.

In thus working for a peace which shall be real and not a double-talk mockery, both of us must increasingly work together and with other nations. Canada was among the first signers of the "declaration by United Nations" on January 1, 1942, which foreshadowed the United Nations organization of today. Sometimes we falter in using that great organization well, but it remains the frame of our hope of the world to be, a world of peace, under law, guaranteeing freedom from fear to the world.

Combined, our two countries constitute in present fact the largest and strongest single regional group in the free world. There are others like it, notably the British family of nations, whether called empire or commonwealth, and the Atlantic group we call NATO. In building these as we have, we cannot forget that at long last statesmanship must bring them all into harmony. This is not theory. In Montreal are the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization, a United Nations agency. Because of it a Canadian pilot leaving Toronto knows he will find the same signals, the same language, the same rules for landing or leaving in Paris or Bombay or Manila that he has in his home airport. This is a measure of real, tangible peace. The time must come when the major human necessities are dealt with is as commonsense cooperation as has been worked out in the air.

Our purpose must be to work toward this goal of world peace and world civilization without war. We know, of course, that this is not wholly our choice.

Such information as we have indicates that the Communist government in China is giving considerable thought to starting a war this year for the purpose of seizing Formosa. The American Government has made it clear that the United States will resist if this happens. In my judgment, the United States Government can do nothing else. Failure to resist an armed attack on Formosa would merely mean a Communist conquest there, and within a few months we should have to fight somewhere else. Even in this grime picture there is still a respectable possibility of limiting the war so that it does not become general. Modern war is so horrible and its results so unpredictable that I do not think any sane group can adopt war as a policy as did Hitler in 1939. Yet, in any event, between us we must maintain such strength that no one will dare challenge with force, or assume that counterforce does not exist. No one can guarantee success in the field of foreign relations, but we shall try for peace and keep on trying and I do not despair of success. In this task, as an old politician, let me suggest that the men running foreign affairs—the men in our State Department and your Department of External Affairs—need all the help and support you and I can give them, whether we are of their political faith or not. They are working amid tremendous hazards and their burden is greater than any in recorded history.

Are we starry-eyed in thinking that the vast task of bringing a reasonable measure of peace to the world may be accomplished in the coming generation? Perhaps, but the example of Canada makes me believe it can be done. Your country was born of diverse races with different languages. History insisted they were sworn enemies, and you refused to accept that decree. You had to build a nation out of different civilizations, customs, and religions. Beyond possible expectation, you nobly accomplished that task. In my own time your great Prime Minister, MacKenzie King, a Scot, steadily worked with Canadians of French ancestry, religion, and custom. I have no doubt that his brilliant successor, Prime Minister St. Laurent, of French ancestry, no less carefully works with his countrymen of English stock. With patience, tolerance, and commonsense, you made a union when elsewhere in the world race rivalries, disorder, and hatred were the order of the day. In my own country Irish and English, Italians, Germans, Jews, and Negroes have steadily moved toward union so that today Americans, the most composite population in the world, are also the most unified. We have done in North America what has not been achieved in any other part of the world.

In virtue of these achievements, Canada and America can claim the privileges, as they must assume the burdens of a common mission. We must enter upon it without superiority. And, with faith, we can justifiably draw assurance and strength from awareness of solid results already attained. "To each and all our equal lamp at peril of the sea," wrote Kipling of the English coastwise lights. No less great is the guiding fire of the fellowship of two great nations in a dangerous but splendid time.

On the Anniversary of Israel's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on this day, April 27, the anniversary of independence of the State of Israel, it is fitting that we, as Americans, pay tribute to a courageous people who have added so much to the culture of our United States of America.

Since World War I, America has been lending wholehearted support to the aspirations of the people of the Middle East in their struggle for independence. The knowledge that the Jewish people were the victims of mass annihilation and suffering by anti-Semitic people compelled a response from the American people whose basic philosophy is founded in the principle of man's right to life and liberty. It was approximately in the year 1933 that Adolf Hitler began his reign of terror against the German and Austrian Jews and later traveled on to other European countries spreading destruction. More than 6 million Jews were murdered in his so-called revenge on Jewry.

The path to independence was not smooth and easy but filled with many obstacles. Through the untiring efforts of the Jewish people and their many friends and allies, this independence was finally achieved on April 27, 1948. In the creation of a Jewish state, a national homeland, refugees were given a chance of survival. Refuge, livelihood, and freedom from persecution were offered them. The state became to the Jewish people, the modern day fulfillment of Ezekiel's prophecy, "Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, wither they be gone, and will gather them into their own land."

But 7 years after this great beginning, peace does not reign in the Middle East. A great amount of hostility and tenseness exists between the Arab States and the State of Israel. It is highly essential in this day and age that peace come to this troubled area. It is essential that tensions be removed and that peace and harmony be restored to the Middle East as one more defense post against godless communism.

In its democratic thinking, Israel is seeking equal opportunity for its people. With the help of the Western World, this objective can be achieved and peace will ultimately come to the Middle East region so that its people may share in a cooperative endeavor to resolve the problems which now face our world.

Statement by Senator Lehman Before Senate Subcommittee on Labor in Connection With Proposed Amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 26 I appeared before the Senate subcommittee on labor in support of S. 662, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR IN SUPPORT OF S. 662 AMENDING THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today to testify on behalf of S. 662, which I introduced on January 21, for myself, Senator GREEN, Senator KILGORE, Senator MCNAMARA, Senator NEELY, and Senator PASTORE.

While not a member of this subcommittee, I have, as you know, been present during most of the testimony thus far on these various bills before you dealing with amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. I do not intend to speak at length at this time.

During these hearings, I have many times stated the basic sentiments which have guided me in sponsoring this bill providing a $1.25 an hour minimum wage and increased coverage. I would like, on this occasion, to highlight the major political, economic, and moral issues which I believe are at the heart of these proposals, affecting the well-being of millions of Americans, their families, and their children.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into the details of my bill, including the substantial increase in coverage which would result from its enactment. Other witnesses have testified on these technical aspects of coverage, and I know that the subcommittee has an excellent staff analysis of S. 662, as well as of the other bills on the subject. I feel strongly that the increased coverage and the elimination of unjustified exemptions are completely consistent with the basic purpose of the act and with the need to provide a fair

amount of economic justice for all Americans.

Mr. President, I remember the arguments that were made against the first minimum wage bill back in the thirties. These same arguments were heard again every time proposals were under consideration by the Congress to raise the minimum wage, or to expand its coverage.

The cry was heard, in the first place, that the establishment of the minimum wage constituted regimentation, and worse: That it would drive many, if not most, of the businesses of America into bankruptcy, that it would result in economic ruin and devastation.

Those arguments were without foundation in fact when they were made 20 years ago, and again 6 years ago. They are without real basis today.

It is generally conceded today—at least no public official of any party would, I think, dare deny it—that a Fair Labor Standards Act is a sound and essential part of our economic structure. It is a necessary safeguard for the bottom ranks of the Nation's labor force.

There is, of course, the question of what a fair minimum wage ought to be. In my judgment, the figures that have been written into law have always been too low. The figure of 75 cents an hour was too low when it was approved in 1949. It is, of course, far too low today.

Since the time the first minimum wage bill was passed, our economy, far from faltering, zoomed ahead with giant strides. Never was progress greater than in the years immediately following 1949. The increase in the minimum wage level in 1949 gave a new impetus to the national economy.

Since 1945 we have had an inflation. It has been a severe inflation. It has been especially marked in the years since 1949, as a result of price increases brought on by the war in Korea.

The minimum wage has not risen since 1949 and the minimum wage in 1949 was already set too low.

It is now more than 5 years since the time the 1949 amendments to the Wages and Hours Act went into effect. During these 5 years, national income has increased from $218.9 billion to more than $303 billion—an increase of over 38 percent. In these 5 years, the gross national product expanded from $265 billion to more than $362 billion—or almost 37 percent. Finally, corporation profits after taxes increased from $16.1 billion to $18.8 billion at the end of 1954—or 16.8 percent.

Most of this expansion took place between 1949 and 1953. The expansion of our economy has proceeded at a slower pace during the last 2 years. If we are to have a dynamic and expanding economy to keep pace with our expanding population, the rate of expansion must be greater than it has been in the last 2½ years.

The passage of the Minimum Wage Bill I have introduced—increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and expanding the coverage to include about five million workers not now covered—would be a step in the right direction. It would help restore a dynamic quality to our economy. It would be a shot in the arm—a much-needed shot in the arm.

Testimony has been heard from some who complain that this increase in minimum wage would ruin this or that industry. While I am not in a position to comment on any particular allegation to this effect, I know that in general the result would be increased prosperity as a result of increased purchasing power.

Of course, it is generally conceded, even by President Eisenhower, that some increase in the minimum wage is desirable, but the increase recommended by the President is a paltry and insufficient amount. It reflects a backward-looking view of our economy. Ninty cents an hour might have been a fair figure in 1949. It is not a fair figure in 1955. Productivity has increased. There is unemployment as a result of automation and as a result of industries moving to low-wage areas. The increase of the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour would help meet the consequences of these developments.

I do not think it is necessary for me to prove that $1.25 an hour is a reasonable figure. I think it is up to the opponents of this measure to prove their case. Certainly the inflation has been no less than the amount of increase proposed in the minimum wage. And when we take into consideration that the minimum wage set in 1949 was already too low, we can easily see that a minimum wage of $1.25 would not be excessive.

In speaking of the desirability of increasing the minimum wage, I do not want to neglect those provisions of the pending bill providing for increased coverage. They are equally as important as the increase to $1.25 an hour. Too many of our workers are outside the protection of the Minimum Wage Law. I see no reason for many of the exemptions now in the law.

Of course, it should be borne in mind that in the last 3 years much damage has been done to the Fair Labor Standards Act by faulty administration. The law has not been policed as well as it should have been. Enforcement has been weak and tragically inadequate. I hope that these aspects of the situation will be remedied.

One of the most desirable effects of the bill I am proposing would be to establish a more uniform floor under the wage structure of the entire country. It is regrettable that there should be a lower standard in some parts of our country than is the case in others.

In this connection, it is paradoxical that so many Americans who have recently learned that what occurs 5,000 miles distant can affect the lives of every American, have not yet seen that what depresses the economy of one section of this country injures the economy of the entire country.

We all take pride today in stating and restating the lesson we have learned after two great wars—that we live in an interdependent world. When will it be said that all of us realize that we live in an interdependent Nation, and accept fully all the ramifications of that axiom?

One of the most potent arguments for a $1.25 minimum wage is in the finding and declaration of policy of the present law. This states that substandard labor conditions constitute "an unfair method of competition in commerce," and cause "commerce and the channels and instrumentalities of commerce to be used to spread and perpetuate such labor conditions among the workers of the several States."

I need not reiterate to members of this subcommittee the problems of the runaway plants and industries which have been a cause of so much economic and human distress in many areas of the country, including my own, during the past few years. I do wish to emphasize, however, that these plants and industries have not only injured the economic well-being of workers and communities in the areas they have left. They are also an economic drag on the peoples and communities in the areas into which they have fled in their search for cheaper labor and substandard working conditions.

I have heard it said, even in these subcommittee hearings, that the administration's 90-cents-an-hour recommendation and its timid excursion into the field of expanded coverage does not really represent its desires, but is dictated by political considerations and the need for passage of some legislation, however meaningless, in this area. If such is the case, this represents one of the greatest abdications of leadership on an issue affecting the health and welfare of the American people that has ever come to my attention.

Congress, I am convinced, if given the proper leadership, would approve a bill raising the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and increasing coverage.

I hope, therefore, that this subcommittee, realizing the seriousness of the legislation before it and the overriding need for prompt action in this field, will report to the full committee a bill to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to increase coverage, substantially as outlined in S. 662.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding a statement by Mr. George W. Ball, in which he answered some of the allegations and charges made against him before the Committee on Finance in the hearings on H. R. 1, extending the Trade Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was much disturbed to learn that in the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee, a statement was placed in the record near the conclusion of the hearings that severely attacks the character and motives of certain members of the committee for a national trade policy.

It has been reported that this material, on the basis that it is a part of the Senate hearings, is being circulated. Since it contains many misstatements of facts, innuendoes, personal attacks as "Foreign Agents" on many fine Americans, I feel that the Senate should be advised as to the truth in this matter.

Further, I feel that in sponsoring or opposing legislation, Americans, of whatever political faith they may be, should be allowed to urge the legislation without having their patriotism questioned or being accused of representing foreign governments.

Certainly the Senate, in the consideration H. R. 1, which extends this basic trade policy of this country under both Democratic and Republican administrations, should not have its attention distracted by such personal attacks in the form of statements placed in committee hearings. Because of the lateness of this insertion in the record, I feel that a clarifying statement is not only fair but necessary.

We should debate and even perhaps disagree on issues such as H. R. 1 as Americans and any attempt to allege or insinuate that foreign influence motivates legislation is not in the interest of sound consideration of important legislation. I shall perhaps differ radically from some of those on the committee for a national trade policy on some of the provisions of the act, but I certainly respect their rights to speak as Americans, in this case. Too often in recent years major debates have been thrown off the track by alleging that certain proponents or opponents of legislation were Communists or scoundrels or both. Such interjection of bitterness—or foreign intrigue and smears

damages our standing in the eyes of our friendly allies and of the world.

The material to which I object was levied against the committee for a national trade policy and are of this order. They were largely designed to attack the character of the supporters of H. R. 1 and are malicious, irrevelant and unfounded. The material was placed in the record by a man named Robert M. Burr, who purports to be president of an organization calling itself the National Bureau for Economic Realism, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York.

Mr. Burr's attack was filed with the Senate Finance Committee just before the hearings closed, too late for reply or investigation and was included in the published hearings of the committee at pages 2306 to 2331.

I do not know Mr. Burr nor the interests he represents. Who his clients or customers are or who pays its expenses is not disclosed.

Conversely, the Committee for a National Trade Policy is a well-known organization and has made no secret of its sponsorship or activities because it has nothing to hide.

The Committee for a National Trade Policy is a nonprofit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. It has about 1,000 members, of which approximately 450 of them are corporations, many being the largest and most important in the United States. There are 550 individuals associated with it as members, among them many leaders in the business world. On its advisory board are to be found representatives of major labor and farm groups.

It is important to note that this committee for the first time in history has joined important elements of American business and industry together, not to work for import quotas or subsidies or higher tariffs, but in an effort to assist in the development of a national trade policy.

The forces in the United States advocating higher tariff protection have long been well organized, for which every right exists. These include the American Tariff League, the National Labor-Management Council, and other bodies which support protective tariffs. The same is true of the many national trade associations which for most part have taken positions either against H. R. 1 or are in favor of its substantial amendment.

The recommendations of President Eisenhower and the report of the Randall Commission have been actively supported by the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Now it is supporting strongly H. R. 1.

Many of the most distinguished leaders of business in this country sit upon the board of directors of the committee and take an active part in its proceedings. The position they advocate are in accord with the positions long held and publicly expressed by these men.

One of the principal points of attack in Mr. Burr's statement, graced only by the dignity of being included in the printed transcript of the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee, is largely devoted to attempting to demonstrate that a lawyer named George W. Ball was responsible for the creation of the Committee for a National Trade Policy—that Mr. Ball has dominated the committee—and that Mr. Ball has been motivated by the fact that the law firm of which he is a member has included among its many clients several foreign business interests and has acted as counsel for various agencies for the French Government. Because Mr. Ball and his firm have had foreign clients in the past, Mr. Burr implies that the Senate should vote down H. R. 1.

If America is to have foreign trade and intercourse with other nations, our distinguished attorneys will in the course of their regular practice have clients from foreign lands. But it is a fantastic argument indeed that because an American lawyer has represented foreign clients the Senate should not pass legislation in the national interest of the United States.

Neither should the tag "foreign agent" be applied—else this necessary legal service and practice by members of the bar will take on a connotation of questionable patriotism.

It is far even more fantastic for Mr. Burr to make such an attack when neither Mr. Ball nor his firm have represented any clients in support of H. R. 1—nor have they been associated with the Committee for a National Trade Policy since long before H. R. 1 was introduced. Neither has this attorney nor his firm taken any part in trying to secure the passage of this bill—whether on behalf of the Committee for a National Trade Policy or for any other organization, company, or individual.

I have known Mr. Ball for many years. I know him to be an able and competent attorney, active in many phases of service to America, as an official and as a private citizen. In fairness to him and to the Committee for a National Trade Policy, he should have the right to keep the record straight. I would like to read into the record a statement prepared by Mr. Ball, commenting on the charges that have been made against him.

He is the holder of the Medal for Freedom, given him in recognition of his services during the war. His patriotism, his standing, and his dedication to public service should be unquestioned.

Mr. Ball's statement is as follows:

"Since July 1946, I have been a member of the law firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, and Hamilton, which has its principal office in New York City, and also maintains offices under the name of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, and Ball in Washington, D. C., and Paris, France. The firm comprises more than 45 lawyers. It is engaged in the general practice of law.

"While the great bulk of the firm's clients are United States corporations and individuals, it has in the course of its practice also represented certain foreign clients. Whenever such representation has come within the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the firm has fully complied with that act.

"In the course of the statement submitted by Mr. Robert Burr to the Senate Committee on Finance, I am described as a founder of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc. Mr. Burr seeks to imply that I was the leading spirit in the creation of that organization and that I was motivated by the fact that my firm represented some foreign clients.

"The facts are quite the contrary.

"On July 14, 1953, I received a telegram from Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of directors of General Mills, Inc., asking me to a dinner in New York to meet with a group of prominent American businessmen to discuss the formation of a proposed Citizens Committee for the Development of International Economic Relations.

"Present at the meeting besides Mr. Bullis were Mr. John J. McCloy, chairman, the Chase National Bank; Mr. Joseph P. Spang, Jr., president the Gillette Co.; Mr. Ralph I. Straus, a director of R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.; and Mr. Stewart F. Louchheim, president, Stewart F. Louchelm Co. of Philadelphia. I had not previously met any of these gentlemen except Mr. McCloy and Mr. Straus. I had been invited to the meeting because of my known interest in trade policy. I was asked to express my views with regard to the form of organization of a committee and the kind of program it should undertake.

"After this meeting I was advised that Mr. John S. Coleman had accepted the invitation of Mr. Bullis to undertake to organize such a committee. Mr. Coleman is president of the Burroughs Corp. and Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. He was at that time also president of the board of commerce of Detroit.

"In August 1953 my law firm was asked by Mr. Coleman to act as counsel of the organizing group in supervising the legal steps necessary to create the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., as a nonprofit membership corporation under the laws of the State of New York. When the committee was organized, my firm was retained as general counsel and I was elected secretary, with the task of keeping the minutes, and also a director. The articles of incorporation were filed with the secretary of state of the State of New York on September 16, 1953, and the organization meeting of the incorporators was held on September 17, 1953. The first meeting of the board of directors was also held on September 17, 1953. Under the certificate of incorporation, Messrs. Bullis, Coleman, Spang, Taft, and I, along with Mr. Charles H. Percy, president, Bell & Howell Co., and Mr. Morris S. Rosenthal, then president, Stein, Hall & Co., Inc., were to hold office as directors of the committee until its first annual meeting. At the first meeting of the board of directors on September 17, 1953, Messrs. William L. Batt, Edward Littlejohn, Thomas B. McCabe, John J. McCloy, Ralph I. Straus, and Clarence Francis were also elected as directors.

"I mention these facts only because Mr. Burr has sought to draw some malign inference from the appearance of my name on the formal organization papers of the committee and refers to me more than once as being the 'founding secretary' or as having 'founded' the organization.

"The second part of Mr. Burr's attack on me consists of an attempt to show that in my relations with the committee I was really acting on behalf of certain foreign clients. Again, the facts are wholly contrary.

Let me make it emphatically clear that neither my firm nor I, nor, to my knowledge, any member or associate of my firm, has ever contributed one cent to the committee for a national trade policy. Nor has any contribution ever been made by any foreign client which my firm represented; in fact, during the period that I served as a director it was an inflexible policy of the committee never to accept a contribution of any kind from any foreign company or interest. I recall, for example, that shortly after the committee was formed it refused a contribution offered by a Canadian company. Since I am no longer a director or officer of the committee I cannot speak for it today, but I should be amazed if there has been any change in this established committee policy.

"The relations of my law firm with the committee were on a professional basis. Not only did my firm make no financial contribution to the committee, it received from the committee fees amounting to $20,000 for the work it performed as general counsel. The implication in Mr. Burr's pamphlet that the services which my firm or I performed for the committee for a national trade policy were compensated for by the fees which my firm may have received for work performed on behalf of foreign clients—work entirely unrelated to United States trade policy—is both absurd and insulting.

"Mr. Burr attempts to make a great deal out of the fact that in the early months of 1953, my firm had represented the Venezuelan chambers of commerce (composed of private firms doing business in Venezuela). Our representation was in connection with proposed legislation that would restrict the import of oil into the United States. My firm, in turn, retained a number of prominent law firms in various parts of the country to explain the issues involved to American companies in their communities. Included among these firms was that of Headley, Sibbald & Taft, of Cincinnati. Mr. Charles P. Taft, of that firm, had the previous year been the Republican candidate for Governor of Ohio. I knew him to be an expert in the field of commercial policy.

"My firm ceased active work on behalf of the Venezuelan chambers of commerce on August 1, 1953, and withdrew its registration

for that client under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. That was 6 weeks prior to the incorporation of the Committee for a National Trade Policy.

"When the Committee for a National Trade Policy was established, I informed the directors of these facts. I informed them also that my firm was then acting, and had acted for several years, as legal adviser to certain agencies of the French Government.

"Let me make it entirely clear, however, that my firm has at no time undertaken or attempted, directly or indirectly, on behalf of the French Government or any other foreign government, to influence the United States Congress with respect to legislation in connection with international trade, commercial policy, or any other matter. To the extent that our services for the French Government may have involved attention to international trade or commercial policy, those services have been confined to the traditional lawyer's function of interpreting laws or regulations.

"Knowing my interest in the subject of trade policy which had long preceded any professional representation in this field, the directors of the committee were of the opinion that, in view of all the circumstances, no fairminded person would misinterpret my professional activities in such a way as to cause any embarrassment to the committee or its work.

"In October 1954, I submitted my resignation as a director and officer of the committee for a national trade policy, as well as the resignation of my firm as the committee's general counsel. I did this entirely on my own initiative, without any suggestion from any officer, director, or member of the committee. I explained to the directors of the committee that my firm was considering a proposal to represent certain clients in connection with a matter bordering on trade policy (not covered by the provisions of H. R. 1 or any proposed amendments thereto), and that I wished to avoid any possibility of embarrassment to the committee because of innocent or deliberate misinterpretation in connection with this representation. My resignation was accepted by the directors of the committee at their annual meeting on November 2, 1954. This was more than 2 months prior to the introduction of H. R. 1, and neither my firm nor I has represented any clients in support of H. R. 1."

In view of Mr. Ball's statement—and I have confidence in what he says—I think we should return the argument on this important piece of legislation to the merits. I feel we have a serious task confronting us to chart the course of this country in its commercial dealings with the rest of the world. To perform that task properly will take all the sober and informed attention which we can muster. We shall not succeed if we are deflected by unfounded attacks or mean insinuations on character and motives.

Editorial Tribute to Former President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, last week, on the 10th anniversary of Harry S. Truman's ascendancy to the Presidency of the United States, a most eloquent and eminently deserved editorial tribute was paid to him by Arthur V. Burrowes, the distinguished editor of the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the appendix of the RECORD this tribute to Harry S. Truman, President, statesman, first citizen of Missouri, and, in the words of the editorial:

A human being, a man who walked and talked with kings, yet never lost the common touch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Personal prejudices: Ten years ago this morning he awakened President of the United States. The first citizen of Missouri—he was this State's first Vice President—now by the tread of the dark angel with the beckoning hand, was President of these United States. That man is Harry S. Truman, of Independence, Mo., 1 of our 2 living former Presidents.

Vice Presidents are traditionally doomed to oblivion. When Harry Truman was born one certain William A. Wheeler was Vice President. Who today ever heard of him? Outside history teachers and statistical-minded newspapermen? In Harry Truman's childhood there were Vice Presidents Thomas Hendricks and Levi P. Morton. Who were they? Where did they go? He came of majority when Garrett A. Hobart was Vice President. He was a captain of artillery in France when Tom Marshall was Vice President and he was a hard-working, rigidly, sternly honest county judge down on the Kaw when Charles Dawes was Vice President.

Now overnight, the humble Missourian had become President. He was to suffer the abuse and the canting criticism that has been the fate of every President who ever was aggressive. History discloses how rabid critics of the great Washington printed their spleen. How exulting when the father of his country declined to run for a third term. No President suffered more personal cruelties than did Abraham Lincoln. He was cursed, North and South, all through his dreary years in the White House.

It is this writer's belief that the shadow of Harry S. Truman has lengthened with the years. That is rarely true of former Presidents, especially in their own lifetimes. He who would damn Mr. Truman to the classification of the Pierce, Polk, Hayes, McKinley, and Taft regimes, does not follow history. History, we believe, will deal kindlier with Mr. Truman than have his contemporaries. And we are not ashamed to strike our breast and whisper "Mea Culpa."

On the subject where President Truman was most harshly criticized by the press of America this editor is proud to stand with him. That was over Dean Acheson, Secretary of State. There, too, is a man with whom history will deal more kindly than have his contemporaries. For the Truman Doctrine and for the Marshall plan we have deep respect. They may have kept the world from going more Communist than it has. In the light of all we knew then, and possibly know now, the grave decision of the atomic bomb on those Japanese cities was justified.

Comparisons are odious, and we shall make no hysterical remarks about Mr. Truman being one of our greatest Presidents. We will say this. No President faced a more cataclysmic world. No President assumed office with graver problems of wierd potentialities, not even George Washington taking over an infant Republic after the feeble Articles of Confederation. Not even Abraham Lincoln, inheriting a secession because of a flabby and vacillating James Buchanan. F. D. R.'s bequest was not wholly blessed.

No President revered the Constitution and the American way more than does President Truman. President Lincoln arbitrarily evaded the right of appeal to habeas corpus. President Theodore Roosevelt was grossly high-handed in the manner in which he acquired the site of the Panama Canal. President Franklin D. Roosevelt flouted the Constitution when he gave destroyers to beseiged Britain. True, all three held that the end justified the means. Mr. Truman accomplished his ends within the law and the Constitution.

It seems to us as that distant day approaches when the bearded man will put the life of Harry S. Truman in history's scroll, for this, will he stand out: A human being, a man who walked and talked with kings, yet never lost the common touch. That and his genuine American devotion to that beloved wife and sweet daughter, Miss Margaret. Of all the Presidential biographies of Presidents we have read, we hail the man from Independence as our No. 1 President. Oh, we all love our wives and children. We think we do. Of our Presidents, some were more tender than others. For instance, William McKinley, whose wife was an invalid, or Theodore Roosevelt, whose loving lines to his wife makes the letters to his children sparkle like champagne.

Yet it seems to this editor, that of this man who 10 years this morn awakened a President, the true history cannot be written by him or by his Secretaries of State. They can be written only by someone who has sensed his devotion, yea, almost adoration, for the two women who make up his life. In these two gentle souls, ah, there lies the real story of the life and times of Harry S. Truman. Therein lies the explanation of greatness of the man with the lengthening shadow. In these days of wife-beating husbands, cruel fathers, those twin curses, abuse of liquor and immorality, shattered homes, the life of Citizen Truman of Independence shines. Its rays are like the morning sun on that towering Liberty Memorial across from Union Station, Kansas City, Mo., or that almost rustic sward in front of the tiny Missouri Pacific depot in Independence.

Soviet Reaction to the Programs of the Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Reds' Angry Blasts at Voice Delight Washington," published in the New York World Telegram and Sun of March 19, 1955. This article deals with the Voice of America, and the anger with which Russia is receiving our broadcasts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS' ANGRY BLASTS AT VOICE DELIGHT WASHINGTON—POWERFUL STATIONS PIERCE IRON AND BAMBOO CURTAINS—PROTESTS SHOW BROADCASTS ARE REACHING BIG AUDIENCE

(By Roger Stuart)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—The roll of dissatisfied listeners is growing at the Voice of America headquaters here—and officials are pleased as can be.

Unlike most radio stations, Uncle Sam's around-the-clock news dispatching organization considers it a high compliment when

its programs are attacked—if the attacks come from Communist officials behind the Iron Curtain. Such blasts, it's felt, provide an indication of the effectiveness of the broadcasts.

Every once in a while nowadays the Soviet powers that be get so burned up at what VOA is telling the Russian people that they order a fresh denunciation of Uncle Sam's news output to appear in one of their official organs or broadcast on the air. That means our programs are getting through.

DOLLAR BROADCASTERS

So, too, when Rumania's Soviet dominated Premier, Gheorghe Georghiu-Dej, recently told his country's Grand National Assembly how little he thought of the Voice of America it was good news indeed to Theodore C. Striebert, Director of the United States Information Agency (of which VOA is a part), and his hard-working associates.

The Rumanian Premier's speech denounced the dollar broadcasters of the Voice of America and described their output as a wave of dirty calumnies and lies. The diatribe was prompted by a series of broadcasts to the Rumanian people, pointing out specific instances when the Communist government had broken its word and made life more difficult for them.

VOA, which moved its studios from New York to Washington a few months back—without skipping a single portion of its 24-hours-a-day broadcast schedule of more than 75 separate programs in 38 languages—now has a potential audience in excess of 400 million throughout the world.

IMPORTANT ADJUNCT

This gigantic network is an important adjunct to Uncle Sam's many-sided effort to carry the truth to every part of the globe. And because radio is the only method of communicating with people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, more than three-quarters of the total program effort is directed to Eastern Europe and Communist China.

In its 9-year history, the Voice has come through some trying times. There was one period when Congressmen and editorial writers alike scoffed at its "silly" programs, complaining that much of their content was ridiculous guff which failed to accomplish more than to make the United States a laughing-stock for the limited number of foreigners who bothered to tune in.

Then, a little later, along came Sen. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY (R., Wis.) with his charges that the whole United States Information Agency was improperly managed, that its overseas libraries contained pro-Communist publications, that it was a waste of the taxpayers' money.

WHITE HOUSE SUPPORT

Things are different now. For one thing, USIA has been dissociated from the State Department, except that its policy still is dictated there. Otherwise, it's an independent, self-operating agency, headed by an energetic former radio executive, Mr. Striebert, who not only has vigorous White House support but who also is a member of the Operations Coordinating Board, an action unit of the National Security Council.

Approximately 1,600 persons are employed by the Voice—which is the radio (and, to a limited extent, television) arm of the far-flung USIA. The latter altogether has 9,500 employees. More than 850 of VOA's 1,600 work in the new Washington headquarters. The remainder, including 525 foreign nationals, are employed overseas.

Voice officials say the move from New York which was completed last November on orders from Congress, has resulted in improved integration within the agency and closer liaison with other Government Departments, notably the Department of State.

BIG BUILDING JOB

The move necessitated construction of 14 studios, 10 recording rooms with equipment to make 40 discs or tapes simultaneously, 10 tape-editing booths, a recording control center and the master control room, along with editorial offices, music and transcription libraries, and other offices, all located in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

More than a half million electrical connections and nearly 100 miles of cable are involved in the highly complex electronic equipment required.

At this moment, preparations are being made for the installation, within another month or so, of a huge control console, which will be capable of selecting program material from any of 100 sources and handling 26 separate programs simultaneously. Until this is completed, VOA will continue to feed its programs to the old board in New York and from there via telephone lines to 30 shortwave transmitters in the United States.

SEVENTY-EIGHT TRANSMITTERS

A network of 78 transmitters, including the 30 shortwave domestic stations operated for the Voice by private broadcasting companies, currently are in use in beaming the programs of news and comment to the worldwide audience.

Government-owned relay stations are located in Salonika, Tangier, Ceylon, Honolulu, Munich, the Philippines, and Okinawa. The last three, each with million-watt transmitters, are the world's most powerful known broadcasting facilities.

Then there's a floating broadcasting station designed to give VOA more mobility and at the same time to combat Soviet jamming. This is located on the U. S. Coast Guard cutter *Courier*, lately stationed off Rhodes.

FACILITIES LEASED

Relay facilities likewise are leased from the British Broadcasting Corp. in England, while still other relays or rebroadcasts are made through arrangement with local broadcasters in France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Trieste, Greece, Belgian Congo, Vietnam, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Formosa, and Latin America.

But equipment is only equipment, after all. What will make or break the Voice is its talent—the men and women who write and direct the programs, who do the broadcasting, who cut the records and turn the switches. Where do they come from, these individuals of varied gifts who devote their energies to this vast effort to combat Communist lies with the truth?

The answer literally is: Everywhere.

There's pretty Mrs. Libussa Kopfstein-Penk, for example. A former actress, she is an announcer and translator who works on programs beamed to Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia. When she speaks into the microphone, it's as though the Czechs were hearing one of their own countrywomen. For that is exactly what she is—or was before she escaped from Prague with her husband and little boy after the Communist regime took over.

"When I acted in Pirandello's play, Lazarus, on the stage of the National Theater in Prague in the autumn of 1947," she says, "I did not suspect that my next role would be announcing for the Voice of America in the United States."

Her son, Charles, was 3 when Mrs. Kopfstein-Penk and her husband made their first attempt to leave Czechoslovakia. Heading for the western border, they spent 3 days in hiding, only to be returned to Prague as a result of unexpected Communist inspection at the frontier.

"The second time," she says, "we tried to get to the United States Zone of Germany through the Soviet Zone, but for a second time were returned because of the small child. On the third try, we succeeded and, via an airliner, landed in Switzerland."

It was in 1952 that they arrived in the United States, by way of Australia.

"ALL I HOPED FOR"

"It's hard to say who of us enjoys this country most," says Mrs. Kopfstein-Penk. "Possibly it is my son, Charles. For me, America and my work are all that I could have hoped for."

Then there's an enthusiastic, dark-haired young man who produces, directs, and often participates in programs intended for Turkish audiences. His name is Irfan Kipman. A native of Turkey, he landed in the VOA setup in a roundabout way, which had its beginning when he left Istanbul on a motorcycle in August 1949.

At that time, he was a correspondent for the Turkish daily newspaper, Vatan. Riding his motorcycle through Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Burma, and Thailand—as he recalls, "over all kinds of roads"—he traveled a distance of 27,000 miles, writing articles about his experiences.

Leaving Thailand by ship for South Africa, he remained there briefly, finally sailing for the United States in the late summer of 1950.

He still possessed his motorcycle when he arrived in New York, but the job as correspondent had come to an end. So he found a job in a steel factory, assigned himself the task of learning English, and after a while became a captain in a Newark restaurant.

Later that year, he began working in the Turkish Service of the VOA, and he has been at it ever since.

So it goes. You'll find writers, announcers, and directors from Indochina, from Bulgaria, from a wide variety of countries. Also you'll find American technicians, like Elizabeth Crandall, who gave up a musical career in World War II to do something for the war effort. That meant learning how to be a studio engineer and recording technician for the OWI and later for the Voice, where she's still happily at work.

MODEST SALARIES

"There's a great similarity between show business and radio," says Miss Crandall. She ought to know. She was under contract to the Shuberts for 6 years and appeared for several seasons with the St. Louis Opera Co. as a mezzo soprano.

The salaries paid these artists and technicians are modest, but their service with the VOA brings them great satisfaction, particularly when word reaches them from listeners in far-off lands—bits of testimony like that volunteered by a Bulgarian escapee, who declared:

"Voice of America broadcasts are the only bright spots for people in my country. The image of a great and strong United States which will win in the end is the only hope."

The Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a telegram which I have received from Mr. Harry Woodward, secretary of the

South Dakota Agriculture Coordination Committee, commending the wisdom of Congress in establishing the Soil Conservation Service 20 years ago yesterday.

In this same connection, I should like also to have printed in the RECORD a news release prepared by Mr. Ross D. Davies, South Dakota State conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service, commenting on the success of the soil-conservation program.

There being no objection, the telegrams and the news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HURON, S. DAK., *April 27, 1955.*

HON. KARL MUNDT,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Convey to the Congress of the United States the official commendation of 32 agencies participating in this organization for foresight in enacting legislation 20 years ago today enabling soil conservation. The continuous result increases our Nation's agricultural production and stability.

SOUTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURE
COORDINATION COMMITTEE,
HARRY WOODWARD, *Secretary.*

NEWS RELEASE BY ROSS D. DAVIES, STATE CONSERVATIONIST, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

HURON, S. DAK., *April 27, 1955.*

Just 20 years ago today a momentous event took place in the agricultural history of this Nation. The basic Soil Conservation Act passed unanimously by both Houses of Congress was enacted into law. The act created the United States Soil Conservation Service as an agency of the Department of Agriculture to provide principally technical help to agencies of the State which can carry on conservation work.

In the preamble of this act it states: "It is hereby recognized that the wastage of soil and moisture resources on the agricultural, grazing, and forest lands of this Nation is a menace to national welfare, and that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion."

This act was the result of some experimental work on character and extent of soil erosion started in 1928 at 10 experiment stations. This was followed by 175 demonstration projects in major soil areas of the Nation and work of several hundred camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Two of these projects were in South Dakota at Huron and Winner. CCC camps under the Soil Conservation Service were located at Alcester, Chamberlain, Presho, Huron, and Fort Meade. In the 5-year program of these projects and camps, many conservation practices were tried out by cooperating farmers. Those that were the most beneficial and practical were used in the expanded program since that time.

Agricultural leaders throughout the Nation recognizing that conservation to be permanent and of maximum benefit would require wholehearted cooperation of landowners and operators who are stewards of the land, and all citizens since it affects most of the source of food, fiber, and clothing needs of all people.

Encouragement was given to States to enact legislation to provide mechanism to carry on soil and water conservation programs to fit local needs, encourage maximum local participation and provide for local administration. The soil-conservation district movement is the outgrowth of this basic philosophy of the Nation on soil conservation.

Today all States, Territories, and insular possessions of this Nation have enacted soil-conservation district laws. There are 2,650 soil-conservation districts organized under State law. All land in farms and ranches in 14 States are within soil-conservation district boundaries. Over three-fourths of all land in this country is within district boundaries and over 2 million farmers are already cooperators wth their districts.

In South Dakota since the State law was enacted in 1937, 65 soil-conservation districts with about 90 percent of all land in farms and ranches within district boundaries have been organized. Nearly 30,000 farmers and ranchers are district cooperators with conservation plans developed in cooperation with technicians of the United States Soil Conservation Service. These plans serve as a guide for applying conservation practices to fit the needs of the land as time, effort, and resources of individuals, farmers, and ranches permit. There are only 7 counties and part of 1 other county in South Dakota not within district boundaries.

This soil-conservation district movement is regarded by historians as one of the most remarkable developments in the history of this Nation or any Nation in the history of the world. A total of 68 Nations have sent representatives to this country to study conservation practices, methods, and the district program.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has made this statement that the soil conservation district has proved to be an effective mechanism through which local responsibility and leadership in soil and water conservation can be assumed and local needs and desires can be made known. Because districts are local units of State government, organized and controlled by local people, we consider them an effective device through which the Government can serve farmers without dominating them.

During the 20-year period, the program of conservation from a national standpoint has been enlarged upon and responsibilities of agencies concerned clarified and coordinated. Today, there is a five-point program—education, research, technical aid, cost sharing, and credit.

In the educational field, the Extension Service has leadership. Experiment stations conduct research work. Technical aid is primarily from the Soil Conservation Service. Cost sharing with payments on many conservation practices is handled by the Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service. Credit facilities are being made available through the Farmers Home Administration and Farm Credit Administration. The last Congress amended the Internal Revenue Act to provide reduction in income taxes for establishing permanent soil conservation practices.

South Dakota can be proud of the fact that the Administrator of the United States Soil Conservation Service, Don Williams, a native of Clark County and graduate of State College, has been entrusted with the responsibility for the activitfes of the Soil Conservation Service in assisting with the conservation program of the Nation. The philosophy being followed by Mr. Williams is to encourage public understanding, local participation, and teamwork among local people, State and Federal agencies assisting soil conservation districts with their programs. The objective being "Use the land within its capabilities and treat each acre in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement."

One notable advance was made in conservation work this past year with passage of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566. This act encourages conservation work beyond the individual tract of land, but brings into the picture of conservation, work on small watersheds. Don Williams has stated this is one of the most important strides made in conservation since enactment of the basic law in 1935.

In spite of the accomplishment to date, conservation leaders feel only a start has been made. Muddy waters, dust storms, even in South Dakota, several times this spring, tend to emphasize there is need for much more conservation on farms and ranches in this State. The past 20 years may be called the trial and organization period. Foundations for a practical and permanent conservation program in the future have been laid.

Soil conservation district supervisors throughout the State have expressed themselves that even greater accomplishments in conservation will come in the 20-year period ahead.

Removal of Smog From Pittsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Smog Cleanup Here Hailed," which refers to the successful program conducted by the city of Pittsburgh, Pa. The article was written by Phyllis Battelle, and was published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegram of April 18.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMOG CLEANUP HERE HAILED

(By Phyllis Battelle)

Look alive, you city dwellers who are biting the dust (or absorbing the smog, or inhaling the monoxide), and turn your smarting eyes toward Pittsburgh.

This is the spot that got religion.

Ten years ago, it was a grimy-faced gargoyle of a city. It was dark as a saloon, at midday. Its citizens were susceptible to TB and silicosis and inflamed eyes. The neatest of housewives had tattle-tale curtains. The millionaires had soiled bills by lunchtime.

Suddenly civic pride stepped in, by firm official order. A strong-willed group of residents formed a United Smoke Council of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development and demanded that Pittsburgh's billion-dollar industries, its railroads, even its households, cease and desist burning soft coal.

A few choice squawk words echoed through the surrounding hills, because gas is a comparatively costly fuel and because bituminous coal was one of the region's vital industries. But by October 1, 1947, the deed was done.

THERE, THERE, LOS ANGELES

Today Pittsburgh, unlike some other cities I could mention, is smog free (there, there, Los Angeles, don't be so touchy). And it is the fastest-growing fairyland in the East.

I looked down upon it from one of the high hills across the Monongahela River from the center of the 197-year-old city. It was night, and the lights were sharp in the spanking-clean air over Pittsburgh. They made splotches of corrugated color in the Monongahela and the Allegheny Rivers, as these two swept past the city on either side, then churned together to form the Ohio River in the form of a great watery Y.

The air is almost as pure as it was when George Washington came here in 1758," said Stefan Lorant, the Austrian writer-historian

who has been fetched here by the Allegheny conference to write a book about Pittsburgh and its "Renaissance."

WASHINGTON'S GHOST VISIBLE

"In fact," and he squinted down at the big point of land where the rivers merge, "you can just about see Washington's ghost, if you try."

I tried, but my retinae are not extrasensory it seems, so Lorant described how Washington found this spot, a rolling, tree-covered plot, and how it became the center of French, Indian, and British warfare till the end of the American Revolution.

Then, beginning in the 1790's with a boatbuilding business, it expanded to become the great industrial center. Oil, steel, coal, aluminum, all were discovered, developed, and shipped from Pittsburgh. Great family fortunes were piled up and stowed away. Dollar bills were a dime a dozen here. And everyone was so busy they scarcely noticed.

WITH SUCCESS CAME DARKNESS

With success came darkness. Fog, smoke, and ugliness swept over the wealthy community. One of the city's most powerful industrialists is said to have lost at least one wife because flowers wouldn't grow in her gardens.

For more than a century the filth compounded until citizens scarcely remembered there was such a thing as sunshine. Then, almost overnight, in one cleanup sweep, it was blown away.

Pittsburghers now are almost deliriously civic-minded. They contribute money and ideas to the reconstruction of their town and watch, with delicious amazement, the building of dozens of new structures, the side-scrubbing of soiled ones, the laying out of real, genuine parks in midtown.

I don't know what courage and money and heartache it took for the men who crusaded to make Pittsburgh sunlit once more, but the fact that it was accomplished, with such magic swiftness, is encouraging.

It can, ye unclean communities, be done.

What Price Quemoy and Matsu?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Price Quemoy and Matsu?" from the April 21 issue of the Iron Age.

Our Nation is fortunate in that we have President Eisenhower, with his military background and his innate desire to keep the world at peace to make the decision as to these islands.

As this editorial points out, it is not merely a question of these two small islands. They are but symbols of other points in this conflict between ideologies.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE QUEMOY AND MATSU?

(By Tom Campbell)

One man will determine if or when we will help defend Quemoy and Matsu. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and others have told President Eisenhower what they think. When the time comes he alone will bear the crushing burden of responsibility—and courage.

There are those who ask loudly why we should defend those tiny islands; as if there is nothing there except real estate. To some people we would be stark crazy to defend such small specks in the Formosan Strait.

But that is not the simple point. We are not interested in the mere physical aspect of Quemoy and Matsu. Something infinitely more important to freedom is involved. No one knows for sure if we will or will not defend these isles against a communistic attack.

It all depends on the Chinese Reds. If they insist on moving toward Formosa, with invasion as their unmistakable goal, they may commit the ghastliest blunder of this century. Yet it would be stupid strategy to tell the Reds what is in our minds—or what we intend to do—about Quemoy and Matsu.

These islands are symbolic in more ways than one. They are the "stop, look, and listen" for the Reds. They contain perhaps the hidden answer to the question, "Is the United States a paper tiger?" They may turn out to be the deterrent to world war III. Or they may be one more setpping stone to the onrush of communism in Asia.

All the hue and cry about these two Nationalist Chinese outposts would lead us to believe that, if we said "No" we won't defend them, or "Yes" we will defend them, everything would be white or black. It isn't that easy. There will always be Quemoys and Matsus of various shades for us.

All the talk in Britain, in India, in Canada, and in the United States will not change this one basic fact; sooner or later we must decide where we are going to stand up against the Reds. If it isn't Quemoy or Matsu it must be Formosa. Even General Eisenhower's severest critics concede that.

The free world did not stop Hitler in time—and so came World War II. Only history can tell us if Quemoy and Matsu will prove to have been the free world's stand—if there is to be any history. Your President needs your support—and your prayers.

Transmission Line From Fort Randall to Grand Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RESOLUTION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 230,000-VOLT TRANSMISSION LINE FROM FORT RANDALL TO GRAND ISLAND

Whereas the economy of the State of Nebraska is dependent primarily on the production of foods and fiber products from its lands; and

Whereas Nebraska is blessed with the priceless asset of an abundant underground water supply in much of its area; and

Whereas the productivity of much of Nebraska has already been materially increased by means of pump irrigation; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has recently initiated a special rate for electric power used for irrigation pumping, by which large quantities of surplus power available during the summer months from the Missouri River Basin project can be put to beneficial use for irrigation and reclamation purposes; and

Whereas there will also be blocks of low cost firm power available from the hydroelectric developments on the Missouri River; and

Whereas there is and will be definite need for such blocks of firm power as they become available for agricultural, industrial and defense plant purposes in Nebraska; and

Whereas to effect delivery of such low-cost power from the hydroelectric plants on the Missouri River to areas of Nebraska where it can be most effectively used requires the construction of a 230,000 volt transmission line capable of carrying some 150,000 kilowatts of power from the Fort Randall hydroelectric powerplant site to the vicinity of Grand Island, Nebr.; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has built many similar transmission lines in other States in the Missouri Basin; and being interested in all programs which further expand the economy of the State, is vitally interested in the development of additional pump irrigation, rural electrification, and industrial and agricultural development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Platte United Chambers of Commerce endorses and supports the construction of the proposed 230,000 volt Fort Randall-Grand Island transmission line; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to give support to this line and appropriate the necessary funds for the construction and completion of this line in 1956 fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our Members of Congress requesting their support of this important propect.

This resolution adopted at the regular April meeting at Superior, Nebr., on April 14, 1955, by a unanimous vote.

THE SOUTH PLATTE UNITED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,
ORAN KING,
President, Superior, Nebr.
CLETUS NELSON,
Secretary-Manager, Holdrege, Nebr.

Ulysses Simpson Grant: The Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday it was my pleasure to attend the exercises on the Capitol grounds honoring the 133d anniversary of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant. This significant celebration is an annual event, and I was pleased to see that it was attended by a large number of people. The Marine Band played appropriate music; veteran and patriotic organizations laid wreaths at the monument; introductory remarks were made by Col. Randle Bond Truett, Chief of the National Memorials and Historic Sites Section, and Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the former President, expressed his appreciation for the observance.

The principal speaker was our amiable, capable, and devoted public servant, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, who spoke eloquently on the sub-

ject: Ulysses Simpson Grant: The Man. I earnestly solicit the attention of my colleagues to Representative DONDERO's address.

ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT: THE MAN

(Address of GEORGE A. DONDERO, Member of Congress at the Grant Memorial in Washington, D. C., April 27, 1955)

One hundred thirty-three years ago today, Ulysses S. Grant, one of our greatest Americans, was born.

It is not my purpose to dwell on his brilliant military career nor his political career as President of the United States. The great man in whose memory we have met to do him honor had certain striking elements of character which made him what he was and which enabled him to accomplish what he did. I propose to confine my remarks to his characteristics as a man.

I know of no place more appropriate to discuss his life and character than here in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol Building, and at this imposing memorial erected by a united people to commemorate his name and fame. May we rekindle within us respect and admiration for the knightly character and leader that he was.

General Grant presents one of the strangest anomalies in history: that a man so distinguished in war should be so unwarlike in personal characteristics and free from the ambitions supposed to dominate the soldier.

Among the qualities which enabled him to accomplish what he did were his self-confidence, perseverence, and firm discipline. These qualties were not manifested in an extreme manner, for they were balanced by his temperate character. His self-confidence was combined with humility; his perseverence was attended with adaptability; and his discipline was softened by his innate kindness.

His self-confidence is clearly illustrated in a unique way by a letter which General Grant wrote to his sister Mary from his headquarters at Oxford, Miss., December 15, 1862. The Vicksburg campaign was in progress. The General was expecting his wife and his father to visit him in a few days. Notice what the General said to his sister: "We are now having wet weather. I have a big army in front of me as well as bad roads. I shall probably give a good account of myself however notwithstanding all obstacles." We all know that 5 days after the General wrote the letter to his sister, expressing supreme confidence in his plans, a Confederate force captured Holly Springs where Grant's supplies for his army were stored and where his sister and father were at the time he wrote the letter.

A man of less courage and resourcefulness would have been frustrated and discouraged, but not so with General Grant. He immediately sent all the wagons he had "to collect and bring in all supplies of forage and food from an area 15 miles east and west of the road," to subsist his troops on the people in the region. This lesson, that an army could live off the country, was used in order that he could persevere in his long-range plan to capture Vicksburg.

He was so averse to inflicting pain that as a boy he never enjoyed the sport of killing small animals. He sickened at the sight of blood, yet was forced to witness the greatest outpouring of human blood for freedom in all our history.

He was a lover of horses. During the Wilderness campaign, he came in sight of a teamster brutally beating his horse in the face with the butt of his whip. He directed that the scoundrel be taken in charge and tied to a tree for 6 hours as punishment for his brutality.

During the Vicksburg campaign, or seige of Vicksburg as it is sometimes called, General Grant and staff took possession of a house as headquarters. He informed the family they might retain the upper rooms of the house and the kitchen below. One day the General met a young girl in the hallway carrying a tray of food. He inquired whom it was for. Frightened and trembling with fear, she admitted it was for her brother, a young Confederate officer who was wounded and concealed in the basement of the house. She had visions of a Northern prison for her brother and punishment for herself. "Tell your brother I will have my personal physician attend him and he shall have what food he needs," was the General's directive.

During the late twenties or about 30 years ago, an old lady, on whose head the snows of many years had fallen, entered the office of Ulysses S. Grant III, grandson of President Grant and one of the most respected and highly esteemed citizens of Washington, and told him the story. She said "I am the little girl who carried the tray of food, and I wanted some member of the Grant family to know of the incident before I passed away." Such are the facts as I heard them from the lips of the distinguished grandson of the man we honor today.

General Grant always abstained from profanity and would not tolerate it in others. He hated liars and cowards. The familiar saying that "an honest man is the noblest work of God" could literally be applied to Grant. Characteristic of the man and his meticulous adherence to the truth in an incident which happened in camp. After returning from an inspection, he was heard to say: "I was told so and so about the wounded by Dr. Smith while we were talking this morning inside his tent." A half hour later, he took the trouble to come back and say, as if it were a matter of the greatest importance, "I was mistaken when I told you that my conversation with Dr. Smith occurred inside his tent, that was not correct, it took place while we were standing in front of his tent."

One of Grant's generals, Ingalls, who knew him at West Point while a Cadet said, "He was always frank, generous, and manly." He would not tolerate obscenity or even off-color stories. They were objectionable to him. One evening a citizen who had come to camp said he would tell a story, and began by looking around and saying, "I see there are no ladies present." General Grant interrupted him with the remark, "No, but there are gentlemen present."

He entered the Military Academy because his father desired him to do so and not because he wanted to go. While there, he secretly rejoiced when it was rumored that Congress proposed to abolish the academy. While at West Point, he deliberately planned to be fired from the academy by putting on his full-dress uniform and leaving the grounds without permission. He walked a considerable distance to a favorite meeting place for the cadets. On the way, he passed several officers, who, believing he had authority to leave the grounds, made no report of his escapade, and his whole plan to be fired from the academy failed.

Years after graduating from West Point, he related that on his way to the academy from home he hoped the train would be wrecked and he would be injured just enough to disqualify him from entering. However, his training at West Point left its impress upon the young soldier. He was always refined in his manners at table and never violated the requirements of true politeness.

There was little if anything in Grant's early life to mark him as a man of destiny. Adversity, hardship, and poverty were not unknown to this famous soldier. Shortly before the breaking out of the Civil War, he pawned his watch for $22 in order to provide a few Christmas presents for his children. His weaknesses, if they can be called such, were his devotion to his family and his singular love for children.

When his family visited him at City Point, his headquarters during the last months of the war, his meeting with them afforded him the happiest day he had seen since they parted. The morning after their arrival an officer entered the general's tent and found him in shirt sleeves engaged in a rough-and-tumble wrestling match with his two older boys—age 14 and 12 years respectively. He had become red in the face and seemed nearly out of breath from the exertion. The boys had tripped him up and he was on his knees on the floor grappling with his playful youngsters,and joining in their merry laughter as if he were a boy again himself. Noticing the officer, Horace Porter, with dispatches in his hand, the general rose to his feet, brushed the dust from his clothes and said, "Ah, you know my weaknesses—my children and my horses." The older son, Frederick Dent Grant, was the father of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, my warm personal friend whom we all admire and respect.

This was the man who commanded the Armies of the Union. One army under his immediate command numbered over 100,000 men. He held in his hand the destiny of our Republic. He was intensely human and most considerate of others.

There is an erroneous impression abroad that General Grant was a poor student and left a somewhat indifferent record at West Point and graduated low in his class. His grandson, in an address delivered quite recently, called attention to the fact that this popular fallacy was incorrect. He quoted an officer who made a study of this subject and found that General Grant stood in the middle of his class and relatively higher than Jefferson Davis, General Hooker, Longstreet, Hancock, Custer, Pickett, Hood, and Sheridan.

His innate modesty is well expressed by Alexander H. Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy, who said, "He is one of the most remarkable men I ever met. He does not seem to be aware of his powers."

Although his education was limited to country schools and the Military Academy, he acquired a general knowledge of literature sufficient to develop a most unusual facility for straightforward and clear expression, which assisted him greatly in later life. No one can read his memoirs without noticing his simple and direct method of expression. During the Civil War, his orders, written by himself, and many of them in the heat and confusion of the battlefield, distinctly conveyed his views, and none of them were ever misunderstood.

It is claimed that General Grant was careless about his personal apeparance. It is true that many photographs of him as an officer during the Civil War show him with his vest unbuttoned or otherwise unconscious of his appearance. However, we have the authority of his grandson that his mother, in her effort to train him in the way he should go, tried to impress on him the scrupulous cleanliness of his grandfather and his meticulous insistence on clean linen. It will be remembered that when Lee surrendered to him at Appomattox, he apologized for his appearance because of his muddy boots and wearing no sword. These were his remarks when asked what his thoughts were at that supreme moment of his military career.

Those who knew him best loved him most; to dislike him was to misunderstand, like the little Southern girl who didn't like the new minister. After the church service, she asked, "Mama, is the new minister a Yankee?" "Why, no, dear, why do you ask?" "Well, I don't like him, anyway; when he prayed he kept saying, 'Grant, O Lord; Grant, O Lord;

Grant, O Lord,' and he never once mentioned General Lee."

Perhaps no better example of his extreme modesty exists than the occasion in 1884 when he wrote an article for the Century magazine on the Vicksburg campaign without mentioning himself. We all know he was the commander at Vicksburg and brought about its fall and the surrender of its garrison of 31,000 men.

Hamilton Fish, who was Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Grant, when asked what he thought was Grant's dominant quality, said "absolute truthfulness, complete inflexible veracity. I do not think it would have been possible for Grant to have told a lie even if he had composed it and written it down."

It is a common expression among men in uttering the highest faith and confidence in a person to say: "His word is as good as his bond." During the administration of President Johnson, General Lee and other Confederate leaders were threatened with indictment and arrest for treason. Under the terms of surrender given by Grant they were paroled and were not to be molested as long as they obeyed their paroles. That his word be kept as good as his bond, General Grant told the President, "I will resign the command of the Army rather than execute any order directing me to arrest General Lee or any other of his commanders." That put an end to all attempts for vengeance against southern leaders.

Bearing on the character of the great Union commander is the statement of William H. Cook, chief usher at the White House during Grant's administration, who declared, "I have never seen a more devoted family or a happier one," and this during the tempestuous period of speculation and reconstruction of our country. Be it ever said to the everlasting fame and credit of President Grant he entered upon the duties of that high office without political experience or training in the art of diplomacy and statesmanship and made good. The only criticism leveled against him, and the one mistake he made, being as honest a man as God ever made, was that he believed other people in whom he placed trust and confidence were as honest as he.

A fair measure of the esteem and respect in which he was held is included in a tribute paid by a political opponent, a Democrat, assistant attorney general of New York, William A. Poste, who declared, "The century has produced and honored no more rugged and manly man than Ulysses S. Grant—he has gone down to his grave faithful unto death."

The estimate of the Confederate General Longstreet, foe and adversary in battle who fought on the other side and who knew Grant at West Point, speaks in loud praise of the man in whose memory we have gathered here today. He said, "Grant will hold a place with Washington in the hearts of his countrymen. Personally, Grant was a warm-hearted, lovable friend, a magnanimous opponent. His greatness was marked by a modesty so noticeable as to win him the appelation of the 'silent man of destiny.' "

We honor ourselves by honoring Ulysses Simpson Grant on the 133d anniversary of his birth. We bestow upon him today the affectionate appreciation of his countrymen and the loving memory of a grateful people. "A man he was without vices, with an absolute hatred of lies and an unreserved love of truth, of a perfect loyalty to friendship, neither envious of others nor selfish for himself. With a zeal for the public good, unfeigned, he has left to memory only such weaknesses as connects him with humanity, and such virtues as will rank him among heroes."

Assistance to Small Firms From Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, during the past few months the Small Business Administration has developed, tested, and placed in operation a program of products assistance. This program is designed to aid small business firms and individual small busines owners to keep up to date in production and marketing techniques, particularly as applied to new product development.

An article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1955, has reported on this program and how it operates. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1955]

SMALL FIRMS NEEDING HELP ON MARKETING CAN NOW GET IT FROM SBA—PRODUCTS ASSISTANCE FUNNELS DATA TO COMPANIES STUMPED BY INDUSTRY PROBLEMS

(By Tait Trussell)

WASHINGTON.—If you're a small-business man with problems in marketing, developing, or, maybe, redesigning one of your wares, the Government's Small Business Administration probably can help you.

At least, you'll get quick attention from officials pushing the agency's newest undertaking called "Products Assistance." Their idea is to funnel already-available information to the people who need it.

A Rutherford, N. J., plant, for instance, had what it thought was a stickler of a problem recently.

"Our company has developed an aluminum carport and is about to launch a marketing program," wrote the New Jersey firm. "However * * * certain statistical information and data is needed."

In less than 24 hours, said an SBA official, the company was given complete data covering all phases of marketing its product, including the total number of United States homes, exclusive of farm homes, the number of houses built since World War II, whether the carport trend is increasing, and the number of homes with garages and with carports.

INFORMATION READILY AVAILABLE

Though the New Jersey company had gone to 10 different private sources without success, the information was readily available, said the SBA, if you knew where to look: The American Association of Home Builders, the American Institute of Architects, the Commerce Department, and Federal Housing Administration.

This was one of 2,000 inquiries that have poured into SBA offices in the past several months. Such puzzlers as what is a new outlet for an ore byproduct, what equipment is needed to make paint pigments, what manufacturer is interested in producing a new aviation toy, all have been handled under the SBA products assistance program.

SBA Administrator Wendell Barnes calls it a unique Government program in that 80 percent of the calls for specific product assistance are processed and solved right in the little firm's locale, in SBA's 12 regional offices scattered throughout the country. These offices are staffed by what the agency calls industrial specialists, in addition to other SBA personnel who handle small-business loans and other agency functions. Problems the field offices can't solve are tackled in the Washington headquarters.

"Over the years a wealth of technical information and data on research and product development of a nonconfidential nature has accumulated," says James Salisbury, products assistance chief. "There's a billion dollars worth lying around if you know where to put your hands on it," adds his assistant, Phil Nelson.

They note about 3,000 research laboratories run by private industry are conducting research and development and 4,500 trade associations are studying problems of their respective industries. Much of what is turned up is available to small business without cost, they say.

NO RESEARCH FACILITIES

Most of the 300,000 small firms in the country don't have research facilities or money to keep abreast of current developments in production and marketing techniques, thus putting the small concern in an unfavorable competitive position. The small-business owner, busy with all the other operations of his firm, meets such problems as: how to make something faster, how to eliminate a costly process, where to find a substitute.

SBA's new program aims at helping the small-business owner find the answer to his particular problem and counseling him on the profitable application of the information.

One of the things about the program which Mr. Barnes says has happily surprised him is the generous cooperation from big business. Scores of king-size companies have given SBA information on techniques or developments they can't use themselves.

Such ideas as these, along with other processes and products and gadgets which lend themselves to production facilities of small business are listed on a circular which SBA puts out to businesses which ask for it, as one phase of the products-assistance program.

The newest SBA circular carries a score of products, inventions or commercial ideas being offered by their owners for development and marketing. The list includes a telephone-holding device which permits free use of both your hands. The inventor wants to license it on a royalty basis to some manufacturer on the west coast.

Seven Years of Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting record of progress made in Israel since it gained its independence:

SEVEN YEARS OF ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE

POPULATION AND IMMIGRATION

At the time of the proclamation of independence the Jewish population in Israel was 650,000.

The total population of Israel on December 31, 1954, was 1,717,834, of which 1,526,016 (89 percent) were Jews and 191,818 (11 per-

cent) non-Jews. Of the non-Jews, mainly Arabs, 131,500 were Moslems, 42,800 were Christians, and 17,500 were Druzes.

Most of this population increase has been brought about by mass immigration. Between May 15, 1948, and December 31, 1954, 735,394 persons immigrated to Israel.

The natural increase in population amounted in recent years to an average of 30,000 to 35,000 per annum. The birth rate rose from 27 per 1,000 in 1948 to 29 in 1954. The death rate declined from 7.3 per 1,000 in 1952 to 6.7 in 1954, while the infant mortality rate was reduced from 52 per 1,000 live births in 1949 to 39 in 1954.

Absorption and integration of immigrants

Less than 2 percent of the new immigrants who have arrived in the country since 1948 had previously engaged in agriculture, while half of them had no vocational or professional training at all. In 1954, 15 percent of the active Jewish population was engaged in agriculture (12.6 percent in 1947) and 42 percent in industry, mining, construction, and transportation.

Housing

More than 110,000 permanent housing units have been built since the establishment of the State, the majority of which are occupied by new immigrants.

Cultural integration

Some 150,000 adults have studied Hebrew in a comprehensive network of courses for adult education. Of this number, 40,000 attended classes in 1954–55 under Operation Hebrew, a voluntary endeavor designed to impart an elementary knowledge of the Hebrew language and culture to newcomers.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

When the term of the Second Knesset (Parliament) expires in July 1955, the young democracy, which more than doubled its population and voters through immigration from some 70 countries, will have experienced significant political stability. Israel is a parliamentary democracy of the type which has been evolved in Western Europe. The Knesset consists of a single 120-member chamber elected for a 4-year term on the basis of proportional representation. The Cabinet is responsible to the Knesset and holds office as long as it enjoys the confidence of the Knesset. Since the establishment of the state, there have been three coalition governments comprising almost the same political parties.

While the First Knesset, elected by the general elections of January 1949, dissolved itself because of a Government crisis in the middle of its term, the Second Knesset, and the coalition cabinet of the four parties (Mapai, General Zionists, Progressives, and Hapoel Hamizrahi-Mizrahi) based on it, held office for the whole term prescribed by law, enjoying the continuous support of over two-thirds of the legislature.

Despite the multiplicity of political parties resulting from the proportional system of elections, a prevailing majority of the nation is, through the normal working of the democratic process, united on the main issues of internal and foreign affairs.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND GROWTH

National income

In 1954, national income amounted to IL.1,426 million, as compared with IL.1,100 million in 1953. National income per capita increased from IL.666 in 1953 to IL.843 ($444) in 1954 (compared with $650 in France, $450 in the Netherlands, $420 in Austria, $270 in Italy, $250 in Greece, and $170 in Turkey). Less than half of this increase reflects changes in prices. The rest represents a net increase in the average level of productivity in the Israel economy. Compared with 1950, real national income increased by about 60 percent, and real per capita income by about 20 percent.

National investment

Gross national investment in 1954 amounted to IL.432 million, as against IL.325 million in 1953. Net capital formation increased from IL.220 million in 1953 to IL.292 million in 1954, in both years amounting to one-fifth of the national income.

Prices

The inflationary pressures in the economy, caused by the mass immigration and long-term overhead investments, were considerably checked following the large increases in production and the new economic policy initiated in February 1952. The consumers price index, which rose from 100 in September 1951 to 196 in 1953, increased in 1954 by only 10 percent to 220.

Agriculture

Since 1948–49, the physical volume of agricultural production has increased by almost 125 percent. In 1953–54 alone, the physical volume as well as the added value of agricultural production increased by 22 to 24 percent. The cultivated area increased from 412,500 acres in 1948–49, to 925,000 acres in 1954–55. During the same period the irrigated area almost trebled from 72,500 to 200,000 acres. During the 7 years of independence over 400 new settlements were established, as compared with 277 settlements in the course of the previous 70 years.

A $40 million 60-mile Yarkon-Negev pipeline, diverting the waters from the River Yarkon, north of Tel Aviv, to the parched land of the Negev, is near completion. This pipeline will supply the Negev with 100 million cubic meters of water annually.

Industry

In the 4-year period, 1950–54, the volume of industrial production increased by about 60 percent. In 1954 industrial manpower increased by 10 percent, while production rose by 20 percent. The sale of electrical power for all uses, which may serve as a partial indicator of industrial activity, increased from 329 million kilowatt-hours in 1949, to almost 820 million kilowatt-hours in 1954. In 1954, 48 new factories started production.

The Investment Center was established in 1950 to encourage capital investments in the various industries. Since then, the center has extended facilities and recommendations to more than 1,750 enterprises, which have mobilized over IL.105 million in local capital and over $220 million in foreign capital. By March 31, 1954, 425 enterprises had started production with investments of IL.37 million in local and $57.7 in foreign capital.

Natural resources

Since the establishment of the State, many mineral resources have been discovered, chiefly in the Negev. Today, the mineral wealth of the country consists of the following principal natural resources: Potash, caustic soda, magnesium, bromine, rock phosphates, ceramic clays and glass sand, feldspar, manganese, copper, iron ores, and mica.

Trade

The large increases in production, which were recorded in all branches of the economy, and the economic and commercial policy of the government have made a very important contribution to the improvement of Israel's international accounts. Imports, which reached a peak of $343 million in 1951, declined to $290 million in 1954. Exports in 1954 reached a level of $88 million, a more than 100-percent increase over the 1952 level and a 50-percent increase over the 1953 one. In 1949 exports covered only 11 percent of the imports while in 1954 they financed 30 percent of them. Since 1951, the annual deficit in the balance of trade has been reduced by $100 million.

In 1954, Israel established a market for her exports in 16 new countries, thus bringing the total number of countries buying Israel's products to 80.

Besides earnings from the export of merchandise, Israel earned in 1954, $29 million from invisible exports, partly from the 38,661 tourists who visited the country in the course of the year.

Transportation

Railroads: In 1954, the total length of broad gage lines was 220 miles, as against 62 in 1948. The length of sidings and branch lines was 112 miles, as compared with 80 miles in 1948. In addition, the first stage of a 45-mile Negev railway, connecting Na'an and Beersheba, is now being laid.

Roads: The total number of motor vehicles in Israel reached 44,614 in 1954, as compared with 24,366 in 1949. The length of asphalt roads increased from 890 miles in 1949 to almost 1,250 miles by the beginning of 1954.

Merchant fleet: The merchant marine of Israel expanded from 6,000 tons in 1948 to 21 vessels with a gross tonnage of 55,000 tons in 1950 and 34 vessels with a gross tonnage of 137,000 tons at the beginning of 1955.

Air transportation: El-Al Israel Airlines started operation in July 1949. At the end of 1954, El-Al operated 8 planes, 4 Constellations and 4 of the Curtiss-Commando type, linking 4 continents: Asia, Europe, North America, and Africa. The total number of passengers carried by El-Al, which has a perfect safety record, increased from 15,514 in 1950 to 32,639 in 1954. In addition, the Arkia Corp., a subsidiary of El-Al, operates within Israel, linking Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Eilat.

EDUCATION

Universal, compulsory, and free education for children from 5 to 14 was established by law in September 1949. The philosophy of the educational system is defined by law as follows: "The state educational system aims to base fundamental education in the state on values of the heritage of Israel and the achievements of science, on love for the country and fealty to the state of Israel and the Jewish people, on training in agriculture and manual labor, on pioneering, and on striving toward the creation of a society built on freedom, equality, tolerance, mutual help, and love of mankind."

From 1948 to 1955 school attendance increased from 98,000 to about 350,000.

Higher education: The 1948 war cut off the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus from Jerusalem. The university resumed classes in temporary premises scattered throughout the city. Despite these difficulties, four new schools have been added (medicine, including departments of dentistry and pharmacology, agriculture, law, economics, and social science) and former departments have been expanded. The number of students increased from 870 in 1948 to 3,200 in 1955.

The Hebrew Institute of Technology, "Technion" in Haifa, has experienced a similar expansion. In the course of the last 7 years, 5 new departments have been added (science, industrial chemistry, architecture, aeronautics, and agricultural engineering), and the number of students rose from 660 in 1948 to 1,480 in 1954–55.

SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES

By the end of 1948 Israel had 63 hospitals with a total of 4,626 beds. By the beginning of 1954, the number of hospitals had risen to 87 with 10,609 beds. In spite of the large increase in population, the number of hospital beds per 1,000 of the population rose from 5.33 in 1949 to 6.50 in 1954.

The first stage of the national insurance law was adopted by the Knesset in November 1953. It covers old-age and survivors insur-

ance, maternity, and industrial-accident insurance.

PROGRESS IN THE ARAB COMMUNITY

First experiences in democracy

The Arab community in Israel enjoys full equality of rights and duties. Israel enfranchised Arab women without any qualifications for the first time in history. The First Knesset had three Arab members. Eight Arab members are seated in the Second Knesset. They may, and do, address the legislature in Arabic, and the proceedings in Hebrew are translated simultaneously into Arabic.

The Government has initiated and encouraged local self-government in the Arab communities. For almost all of them this has been their first experience in democracy and self-government. There are now 2 Arab municipalities and 12 Arab local councils, out of a total of 21 municipal corporations and 78 local councils.

Improvements in living standards

The Ministries of Agriculture, Education, Health, Interior, and Religion include special departments for the promotion of the economic and cultural standards of living of the Arab population.

Since three-quarters of the Arab population lives in rural areas, the emphasis has been on the modernization of Arab agriculture through loans, new methods of cultivation, and mechanical equipment. In the last 4 years Arab agricultural production increased considerably, e. g., vegetables from 2,550 to 9,500 tons a year, fruits from 7,910 to 16,300 tons, and olives from 2,400 to 10,100 tons.

With the assistance of the Ministry of Labor and the Histadrut (General Federation of Labor), Arab farmers and workers have established more than 130 producer, consumer, and distribution cooperative societies.

Great strides have been made in wiping out the scourges of malaria and tuberculosis, which were so rampant among the Arab population, and in generally improving their health conditions. Special clinics have been set up in Arab centers and mobile clinics serve outlying areas in the Negev and Galilee, at which medical service as well as hospitalization is free of charge.

Advances in education

The Proclamation of Independence guaranteed to all citizens freedom of language, education, and culture. The Arab community has availed itself of this right and the majority of Arab children attend state government schools with Arabic as the language of instruction. In 1954–55 more than 26,000 students were enrolled in these schools as compared with 7,400 in 1948–49. About 80 percent of the Arab school-age population now attends school, the highest percentage among all the Arab countries. (It was 45 percent during the later period of the mandatory regime in Palestine.)

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Israel has been recognized by 62 countries and is represented in 48 countries.

In 37 of them Israel maintains diplomatic missions, five of which are Embassies (United States, United Kingdom, France, Soviet Union, and Canada). In 17 other states Israel maintains consular offices.

Israel was admitted to the United Nations on May 11, 1949, a year after the proclamation of independence. Two Israel missions are attached to the United Nations, one at the New York headquarters and one at the United Nations European office in Geneva.

Thirty-eight states have representations in Israel; 25 with diplomatic missions, 4 of which are Embassies (United States, United Kingdom, France, Soviet Union), and 13 with consular offices.

Senator George: Quarterback for the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Senator WALTER GEORGE has been doing a remarkable job in recent weeks as a quarterback on foreign affairs. From crisis to crisis he has been out ahead of the Secretary of State, and the President, and the country is the better for it. Last Saturday night he delivered an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, and again he seems to have influenced a change of policy by the administration. Those who heard this speech called it an "extraordinary address," and it deserves a wide audience. I present herewith a partial text of these impromptu remarks:

Jimmie Pope and ladies and gentlemen of this distinguished audience, now, I suppose you want me to talk to you a little bit about foreign affairs.

From the beginning, of course, we have had relations with other peoples, but prior to World War I, to the great masses of the American people, our foreign relations were hardly known.

These relations and the relations growing out of them occupied the attention of the President, the Secretary of State, and a small group of men in the United States Senate, and intellectuals—men and women throughout the Union.

Even after the outbreak of World War II we said: "Aren't we separated from all that clash and all that confusion by 3,000 miles of ocean and do we not live under other political institutions, and are we not dominated by other social and economical ideas?"

MARKETS DECLINED

Well, we very soon found the answer. The ranchers and cotton growers and manufacturers soon found their markets declining and all but disappearing. And in every accounting and banking house in this Nation, business, temporarily at least, came almost to a standstill. For the first time, Americans in all walks of life began to realize that every important public act committed on the other side of the globe directly affected the welfare and well being of the American people.

At that time and prior to that time and from the beginning, we had the policy of what you and I know as strictly isolationism. We were protected by two great oceans. The British Navy was the unquestioned mistress of the seas, and behind that navy and those two oceans, we enjoyed an immunity seldom found to a young and struggling people, for a long, long time.

World War I came and ended, but we did not reserve the power unity which enabled us to win that war. It fell apart. We were conscious, of course, of how slightly our interests were affected by international affairs, but the unity which enabled us to win that war fell apart.

At the end of the Second World War, the power unity was again dissolved and almost completely dissolved because the American people, true to their traditions, true to their innermost longings, wanted to get back home and wanted to get the boys back home and wanted to settle back into a normal life.

That war, of course, was marked by certain mistakes. All wars are, in point of policy or strategy, and we made some mistakes.

CREATED VACUUMS

I think it may now be said, since the Yalta papers have been published, that we made a great mistake in insisting upon the complete destruction of the great producing nation in Europe—Germany.

Then, after Japan came in and before the end of the war, we again insisted upon the complete, utter destruction of that great producing nation, upon the destruction of the two greatest producers in the world, outside of ourselves, unmindful of the fact that at the moment we were creating economic and political vacuums.

We were right, I think, in insisting upon the utter destruction of Hitler militarism as it had been developed in Germany and as it had lived in Japan.

At any rate we did, and at any rate, these two great powers were destroyed. We made a peace treaty with Japan and Japan is now slowly coming back. We made but recently a treaty with West Germany under which sovereignty is restored to West Germany. But more than that, she is entitled to come into NATO and under which she will come into NATO on May 5, according to present schedules.

Both Germany and Japan are moving back industrially, and commercially, especially West Germany, and you can't understand, I do not believe any of us can understand, what is going on in Europe and what has gone on there for several months, without a realization of what Germany's return to the sisterhood of states in that area of the world means.

SEES SOVIET RETREAT

Many of the actions taken by our Soviet friends undoubtedly are predicated upon the return of Germany, of the entry of Germany into NATO, upon the rearming under restrictions, of West Germany.

The coming back of West Germany, not immediately, but ultimately, will mean the organization of all Western Europe and the retreat of the Soviets back to their ancient boundaries with possibly the exception of one satellite which cannot be defended by Western Europe. Ultimately and at no great distant date, with the return of Japan, there will commence again the age-old struggle for Northern Korea and the rich area of Manchuria, and that struggle will be between what we now call the Chinese People's Republic and Japan.

Moscow is 6,000 miles away from that battlefront, and that battleground, and so two great significant facts have come to pass. They are: The peace treaty with Japan and her entry into world affairs; the peace treaty with Western Germany and her entry again into world affairs.

These are two important facts. I believe Justice Holmes once said that a single page of human history is better than a whole volume of logic. Here are your pages.

Many men and women in this audience tonight will see the day when our Russian friends will go back to their ancient borders and boundaries and when again there will be reestablished a power group in the Far East that will give some stability to that area.

STABILITY IN FAR EAST

Although you may disagree with me, I would be less than frank if I did not say to you that in my considered judgment, whatever it is worth, the great hope for stability in the Far East is somehow, sometime the revival, and I will not say consolidation, but I will say the solidification of the efforts of Japan and India, the most populous countries outside of the Chinese People's Republic, in all of Asia.

I know that you would say that oil and water can't mix, and sometimes we are all a bit worried with Mr. Nehru. Sometimes he is a bit trying and he takes some funny courses and yet he stands very definitely for something in the Far East. And when there is a great commercial power, which again can live and thrive in Japan, reaching out for markets, both for her fabricated goods, and particularly for her new raw materials, there will begin to be order in the Far East.

I am not speaking to you about tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. I am simply saying to you what, in the course of human events must be the pattern which we will see for the development again, both in Western Europe and in the Far East.

We made the supreme mistake, perhaps, at the end of World War II, in assuming that because we had fought side by side with our Russian friends to win that war and because we had come to know them, that they must be, on the whole, people with aims and purposes and aspirations much or very similar to our very own.

AUSTRIAN TREATY RUSHED

Perhaps we were not justified in reaching that easy conclusion, but we did reach it. We acted upon it, and that is past history. There is no need to discuss it here.

We, of course, know that Russia is still actuated with the old Russian imperialism, plus the communistic ideologies of the 1917 revolution. Capitalism or the capitalistic system could, of course, not be tolerated inside the Russian state or empire, and capitalism and the capitalistic system, could not be tolerated outside because it is the way of Communist expansion.

Now, what is the state of the world tonight? Some most interesting things have been going on.

In Austria, a treaty has now been hurried to a conclusion and the four powers are invited to witness this ratification, and its signing.

A study of Russian tactics ought to show us that it can mean but one thing and that is that Russia is tremendously concerned with the rearming of West Germany and wth Germany taking her place in the NATO group.

A little while ago we were very much disturbed because the Colombo group had called a conference down in Indonesia. Now the nervousness in Washington and in some high places in Washington stemmed from the belief that we would have no friends in that conference and that resolutions would come out of that conference solidifying the yellow and black races against the white man everywhere. So there was nervousness here.

STATEMENT BY CHOU

Then we began to speak in more optimistic language about that conference and only last Saturday, I was rash enough, perhaps unwisely, to say that I thought the heads of state should have something to say about that conference, that at least we should have an understanding of what that conference meant and what its real objective was and that I believed there would be some friends of the Western Powers there.

You have heard the speeches that were made within the past week. You have noted the utterances they have made, and while perhaps those speeches do not represent the rank and file of the Asiatic states represented there, they nevertheless do represent the thinking of some of the leaders of those Asiatic states. And then; just last night and this morning you read that Chou En-lai had said he had no purpose to go to war with the people of the United States; that he was not planning sucif a war, and indicated that he was willing to sit down and talk with us.

Now I have been thinking, for many weeks and even many months, that after a period of great wars, and particularly of great revolutions, fairly shaking the foundations of the old civilizations, a people into whose hands leadership has been thrust, or to which leadership had come, must be able to make some adjustments to meet the changing conditions of the world.

WOULD CONFER WITH FRIENDS

You may recall that not too long ago I said that I believed the time was rapidly approaching when the heads of government of the four great powers could sit down and talk about the problems of Europe and the tensions in Europe; the tensions, indeed, which shadow all civilization.

Day-by-day the conviction that grows—at least to my way of thinking—is that we should have a conference first with our friends, with those nations who have been uniformly friendly to us, and with those nations in the southeast of Asia who are our friends.

Why? Because I think it important that we know precisely their thinking on the important problems that have arisen in the Far East and precisely what readjustments, if any, we should be willing to make to meet changing times and changing conditions.

That is not appeasement. It never has been and never will be appeasement for any strong power to say to another power that it is willing to sit down and talk about the problems that concern you and concern the world.

I do not know and I doubt if anyone can know what degree of sincerity is in the mind and heart of Chou En-lai, but I do think the things that he saw and witnessed down in Indonesia since the last Sabbath have opened his mind and when he says that he is willing to talk, then I will unhesitatingly say that this Nation should be big enough and great enough, through its highest officials, to talk to him.

It is time that we were relieving the tensions of this world, if we can. We should know what our friends think and say, what position they have, in what conclusions they concur in about the trouble spot in the Far East. We should not be unmindful of the concurring judgment and opinion of our friends. Indeed, I do not think that any nation can be unmindful of the opinion and judgment of its friends.

I am not talking about what the President should do or should not do with reference to his position now or hereafter, in the Formosa area.

From the beginning I have said and taken one position, and I believe it is right. I still believe it is right, and that position is that this decision is with the President himself.

In that conviction I have not wavered and will not waver; but I have also expressed the belief, and I believe it profoundly, that when and if a fateful decision must be made by the President as to whether or not he will defend any island or islands in the area of Formosa, that he will get all the information that he can from his joint chiefs, from his military leaders, from every agency of information that is available to him, and if I do not mistake the man, he will then go into his closet and face-to-face with his Maker, he will make his own decision.

I say now that out of a world conference, there can come good, that a conference with our friends will be helpful to us, and that we ought to be willing to talk with the Chinese Peoples' Republic or their leaders. We owe this to our own country, to our friends, and to all mankind everywhere. Out of that conference might come, not a final solution, but a first step which could lead to a second and third step toward the solution of some of the problems of our present time.

WOULDN'T DENY AID

I know very well that there are many good friends of the United States who believe that the time has come when we should give more attention to our home affairs and when such aid and assistance as we might give to other countries should be very definitely marked in behalf of the essential American interests which we are seeking to serve.

With that general thought, no American can quarrel, but I say to you tonight, and I hope that you editors and managing editors will bear it in mind, that this is no time to do either of two things, or both. This is no time to say that there will be no further aid or assistance given to those people of the world that are struggling to make themselves strong.

I change my mind as I go along, frequently. I am glad I do because it is probably the only proof that I have that I am in existence. I have changed my mind about economic aid because undoubtedly tonight in many wide areas of this earth, especially in the Asiatic and African countries, economic aid, point 4 if you please, technical assistance if you wish to be more technical in describing it, is a far greater military aid to people who love peace and who don't want a war. This is no time to turn away from our international obligations; whatever those obligations are. It is no time for us, in the present state of the world, to grow soft in our own ability to carry out and execute those programs that we regard as vital.

STRENGTH IN BEING

No foreign policy will receive any respect unless the people who put it forth have the strength and the will to carry it to execution. In an atomic age, that means strength in being, because the nuclear weapons of this modern age threaten to destroy the productive capacity of the people on which great reliance could have been placed. You must have something ready and presently at hand.

So this is not the time for us to turn back in our efforts to continue militarily strong, nor is it the time for us to lose interest in the economic soundness and strength of the whole free world.

How can the free world be strong, militarily and economically unless through the cooperative efforts of all free peoples, ourselves included?

How can we turn the clock to another day and say that the trade and commerce of the world, especially the free world, again should be circumvented and departmentalized to the point almost of the stagnation of that commerce? How can we do this and yet hope all free nations will become economically strong and prosperous?

DIDN'T SEEK LEADERSHIP

Upon their prosperity and strength will depend their ability to maintain their own military equipment, their own military strength.

We didn't seek world leadership. You don't get it by seeking it. World leadership comes to a nation if it comes at all, because of the superb and supreme heroism of its people; because of their devotion to duty, private, and public, because of their tireless exertions to bring it about.

Above everything else, it comes to a nation when it is great enough and big enough and strong enough, when mighty impulses are running through the world, to rise to the challenge of stirring times.

So it came to us. Would we pass it up? Can we pass it up? Future generations would hold us responsible and rightly responsible for failure to grasp the high responsibilities resting upon us.

The road which we are traveling may be long and hard and thorny. Indeed, it is hard and long and thorny, but it is worthwhile, my friends, to travel along that highway that can lead us, and will lead us, if we keep our courage and our faith, to a world in which the normal things of mankind and of human life again may be enjoyed and appreciated.

A Music and Fine Arts Center in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement by Patrick Hayes, chairman, cultural development committee, Washington Board of Trade, before a House District Subcommittee on Legislation for the establishment of a music and fine arts center in the Nation's Capital:

THE THOMPSON BILL, AND RELATED BILLS, FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION TO STUDY AND RECOMMEND LEGISLATION FOR A MUSIC AND FINE ARTS CENTER IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(Statement by Patrick Hayes, chairman, cultural development committee, Washington Board of Trade; former president National Association of Concert Managers; former president Greater Washington Music Council; former manager, National Symphony Orchestra, before a House District subcommittee, February 15, 1955)

Gentlemen, Burl Ives, the folksinger, has a song that goes: "There's a great day comin' and it's not far off, been long, long, long, on the way." The spirit of those lyrics fits the subject of this hearing, a dream harbored by countless thousands of citizens of the Greater Washington area, and throughout the Nation, that 1 day in our lifetime we shall see established here in the Nation's Capital a home for the living arts of music, grand opera, ballet. That it is fitting, few deny. That it is needed, more and more people are becoming aware.

This hearing is a milestone in the progress toward this important objective. A short 10 years ago, and for decades before that, there was little apparent interest in the Congress in fine arts legislation. During the postwar years there has been an upsurge of interest, and many distinguished gentlemen in both Houses of Congress, and on both sides of the aisle, have introduced bills aimed at recognition of the fine arts in American life, and in varying degree pointing the way to strengthen them and extend their influence in the daily lives of our people.

As Congressman KLEIN, of New York said here last week, "Man does not live by bread alone." Neither does a nation become great in terms of history solely by industrial might, inventive genius, advanced techniques of agriculture, etc., and no nation's capital city has endured in history in terms of true greatness without also being a great center of art and culture. Athens and Rome are examples in ancient history. Berlin, Vienna, London, Paris are examples in modern history, which we must observe in planning for the future of the great city of Washington. National significance is deeply involved in what is proposed. In recent years we have observed that Germany and Austria gave top priority to the reconstruction of their buildings for art in the postwar years. By 1950, 10 opera houses had been built or rebuilt in Germany. This year, 1955, the great Vienna State Opera House is being completed.

Ours is a Nation that has become so great and so big, that it staggers the imagination of newscomers to the country. We are out of our covered wagons, our industrial plant is highly developed, we have fought our wars, and survived what we hope is our one big depression, and now find ourselves well along in the second half of the 20th century. A major challenge before us in this era is the conquest and development of the broad area of the fine arts in life, with all their rich dividends for the Nation and its people, and with their opportunities for the gratifying use of leisure time which is increasing, and for combatting juvenile delinquency by channeling more young people into musical and artistic pursuits. This is no idle point in passing. Ten years ago the late Olga Samaroff Stokowski did some research at Sing Sing prison in New York State, and came up with the astonishing fact that over 95 percent of the inmates had had no exposure to music in their lifetime; and conversely, relatively few people in the world of music have gotten themselves into trouble to the point that they become inmates of our jails.

This hearing today could be the moment, as recorded later by historians, when the United States Government began a long term movement in behalf of the fine arts, by approving legislation to appoint a national commission to study and prepare actual later legislation to establish in the Federal city a great center for music and the living arts. The atmosphere is lively and favorable for what is proposed. We have become a great musical Nation. Our universities and colleges, and our musical conservatories, turn out graduates in increasing numbers each year who have had major exposures to the musical arts during their 4 years. Public school music grows by leaps and bounds each year. There are tens of thousands of school and college bands in the country. There are over 700 symphony orchestras in America, ranging in size from Columbus, Ind., population 6,000, and orchestra budget $600 to Boston and Philadelphia and New York, with their great professional orchestras of 100 men and budgets approaching $1 million a year. Radio, recordings, and currently TV pour music across the land, taking it where it never had been before, and never would have been. Every corner of this vast country has readily available the world's finest music for all ears to hear and enjoy.

As a citizen of greater Washington, I am proud to report to this committee of the Congress that by all standards of comparison, qualitative and quantitative, Washington, D. C., is one of the most musical cities in the world. From September through April each season nearly 1,000 programs worthy of the attention of music-lovers are performed here, in concert halls, at our universities, in our churches, in our art galleries, and at the Library of Congress. The Budapest String Quartet resides here, tours the world from here, and gives two extensive cycles at the Library of Congress in the Coolidge Auditorium. The National Symphony Orchestra, Dr. Howard Mitchell, conductor, has reached a level of excellence that is acknowledged by all in the field—next season is its 25th anniversary, founded in 1931 by the late Hans Kindler. It performs nearly 30 major concerts in Constitution Hall, open to the public at prices within the reach of all, and performs nearly 30 concerts for young children, many of which are underwritten by public spirited people and business houses and are free of charge to the youngsters. The National Gallery of Art, whose distinguished Director, David E. Finley, testified before you last week, presents to the public over 40 Sunday evenings of music each season, including 10 orchestral concerts, and including a month long festival of American music, founded by Richard Bales, director of music at the gallery, and conductor of the gallery orchestra. Nearly 50 concerts are presented in the Phillips Gallery on Sunday afternoons and Monday evenings, free to the public. Constitution Hall is the scene of recitals and choral concerts.

You would have to search hard to find the name of a great or established artist in the world of music who does not appear here annually, either alone in recital or as soloist with the national symphony, or the visiting orchestras of Philadelphia and Boston, which play series of 8 and 4 respectively. The foreign orchestras from abroad visit here and play in Constitution Hall. This year we are host to the Amsterdam Concertgebouw and the Berlin Philharmonic orchestra. This is the niagara of music that marks Washington life as rich indeed, together with the church and university programs, not to mention the quality performances of our service bands and orchestras.

Our great lack, and your concern here this morning, is in the fields of opera and ballet, and also in the sybolism inherent in special buildings for music to dignify this art as the National Gallery of Art dignifies the art of painting. Music needs its own home in the Nation's Capital.

In passing, I should mention the tremendous debt of gratitude we all owe the Daughters of the American Revolution for making Constitution Hall available for orchestra, recital, and choral concerts and lectures. Without it, Washington would have a serious problem indeed. That the hall is not suited for opera and ballet is not the fault of its owners. It was built for convention purposes, as the home of the DAR, and not intended for public use at all. When the old Poli's theater was torn down about 25 years ago, with its perfect stage and attractive auditorium, there went our opera house, gentlemen, and stage for ballet, to make way for the Federal Triangle. And the irony is that the actual ground where Poli's theater stood has on it today only a temporary building of the kind that Congressman BROYHILL and many of us would like to see eliminated.

Grateful for our blessings, including Constitution Hall, and our devoted people who have gone on and forward year by year in spite of the handicap of not having a great hall of music, we are now grateful and hopeful for what you are about to do. The Washington Board of Trade is on record by vote of its directors and by resolution of the cultural development committee as favoring the proposed legislation and its ultimate objectives. While many of our carefully studied points are the purview of the proposed commission once established, I would like to mention the following specific points at this opportunity:

A theater for drama is one thing; a concert hall is quite another thing; an opera house of grand proportions is another; and a large hall for the inauguration of Presidents is still another. Modern achitectural techniques of functional design can do wonders, but I urge caution and care in determining what is needed to meet current and future needs. As for theater, or a theater, we have here now the National and Shubert houses—perfect theaters—and the problem with them is in keeping them open with plays and musical shows. The problem today lies within the field of drama itself, starting with a shortage of playwrights and producers. A concert hall in the manner of the Royal Festival Hall in London is clearly very much needed. So is an opera house, like the new edifice just completed in Vienna. An inaugural hall for Presidents is essential. Thus, we need 3 separate buildings or 1 massive edifice containing the various units, like the Municipal Auditorium in Kansas City. I would like to point out that these buildings will serve for decades and perhaps for a century or more and initial decisions must be wise ones. Errors of initial judgment could be fatal or at least costly. There should be included in plans to be drawn by the commission facilities for a great national conservatory of music, including opera and ballet instruction. Such are the feeding grounds for the companies of the future that will enrich our national life. An area with the greatest possibility for miscalculation is the stage of proposed buildings. The stage and storage areas should equal in size the square and cubic footage of the rest

of the building—it is a commentary on our entire country in this regard that only three stages in America are big enough to accommodate comfortably the repertoire of the Sadler Wells Ballet and the Old Vic production of Midsummer Night's Dream which played in the United States last fall. They are the Met in New York, the Chicago Civic Opera House, and the War Memorial in San Francisco.

When the eventual legislation might be readied and passed, I would like to see a great triple play for the fine arts. First would come the acts of legislation. Next would come a major address on the subject of the fine arts by our President, leading to the eventual establishment of a department or division of fine arts in our National Government. And finally, the President would invite wealthy American citizens, companies, and foundations to come forward and participate, to build and endow the buildings, or share the cost with the Federal Government, and enlarge our fine-arts programs, as Andrew Mellon did so nobly and effectively in establishing the gallery which some of us still prefer to call the Mellon Gallery, although he insisted it become the National Gallery of Art. All that would transpire here would be sent out to the Nation by radio and television, bringing art and culture to all our citizens, as well as having these arts available in live form when citizens visit their capital city. And speaking of visitors, we estimate that nearly 300,000 young American citizens, school children, visit their Nation's capital each year in organized school parties. They see the monuments to Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson; the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Iwo Jima statue, the Capitol buildings, the National Gallery of Art. They see no great monument to music and theater, opera, and ballet. These arts have become important in their daily lives, in school and at home, and in their communities. They would find inspiration here in such buildings and grounds as we envision, and they must now think it strange that we do not have such buildings already.

Lack of facilities for all forms of musical art to be presented at their best in our Nation's capital exposes us in the eyes of our international friends of the Diplomatic Corps; and of our enemies behind the Iron Curtain. I feel that I speak today not only for the board of trade, but for hundreds of thousands of citizens across the land, represented by the National Association of Concert Managers, the American Symphony Orchestra League, and certainly in this area where I have the privilege of being a spokesman on this general subject in regular Sunday broadcasts over the good music station, WGMS. I express to you, gentlemen, of the committee our gratitude for the attention you now give this subject, and I convey to you our urgent hopes and prayers that this step will be taken, with dispatch, so that the living arts may come into their full flower in our Nation's Capital soon.

Understanding Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by David S. Smith, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, for the junior chamber of commerce, Lowell, Mass., on April 27, 1955:

UNDERSTANDING AIRPOWER

I consider it a great privilege to appear before the junior chamber of commerce of such an important city as Lowell, Mass. I am grateful to Mrs. ROGERS, your distinguished representative in Congress, through whom the invitation was extended. I am grateful to the members of the junior chamber of commerce, who indicated their interest in hearing an Air Force speaker.

I accepted the invitation so cordially extended because of the opportunity it gave me to thank you, and through you Jaycees everywhere, for what they are doing for the Air Force. I accepted it also because it is a personal pleasure for me to get away from the Pentagon, and have a good heart-to-heart talk with people like you. You are the present and future leaders of your community. Many of you, probably most of you, are veterans of military service. All of you are citizens deeply concerned with national security. My job at the Pentagon lies in helping to make sure that our plans are right, and that our security will be maintained. I am happy to have the opportunity to make a report to you on some of the things we are doing.

First, however, a further word about the junior chamber of commerce and the Air Force. Last January, as you well know, the national organization of the junior chamber of commerce launched its Air Force recruiting assistance campaign. It is a little early to identify the current success of recruiting efforts with any one type of assistance. In fact, it is not even desirable to identify different contributions to the recruiting effort, because we are all working as a team—a national team—and our pride must be in the success of the team, not the performance of individual players. I am sure, however, from the news that reaches my office, that your efforts are combining with various other steps being taken, and are bringing results. More and more young men are signing up for the Air Force, and reenlisting in order to make a career of service in the Air Force, and we are very pleased with the results.

Three months ago, only a little more than 20 percent of the airmen scheduled for separation in February 1955 indicated an intent to reenlist. The Air Force now estimates that this figure has increased to 30 percent for airmen who did reenlist in February or who plan to do so within 90 days from their separation. From 20 to 30 percent is a 50 percent increase. Things are really looking up.

We also believe that as a result of this increased interest in the Air Force, the bonds between the man in uniform and his civilian supporters are being greatly strengthened. The stronger those bonds, the stronger our national security. A few weeks ago the Gallup poll reported that 71 percent of the American people are convinced that if another world war comes, the Air Force would play a much more important part in it than either the Army or the Navy. Analyzed by age groups or by education levels, the percentage is the same. The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. The American sense of reliance on air power is strong.

I am not sure, however, that American understanding of airpower is commensurate with American appreciation of the traditions and the performance of the Air Force.

We are, we say, an airminded Nation. So rapid have been the developments in this half-century which we call the air age, and so conclusive are the lessons of history, that airpower is now generally accepted as the predominant military force. But we are tired of war. Recurrently through the last 15 years homes throughout the Nation have been saddened by the loss of loved ones. We are reluctant to face the fact that preparedness must be for a lifetime, and not merely for a foreseeable, limited period. We have not, as a nation, given evidence that we accept the security of our Nation as everybody's business, and not the exclusive responsibility of the man in uniform. We gripe—to use the GI term—because, 10 years after V–E and V–J Days, we still face the sacrifices necessary to maintain a huge Military Establishment.

This griping may well be a habit of democracy, but not all habits are good habits. The thought that preparedness can be seasonal is certainly a mistaken idea. William Jennings Bryan expressed a national attitude when he said that in times of national peril, a million men would spring to arms. And millions of men did spring to arms to defend the Nation in two world wars. However, millions of men have been reluctant to remain in arms, when the victory was won, to make sure that the peace was well guarded.

I am sure that all of you can recall the frantic effort to demobilize, after World War II. The sad truth is, that when the peace was won, no nation's people were ever quicker to lose interest in their armed forces than the people of the United States.

For this reason, the history of our armed services in America has been one of high peaks of military strength, followed by almost bottomless valleys of weakness. And the wonder is that we were able to rise from the valleys to reach the peaks.

We might ask what course history would have taken, if we had never permitted ourselves to descend into the valleys. If we had been strong in 1916, would Germany have sunk the *Lusitania*? If we had been strong in 1941, would the Japanese have dared to attack Pearl Harbor? If we had been strong in 1950, would the Communists have struck in Korea?

It may be academic to ask the questions, because there can be no definite answers. But it is necessary for us to realize that while our Nation has sprung to arms in the interest of national defense many, many times in the past, it is no longer possible to wait for war to begin, in order to start building national defense. Modern warfare begins too suddenly and strikes with too much devastation—witness Pearl Harbor—to permit delayed mobilization. We must be ready when war starts—if it should start again.

Quite aside from the fact that this is so because our survival as a nation depends upon it, we should be willing to admit that it is so because it is enormously expensive and wasteful—wasteful of human lives, money, material resources, and opportunities for the development of mankind—not to maintain preparedness. It is amazing that in the past we have seemed willing to pay so high a price for the privilege of ignoring danger until it was upon us.

What we now need to understand above everything else is that the price is higher, beyond estimate. Nuclear weapons, combined with the capabilities of long-range airpower, have revolutionized warfare. And we hold no monopoly on such weapons.

We hold no monopoly—neither the practical monopoly in long-range bombers nor the absolute monopoly we once possessed in nuclear weapons—because there can be no monopoly in science. Our pilots who first encountered the Soviet-built MIG–15, in November 1950, were surprised to discover what a formidable weapon the Communists had. Before the war was over we learned a great deal about the general excellence of Soviet technology. We have developed a healthy respect for Soviet industrial capacity.

We know now that the Soviet Union has made remarkable progress in the building of nuclear weapons and modern long-range bombers. It is this progress that has put us in what President Eisenhower has forthrightly called an age of peril. Communist exploitation of the potentiality of their weapons makes it an age of tension as well.

In addition to the world's largest air force, containing some 20,000 aircraft in combat units, the Soviet Union has a huge ground force, a powerful submarine force, guided missiles, and a large industrial capacity, most of which is devoted to the production of war goods. As early as 1949 her industry was able to produce an atomic explosion, and in 1953 she announced to the world that she possessed the hydrogen bomb. Thus on the one hand, our national security program must be designed to meet the most serious of all threats to the survival of western civilization—the combination of Soviet long-range airpower and atomic weapons. On the other hand, it must also be designed to cope with the constant possibility of local warfare such engagements as the free world has experienced in Korea, in Indochina, and is now experiencing in the Formosa Strait.

The leaders of communism have repeatedly made it clear that their goal is communism worldwide. The United States is a principal obstacle which confronts them in their path to this goal, and the support you give your Air Force enables it to remain that obstacle. I said remain, not maintain. I do not mean maintain for a limited period, but maintain indefinitely. The United States is and must remain a roadblock to international communism. The understanding our air-minded Nation has not yet fully acquired is that if there is a new kind of war, there is also a new kind of peace. This is a peace that can be kept only through strength.

It is not enough for our Nation to be air-minded. It must possess air superiority. It must control the airways, and be prepared to defend them against all who would use them to violate our freedom and our democracy.

To give the Nation the strength necessary to maintain peace as the most precious gift of our times, and to resist and conquer aggression if it comes, the United States has established its Air Force, and assigned it certain definite missions. The development of nuclear weapons and of guided missiles carrying atomic warheads, which has come in the 8 years since the Air Force was established, has not altered these missions. What such development has done is to place greater responsibility on the Air Force for the successful carrying out of its missions. These missions are the conduct of strategic air warfare, the defeat of enemy air forces, combat support of the Army, support of the Navy in keeping the sea lanes open and the air defense of the United States directly related to Air Force offensive capabilities.

To perform its missions in this age of crisis, the Air Force is continuing today, and will continue for the next several years, the build up of air strength which was programed in 1950, after the Korean war caught us in a period of lessened guard and depleted military resources. When the Korean war began the Air Force consisted of about 42 effective wings and about 400,000 men in uniform. Today we have 121 wings, ready and effective, and about 960,000 men in uniform. By the end of June 1957, we expect to have reached our 137-wing goal, and 975,000 men in uniform. All Air Force wings are now equipped with modern aircraft, and all fighters are jet propelled.

Constant progress is being made in modernization of aircraft. New types are replacing outmoded types.

Technological advances in propulsion and electronics are making substantial contributions to the development of guided missiles. The Air Force has made significant progress in the development of strategic, tactical, and air defense missiles, all of which are being pushed vigorously.

Construction of the base facilities needed to support the 137-wing program is a most serious problem. Our offensive forces must be able to hit any potential enemy on short notice under all conditions. Our long range aircraft can operate from the United States in the event of war, and advanced refueling techniques have greatly lengthened ranges of smaller combat aircraft. However, the existence of bases overseas, equipped to handle all types of aircraft, greatly increases the flexibility, economy of operation, and hence the effectiveness of our offensive air forces. Overseas bases also increase the capability of tactical air forces to operate in overseas theaters.

Our air defense forces require bases located so that our interceptors can reach attacking enemy aircraft before they reach the line where they would drop their bombs on American cities. Radar facilities are needed to detect the approach of enemy aircraft, and communications and navigation facilities are needed to direct the defenders to intercept them. It is not sufficient to have such facilities within the United States. We must have them in Canada, Alaska, and the Arctic.

Bases within the United States are needed for training our tactical forces, for providing logistic services, and to maintain a strategic reserve which can be sent to any theater of operation in need. I have just returned from an inspection of several bases. I can tell you that I was proud of what I saw.

Maintenance facilities must be increased to keep up with the increased complexity of modern aircraft and equipment. With the greater consumption of fuel by jet aircraft, increased fuel storage facilities are required.

In the past 4 years the Air Force has gone a long way toward building the base structure needed to support its modernized and expanded forces. Continued modernization of base facilities is required to provide base support for the programed increase to 137 wings.

All this costs money, lots of money. Whether or not we understand fully the continuing need for maintaining strength in order to guarantee peace, the American people have certainly been generous in supporting the build-up of the Air Force under the present program. In 1954 and 1955, the Air Force budget, requested by the President and approved by Congress, was for about $11.5 billion. For fiscal year 1956, beginning next June, the President has requested $14.53 billion, excluding appropriations for base construction. Our President, and his administration, have recognized the real nature of the continuing threat to national security, and the most effective way of countering it.

A great deal of the money appropriated for the Air Force will go in pay to personnel—and toward increasing the attractiveness of a service career in order to attract and retain qualified personnel. I said at the beginning of my remarks that we have been concerned about our reenlistment rate, and that it is improving. Now I want to backtrack on one score. Whereas the reenlistment rate in general has been about 20 percent, among the men we need the most—the trained, skilled, and experienced technicians—the rate has been even lower, below 15 percent. We are also losing veteran pilots and experienced staff officers. We are losing trained mechanics, radar men and technicians. So the shortage of trained, experienced personnel is the No. 1 problem within the Air Force.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Harold Talbott, has taken the keenest personal interest in accomplishing those things which will increase the attractiveness of a service career, and encourage men to reenlist, and remain in service. We are all grateful for the fact that Congress recently approved a substantial pay raise, earnestly advocated by Mr. Talbott, and is now considering other legislation designed to improve service attractiveness. One such measure is adequate family housing of proper standards and within the proper rental brackets for men in the Air Force. Considering what it costs to train a man, approximately $14,000 for an airman, and more than $200,000 for a triple-rated pilot of an atom bomber, his pay could be increased by many, many dollars before it would equal the cost of losing him. We could increase service attractiveness in many ways, and still not make the rewards of a military career comparable financially with those offered by civilian industry to these trained men.

Earlier, I also spoke of the bonds between the men in uniform and the citizens at home, that are being strengthened. These bonds are numerous and of many kinds, and I shall not attempt to identify them all or to define them. They are bonds of interest, affection, and sympathy, of gratitude and honor. But the most important bond of all is that which I have stressed, the bond of understanding. If the people of Lowell and of each community in this Nation develop a real understanding of our Air Force, of its responsibilities and its needs, your community will send more men into the ranks of the Air Force. It will also stand ready to support the Air Force in every necessary way in its supreme mission of preventing war, and securing peace under acceptable conditions.

When this understanding of airpower and of the role of our Air Force in maintaining it is widely and thoroughly understood, the youth of our land will turn naturally to the air, as the youth of England in the days of her greatest glory turned naturally to the sea, as the proper sphere for their noblest careers. When that happens, we will indeed have become an air-minded Nation.

I think that understanding is coming, and coming very rapidly. People like you, throughout the land, are helping to bring it about, and the evidences are unmistakable. I feel confident, therefore, that our Air Force will be able to carry out the missions for which it was created. I feel confident that our national security will not be violated, and that we will be able to enjoy those rights we consider inalienable—those rights which were won for us, and must constantly be rewon by sacrifice.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the major legislative issues to be considered during the present session of Congress concerns the proposal to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 per hour.

In view of the interest in the subject, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the enclosed letter received from Mr. Bernard Navasky, president, Charles Navasky & Co., Inc., Philipsburg, Pa.:

CHARLES NAVASKY & CO., INC.,
Philipsburg, Pa., April 23, 1955.

Hon. JAMES VAN ZANDT,
New Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: The proposed revision of the Fair Labor Standard Act of 1938, by changing the minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to $1.25 per hour, should merit your support, because it would benefit the citizens of our State and country.

An increase in the minimum wage would in my opinion increase the Nation's purchasing power and would, naturally, stimulate and strengthen our entire economy.

Therefore, I urge your support of this revision.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD NAVASKY,
President, Charles Navasky & Co., Inc.

The Passing of the Little Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the life of a great and good man came to a close on earth. Dr. Clinton N. Howard, wide and favorably known to many Members of the House, journeyed to that "undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns."

In the passing of Dr. Howard our country has suffered the loss of a great American. He possessed all those qualities that go to make up a truly Christian gentleman. Dr. Dale Crowley, a close friend of Dr. Howard, described Dr. Howard most eloquently in a radio message delivered this morning over radio station WPIK on his Start the Day program. I am honored to include herewith the tribute of Dr. Crowley to the life of Dr. Howard:

THE PASSING OF THE LITTLE GIANT

At sunset on Monday, April 25, the colorful life of a great hero of faith came to the end of its earthly sphere, when Clinton N. Howard, at the age of 87, sheathed his sword, and answered the call of God to "Come up hither."

Affectionately known as the Little Giant, this mighty warrior influenced three generations of Americans in his uncompromising crusade against the forces of intemperance and unrighteousness.

As superintendent of the International Reform Federation and editor of Progress magazine, he spent his last 20 years in our Nation's Capital. During this period he represented the cause of temperance and good government before hundreds of congressional hearings. His forceful logic, eloquent discourse, and whole-souled earnestness, flavored by perennial wit and humor, won for himself the respect and confidence of great men. At his funeral were many of the Nation's outstanding citizens—ministers, political leaders, editors, businessmen, Congressmen, and members of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Howard began his crusade against King Alcohol at 12 years of age when he made his first public lecture against the evils of rum. After 75 years in "battle against the bottle" he was unflagging in zeal, in devotion, and in optimism. This was his diamond jubilee year, and how fitting that it should be the year of his coronation.

His peerless oratory has been heard in every State in the Union. No man deserved so much credit for the enactment of the 18th amendment as the Little Giant. He inspired Billy Sunday, and gave him the material for his first two temperance sermons. He spurred William Jennings Bryan in his great temperance crusade. He challenged such stalwarts in the United States Senate as Senators Sheppard, Capper, and Borah, and many others.

His Progress magazine was a two-edged sword, piercing, pungent, penetrating. Times without number his fearless exposures of wickedness in high places, and in low places, has served to halt the evil designs of those men who would further corrupt the morals of our community, State, and Nation. The publication of his classic discourses, Pearls of Paradise, Jesus, Human and Divine, and others have been printed into the millions. Everything he wrote may be considered both timeless and priceless, and will continue to bless many lives.

Clinton Howard's annual fellowship breakfasts at the Capitol (which always lasted for 3 hours) have been milestones of blessings along the way, and have served to fire the flagging zeal of many leaders in the temperance cause.

The influence of the Little Giant, both upon the young and the old, and upon all classes of people in our Nation has been immeasurable in its impact during the three-quarters of a century of his vigorous, fruitful life, and shall live on, and on, in the lives of all who have ben so fortunate as to know him. "Though being dead, he yet speaketh."

We have parted with a truly great citizen, a cherished friend and neighbor, a wise and helpful counselor, and a Christian leader who was completely devoted to God and to his fellow men.

Few men have ever poured more of love, and of devotion, and the spirit of courage and hope into the stream of human life; and certainly no man ever planted more indelibly his footprints on the sands of time.

Goodby, Little Giant, we shall see you on the morning of the Resurrection.

H. R. 5120 and H. R. 5211

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statements on H. R. 5210 and H. R. 5211:

H. R. 5210 is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to promote diversified ownership of domestic corporations by encouraging small investors to buy stock and reinvest their dividends.

It is hoped that the passage of this bill will result in direct ownership of American industry by Americans. When the people of the Nation own the corporations, it will be impossible to socialize the country.

Through this bill millions of capitalists will be created. For example, the employees of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. or other corporations would not only buy shares of their companies out of current income but would increase their ownership through the reinvestment of their dividends and yet would have the privilege of deferring taxes on those dividends for at least 10 years or until the shares disposed of, such as the provision which now prevails in the series E savings bonds.

The masses are customers of many of the American corporations. They should also be the owners. They can do this by purchasing shares directly or through an investment company. The investment companies and the New York Stock Exchange have automatic purchase plans whereby individuals can, out of current income, buy into American industry, and many corporations have the same provision for the purchase of their own shares by employees.

In connection with the use of common stocks in a long-term investment program, a research firm prepared a computation which will easily convince the most confirmed skeptic. These figures cover a 30-year period and assume that the investor will start with a salary of $3,500 and gradually increase until at the end of the 30-year period he was receiving $7,500, with the indicated changes over the period:

Years:	*Salary*
1–5	$3,500
6–10	4,500
11–15	5,500
16–20	6,500
21–30	7,500

The figures assume that the investor put 10 percent of his yearly salary aside and these amounts were invested quarterly in common stocks in over seven different 30-year periods and the dividends were reinvested. The averages of industrial common stocks were used in making these computations so that no assumption of better than average is involved.

Period:	*Value at end of period*
1858–88	$97,545
1868–98	61,070
1878–1908	65,515
1888–1918	70,400
1898–1928	107,585
1908–38	50,010
1918–48	52,860
Average	72,140

These remarkable results were achieved with a total investment of only $17,500. In the worst period, 1908–38, the fund at the end was worth a little less than $3 for every dollar put in and on the average it was worth about $4 for every dollar put in.

These results would certainly indicate that passage of the bill H. R. 5210 is a step in the direction of individual security for the individual to supplement his social security and pension plan. It is hoped that through this bill the 63 million working people of the Nation will own the business corporations and reverse the present trend—with 6 million to 10 million who now own these corporations.

H. R. 5211 is a bill to exempt from Federal income-tax dividends paid by regulated investment companies whose income is derived entirely from tax-exempt Government obligations.

Because of the Federal tax program of the last decade the number of wealthy individuals who normally would absorb a large amount of tax-exempt obligations has been greatly reduced. Therefore, to finance the $7 billion school program it will be necessary to get the masses to purchase such bonds. The investment companies have proved that their method of operation is the best yet discovered for reaching the masses—hence the provisions of this bill.

To sell $7 billion in school bonds, in addition to the normal amount of Government obligations, plus the expanded financing of toll roads will not be easy unless we reach the masses.

It is hoped that the various State regulatory authorities will declare as legal investments the shares of investment companies whose assets are invested in tax-exempt Government obligations and that the Congress will amend the proper bills to permit national banks to deal in the shares of the tax-exempt investment companies to the same extent that they deal in tax-free Government obligations.

From the standpoint of the small investor this is an ideal way to build an estate. For example, an individual could systematically invest a specified amount—say, for example, $100 a month—in the shares of one of these investment companies and compound his earnings. When millions of Americans, through ownership of shares in a tax-exempt

investment company own the obligations of the school districts and other Government agencies it is only natural to expect that they will take a greater interest in the operations of these agencies and will be more concerned as to the efficiency of those operations.

This bill (H. R. 5211) might very well go a long way toward revolutionizing the financing of municipalities because instead of having a few hundred dealers specializing in municipal bonds there would be more than 10,000 salesmen discussing these obligations with investors.

Israel Made the Desert Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate next week the seventh anniversary of the founding of Israel, our hearts go out to the millions of Jewish people who have made the desert bloom and established a sturdy democracy in the Middle East.

We recall the agony of the Jewish people as they suffered under the lash of the Nazi storm troopers throughout Europe. We recall a brave people huddled in the streets of the Warsaw ghetto as political gangsters sought to decimate the Jews.

Today the disease of anti-Semitism is carried by a new totalitarian power—world communism. Throughout Eastern Europe, in Russia itself, and now in China, the claims of the cynical Communists to be the benefactors of mankind have been unmasked as the deceitful Reds employ wholesale bigotry to whip disgruntled people in line.

History tells us that a healthy government can profit from the talent and devotion to morality of the Jewish people. A sick and decayed government—Nazi or Communist—traditionally turns on the Jews to cover up the failures and shortcomings of their boastful ambitions.

The American people can be proud of their contribution to the growth of Israel and for our part in relieving the pressures of world anti-Semitism as Israel welcomed Jewish refugees to its shores.

The best way I know of paying tribute to Israel's seventh birthday is to dedicate ourselves to working vigorously against all forms of racial and religious discrimination in this country. We must be on guard to see that anti-Semitism, which has destroyed and weakened other nations, does not gnaw at our foundations.

While we devote ourselves to keeping our own house in order, we must not overlook the perilous political and economic condition Israel finds itself in today.

The tension between Israel and the Arab States continues. In shipping arms to Israel's neighbors to build a bastion of military strength against communism, we have contributed to the tension and hostility lurking along Israel's frontier. We must return to our earlier policy of making peace between Israel and the Arab States our foremost aim in the Middle East.

Israel has passed through its infancy. It can walk now, and we must see that Israel is able to grow up with healthy muscles.

Cuban Trade Benefits United States Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter written to me by a constituent, Frederick W. Green, of Cedar Hills, Weston, Conn. This letter points up the advantages to United States industry realizing from fair marketing quotas for Cuban sugar.

Although Mr. Green confines his remarks to the effect of Cuban trade on Connecticut industry, it is a fact that throughout the Nation many industries are dependent on the Cuban market for a substantial share of their export volume.

Maintaining Cuban sugar quotas at a just level means maintaining Cuba's economy, and a strong Cuban economy is essential in many ways to the welfare of the United States.

The letter follows:

CEDAR HILLS,
Weston, Conn., April 22, 1955.

Hon. ALBERT P. MORANO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Senate bill S. 1635 and companion House bill.

DEAR SIR: This letter is being written to voice an opinion concerning the need for increasing marketing quotas for Cuba and the other nations in the Caribbean whose marketing quotas may be curtailed if the above bill is enacted.

Recently, while traveling through Cuba and Puerto Rico it was easy to see how closely the economy of the country is tied to the sugar industry. At the same time, it is also easy to see how Connecticut industry benefits as a major supplier of equipment to all the sugar producers. The cane mills are almost entirely produced by Farrel-Birmingham, Ansonia, Conn.; clarifiers and filters by Dorr-Oliver Co., Stamford, Conn.; the vacuum pumps, in many instances, by the Nash Engineering Co., Norwalk, Conn.; the cane knives or machetes by Collins Co., Collinsville, Conn. In addition there are many other items such as instruments produced by firms like Bristol. I would venture to say that perhaps in no other industry is there such a large portion of the total equipment required, furnished from one State such as ours.

In view of this I feel that we in Connecticut are definitely obligated to throw our weight behind the sugar industry, if not for a magnanimous reason at least for our own personal interests.

Sincerely,

F. W. GREEN.

American Surplus Wheat to the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent proposal to offer the Soviet Union a gift of American surplus wheat was so ill-founded in fact that it is almost difficult to believe the naivete which in part inspired it. Fortunately, due to the opposition to an unconditional gift, raised by many organizations and individuals, myself included, the President has announced that at this time no such offer is being contemplated. However, in one of his press conference statements, the President did leave open the possibility of such a plan in the future.

This time qualification in the President's statement has impelled one of the most vigorous opponents to the unconditional gift to write to the Presiednt a detailed letter containing all the necessary factors that would have to be weighed before any intelligent action on the matter could be undertaken. In this letter Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in his capacity as president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, puts forth essential points and questions that in their consideration by any fair-minded American can logically lead to only one conclusion, namely, no unconditional gifts of surplus wheat or any other commodity to the U. S. S. R. even in the foreseeable future.

The contents of this letter deserve the careful attention of every Member of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a copy of the letter written to President Eisenhower on March 8, 1955, by Dr. Dobriansky, on the subject of no unconditional gifts to U. S. S. R.:

MARCH 8, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The possible shipment of surplus wheat or any other commodity to the Soviet Union in the form of a gift has for some time been of profound interest and concern to this committee. This has been shown in testimony on H. R. 1 before the House Ways and Means Committee, in newspaper editorials (for example, Why Consider Giving Reds Wheat? Cleveland Plain Dealer, February 23) and through other essential informational media.

We now take note of your statement, made at the press conference on March 2, that "There is no purpose and no plan being studied at this time for sending any grain of any kind to Russia." It is regrettable that this statement perpetuates the untruth of identifying Russia with the Soviet Union, but aside from this basic error, the time qualification in the statement leads us to believe that this issue might be reopened in the foreseeable future. Since we are dealing with political elements that will certainly remain unaltered within this time context, we wish to explain our position further in the hope that some of the points

advanced below will receive adequate consideration when and if the issue is revived.

It is our considered opinion that on grounds of Christian humanitarianism and opportuneness of political occasion a limited supply of surplus food commodity should be offered in the form of a gift but, in full view of imposing political realities, not without strict recipient observance of certain necessary conditions of offer. A gift without strings attached may, like peaceful coexistence or else, possess superficial slogan appeal, but on sober analysis its patent divorce from reality reflects only a perilous naivete concerning the Soviet Union and our relations with it.

As you well know, with regard to many other issues pertaining to Soviet-American relations we have consistently endeavored in behalf of the security interests of our country to utilize effectively the assembled knowledge and experiences of escapees and exiles from Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. On the basis of this wealth of knowledge we would like to emphasize the following major observations which determine our opinion:

1. The pressing food problem in the Soviet Union is not nearly the result of natural acts as it is the consummate end of a brutal collectivization program coupled with the active and passive resistance of patriotic Ukrainian, Uzbek, Caucasian, and other non-Russian farmers whose rich agricultural lands are being exploited by imperialist Moscow;

2. The genocidal policy of Moscow in currently forcing hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian youth for agrarian occupations in Central Asia, as an essential step in the build-up of an inner fortress for war, has with its disruption of agricultural activity in Ukraine accentuated this problem;

3. The outstanding Ukrainian experience with Moscow's manmade famine in 1930–32, when millions starved to death while Moscow was exporting requisitioned grains for capital equipment, stands as a grim reminder of the extraneous uses to which Moscow might put a gift if tendered without conditions; and

4. The reality of economic imperialism in the Soviet Union, as consistently evidenced by the relative plenitude of goods in the Moscow center as against the drained non-Russian peripheries, in itself, reveals the bald fallacy of the monolithic term "Soviet people" to whom the gift was to be extended.

It appears to us that each of these major factual observations raises pertinent questions that must be answered before a decision could be arrived at on this crucially important matter. Concerning (1), in the face of untold human sacrifice since 1930, are we to be grossly unwitting in sponsoring a scheme that would seriously counteract the heroic effects of peasant resistance to Moscow's economic and political tyranny? (2) By a substantial, unconditional gift what degree of moral, not to say political, satisfaction could we realize in the knowledge that this in some measure would serve to implement Moscow's genocidal policy, clearly calculated in preparation for war? (3) Even in the circumstance of famine, for which there is no evidence in the Soviet Union today, are we to be recklessly heedless of the propaganda and political uses to which Moscow can advantageously put the gift? Finally (4), are we so indifferent to the crying needs of the non-Russian captives in the U. S. S. R. that a possible canalized distribution of the gift among the elite centered in Muscovy is of no concern to us?

The answers to these basic questions are self-evident if one pays due respect to facts rather than to misleading catchwords. Also, they obviously point to the logical necessity of conditions surrounding an offer if equity, genuine charity, and political prudence are to be served. In the reasoned judgment of this committee, for the foreseeable future, as also of now, the political complex of our relations with the Soviet Union necessitates the following conditions of offer: (1) A verbal stipulation of our desire to witness an equitable distribution of the gift among all the affected nations in the U. S. S. R., (2) in the effectuation of this desire, the admission of carefully selected neutral distribution teams, and (3) the offer of a limited supply measured according to terms not offsetting the basic effects of resistance in the U. S. S. R., and not overlooking the needs of many impoverished areas in the free world itself.

In our view, a propitiously timed gift with these necessary conditions is a gift with charitable responsibility toward the nations involved. To merely dump surplus food into the laps of Moscow for its indiscriminate and politically determined use would be an incredible repetition of our naive UNRRA experience. As indicated in our testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, we fear, too, that a gift with no strings attached would be the first conditioning step toward the virtual dumping of our stored agricultural wealth into the entire Russian Communist empire and subsequent American-Red empire trade which we, along with countless other Americans, strongly oppose.

In addressing ourselves to you in this detailed manner we feel confident that the merits of the arguments presented herein will doubtlessly be observed by your sense of fairness and Christian charity, and we earnestly believe that your leadership will enable us to avoid the pitfalls of hastily concocted ideas which bear little relationship to actualities in the Soviet Union.

With God's many blessings upon your leadership in these eventful moments, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Negro's Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the April 18, 1955, issue of the Clarion-Ledger-Jackson Daily News:

NEGRO'S LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

No one group is more concerned with the United States Supreme Court's school desegregation order than the fine Negro teachers of the South. None is more aware that where there is no segregation in public schools there is little oportunity for Negro teachers.

In our segregated Southern schools there are about 20 times more qualified colored teachers employed than in all other States combined, according to the U. S. News & World Report. Likewise, the proportion of Negro college students to the colored population is greater than the proportion of college students to total population in any other country in the world; and most of the Negro college students are in the South.

We hope that all Clarion-Ledger readers saw the letter from J. W. Jones, of New Albany, prominent Negro educator and publisher, in our editions of April 15. Taking a strong stand for segregation, he pointed out the 17 Southern and border States employ 7 times as many Negro teachers as all 31 so-called nonsegregated States combined.

In these entire nonsegregated 31 States, Jones reminds us, there are only 10,248 Negro teachers compared with 722,487 white teachers. This is a ratio of 1 colored teacher to each 72 white teachers. Thus, despite professed equality and specious arguments against discrimination, non-Southern States cannot match Dixie's superb record of fair dealing with the Negro educator.

Actually, the South is the only real land of opportunity for Negroes on the entire face of the earth. In addition to more Negro teachers, the South has more Negro college presidents, college professors, doctors, lawyers, and prosperous independent businessmen than all other States combined.

Thinking Negroes are aware of these facts which is why failure will greet efforts of present-day carpetbaggers, political hacks, and agitators who seek to turn the Negro against his only time-tested friend—the Southern white man.

The Andrada Statue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1955, a new statue was dedicated in Bryant Park on the Avenue of Americas in New York City. The statute of José Bonifacio de Andrada e Silva, patriarch of the independence of Brazil, took its place with two other great South American liberators as a visible symbol of good will toward our South American neighbors.

Presiding at the dedication was the Honorable Robert Moses, commissioner of parks for the city of New York. The invocation was given by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York. The presentation and unveiling of the statute were made by His Excellency, Joao Carlos Muniz, Ambassador of the United States of Brazil to the United States of America. The acceptance of the statute was made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York. Also at the dedication were the Honorable Hulan E. Jack, borough president of Manhattan; the Honorable Edward J. Sparks, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs of the United States of America; and Consul General Hugo Gouthier, of the Brazilian consular office in New York City.

I am pleased to direct the following words regarding this dedication to the attention of our colleagues:

THE ANDRADA STATUE

The dedication today of the statue of José Bonifacio de Andrada e Silva, patriarch of the independence of Brazil, marks a third significant addition to the Avenue of the Americas since its renaming 15 years ago as a symbol of hemisphere solidarity. The Andrada statue, located in Bryant Park at 42d Street, joins with Bolivar and San Martin, great South American liberators whose statues were dedicated in 1951 at the north end of the avenue in Central Park.

Andrada was as much dedicated to the freedom of the individual and the abolition of slavery as he was to the independence of

Brazil as a state. It is fitting that a memorial to Andrada, a professor and scientist, a scholar and statesman, should be located near New York's great central public library.

The statue is by Brazilian sculptor José Otavio Correia Lima, the winning design in a competition. The idea was conceived by former Consul General de Berenguer-César, authorized by Foreign Minister João Neves da Fontoura and followed through to reality by Brazil's present Consul General Hugo Gouthier. The $60,000 contribution for the plaza and base was made by the Government of Brazil to the Avenue of the Americas Association and transferred to the department of parks.

The 9-foot 2-ton bronze statue is located at the northwest corner of Bryant Park in an open plaza facing the avenue. The 2,000-square-foot plaza rising three steps above the surrounding sidewalk, is paved in bluestone flagging and granite block in a fish-scale pattern. The statue stands on a 9-foot-high granite base. Steps at the east of the plaza give direct access to Bryant Park.

The people of the city of New York are indebted to the United States of Brazil for this magnificent gift and it is their hope that it will serve as inspiration for continued cooperation between North America and South America. The park department will consider it a privilege to protect and maintain this distinguished memorial.

The Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from Collier's of April 29, 1955:

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. Harry A. Levinson, of Beverly Hills, Calif., has lately been involved in a row with the United States Government. Because it is not Mr. Levinson's fight alone—because 165 million other Americans are deeply involved along with him—the matter at issue bears examination.

Mr. Levinson protested the Postmaster General's seizure of a volume of Aristophanes' Lysistrata which had been mailed to Mr. Levinson, a dealer in rare books, by the Hammersmith Bookshop in England. The Postmaster General told Mr. Levinson that the volume "contains numerous passages which are plainly obscene, lewd, and lascivious in character and which are well calculated to deprave the morals of persons * * * and almost equally certain to arouse libidinous thoughts in the minds of the average, normal reader." After Mr. Levinson went to court to challenge the validity of the law under which the book had been seized, the Post Office Department finally gave it back. But it did so only after receiving "assurance * * * that the book in question is not for general distribution and is intended for delivery to a collector of rare books." In other words, a seasoned rare-book collector might be trusted with it—but not the average normal reader.

Lysistrata is certainly a frank-spoken play; whether its passages are well calculated to deprave morals depends upon what was in Aristophanes' mind when he wrote it; whether it is certain to arouse libidinous thoughts in the minds of the average, normal reader depends upon one's assessment of the character of the average, normal reader. Considering that Lysistrata had its premiere 2,366 years ago, has since found its way onto the shelves of countless public and private libraries, and has been through a couple of recent Broadway revivals, all without stirring more than a casual raised eyebrow, the Postmaster General would seem to be overstating the case. Indeed, it seems possible that whatever libido-stirring tendencies the play might possess would have escaped public notice indefinitely if the Postmaster General hadn't made, as they say, a Federal case of it.

But there is much more involved here than the merits or demerits of the Greek classic.

This is a time when censorship, in general, is enjoying a vigorous revival in this free land. More and more people are telling more and more other people that their tender little minds aren't able to weather the shock of exposure to this or that idea. The solicitude is not confined to the area of ordinary morality. This is a time when, in spite of the fragile quality of world peace, the American people were for 1 year denied the vital knowledge that a hydrogen bomb had been exploded which was able to wipe out a whole State. This is a time when, in the face of the most cunning and complicated ideological threat ever raised against freedom, a teacher takes his professional life in his hands if he tries to acquaint his students with the nature of the Communist threat. This is a time when, in the face of an unprecedented need for this democratic people to be informed, the public was banned last year from 41 percent of congressional committee sessions where public business of the most critical importance was being transacted. It is a time when a copy of Marx's Das Kapital under a scholar's arm raises fearful suspicions of his loyalty; when the Soviet newspapers Pravda and Izvestia are banned from the mails; when a Midwestern lady can command a scattering of respectful applause by denouncing Robin Hood as a communistic tract.

Censorship is not new. What is new, and alarming, is its increasingly casual acceptance by a people with a venerable tradition of liberty.

For many centuries men lived and died beholden to self-appointed groups or individuals who did the thinking and the governing for all.

Freedom came to the Western World, and to America, because some men dared to assume that ordinary people had in them the innate stuff to be noble in their own right—the ability to discern, to exercise that restraint and judgment which had until then been considered the exclusive endowments of their "betters."

One of these men, John Milton, declared 300 years ago that "our faith and knowledge thrives by exercise." He wrote that if all judgments were left to the censors, "to be a common, steadfast dunce would be the only pleasant life."

This is no time for America to be breeding a community of common, steadfast dunces. The very format of a free nation, spreading the responsibility for stewardship among all the people, demands the steady, purposeful development of uncommon men with the grasp and the character to make sound decisions in the heat of crisis.

That is the kind of people we have bred in our 180 years of freedom. We have remained free and grown great because we have thrown upon each individual the responsibilities of adult behavior—for making appraisals on the basis of all the facts, and acting upon those appraisals.

How shall we deal with the present crisis?

Not by making a virtue of ignorance. Five hundred million Chinese followed 200 million Russians into the Communist trap because they didn't know it was loaded. They went for bait labeled "security" and "land reform" and "progress" because they lacked the experience and perception to recognize the phoniness of the promises.

This is a time for caution, certainly—for denying the enemy knowledge he could use to attack us, for defending against both spies and cynics bent upon subversion.

But it is no less a time for a democracy to keep firmly in operation those processes which fit free men to exercise their power.

The character, the competence, the ruggedness demanded of our kind of uncommon man are not grown in a hothouse; the facts of life and politics aren't learned in a Child's Garden of Verses. They are developed only by practice in appraising—in sorting right from wrong.

There is far less peril in books—whether plain-spoken classics or claptrap comics—than in the American family's failure to ingrain youth with the sense to discriminate between quality and trash. There is less reason for concern over young people's exposure to Das Kapital than over the chance that they will grow up innocent of the fraud it preaches. There is less ground for worry about any American's contamination by Lysistrata than about his degration by a clique of censors who believe themselves to be made of some special kind of clay. This is a poor time to tolerate tinkering with the people's right to know, when knowledge is a condition of survival.

Mayor David L. Lawrence and Pittsburgh City Solicitor J. Frank McKenna, Jr., Wage Battle for Consumer in Fight Against Legislation To Exempt Natural-Gas Producers From Federal Power Commission Price Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, some of the most effective work on behalf of the consumers of natural gas in this country is now being done by a committee of mayors formed by Mayors David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, and Robert F. Wagner, of New York. More than 50 mayors of major cities have joined their committee.

Mayor Lawrence and the Pittsburgh city administration which he heads has been in the battle over natural-gas rates and effective Federal regulation for many years. They have always been leaders in the fight. Former City Solicitor Anne X. Alpern, now a judge of our common pleas court, was for years one of the foremost legal experts in this field, and carried the day for the consumer, time after time, both in the regulatory agencies and in the courts. She was, in addition, a tremendously effective witness before congressional committees considering legislation in this field.

Mayor Lawrence's present city solicitor is also waging a determined battle in this same field. City Solicitor J. Frank McKenna, Jr., appearing before the House Committee on Interstate and

Foreign Commerce on the Harris bill and other bills to exempt the so-called field price of natural gas from Federal Power Commission regulation, presented a very fine statement of the issues involved in this legislation, particularly from the consumers' standpoint.

He said it would be shocking to exempt from regulation the sales of gas to the pipelines; that the pressure for legislation of this kind appears to be based on a feeling that the fair return guaranteed to producers by law is somehow considered not enough of a return.

Mr. McKenna says that the opponents of this proposed legislation "have already won at least 3 times on the merits. The Rizley bill was defeated, the Kerr bill was defeated, and the opponents won again on the merits in the Supreme Court in the Phillips case."

Mr. Speaker, I think the entire membership of the Congress will be interested in reading the full text of Mr. McKenna's statement on behalf of Mayor Lawrence and the natural gas consumers of the Pittsburgh area, and I include it as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. FRANK MCKENNA, JR., CITY SOLICITOR OF PITTSBURGH, PA., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN OPPOSITION TO THE HARRIS BILL

I am J. Frank McKenna, Jr., city solicitor of Pittsburgh, Pa. I was admitted to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 1932, and have been practicing law in Allegheny County since that time. I entered the office of the city solicitor in 1947 and became city solicitor in January of 1954.

Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, is a member of the mayors' committee opposing the bill.

The city council also adopted a resolution expressing its opposition to the bill and directing me to seek an appearance before your committee to testify in opposition to the proposed legislation.

To me it is shocking that sales of gas by producers at the wellhead for transportation in interstate commerce should be free of regulation on a national level. The desire to be free of such regulation can only arise from selfish motives. Anyone subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission is still entitled to a fair return on his money invested, and adequate compensation for expenses. Why, then, is there such great force put into the drive for passage of the bill? It can only be because the producers will not be satisfied with a fair return. The fact that gas is a natural resource situated chiefly in a relatively small portion of the country, and the fact that the consumers are nationwide and are really at the mercy of the producers, indicate that regulation is necessary.

I think that the Harris bill proposes two things—both bad. It proposes to reverse the only favorable break consumers have had for some time, which resulted from the Phillips decision by the Supreme Court of the United States (348 U. S. 672), that the Federal Power Commission does have jurisdiction over the price of gas sold at the wellhead. The other objective of the bill is to write into statutory law one of the most serious reverses the consumer has suffered, namely, the Panhandle decision by the Federal Power Commission, of April 15, 1954 (3 PUR 3d 396), that a pipeline company is entitled to treat as an expense the fair field price of gas it produces instead of the cost of the product, based on the historic "rate base" approach.

The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers (NIMLO) has carried on the fight against the bill for some time. I am a member of the institute and join with it in voicing objections to the bill. This was the position of the city of Pittsburgh as early as last summer when the issue was discussed at the convention of NIMLO in San Francisco.

It has often been said that the opponents of the bill represent the little people. I cannot concur in this. In the Pittsburgh district the gas consumers are all of the people—big and little. It is a very serious problem with them. Gas prices have risen very sharply from a point where they were rather insignificant to a position today where they constitute a substantial portion of the budget of every consumer. We receive many phone calls and letters from our residents who are feeling the pinch and who are relying on the city government to resist rate increases.

The city of Pittsburgh is supplied by three gas companies, Equitable Gas Co., Peoples Natural Gas Co., and Manufacturers' Light & Heat Co. The city has been dependent upon natural gas for many years for cooking, water heating, heating homes, and for fueling its great heavy industries. For a good many years the city was supplied by gas produced in western Pennsylvania and nearby West Virginia. Shortly after World War II, however, local suppliers were no longer able to keep up with increasing demands of our growing population and our expanding industries. Today the greater part of gas consumed in the Pittsburgh area comes from the Gulf Coast gas fields. The gas purchased by the three distributing companies in the Pittsburgh area from the pipelines has been increasing in cost at a startling rate in recent years. The distributing companies are now faced with the prospect of being priced out of their markets. If they lose a large part of the industrial load to competing fuels because of the ever-rising price of natural gas, the small consumers will be hurt even more because they will be saddled with all the overhead that formerly had been carried by the large consumers. So the rise in gas prices is more dangerous to the ultimate consumers than just the rise in the cost of gas purchased by the distributing companies.

I know that the producers claim that the increase in the price of gas at the wellhead affects the consumer very little. The answer is threefold. In the first place Mr. J. French Robinson, president of Consolidated Natural Gas Co., which serves a portion of the Pittsburgh area has already testified that the field price represents 25.1 percent of the average rate which the company receives for all gas sold. Secondly, as Commissioner Draper said in his dissent in the Panhandle case (3 Pur. 3d 476):

"The majority should be aware that the test of a proposed increase or decrease in rates is not the impact on the individual consumer. The test is, of course, whether the proposed rates are reasonable when measured against the company's cost of service, including a fair return which the company should have the opportunity to recover in its rates."

Thirdly, in the Phillips case, Mr. Justice Minton, speaking for the majority, stated flatly that, if the price of gas at the wellhead is not regulated, this will mean a substantial increase in the price of gas to the ultimate consumer.

It seems to me that the opponents of this bill have already won at least three times on the merits. The Rizley bill was defeated, the Kerr bill was defeated, and the opponents won again on the merits in the Supreme Court in the Phillips case. I know that the ruling in the Phillips case is that Congress intended that there shall be the disputed regulation, but the opinion indicates that the Court believed regulation to be necessary for the protection of the consumer.

Now the Harris bill proposes to remove this protection. If this is done, investors in pipeline and distributing companies are no longer going to have the security which came from the stability of the cost principle. They are going to demand a greater return on their investment since they may find their business going to competitive fuels as a result of their prices being forced upward through the application of the ephemeral concepts of fair field price.

We have heard it stated that competition will regulate field prices, but you can be sure that if competition is all that regulates field prices they will be regulated ever upward. The reason is simple because there is no competition among producers. The competition is among buyers and when buyers compete for something the price goes up. We have seen this time and time again as pipelines have had to expand to meet growing demands of their markets. The spiral has been accelerated even further through "favored nations" clauses on which the Federal Power Commission has at last begun to look with disfavor.

A hypothetical example is all that is needed to show what I mean. A pipeline connects up a gas field and starts transporting the gas from the fields to the markets. Pipelines cost a lot of money. The big ones run around $75,000 to $100,000 per mile; some even higher. When a pipeline is once in the ground it can't go shopping all up and down the Gulf Coast for additional gas. It has to buy gas that is accessible, and it finds itself then in a seller's market, or perhaps I should say, a gouger's market. It has to pay more for this gas than it has been paying the other producers. So it does and then it finds that, under the "favored nations" clauses in its old contracts, it has to pay the original producers the new high price even though they have been enjoying a market for their gas since the line was first built. This is the "favored nations" clause in its least offensive form. Some forms of favored nations clauses bring about an increase of price because some other pipeline comes into the area for a supply. Do you call this competition? Perhaps it is, but it is competition among buyers, not among sellers.

All of the public utility industries in the United States which have grown and prospered and served the ever expanding demands of our economy so well—power, telephone, water supply, and gas—have accomplished this under the cost principle which has been the basis of public utility regulation for years. The investors have put their money into utility plant primarily because of the stability which has resulted from the cost principle. Industries have invested huge sums in gas burning equipment because of the stability which they thought was inherent in a public utility supply of fuel. The small consumer with his gas stove, his water heater, and perhaps a gas furnace, has invested a large proportion of his capital in gas burning equipment with the expectation that prices would be fair and stable because they were based upon the cost principle. To scrap this principle at this time is to break faith with the large consuming interests in our national economy. This is a scandalous thing to do and will have reverberations that will do no one good, including many of those who have made fortunes in the gas producing business.

I can see no good for anyone in the Harris bill. If it becomes a law, it will do irreparable harm before it can be repealed. We cannot take this chance.

Any increase which the producer secures is bound to result in an automatic increase in rates charged the consumer. The pipeline companies will increase their rates as will the distributing companies in the Pittsburgh district. It is difficult to advance any argument that the pipeline companies and the distributing companies should not be per-

mitted to pass on to their customers the increase in the cost of purchased gas.

In conclusion, I again want to state that I heartily endorse the arguments made by the other opponents of the bill, particularly those made by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers and the statement of Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, made in the Senate of the United States on Friday, March 18, 1955. The arguments in favor of the bill arise from a human desire to increase profits. Since gas is a natural resource and a product distributed by monopolies, namely public utilities, it is eminently unfair to permit the producers to reap profits from the consumers without regulation. If producers are free from regulation this will destroy effective regulation of the industry. It is difficult to see why the producer should fear the Federal Power Commission. The producers, the pipeline companies, and the distributors are all entitled to a fair return on the value of their properties. What more can they ask?

I wish to thank the committee for affording me the opportunity of presenting the view of the city of Pittsburgh.

APRIL 26, 1955.

Foster True Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and eloquent address entitled "Foster True Patriotism," which was delivered by a brilliant and charming daughter of North Carolina, Miss Gertrude S. Carraway, president general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, on April 18, 1955, before the 64th Continental Congress of that great organization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOSTER TRUE PATRIOTISM

(Address of Miss Gertrude S. Carraway, president-general National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, 64th Continental Congress, April 18, 1955)

Now of all times, in these crucial days of national problems and international tensions, Americans, especially Daughters of the American Revolution, should endeavor in every way possible to foster true patriotism.

Taken verbatim from our second major objective, this clause has been our special theme for the year. Actually, it incorporates our three primary aims—historical appreciation, patriotic service, and educational training. These are the main ways in which for 64 years we have tried to foster true patriotism: by understanding of the past, good citizenship in the present, and preparation for a better future.

Citizenship in the United States of America is the freest and finest devised by mankind. Here we have more rights, higher standards of living, and greater opportunities for advancement than anywhere else in the world.

But these advantages entail responsibilities. To preserve our priceless heritage in this representative republic, we must assume its obligations. Each of us should apply personally the closing paragraph in The American's Creed, by the late William Tyler Page, which we say so often together:

"It is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its Flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

True patriotism observes these five duties of good citizenship.

By literal definition, patriotism is love of one's country. This is a noble emotion. The Apostle Paul, in thongs, boasted of his Roman birth and citizenship. On the gallows Nathan Hale expressed regret that he had only one life to lose for his country. At Valley Forge, George Washington ordered: "Let only true Americans be on guard."

At long last patriotism is becoming more prevalent and popular. For sometime recently it was erroneously considered narrow-minded and old-fashioned. Now we are returning to the conviction that as our Nation is the only one to which we pledge allegiance, the only one protecting, training and benefiting us, we, in turn, should give it our support and devotion. How proudly we should answer the question asked at customs offices: "I am an American."

W. P. Merrill wrote: "Those are quite right who tell us that it is just as immoral to say, 'I love every country as well as my own,' as to say, 'I love every other woman as well as my wife.' God has set us in families and in nations, and we realize our best possibilities in loyal allegiance to those relationships."

We must cherish our Federal Constitution. Its basic principles should be more fully comprehended and carefully followed. We must be familiar with its content and intent, if we are to keep its foundations from being undermined, its flanks from being attacked, its spirit from being violated.

It should be safeguarded from those who misuse its fifth amendment without being willing to abide by it in its entirety. If they are accorded the privilege of enjoying its liberties, they ought to undertake its obligations. Investigations along these and other security lines should be continued by the FBI and by congressional committees.

Abraham Lincoln declared: "As the patriots of '76 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor."

Why should any real American object to pledging loyalty to our country? Often we recite our religious creeds. From time to time are repeated scientific beliefs and theories. Frequently we express our love for friends. Why not for our native land?

Our laws are not strictly enough obeyed. Unless leading citizens keep them, how can we expect others to do so? So long as adults violate ordinances, there will be juvenile delinquency. We cannot presume to reform the rest of the globe until we check the crime and corruption at home. The young as well as old would be more law-abiding, if greater emphasis were placed on the responsibilities of citizenship.

Too few pay proper respect to the Stars and Stripes, the symbol of our Nation. DAR activities have long included presenting flags, distributing flag codes, teaching the correct salute to the Star-Spangled Banner as it passes in a parade or when the national anthem is played or sung.

It is not sufficient to be law-conscious, flag-honoring citizens. Our duty is also to help defend our Nation against enemies. When half the world understands most clearly the language of force, it is essential to be adequately prepared militarily for any emergency.

A strong citizenry, however, is just as necessary to save our land as are an invincible Army, Navy, and Air Force. For, in this age of subversion, dangers come from within as well as from without. Therefore, we must be vigilant on the home front, being good citizens ourselves and promoting better citizenship among others.

The best defense against the deadly foe of communism is to build up resistance to its subtle inroads by becoming imbued with Americanism. Constructive programs should be sponsored for American history, the Constitution, and Declaration of Independence. So many of our young people fail to study our representative government. How can they be for it, if they do not know it and its preeminence?

Communism and Americanism are as contrasting as falsehood and truth, darkness and light, slavery and freedom, barbarity and humanity. Many who espouse Red propaganda, have a pinkish tinge or sympathetic ear for its high-sounding phrases, do not recognize its underlying implications.

What does communism offer in the place of our freedom of worship? No religion; no God. Instead of our freedom of conscience? Atheistic materialism; mass indoctrination. Our preferred peaceful negotiations? Brute force. Our freedom of movement? Police guards for circumscribed limits. In place of our freedom of speech? Gag rule; censorship.

For our freedom of press? Controlled newspapers. Our right to own property? No private property. Instead of trials by jury? A mockery of justice. Fair treatment? Brainwashing, water cures, so-called truth serums, unwarranted imprisonment. Our initiative? Stifling of free enterprise. Rather than integrity? Misrepresentation, deception, failure to keep promises. Instead of trust and charity? Suspicion and hatred. For benevolence, human welfare, and mercy? Terror, cruelty, purges.

The Communist approach is to make government the master, with all subjects subservient. It tends to eliminate individualism.

Right kinds of competition and good sportsmanship must be maintained in scholarship and recreation at our schools to train better for later competition in our businesses. This means voluntary cooperation, a desire to do one's best, to use skills to the utmost, and to be worthy of success in attaining goals.

Lord Wellington remarked: "The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing field of Eton." A later illustrious warrior, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, wrote the inscription on the gymnasium at West Point: "Upon the fields of friendly strife are sown the seeds which in other years, on other fields, will bear the fruits of victory."

Our philosophy incorporates diversity of endeavor, even differences of opinion, changes when sanctioned by majority votes. It is our acknowledged privilege to find fault constructively. That is how we bring improvements. But we must not allow our disagreements to become weaknesses or liabilities. That is what our enemies want. In the big things, on fundamentals, we should stand firmly united, with the "Faith of our Fathers."

It is our mission to preserve the bequest of individual liberty, free enterprise and national sovereignty for which our ancestors risked their lives and fortunes. That is why our society has taken firm stands against any form of world government. We prefer our constitutional government, which has served us well for so long. We must not barter it away by becoming a vassal province in any kind of world or regional superstate.

World government is not safe or practical. So much of the globe's population is under the iron heel of an implacable foe, including aggressors and gangsters, whose ideas are diametrically opposed to our own. Incredible as it may seem, some would thus throw overboard our Declaration of Independence, which for 179 years has been for us such a trustworthy prop, domestically and internationally.

Our Constitution should have an amendment to prevent treaties or executive agreements with unconstitutional provisions from becoming the supreme law. Why lock the front door and watch it with expensive munitions and precious lives only to lose the

structure by allowing the enemy or unrealistic visionary to slip in through the back door? Such an amendment would safeguard the constitutional rights of Americans and our duly elected representatives to pass our own internal legislation.

Benjamin Franklin warned: "Those that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Daughters of the American Revolution can and should foster patriotism by aiding our fine committees. Each has a patriotic purpose. The more we assist them, the more truly patriotic we will be and the more true patriotism we will engender in others. Activity along any of these lines will be of value. Samuel Johnson said: "He who waits to do a great deal of good at once will never do anything."

Our historical projects promote patriotism. The more we know of the past, the more apt we are to want to prove worthy of our heritage and emulate the outstanding examples of earlier periods. Abraham Lincoln advised: "Return to the fountain whose waters spring close by the blood of the revolution."

All our efforts for our country are in behalf of true patriotism, for what we believe to be for the preservation and enrichment of the American way of life, especially our committees on national defense, Americanism, and the many other ways in which we stress better citizenship.

The numerous goals through we undertake educational training for the future also help foster true patriotism. In our own two DAR schools we add to the three academic R's of reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic two other R's—responsibility and religion.

That this is advisable is shown by the fact that our Kate Duncan Smith DAR School has raised substantially the standards of its surrounding area and the fact that during the 35 years of our Tamassee DAR School not one of its graduates has ever been involved in crime, all making good American citizens, most of them leaders in their communities.

Through our large student loan and scholarship funds, including our scholarships for American Indians and young Negro women, we help build for the future. By such committees as our DAR Good Citizens, Children of the American Revolution, Junior American Citizens Clubs for all grades, races and creeds, we are teaching younger generations to take responsible roles in our republic, to appreciate the ideals on which it was founded and which have made it so strong and so great. Patriotism is not born in infants; it must be instilled in our youth, carefully nurtured and constantly cultivated through the years.

Our National Society thus has excellent programs for fostering true patriotism. If they were more zealously adopted by our members and their principles cherished by all Americans, there would be no reason to fear the Communist menance or un-American infiltration. Our country's future would be assured.

History proves that tyrannical governments, through temporarily successful, have finally failed, because there is an inherent desire in all men to be free agents. In time they rise up to oppose despotism, and as individuals they can be far more effective than slaves, mouthpieces or automatons carrying out the commands of dictators. In past annals those who have had ambitions to conquer or control the world have met death, defeat or downfall. The same fate in the long run may await those who currently seek to dominate the globe, if we patiently persevere to spread the will for freedom.

It is not isolationism to love our country best, to put its welfare foremost. Some might mistakenly call it that. It is realistic and practical, enlightened self-interest, treading the paths which have proved satisfactory, cooperating with other nations and helping those which are worthy to help themselves but not becoming too involved or submerged for our own economic stability or political security.

Theodore Roosevelt asserted: "There is one quality which we must bring to the solution of every problem—that is an intense and fervid Americanism. We shall never be successful over the dangers that confront us; we shall never achieve true greatness, nor reach the lofty ideals which the founders and preservers of our mighty Federal Republic have set before us, unless we are Americans in heart and soul, in spirit and purpose, keenly alive to the responsibility implied in the very name of American, and proud beyond measure of the glorious privilege of bearing it."

This doctrine should be stressed today. The dynamic, crusading spirit of Americanism forms our most powerful weapon, of offense as well as defense. It can bring peace and victory in the cold war of ideologies.

The American way of life excels all others. It is our duty to maintain it, with confidence in ourselves, faith in its high principles, and trust in Divine guidance.

True patriotism should be fostered, strongly and surely. For, the strength of America and Americanism is humanity's best hope.

Your Job: Where Does It Come From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very interesting article entitled "Your Job: Where Does It Come From?" which was published in the Reader's Digest, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR JOB: WHERE DOES IT COME FROM?

(Condensed from the Freeman)

(By A. J. Gallager)

If we know what it takes to make one job, we will know what it takes to maintain the many we have today and to create the necessary new jobs for tomorrow.

That sprawling thing we call the national economy is nothing but a lot of individual jobs. This confusing subject "economics" can be quite simple: A job is the security of the home. A business is simply a group of jobholders at work. A community is just a group of different businesses. The Nation is the sum of its communities, or 60 million jobs.

If you have a job, you're a valuable person. To your family, your pay is what buys the groceries, clothes the kids and provides the other things that make a comfortable home.

SALES NECESSARY FOR EACH JOB

But to your employer, your pay means something much different. To meet your wages and other costs and keep you on the job for a year, the company must sell about $14,000 worth of goods. That's the average for a great many businesses, with some requiring as much as $40,000 in sales. Let us look at one job in a big steel company (United States Steel) whose products are used for anything from a kitchen paring knife to a giant steel-framed skyscraper.

United States Steel's sales of $12,850 for each one of the people on the payroll are close to the average for all types of business. In 1953 the $12,850 was divided for each of the 301,560 jobs as follows:

Wages and benefits, $5,200; products and services bought, $4,700; taxes, $1,370; other expenses, $843; put back in the business, $393; paid out as dividends, $344.

Of the $737 per job that remained after all costs and expenses, $393—more than half—was reinvested in the business to improve methods and buy better equipment, which results in lower costs, better products, more customers and more jobs. The $344 left was paid out as dividends to the 286,240 people who had their savings at work in the business.

INVESTMENT NECESSARY FOR EACH JOB

As important as they are, the sales it takes to keep a job going are only one side of the picture. Before there can be any sales, someone has to save the money to provide all the necessary things to make a job possible, such as land, buildings, machines, and materials.

In United States Steel, about $14,000 was at work in plants and equipment alone for each of its 301,560 employees. Thus, a small fortune is at work for every individual on a payroll.

ONLY CUSTOMERS MAKE JOBS

In any business, however, you, the customer, are all important. You are a jobmaker for countless people you have never seen. And these people, as customers for what you help make or sell, keep you on your job.

For example, here is what the customers of the country must do each year to keep one average jobholder at work making these typical products; and so on for thousands of other products.

These are not unusual examples. The sales required to maintain one job in any business are large and steadily growing.

In terms of jobs, all businesses look much alike. A great food manufacturer and the corner grocery store, a dairy and a department store. Measured by jobs, the big total figures become small, understandable figures. For instance, the vast steel company, whose profits in 1953 were $222 million, made about the same amount of money per job as a roadside diner whose profit was $7,300.

To keep our present living standards, we need about 3 jobs for every 2 families. You can imagine the vast task of maintaining more than 60 million jobs.

The largest business concern in the country maintains something over half a million jobs. All manufacturing combined supplies little more than a fourth of the total.

The big share of creating jobs is done by the more than 2 million small businesses and farms, started by people willing to risk time and money in the struggle to progress.

In every community, farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and service people might well hang out the sign, "jobmaker."

The security of your job depends upon the sincere cooperation of business, labor, and government—backed by general understanding of what it takes to maintain a job; who the jobmakers are; what helps and what hinders them.

Air Transportation for All Our Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Air Transportation for

All Our Citizens," delivered on April 26, 1955, by Col. Joseph P. Adams, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, at the second annual airport management conference, sponsored by the Washington State Aeronautics Commission, in cooperation with the Association of Washington Cities and Washington State Aviation Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRANSPORTATION FOR ALL OUR CITIZENS

(Address by Col. Joseph P. Adams, Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, and member, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, delivered at the second annual airport management conference sponsored by Washington State Aeronautics Commission in cooperation with Association of Washington Cities and Washington State Aviation Association, April 26, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, colleagues, and guests, I am very happy to have this opportunity to make a report to you on the very substantial and laudable progress that has been made in bringing air transportation to all our citizens—the low-income people of our country, as well as those in the higher-income brackets; the people living in small communities, as well as those in our largest cities. As air transportation has been brought to an ever-expanding portion of our total population, regardless of income and place of residence, all of the public have been directly benefited—the stockholders, the taxpayers and, of course, the air travelers themselves. Air transportation is rapidly losing its luxury label as more and more people find they can afford to fly, and at the same time air transportation is gaining wider and more stable support as it serves more and more of our people and more of our smaller communities.

My own record makes it clear that I have consistently favored both low-fare mass air transportation and the further development of our local-service air carriers. I have taken this consistent position ever since I have been a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in majority and dissenting opinions, in speeches which were made here in the West and elsewhere, and in testimony before Congress.

I propose to report to you today on the progress achieved in the field of low-fare mass air transport and that of local air-carrier development not only because of my own position and attitude, but because the progress thus far made is eloquent testimony of what can be accomplished when the efforts of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the air carriers themselves, and the people like you here assembled representing the States and cities served, are all directed toward a common goal. It is a record in which all of us can take great pride. I can go further and assure you that under our New Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman, Ross Rizley, even further and greater progress in bringing air transportation to all our citizens will be assured if such cooperative efforts continue.

LOW-FARE MASS AIR TRAVEL

My personal interest in furthering the development of mass air travel through low air fares has long been a matter of record. In a dissenting opinion written in November 1951, I stressed the need for the immediate expansion of low-fare air service not only in order to recognize the pioneering efforts of our nonscheduled or irregular air carriers, but also because I was convinced that a hitherto untapped market was available to all our carriers, both scheduled and nonscheduled.

I reiterated this position in two speeches which I delivered in April 1953 in Oakland, Calif., before the chamber of commerce there, and in Eugene, Oreg., on the occasion of the first Northwest airport management conference. In the first of these talks I expressed this conviction of mine as follows:

"Air transportation must leave the luxury class and become a necessity. It must forget and actively campaign against its reputation for being in business to serve only the few. It must develop and encourage a reputation for being available to the mass of travelers in this country."

I also called for a reversal of the relationship which existed as late as 1952 between low-fare air passenger traffic and first-class or luxury-class air passenger volume. This ratio in that year was 20 percent low-fair air coach to 80 percent first class, and I urged that all of those concerned—the Board, the air carriers, and such aviation-minded people as you here, representing cities and States throughout this country—do our utmost to convert this 20 to 80 ratio to the reverse ratio, or 80 percent for low-fair air coach and 20 percent for first class.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to report to you today that while we haven't yet reached that 80 to 20 goal, we are well on the road to it. In the calendar year 1954, low-fair air coach services carried approximately 33 percent of the total passenger volume transported by our trunklines, so that the ratio is now 33 to 67 rather than 20 to 80. Two of our trunklines, incidentally, are now generating a greater volume of low-fair air coach passenger miles than they are first-class passenger miles; so in these two instances the ratio is 52 to 48, and 55 to 45, in favor of low-fair air coach.

Total air travel, including coach, has increased by leaps and bounds since 1952, and with such increasing revenues, unit expenses have gone down. The average operating expense per revenue ton-mile reported to our domestic trunk carriers approximated 47½ cents for the calendar year 1954—about 1½ cents less than for the year ended 6 months before, June 30, 1954, and more than 5 cents less than for the fiscal year 1950. It should be noted, furthermore, that such declining expenses have enabled our carriers with the encouragement of the Board to maintain a fare level which has been stable for the last 5 years.

I can therefore report that we are now well into the era of low-far mass air transportation in the United States. The day of air transportation for all our citizens therefore—including those of low income—is almost here. I am also happy to be able to tell you that Seattle, my own hometown, has shared in the general increase in low-fare air service. Four and a half years ago in September 1950, Seattle enjoyed only 1 round trip daily coach flight to and from the California area and only 2 daily round trips to and from the East. A year later in September 1951, 1 more daily round trip coach flight had been added to the Seattle coach service, so that at that time Seattle had only 4 daily round trip coach services—2 operating to and from the South and 2 operating across the country to and from the East.

This total of 4 daily round trip flights for Seattle had been increased by last September to 11—5 up and down the west coast and 6 operating east and west across the country to and from Seattle. Here again, then, with reference to this area and our own State, there has been substantial progress made in bringing more and more low-fare air coach service to our citizens.

As I have already indicated, there is still much to be done before the low-fare mass air travel market will have been fully exploited. This is shown by the 33–67 ratio, which must continue to change to 45–55, 60–40, and so on. With the continued cooperative effort of the air carriers themselves and of such aviation-minded people as you here before me today representing the public, continued progress in increasing the "air coach to first class" ratio is assured. As such further development and progress takes place in mass air travel, the recent significant profits earned by all our trunklines enable us to predict even further and greater profits for them. Both the air carrier and the public served by them can be confident that the Civil Aeronautics Board under the leadership of its new Chairman will spare no effort to continue and improve upon the progress already made in bringing more air transportation to our low-income citizens.

LOCAL AIR SERVICE

Just as I have consistently favored air transportation for the person with the small income, so I have championed air transportation for the small community ever since I have been a member of the Board. All parties responsible for the local air service development seen in the last 3 years are to be congratulated. The air carriers themselves, the CAB and its staff, and most important, aviation-minded civic leaders like you here assembled, have reason to be proud of the job that has been done. It is obvious, of course, that there are many problems in the local air service field which are not yet settled and there are some which as yet have not even been clearly defined. Nevertheless, the progress made thus far, during th period of initial experimentation and development, leaves no doubt in my mind that the problems will be defined and will be solved.

Overall passenger volumes carried by our local air services have increased considerably in 1954 over 1951 or 1952, while in the first few months of this year all previous records are being broken every month. One local air carrier reports gains in terms of passengers in the first quarter of 1955 of 27 percent over the same quarter of 1954. Another reports a first quarter traffic increase of 35 percent, while a third carrier shows, for the month of March 1955, an increase of 163 percent over the same month last year.

As more and more people have been carried every year by our local air services, it is most significant that those services are no longer requiring great increases in Federal mail pay subsidy support. We estimate, for example, that the current year, fiscal 1955, will see an increase of less than half a million dollars of subsidy over 1954, and that in 1956, there will be only some $100,000 more subsidy needed than for 1955. This leveling off of dependence on subsidy by our local air carriers is taking place in the face of the substantial increases in traffic generated, which I have already mentioned. This means, in other words, that as the local airlines carry more and more of the smaller community people, it is costing the taxpayers relatively little; and, of course, it is costing them less and less on a per passenger or per passenger mile basis.

It is, of course, a fact that as yet there have been but few similarly demonstrable benefits accruing to the stockholders of the local airlines. A 10-year period, however (which covers the entire existence of these carriers) is not a long time. In fairness to the local carriers it should be noted that even our trunklines received subsidy mail pay and did relatively little for their stockholders as long as the DC–3 airplane was their chief type of operating equipment, and for a period much longer than 10 years.

I repeat, therefore, that the record achieved by our local service air carriers has been a good one. I am particularly gratified at that record, since 2 years ago at Eugene, Oreg., and again at Edgewater Park, Miss., I was the one who advanced to my friends the "use it or lose it" slogan as to local air service. I stated that either the public would have to patronize these carriers or we at the Board could not continue the service. My position was premised upon my confidence in

the ability of the carriers and the State and city organizations to work together toward a goal which I believed in, and which I was sure was attainable by them. It is always a good thing to find that one's faith has been justified. It is even better to have the opportunity, as I have now, of describing the fine record that has been achieved by those in whom that faith was placed.

Congress, itself, has recognized already the national importance of the local service air carrier role. Both Houses of Congress passed permanent certification bills last week, and this week will probably agree on a single bill. In this connection I am pleased that I urged such permanent certification of the local service airline routes before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in February. As I stated before that body:

"I am in favor of permanent certification for our local air carriers, particularly if the Civil Aeronautics Board retains some flexibility of control in the grant of the new certificates as to future adjustments of loss points or route segments.

"* * * my position on the basic issue of premanency for these carriers is simply that it is time for us to recognize that these carriers are here to stay just as the smaller communities which they serve are here to stay."

The forthcoming permanent certification of our local carriers by Congress can be regarded by both the airlines and their supporters—such as you people here—as a real tribute to all your efforts—expended on their behalf for the past 10 years.

Together with this general overall local air carrier trend, your own local carrier, West Coast Airlines, serving Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, while not one of the largest of our local air services, has done well and its record is worthy of note here. West Coast has always been one of the most economical of all our local carriers. For the year ended September 30, 1954, for example, its direct flight costs per total hour flown were the lowest in the entire local air industry. It's passenger fare policy has also been most favorable to the traveling public in the area it serves and it should be noted that its average passenger fare for a recent year was next to the lowest reported by any local carrier.

Therefore, both in this Northwestern area and throughout our entire country, this local service carrier "progress report" is highly favorable. More and more air transportation is coming to the smaller communities of the United States, resulting in present and real benefits to the traveler and taxpayer and in ultimate benefits to the stockholding public as well.

I cannot leave the local air service portion of my report to you today without pointing up the Civil Aeronautics Board's own responsibility for the future progress of our local air carrier program. We at the Board cannot expect your cooperation unless we pledge our own. As your Washington State Aeronautics Commission Act of 1947 specifically provides, your State commission, "shall cooperate with and assist the Federal Government, the municipalities of this State, and other persons in the development of aeronautics, and shall seek to coordinate the aeronautical activities of these bodies and persons."

Progress made thus far indicates that State commissions such as yours and the Civil Aeronautics Board have cooperated with one another thus far. We at the Civil Aeronautics Board have made real efforts thus far to promote and develop the local air service program which we began some 10 years ago.

A pertinent inquiry at this point in its development, however, is, Where do the local service carriers go from here and what is the Civil Aeronautics Board prepared to do, to see that they get there? I cannot, of course, speak for the entire Board as to future policy, but in light of the positions I have taken in the past as to this program, I can certainly state my own position based on past developments and facts known to me at this time.

Our local air carriers, if they are to play their proper role in our air transport system, must be granted increased operational flexibility on the one hand, and must be permitted to serve more lucrative air travel markets on the other hand. If these carriers are expected to live on limited subsidy, or if they are to operate on declining Federal subsidy support, then their load factors must be increased and their costs on a unit basis must decrease. Only when these changes in their operating results take place can we reasonably expect the subsidy burden on the taxpayer to go down and dividends or other benefits to the stockholders to materialize.

I, as one Board member, expect to do all in my power to bring this about. The carriers themselves, and all you aviation-minded State and city civic officials must continue to work with these carriers to increase revenues and reduce costs; but unless the Civil Aeronautics Board supplements these efforts by improving the route systems of the local carriers—in terms of both revenue potential and operational flexibility—the subsidy bill will not go down. By the same token, the taxpayers' total burden will never be substantially reduced, and the stockholders' interests will never be adequately protected. In light of the fine record achieved by our local air-carrier experiment thus far, I propose that we all dedicate ourselves to removing or, at least, reducing the amount of Federal subsidy support and the onus which attaches to such subsidy support of our local air carriers and the cities they serve. Only when this is done can any of us seriously defend and espouse the future economic soundness of our local airline industry. I assure you that I shall continue to do what I can to help these carriers attain an economically sound status—since only that status will enable them to best serve all the interests of the public. With the continued support of the carriers and the public, I have no doubt that the outcome will, ultimately, be successful.

In conclusion then, my overall report is a favorable and optimistic one, I believe. Air transportation is rapidly coming to all our citizens—the low-income people as well as the high-income people, the small-community people as well as the big-city people. This kind of progress must and can continue with the continued efforts of the air carriers, the public served by them—represented by you here—and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"God Meant Us To Find the Atom"—Thomas E. Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the Honorable Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, which appeared in the April 1955 issue of Better Homes and Gardens.

The story, God Meant Us To Find the Atom, is a moving statement of principle, which I urge every Member of Congress to read. The article follows:

GOD MEANT US TO FIND THE ATOM

(By Thomas E. Murray, as told to Henry Lee)

Once I stood within 9 miles of one of our sizable nuclear explosions. I stood riveted, dumbfounded, awe-stricken. I had a feeling I might be looking into eternity.

Space is annihilated, time measured in millionths of seconds. Temperatures approaching those at the center of the sun are produced. Out of the blackness and stillness of the night, a great ball of light plunges into vision. Opaque glasses, so dense that ordinary light does not penetrate, seem to melt before one's eyes. You count 1, 2, and 3, and then remove the glasses.

Now the fireball surpasses summer's midday sun. It represents energies greater than ever before released by man. There is an empty feeling in the pit of your stomach as you watch the familiar mushroom which might remind you of those highly colored medical pictures of the human brain. Then, a rush of heat like the opening of a furnace door—a crash that seems to break the eardrums and does knock you off your feet if you haven't braced yourself. And all this at 9 miles away.

Finally, the awesome mass rises rapidly skyward with its cargo of radioactive dust, some of it, perhaps, to sail endlessly around the world and make its presence known wherever it goes. For some of its particles will give off radioactive rays for thousands of years.

Again, in the far Pacific at Eniwetok, where little pieces of God's earth used to be and now are no more, I participated in Mike, the test of our first thermonuclear explosion, the forerunner of our present hydrogen bomb.

Before Mike, scientists had speculated on the possibility of world destruction through nuclear reactions. After Mike, they knew that the possibility could be triggered into actuality.

Bluntly, here are the facts. Man now can make weapons capable of reducing the world to the primitive conditions of the time of Cain and Abel. He even has, within the range of his grasp, means to completely exterminate the human race.

And since Mike was developed 3 years ago, other versions and improvements have also been successfully tested. Today, scientists can make a good educated guess as to the number of Mikes needed for total world catastrophe—to scatter to the four winds, in a matter of seconds, the civilization it has taken man so many centuries to put together.

This magic number is less than the scientists had calculated in 1952—and only God knows how much smaller it will become in the years ahead. No wonder some ask, "Are we not playing with things that belong to God?"

It is a haunting question in this season of the resurrection and the promise—the 10th Eastertide since, in the presumption and witchery of our science, we first reconstituted a piece of the sun over the sands of Alamogordo in New Mexico.

And it deserves a respectful, straightforward answer that does not beg or neglect the spiritual implications. The course of history is irreversible. We cannot undo the atom. Nor should we even try to cork the genie back into the bottle, for one simple reason: The concerted, atheistic threat against all we hold dear has increased and grown bolder in the ratio that the hydrogen bomb has surpassed the rifle. We, in turn, must remain armed to the teeth to contain that threat.

With this, I agree. But, fundamentally, because I believe in Providence, I believe that God meant us to find the atom. And, let us not forget, it was He who made the atom. Since it is of God's creation, it is good. The

fault lies not in the Giver or the gift but in the perverse will of man, the recipient. Those who let themselves lapse into despair and disbelief already are suffering in their souls the atomization they fear for their bodies.

If you agree with me that the atom is heaven-sent and not an awful thing that slipped out of hell's door, we can pick our way more accurately, more serenely, through the frightful complications of the atomic era. Admittedly, we are wrestling with the greatest alteration in man's relation with nature since the upheaval at the time of the Garden of Eden. But his fundamental relation with God has not changed one whit.

The same trial that tested the first man in Eden, and every man since, challenges us in the atomic problem. It is the exercise of choice, the dangerous freedom to use God-given power for good or ill. Out of a piece of steel, man can fashion the scalpel—or the stiletto.

I believe—to believe otherwise would be idolatry of self—that free man, as a creature of God, exults in genuine liberty only when he is subject to Him. Eternal principles govern man's life, his purpose, his destiny—whether he achieves his perfection by them or nihilates himself without them.

After 5 years of almost ceaseless contemplation of the atom, in all its wonder and horror, I still believe intensely in the three simple ultimates I learned as a child. They are faith, hope, and charity. More than ever in recorded history, man needs to believe and accept them today. We need faith that we may be brought neare to nature's God and not be led astray by a false man-made god called science. Hope that with God's help we can avert the worst fate with which war, powered by the atom, can menace us. Charity that we may truly learn—learn or die—the old, old words—love one another as I have loved you.

I do not mean for a moment that science is wrong, but only man's worship of it. Surely, a part of our duty, the effect of the primal urge implanted by our Creator, is to discover more and more of the world we live in. It is a part of the instinctive search for God, in the heart of every man created of God. The unity, the harmony, the order of the universe, revealed little by little to us, reflect the unity, the order, and the harmony which are God's perfections, "See how the skies proclaim God's glory."

But science can give man mastery only over matter. It never reaches ultimates. It becomes a process of smashing atoms and then of endlessly smashing the parts into which atoms are broken. It "explains" matter by simply dividing it into ever smaller subatomic particles—electrons and protons yesterday, neutrinos and mesons tomorrow. While it explains much, there is a sense in which, we can say, it is forever deferring explanation. It is always postponing the ultimate reason.

Can we get any nearer the good life by thus constantly raising atomic dust, and giving that dust Greek-derivative names to mask our ignorances?

While progressing without end in the knowledge of broken things, can science ever properly answer such fundamental questions as what is man? What is his destiny? Who is God?

In our morality and ethics, the relation of man to man, what does science offer? It is a matter of closed systems in which action equals reaction, input must equal output. Mathematical equations, in which one member always precisely equals the other, best define its laws.

But sacrifice and generosity are precisely what they are, because input does not equal output. If we are generous or charitable, reaction is greater than the action. Life and love cannot be compressed into tidy equations, and we know the sum of goodness more than equals its parts.

Therefore, I continue to put my faith for our salvation on religion and philosophy. Here are open systems unlimited by any physics, chemistry, or by astronomy. The atom's diameter and the vast areas, measured in billions of light years, between the fringes of the expanding universe are crossed with equal ease and speed by lightning flashes from the best minds of man. Mind penetrates all boundaries, bringing us in one direction to God and in the other beyond tomorrow's tiniest division of submicroscopic particles. Spirit is open to all reality; it is not limited to matter and physical energy as are our experimental sciences.

I greatly fear one thing. If men will not clothe the bare framework of science with the warm garments of true humanism, they will end up by making machines their god and mathematics their only dogma. The rising paganism of the western world will make our civilization cold as interstellar spaces, ruthless as the atoms which smash each other.

Yet, do you believe, can you believe, that this is a random world tossed by chance upon the gaming table of space? For all their reality, the great, glittering galaxies and the dizzying circuits within the atom are not what a man can really live for or be willing to die for.

Against our fears, I oppose a great hope. The physical discoverics, which have shaken the spiritual faith of some men, are also shaking the philosophic foundations of materialism. I have noticed a new, extremely encouraging disposition on the part of some leading nonreligious scientists. They are beginning to acknowledge that the concept of divine creation should no longer be dogmatically excluded from rational speculation about the origin of the universe.

What a far cry from the mechanistic hopes and religious skepticism of the 19th century. What a challenge to godly men of science, trained in their philosophy and their faith, to reconcile scientific and religious thinking because genuine science and religion are never in conflict.

To my mind, there are today startling possibilities for a religious break through into the secular mind. The time is ripening for a marriage of religion and science.

GOD IS WAITING

Pope Pius XII has said, "According to the measure of its progress * * * true science discovers God in an ever-increasing degree * * * as though God were waiting behind every door opened by science." There you have it. God waiting behind every door opened by science.

I emphasize the spiritual aspect of the atom because it transcends all the other problems, military, political, and economic, that seem so overridingly important. The fact is, atomic bombs are dangerous only because some atomic men cannot be trusted. Our crisis today comes from man's greed and will to power, his refusal to submit to reason.

Like ourselves, every person in the Soviet Union is a human being, compounded of mortal body and immortal soul. Each is dear to God, his creator, as we men and women of the Western World are dear to Him. The resurrection is the credential of liberty and faith for them as well as for us. Outlawry on the part of others cannot justify outlawry on our part.

As Christians, we must hope that in the Kremlin's dictatorial mind there can eventually be sown some small measure of skepticism as to the value of the barren earth which any atomic war would bring. We must pray for that, with our lips and with the example of holy lives.

I have been especially surprised to see that the unbelievers among scientists sometimes seem more concerned for the peace than those of us who believe the peacemakers are blessed. It is not their excess of good will, but rather their sharp knowledge of what nuclear war would do to this planet. Therefore, if one does hope to be blessed as a peacemaker this critical year of 1955, he must grasp the facts of atomic life.

You, I, the American public cannot "leave it to the experts." In this cosmic drama, the bald truth is that there are no experts. It is not enough to be merely a technician. For unless the technician in some small way is enamored of the idea of becoming a saint, he will fall short of success. He will only exemplify the definition given by one learned educator who called the mere technician "a man who understands everything about his job except its ultimate purpose and its ultimate place in the order of the universe."

THE MAIN INGREDIENT

No, the essential ingredient to atomic survival is a broad base of informed and interested civilians. It is the only way in which we can cope with the immoral fatalism that considers war "inevitable"—with the folly that professes unconcern over man's darkest threat. Surely, these ostrich attitudes are like the frivolity of those who deny the reality of hell by refusing to think about it.

Perhaps the secrecy with which we have guarded certain especially sensitive areas of atomic information contributes to this apathy. But the extent of this secrecy is greatly exaggerated; it is more an alibi for than an explanation of our abandonment of the normal functioning of public opinion. The fact is, the greatest atomic decisions must come from the heart and the soul, not the skilled brain that comprehends a cyclotron.

Let me give an example. In this country, the demand for power is doubling every 10 years, and there are many other regions of the world where the power shortage is already acute. We talk vaguely of using the atom "for peace," but we are comfortably supplied with the standard fuels, even if many other countries are not; we can wait leisurely for the development of large nuclear reactors (the atomic-power engines), even if they cannot.

Therefore, I say, we face a problem that calls for a heart-and-soul solution. Here we have a technology and industrial capability that are unsurpassed, a pool of brillians scientists who could acccelerate the development of atomic power. Overseas are "have-not" nations which desperately need that power now, but which may never enjoy it if they must first acquire the technical skills and supporting industries to produce their own reactors.

Shall we fail them? Shall we say, "We could have atomic electric power if we wanted it. But, unlike you people, we don't really need it today, and so its development can wait for economic and financial forces to move it ahead." Actually, though we are investigating many different reactor types, there is only one operating reactor in the United States today. I very much fear that if we fail to push a broad, vigorous program in this field, we will be accused of following a dog in the manger policy.

I fear even more to consider the consequences if the U. S. S. R. should win the industrial-power race. Certainly, the price tag for nuclear-power reactors would be very high, with the purchasers surrendering their birthrights and civil liberties as the down-payment. What a tragedy if world leadership in reactors fell into Soviet hands by our spiritual default.

It seems clear to me that, "realistically" and humanely, we should use the atom to help eliminate want where it already exists and to forestall want where it threatens. By developing nuclear power, we can simultaneously enrich ourselves and the world, materially and spiritually.

But I would add one word of caution. The spreading of atomic material benefits, however generously we may decide to do it,

is not the final answer to the 20th-century dilemma. A material solution alone can never be more than a tentative answer, for only in the realm of the spirit is man complete. If all the world were made up of have-nots or we lived in some kind of atomic Eden, we would still have to remember the words, "Not by bread alone does man live."

WE MUST CRUSADE

It was faith in man alone that robbed us of our peace, and only a universal return to faith in God will restore it. We must crusade, not only with good works, but also with prayer that this supernatural faith may lay hold of the hearts of all mankind. In my belief, we must trust the faith that can move mountains, the prayer that may find divine favor in living realities as real as the atom and indescribably more powerful.

I do not mean to speak in tones of careless reassurance as one sometimes does to a child. For all you and I know, it may be the incomprehensible and inscrutable will of God to make the 20th century closing time for the human race. But we do know from the law He implanted in us that we have a personal obligation to use the normal means to stay alive as long as possible. Our Nation and the human race have an inescapable duty to the Almighty to avoid an ending of this civilization until God's good time.

How can we ignore the manmade threats? How can we leave it to the experts? How can we pretend—and that's all it is, pretense—that God's laws have been mashed to nothing in the cyclotron and only amoral power survives? How can we ignore the fear, not panic but a holy fear, that our lives are failing Him and us in the time of His sternest test?

If each of us does his part, the rest is divinely simple: Thy will be done. Once, you may remember, a wise and simple man named Francis was hoeing in his garden. Someone asked, "If an angel appeared to tell you, Francis, that tonight you are to die, what would you do?" And St. Francis very calmly said, "Keep on hoeing in the garden."

With all its tremendous complications, with the very future of the human race at stake, our atomic agony comes down to this. We keep on hoeing and await God's will. In faith, we celebrate the resurrection and look beyond Eniwetok to Galilee.

Statesman From the New South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. Boyd Campbell has been a leader in Mississippi for many years, and his accomplishments and contributions to society are well known to the people of my State. His recent election as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce has brought national recognition to our State, and we are understandably proud of him and his achievements.

In order that others throughout the country may have some knowledge of Mr. Campbell's background and abilities, I am including, under leave to extend my remarks, a feature article entitled "Statesman From the New South," which appears in the current Nation's Business magazine. This article is written by Mr. Tris Coffin, who recently spent some time in the State of Mississippi making a survey of conditions in our State. Not only did Mr. Coffin express amazement over Mississippi's tremendous progress in recent years in articles which he wrote following his visit, but he had the opportunity, also, to meet Mr. Boyd Campbell, the new president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and to learn first hand of the esteem which Mr. Campbell enjoys at the hands of his fellow Mississippians.

It is with a great deal of personal satisfaction that I include the following article about my friend and neighbor as part of my remarks:

STATESMAN FROM THE NEW SOUTH

(By Tris Coffin)

A tall man walked down the main street of a thriving southern town. Every few feet, he was stopped by a friendly word or a handshake. For each well wisher, bank president or gas station attendant, he had the same warm smile—the smile of one who loves people.

This was a typical moment in the busy life of A. Boyd Campbell, the president-elect of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. He is one of those rare souls, a natural leader, intelligent and broadminded, with a genius for conciliation. He gently closes the door on bombast and intrigue and tries to win other men's minds by reason and friendship.

He is chairman of the Mississippi School Supply Co. He calls himself "just a pencil peddler." After his election by the chamber of commerce board of directors, Mr. Campbell received a note from a Pittsburgh banker, a former member of the chamber's board.

"If anything is needed to demonstrate that the presidency of the chamber of commerce is awarded on a basis of merit and personality, rather than the influence of so-called big business, you are a perfect example."

Actually, Boyd Campbell is a statesman of the new South, a South busy with progress and growth. He and his friends—utility and railroad operators, publishers, bankers, planters, lumbermen, and industrialists—have changed the tide of Mississippi. Just three decades ago, this State was the poor relation haunted by illiteracy, a sagging cotton economy, and a spirit of lethargy. Today, thanks to these business leaders, dairy herds, beef cattle, and rice flourish on thousands of diversified green acres; factories are producing goods for an expanding southern market; hammers and rivet guns are building new schools. Boyd Campbell's foresight and persistence helped build these schools. He says again and again, "I believe with all my heart that public education is an economic good, a moral obligation, and a spiritual trust."

The new South of Boyd Campbell no longer waves the bloody shirt. The term "carpetbagger," which once described the hateful despoiler from the North is now an affectionate phrase for the hundreds of northern businessmen and technicians who have come to Mississippi to take part in its progress. This economic transfusion of capital and know-how is bringing to the South the grandsons of Federal troops which fought and burned their way to victory. A prime mover in Mississippi's startling growth is Michigan-born Rex I. Brown, chairman of the Mississippi Power & Light Co. In Mr. Campbell's hometown, Kosciusko, Attala County, a bus company with headquarters in Lima, Ohio, is manufacturing an export order of 500 buses to carry the Mohammedan faithful of Saudi Arabia to Mecca.

Across the State, trim new houses line the good roads where new model cars whiz by. The magnificent contrast that is Mississippi is on every hand.

In Jackson, the State capital, is the gracious 114-year-old Governor's mansion, presently tenanted by two-term Gov. Hugh White, founder of Mississippi's balance agriculture with industry program and spearhead of the State's industrial development. On entering the majestic old building with white pillars, stately arabesques and hand-hewn four-poster beds where Jefferson Davis slept, the visitor meets a soft-voiced colored maid who asks, "Kin ah rest youah hat, suh?"

Down the street, carpenters, metalworkers, and plasterers are busy on a building that will soon house the modern offices of the Mississippi School Supply Co., Jackson unit of the office equipment and printing division which Mr. Campbell says is the tail of his company which wags the dog.

In this new South, the New Orleans Symphony plays to sellout crowds in Cleveland, a town of 5,000; the Little Theater flourishes everywhere; the church plays an intimate part in the life and thoughts of the people. The divorce rate is relatively low. Juvenile delinquency is little known. A psychiatrist or ulcer specialist could starve.

This serenity and progress has been achieved by what Boyd Campbell calls a sense of mission.

It certainly is the chisel that molded his life. Mr. Campbell believes, as deeply as he believes in his God, that a solid society must have these elements: Equal opportunity, a high educational level, an expanding economy, deep moral and spiritual roots, and a sense of civic responsibility. His is a "benevolent and productive nature," in the words of Mississippi's famous editor-author, Hodding Carter.

This is proven by his own well filled life. He has worked not only in the chamber of commerce, locally, in the State and Nation, but in the Rotary Club, the Boy Scouts (he holds the second highest award that can be made to an adult, the Silver Antelope, for his years of devotion to scouting), educational groups, as treasurer of the board of trustees of his alma mater and has represented his country at the International Labor Organization Conference last year at Geneva.

Mr. Carter, writing in the Delta Democrat-Times, reveals another side of this extraordinary man:

"Quietly, but with personal enthusiasm, he has worked to help the people of our State. He has been particularly interested in cultural improvements, and in helping the underprivileged. Several years ago he helped to sponsor a concert tour in Mississippi for Laurel's then unknown Negro soprano, Leontyne Price. More recently, he completely supplied with art materials a Negro youth in Greenville whose unusual talent in primitive type painting had been discovered by local artists. We know there have been many such examples, rarely given any publicity and most frequently unknown even to his friends and family."

Long before the Supreme Court was ruling on the educational opportunities for Negroes, Boyd Campbell was fighting with reasoning, charm, and compromise for better Negro schools.

The same sentiment was sounded by Maj. Frederick Sullens, veteran editor of the Jackson Daily News: "Boyd Campbell has never shirked a civic duty or failed a public responsibility. Always he has been alert to all opportunities to serve unselfishly the community to which he is so ardently devoted."

Boyd Campbell's life is the story of the new South. His grandfathers Boyd and Campbell were officers in the Civil War. (It seems that only northern orators speaking in the South refer to it delicately as "the War Between the States.") He can recall both of them, one who fought at Shiloh, the other at Vicksburg, as courtly white-

haired, bearded gentlemen who never discussed the war.

When the grandfathers were mustered out, Jackson had been burned to the ground. It was wryly called Chimneyville. The devastated land, looted of its treasures, run by alien conquerors, fell into a sleep where the glory of the past lived again. In 1897 when Boyd Campbell was 8 years old Jackson was a drab town of 5,000. The streets were unpaved and dusty. There was no sewage system.

The boy lived on a small farm belonging to the impoverished gentility, a class, it seemed, with no future. Even then he could see the economic erosion of the South. Adventurous boys ran away to "make a good livin'" in Oklahoma and Texas. Wagons, headed west, creaked past his door. Today, the grandsons and great-grandsons of many who deserted Mississippi are returning to find what their grandparents found in the West—better economic opportunity.

The Campbell farm was in the sloping hill country about 80 miles northeast of Jackson. Old timers there remembered his father as a gentle philosopher; his mother as an indomitable spirit who wanted good schools and community activities. Their son, the eldest of 5 children, combines the qualities of both.

Today, many relics of his childhood still stand by the side of quiet, dirt roads. The barn he built in his teens is sagging slowly to one side. Not far from the old post road, the Natchez Trace, is the one-room school where he learned his ABC's. It is a sturdy, unpainted structure made of cypress logs pegged together and hammered through with square-headed nails.

Another link with the past, the 83-year-old Bethel Methodist Church, still plays an important role in Boyd Campbell's life. His parents and grandparents rest in its small cemetery where cedars and oaks protect the simple, hand cut stones from the sun's glare.

This little church, whose door is never locked, is a haven for Boyd Campbell. He often returns alone to seek solace there. He has told friends, "When the way grows dark, I always come back to this churchyard. It is a place of peace where perspective is gained. Somehow, the tangled weave straightens out and becomes simple again."

Even in this simple rural community progress is evident. A short time ago, Mr. Campbell and a visitor from the North stopped at a filling station on the outskirts of Kosciusko. He cheerfully asked the attendant, "How's business?"

"It's sure good," the other replied. "They've just hired a lot more people at the bus company. They've got an order there to make several hundred buses to take the Ay-rabs to their holy place in Mecca."

Mr. Campbell turned to his companion with a delighted smile.

"There now is real grassroots economic education. This is something folks can understand a whole lot better than an academic discussion of reciprocal trade. The immense possibilities of world trade are a known fact to the people of Attala County."

Kosciusko also figures in an enlightening and educational experience of Boyd Campbell. A year ago at the ILO he met a Polish woman delegate. She woodenly parroted Communist propaganda and maintained a cold, even hostile, attitude toward him. This puzzled and ruffled him because one of his traits is an amazing capacity to win friends in an enemy camp. One day, at a committee meeting, he told her, "I want you to know that my hometown in America was named for a great Polish patriot, Kosciusko, who helped the United States gain its freedom."

Her eyes lost their coldness as she replied, "I knew you were sympathetic when I first saw you." As she turned away, he saw her eyes fill with tears.

When the conference ended, she shyly presented him with all she had to offer, a handsomely bound Polish propaganda book.

As a youth, Boyd Campbell attended Millsaps College at Jackson. It is a small Methodist school with a reputation for scholarship. He worked at a sawmill and in wheatfields to put himself through college. His father wanted him to be a lawyer but that required money which he did not have. There were brothers and sisters who needed his help in going to college.

His field of economic opportunity was limited, so he was led to teaching. He rose to school superintendent in the north Mississippi town of Grenada. There he met Miss Sara Louise Horton, who became his wife. (The light of their life is a red-haired daughter, Mrs. Sara Jane Harris, a junior leaguer, who married her classmate, Richard Harris. In New York where Richard was working for an investment house while completing advanced studies in finance at NYU at night, Sara Jane found an outlet for her social conscience as a volunteer worker with the sick and young in tenement slums.)

In the spring of 1919, Boyd Campbell came to a hard decision. He was disturbed by the slow progress of education in the State, and frustrated by his inability to shove it ahead. Teachers, he felt, were not accorded the status in the community which the importance of the profession warranted.

They were bypassed in civic affairs and community development. He feels that the same is largely true today. This passive role did not fit Boyd Campbell. He decided to leave the schools and go into some business close to education. He had been surprised, as a school superintendent, to find that all his supplies had to be bought outside the State. With $250 borrowed on his insurance policy and $9,750 from friends, he launched the Mississippi School Supply Co. in one small room. Today, it is the sturdy parent of office equipment, printing, school supply firms and retail stores in five Mississippi communities. His companies include the School Book Supply Co., the Mississippi Corp., a financing firm, and the Magnolia State Foundation, into which charitable contributions of the Campbell organization are channeled.

Boyd Campbell—"just a pencil peddler"—is actually much more. He is a member of the executive committee of the board of directors of the First National Bank of Jackson, active in its affairs, and proud of its new office building, Mississippi's largest.

Membership on the board of directors of the Mississippi Power & Light Co., the State's largest taxpayer, has been rewarding to him because of his association with a group of kindred spirits who work in season and out for industrial development and community building in the 44 counties served by the big utility.

He is a long-time member of the board of the Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad, a 3,000-mile carrier serving the Middle West and the gulf shore, and promoted the setting up of the G., M. & O.-Tigrett Foundation through which charitable and educational gifts of the railroad are channeled.

A northern business analysis firm studied organization of the Mississippi School Supply Co. and its affiliates and praised it as a model of efficiency and progress. The stores and shops, even the warehouse, are clean, neat, and attractive. They have a cheerful aura. Employees, from office boy to manager, greet the customer with smiles. An old lady from the country buying a 10-cent birthday card gets as much polite attention as a purchasing agent shopping for machines.

This is no accident. Boyd Campbell's business associates, from the least to the most important, are selected with great care; they are carefuly trained and shepherded over the rough spots.

When a promising young salesman hits the bottom the first time and is ready to go back to farming, Mr. Campbell works carefully behind the scenes to perk him up. He may even plant a sale. He says philosophically, "That big grin of self-confidence is worth money to the business."

This is not merely good business. Boyd Campbell has a genuine affection for young people, and tries to pick and mold them to be leaders of the new South. He told a friend, "The South has the greatest promise of any place in the world. But it is going to need stout helpers, leaders with brains, tolerance and understanding. The best work I can do is to provide a few of them."

Every one of his aids knows he is expected to take an active role in civic, religious, and business organizations, and to accept community responsibility. As a result, his staff is abundant with officers of local chambers of commerce, service clubs, Boy Scouts, school board, and churches.

A typical Campbell protege is a young man with a million-dollar personality. Tall, handsome, likable, he took honors in college and has a smart and beautiful wife. Soon after the boy came to work, Mr. Campbell found occasion for a serious talk with them.

He said kindly, "You've had it pretty easy, son, and that makes you careless sometimes. You are going to find that selling pencils will be a lot harder at times than making touchdowns or being class president. I think it would be better in the long haul if you would knuckle down, try hard to do everything the best you can and not rely on the sales that drift to you because you're a nice fellow or have a beautiful wife."

The girl said anxiously, "I'm so glad you said that. I feel exactly the same way."

He took Mr. Campbell's advice and did so well he has just been promoted to store manager. His wife whispered to Mr. Campbell the other day that they were expecting a child. His face lit up, and he said softly, "Now, that's the best word I've heard in a long time."

He meant it, too. This assured the community of a new generation of good leadership and moral responsibility.

How the Campbell employees feel about the boss was summed up by Jim Wilson, the Negro warehouseman who joined the company in 1920 fresh from the country. Jim says, "Mr. Campbell has been like a father to me. He stood by me in my time of trial. No better man ever lived. I'd like to stay with him until I die."

Weekly staff meetings, times for serious decision, are characterized by good-natured bantering. Jim Campbell, Boyd Campbell's younger brother and company president, takes the lead. Gus Ford, treasurer, is the most frequent target as is often the case with figgering men. Mr. Campbell affectionately refers to Randolph Peets, college mate and a few weeks his senior, as the company's "patriarch." The others came straight from Mississippi colleges to the company and grew up with it. This partly explains the spirit of camaraderie and intense loyalty that characterizes the Campbell team.

Boyd Campbell's main interest is education. He always says, however, "I'm not interested in education per se. My interest is in business—more and better business—and I know where to find it. It is always where there is the most education."

Education, to him, is the long-time answer to all the South's problems, from the racial dilemma to economics. He says, "In today's kind of world, unless we educate all the people, and educate them well, we have little chance to survive."

Since 1950 he has been chairman of the education committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and has

spoken repeatedly on the bond between business and education. He opposes Federal aid to education, although many of his best customers are ardent partisans for it. His solution is to reduce the Federal tax load so States and communities have more taxable income and to repeal local laws that restrict taxation for education.

On the difficult and delicate issue of segregation in the schools, he spoke words that commanded the respect of the Nation. He said:

"I believe that all thinking southern leaders realize that the Supreme Court's decision on segregation will not be reversed. Once this fact is accepted, the South can move more rapidly to the solution of vast problems which flow out of that constitutional decision. * * * In solving the multitude of problems now upon the South, the major goal is an improved public-school system for all children. Some have said that the Court's decision is the cocklebur under our saddles to keep us galloping toward the goal of better schools.

"As the South moves toward this goal, it will find that construction of more school facilities, improved teacher salaries, and reorganization and consolidation of outmoded school systems will become as important a force for social and economic betterment as the continuing southern industrial and agricultural revolution.

"No one has the final answer to integration, not even the Supreme Court, and all of us must grope for even the most tentative answers. These tentative answers will evolve from the wisdom and good will of thousands of southern leaders of both races working primarily at the community level.

"This prospect of years of complexities makes it mandatory that we freely discuss the problems and be willing to work toward the only goal upon which all should agree—maximum educational opportunities for all children."

Mr. Campbell has pioneered in bringing educators and businessmen together at business-education days, which he describes like this, "A day when business moves out of the counting house and education leaves the ivory tower and the two meet in an area of mutual interest and agreement; a day when students stay at home and teachers go to school to learn how good a job they are doing in training manpower for industry. They go to learn more about the economic system which picks up the bill for education. In due course, this day will be followed by education-business day when businessmen will go back to school to understand educational problems and to help reinforce the role of education in preserving a free society."

Mr. Campbell explained the feeling that moves the new team of southern leaders of business and industry thus:

"Community development does not come about by chance. It is the result of the price that the most enlightened spirits pay in long hours of thought, study, research, and work for what is best. What is best may not be a factory or a new payroll. It may be better health, better housing, and better education. Whatever it is, someone must take the lead. No one can lead better or further than the businessman. And when he does, he is not only being a good businessman and a good steward; he is exalting the great American tradition."

It is this kind of philosophy that Boyd Campbell brings to the presidency of the chamber of commerce of the United States. When the chamber directors notified him of his election, he said this reminded him of the words of a devout Negro who, when offered a new job, said prayerfully, "Lord, don't give me no job that is too big for You and me." Mr. Campbell added, "This job is too big for me, but not too big for all of us. The failures will be mine, the successes will be yours—and His."

That is the kind of a man Boyd Campbell is.

A Laboring Man Looks at Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very illuminating article entitled "A Laboring Man Looks at Labor," which was published in the Tablet, a Catholic newspaper, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LABORING MAN LOOKS AT LABOR

(By Joseph A. Byrd)

Perhaps this is heresy for me, a man with 25 years' experience in the field of labor, to want to speak for myself.

Yet the more I read of the pronouncements of high union officials and the more I read the pronouncements of so-called labor priests who stem from the social action department of NCWC the more I realize that unless someone from the actual ranks of labor does rise up and speak his mind, we will soon be completely submerged in the sea of "depersonalization."

For all practical purposes, the pronouncements of the union official and that of the labor priest are identical, though the latter insists that we accept a profile of papal thought instead of the full-faced view one gets from studying papal teaching in its entirety.

However, my purpose here is to present the convictions I have had forced upon me over the years and not primarily to refute certain individuals.

LAUDS WORK OF PRIESTS

Nor do I want people to assume that the vast majority of the labor priests are not doing a good and much needed job. However, it is not this vast majority that is heard from today.

I know from experience how many times these really good priests have had to step in and settle a bad situation that could have been avoided in the first place if the labor movement were truly Christian, truly trying to promote the good of the working man.

Nor do I pretend to be right in all of the opinions that I have formed.

I have formed these opinions the hard way, and to me at least they are worth more than those that have been formed on the basis of theory alone.

By this I do not mean to belittle theory, for theory first opened the way to experimentation and then to practice.

But the errors of theory are made clear by experience, and it seems to be the voice of actual experience that has been silenced in the discussion so vitally involving labor today.

In Rerum Novarum (p. 30 of the Paulist Press issue) we read this quotation from Scripture: "It is better that two should be together than one; for they have the advantage of their society. If one fall he shall be supported by the other. Woe to him that is alone, for when he falleth he hath none to lift him up."

Then Pope Leo XIII continues with "It is this natural impulse which unites men in civil society; and it is this also which makes them band themselves together in associations of citizen with citizen; associations which, it is true, cannot be called societies in the complete sense of the word, but which are societies nevertheless."

MAN IS FIRST OF ALL A MAN

This explains why men feel the need of banding together into a union, not because Pope Leo XIII said so or because the Scripture said so, but because it is a natural impulse to do so.

In my experience I have known very few men who would not rather belong to a union if that union met the minimum requirements of decency and honesty in its efforts to serve its membership.

At the same time I know very few men who would not rather maintain their union membership on a voluntary basis.

Before a man is a workman or a union member he is a man and as a man he has a right to liberty of conscience. I think that is what our American bishops had reference to in their statement issued November 22, 1953.

The bishops said: "Liberty in political life may be described as the condition in which the individual finds himself unhampered in the discharge of his duties and in the exercise of his rights.

"Liberty, however, is something more than a political phenomenon as some disciples of free enterprise maintain.

"It is something more mature than that dream of rights without responsibilities which historic liberalism envisioned; it is certainly different from that terrorism of responsibilities without rights which communism imposes.

"It is something wiser than free thought, and something freer than dictated thought. For freedom has its roots in man's spiritual nature. It does not arise out of any social organization, or any constitution, or any party, but out of the soul of man.

"Hence to the whole tradition of the Western World liberty does not come essentially from improved conditions of living, either political or economic, but is rather the spring out of which better conditions must flow.

"A free spirit creates free institutions; a slave spirit permits the creation of the tyrannical ones."

DESIRES LIBERTY OF CHOICE

So we are confronted here not only with a natural impulse to join ourselves into a union but we also have the natural desire springing from the very soul of man to have liberty of choice in the matter.

Having made this the basis of my labor relations with my fellow man, I have been amazed to the point of astonishment at some of the statements made in some Catholic publications and by Catholic priests.

On Friday, January 14, 1955, the St. Louis Register published excerpts from what must have been a long letter from Rev. Albert F. Danter, in which he said this: "The right-to-work laws make it impossible for unions to force laborers to join unions or to compel industry to hire only union workers."

In that one sentence Father Danter has expressed part of the present program of big labor: "Laborers must be forced to join labor unions no matter what their kind or complexion and industry must be compelled to use only union workers." This is not compatible with Catholic teaching.

Paragraph 93 of Quadragesimo Anno, by Pope Pius XI says, "Just as the citizens of the same municipality are wont to form associations with diverse aims, which individuals are free to join or not, similarly, those who are engaged in the same trade or profession will form free associations among themselves, for purposes connected with their occupations."

Not only does this clear papal thought impeach the reasoning of Father Danter as

he stated it, but it also makes it clear that these associations should have for their purposes aims which are connected with their occupations .

Besides, the social teaching of the Catholic Church is designed to save souls, to help and guide us when certain evils confront us, and to bring justice to the workingman. It is not designed as propaganda fodder for a union membership drive.

GOOD UNIONS NEEDED

Speaking either as a worker or as a union member my opinion is the same: So far as unions are concerned, at least, bigness is not a virtue, nor is so-called union strength a virtue.

Too many times have we seen this union strength misdirected to actually oppress the union worker.

There have been far too many Evan R. Dales and Callinans, too many Harry Bridges and Nathan Witts, too many Lee Pressmans and John Abts, too many James Matles and Julius Emspaks and far, far too many small fry who are willing to carry water for them in union circles. We need good unions, not strong or big unions.

Again we turn to Rerum Novarum (p. 32) and read the words of Pope Leo XIII: "Associations of every kind, and especially those of workingmen, are now far more common than formerly.

"In regard to many of these there is no need at present to inquire whence they spring, what are their objects, or what means they use.

"But there is a good deal of evidence which goes to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of invisible leaders, and are managed on principles far from compatible with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their best to get into their hands the whole field of labor and to force workmen either to join them or to starve.

"Under these circumstances the Christian workman must do 1 of 2 things: either join associations in which their religion will not be exposed to peril or form associations among themselves."

Msgr. George Higgins of the NCWC social action department, writing in my diocesan paper (January 30), tells us that this quotation is taken out of context; that it does not apply in the current right-to-work discussion. He said that this passage pertained to certain unnamed, anti-Christian organizations in the past.

I do not think Monsignor Higgins is wholly correct. In my experience I have found it much more frequent that the church will condemn an evil practice rather than an organization; that wherever such evil practice occurs it falls under the ban of Catholic principle.

Let us see if this passage is actually applicable in whole or in part to this situation.

Do we have a movement afoot to get "the whole field of labor" into the hands of a few and to force workmen to join their organization or to starve? Are these unions managed "on principles far from compatible with Christianity?"

ASKS MORE THAN LIP SERVICE

The time is fast approaching—to the point of being upon us—when we must consider honestly whether the policy of big union officials to pay lip service to papal labor teaching is sufficient to protect the spiritual welfare of Catholic workers.

Is not the promoting of the class struggle out of keeping with Catholic principles? Every papal encyclical on labor has condemned it emphatically.

Pope Pius XII said: "If the signs of the times are not misleading, the second phase of the social dispute, on which it appears we have already entered, confronts us with problems and tasks of a different nature. Two of these we shall now mention:

"The overcoming of the class struggle by an organic coordination of employer and employee, for class struggle can never be a goal of Catholic social ethics, since the church feels itself equally beholden to all classes and strata of the people.

"In the second place stands the protection of the individual and the family against their absorption by the state, a process of excessive socialization at the end of which looms the threatening nightmare of Leviathan.

"Against this menace the church will fight uncompromisingly because the highest goods human dignity and the salvation of the soul are jeopardized" (address of Pope Pius XII to Austrian Katholikentag in Vienna, September 14, 1952).

Let us turn to the present program enunciated by the leaders of our two gigantic unions. Under date line from Miami Beach, February 5 (AP), we read that Walter Reuther, David McDonald, and James B. Carey, of CIO, are holding a committee meeting with George Meany, William Schnitzler, and Harry C. Bates, of A. F. of L. to discuss union unity. The purpose of this union unity is stated in that article as follows:

"The union leaders say that by combining forces under a single banner they can build greater political power for organized labor, tougher economic strength against employers, and more efficient drives to sell unionism to unorganized workers."

I have before me my January 1955 issue of the Midwest edition of Steel Labor, the "voice of the United Steelworkers of America—CIO." On page 2 of this issue we read the comments of President McDonald, of the Steelworkers, on labor unity, which he considered a must for 1955.

QUOTES UNION LEADER

Giving a reason for the necessity of unity between these two gigantic labor organizations, Mr. McDonald said: "If we have a united labor movement, we can have united political action and we can go out in a more unified way to support those who will devote themselves in the halls of the legislatures for the good of labor and all the people."

I have read a lot of such stuff in the past 25 years and I see in this the hopes of our union leaders of forming a super labor party or at least to forge a club with which to bludgeon recalcitrant legislators. Again we see the underlying aim to be described by the words "force" and "compel."

Here we see in the making the very leviathan against which we were warned by Pope Pius XII and against which the church must fight uncompromisingly.

Political power is not a thing that will aid the individual worker, but on the contrary is a power which may be used to enslave him.

Nor does it seem to be anything but a contribution to the class struggle to enable the unions to enjoy a tougher economic strength for union officials against employers.

To the average worker it means that industry has already done its share. Wages are higher now than they have ever been in the history of the world. But at the same time taxes are correspondingly higher, thus draining off the savings or the potential savings of the individual worker.

We are now in the position that the average worker himself has to pay himself in higher prices and higher tax percentages for every raise that is being conceded by industry through tough labor policies.

We have also read a great deal across the country recently in Catholic press circles, which derive their information from the NCWC social action department, which in turn expounds the philosophies or the pseudo philosophies of the Catholic Association for International Peace, concerning this right-to-work legislation.

These writers have been given full swing in a number of Catholic papers, and in the St. Louis Register they have gone so far as to create the impression that such legislation was now pending in the State of Missouri.

This legislation was alleged to be immoral according to these reporters and columnists. Yet a check with the State Capital at Jefferson City, Mo., brought us this information which we quote:

"I am unable to send you a copy of the so-called right-to-work legislation, inasmuch as it has not been introduced in either house of the legislature."

SEES MISINFORMATION

Considering this fact, it is difficult to understand the waste of printed space in the St. Louis paper to fight an issue that does not exist. It was apparently a "trial balloon," perhaps an effort to head off such legislation.

If so, it was not pictured in that manner. It was pictured as an organized effort of the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce to fool the unsuspecting workingman and destroy the unions.

It is difficult to see how such an effort can be justified.

Apparently it was necessary to create a synthetic atmosphere in which arguments designed to aid the unions in their third stated objective—"for more efficient drives to sell unionism to the unorganized workers"—may be presented.

But if that is the case, the presentation degenerates to propaganda and seems entirely out of place in the Catholic press.

It misinforms Catholics not only as to an alleged present issue, but tries to indoctrinate the idea that Catholic social teaching aims at building up union membership.

This seems to bear out Pope Pius XII who, in his address to the Italian Catholic Association of Owners-Managers on January 31, 1952, said: "The great misery of the social order is that it is neither deeply Christian nor truly human, but only technical and economic.

"It is not at all built on what should be its basis and the solid foundation of its unity—viz., the character common to men of being men by reason of their nature, and also sons of God by reason of the grace of divine adoption." Here it seems to us that Pope Pius XII and Pope Leo XIII must have come to the same conclusions concerning social relations.

QUOTES POPE PIUS XI

But we might also consult Pope Pius XI. Let us read paragraph 130 of his "Quadragesimo Anno":

"Goods are produced more efficiently by a suitable distribution of labor than by the scattered efforts of individuals. Hence the Socialists argue that economic production, of which they see only the material side, must necessarily be carried on collectively, and that because of this necessity men must surrender and submit themselves wholly to society with a view to the production of wealth.

"Indeed, the possession of the greatest possible amount of temporal goods is esteemed so highly that man's higher goods, not excepting liberty, must, they claim, be subordinated and even sacrified to the exigencies of efficient production.

"They affirm that the loss of human dignity, which results from these socialized methods of production, will be easily compensated for by the abundance of goods produced in common and accruing to the individual who can turn them at his will to the comforts and culture of life.

"Society, therefore, as the Socialist conceives it, is, on the one hand, impossible and unthinkable without the use of compulsion of the most excessive kinds; on the other,

it fosters a false liberty, since in such a scheme no place is found for true social authority, which is not based on temporal and material advantages, but descends from God alone, the Creator and last end of all things."

However, we may hear the complaint that Socialists are not involved in this. This can only be claimed in a most restricted sense. George Bernard Shaw, the father of the Fabians, advocated that the name Socialism be dropped since it had fallen into ill repute. Our adversaries will claim that the Americans for Democratic Action are not Socialists—but in the restricted sense I have mentioned. "A rose by any other name is just as fair."

In the opinion of many Catholic workers, the advice given by St. Pius X, in his encyclical, "Singulari Quadan," given September 24, 1912, to German labor organizations ought to be brought into practice here.

It boils down to the recommendation that each Bishop in each diocese should pass on whether unions made up of both Catholics and non-Catholics in his jurisdiction are worthy of Catholic patronage.

GIVES PIUS XII'S STAND

It further recommends that Catholic unions should be formed and that all Catholic workers should belong to them as well as to the mixed unions that are granted ecclesiastical approval. Such a movement would certainly curtail the Evan R. Dales, the Nathan Witts and the Emspaks.

We earnestly urge all Catholics interested in the problem of labor to read this encyclical on labor by St. Pius X (Singulari Quadam, page 190 of "All Things in Christ," selected encyclicals and documents of St. Pius X by Rev. Vincent A. Yzermans, published by the Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1954).

Now we might bring our discussion up to date and see if our present Holy Father has had anything pertinent to say on the same subject. The following passages are taken in their entirety, lest I might otherwise be charged with taking them out of context; they are from the Christmas Message of Pope Pius XII given December 24, 1952 (pp. 54–56 of Six Social Documents of Pope Pius XII, Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Ind.).

Under the subheading, "Oppression and Persecution," we read the following:

"Consciences are today also afflicted by other oppressions. Thus, for example, against the will and conviction of parents, teachers are prescribed for their children.

"Again, access to employment or to places of labor is made to depend upon registration in certain parties or in certain organizations which trace their origin to the labor market.

"Such discriminations are indicative of a wrong concept of the proper function of labor unions and of their essential purpose, which is the protection of the interests of the wage earner within modern society, which has become more and more anonymous and collectivist.

"In fact, is not the essential purpose of unions the affirmation in practic that man is the subject, and not the object of social relations?

"Is it not their purpose to protect the individual against the collective irresponsibility of anonymous owners?

"Is it not to represent the person of the worker against those who are inclined to consider him merely as a productive agent with a determined price value?

"How therefore, can they consider it normal that the protection of the personal rights of the worker be more and more in the hands of an anonymous group, working through the agency of immense organizations which are of their very nature monopolies?

"The worker, thus wronged in the exercise of his personal rights, will surely find especially painful the oppression of his liberty and of his conscience, caught as he is in the wheels of a gigantic social machine.

"Whoever would think that this solicitude of ours for true liberty is without foundation when we speak, as we do, to that part of the world which is generally called the free world, should consider that, even there, first of all real war and then the cold war have forcibly driven social relations in a direction which ultimately curtails the exercise of liberty itself, while, in another part of the world, this tendency has reached the ultimate consequences of its development."

Certainly no one can say that these passages have been taken out of context, nor can they say that these passages apply to some nebulous group in some far distant age. They apply to us here and now and if we do not heed them now we will surely experience "the ultimate consequences of its evil development."

URGES REVIEW OF STAND

It is difficult to say what has caused some in Catholic press circles to take the stand that they have on right-to-work legislation. Certainly a review of their stand seems to be in order.

For them we would like to repeat the advice of Pope Pius XII given to those interested in Catholic principles that concern our social problems. In his radio address to the Austrian Katholikentag in Vienna, September 14, 1952, he said:

"We feel it incumbent upon us to exhort you and all Catholics anew, from the very outset of the new developments in the social dispute, to hew close to the clearly defined line of Catholic social teaching without deviating either to the right or the left.

"A slight deviation may at first seem inconsequential. However, in the long run, it would lead dangerously away from the right path, and entail disastrous consequences.

"Sober thinking, self-control, steadfastness in the face of temptations from extreme positions, accordingly shall be the watchword of the hour."

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present to you a brilliant report made by the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, United States Senator from Arkansas, national director and outgoing president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I commend this report to the reading of all of the Members of Congress and to the people generally who receive copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout the United States:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, OF ARKANSAS, NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 26, 1954

Officers and directors of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, delegates to its 41st national convention, and honored guests, I am happy that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress can now resume its annual convention sessions which were halted 4 years ago by a defense emergency, and I am especially pleased that so many delegates from all sections of the country are in attendance here today as I give to you this report of activities of the Congress since last we met.

You will recall that the fighting started in Korea 3 months to the day after our 40th session in May 1950 and thereafter all public-works construction except that of a defense nature was banned. In the light of this situation, our directors suspended the annual conventions until the emergency should be past.

In the spring of 1951, however, our officers and directors met together here in Washington, and invited a few leaders in our field to join us in discussions of policy and formulation of a plan of action to take while the Korean fighting went on. It was decided to continue the suspension of Congress meetings, and the project hearings, until such time as they might be expected to have more direct and profitable result.

Meanwhile, the national officers, not desiring to lose, during a sustained period of inactivity, the impetus gained from 40 years of progress, conceived the idea of holding regional meetings where rivers and harbors, flood control, and other water-resource projects pertaining to the particular area might be reexamined and, if so decided, kept in an active status.

Three such meetings were convened, and each was well attended and achieved some beneficial results. The New England States held an area meeting at Taunton, Mass., in May 1952; the Florida Waterways Congress was host to a regional meeting at Orlando in December 1952; and a statewide conference for the State of Illinois was held at Springfield in September 1953.

Out of these meetings came sound advice at the State and local level as to which projects might be laid aside, and which others might be retained and advocated at a later time.

Now we are met here in the 41st national convention of this body to consider many important matters concerned with the general subject of water resources, and to formulate our policies thereon. Much of the agenda was outlined in the call for this meeting sent out in March of this year. The subject set forth included: The urgent need for enactment of an omnibus flood-control and rivers-harbors authorization bill; the long-neglected maintenance of important rivers and harbors channels; the rapidly deteriorating merchant marine; the advisability of a sound program of public works to help absorb any slack in employment by reason of economic readjustments; and, despite the truce in Korea, recognition of the continued need for major expenditures in expanding and maintaining a strong national defense.

You have heard brilliant expositions of these topics yesterday by an impressive panel of speakers. Others are to follow, after which our projects committee will report its findings and recommendations as to the vast number of specific projects which were submitted and argued before it. Matters of general policy decisions will be laid before you in the resolutions committee's report.

Leading the list of officials who appeared before this Congress was the President of the United States. It is difficult to find exact words to express our appreciation for the interest that Mr. Eisenhower has shown in this program of conservation and development of the Nation's water resources.

This interest was first made manifest officially in the message to Congress on the state of the Union February 2, 1953, shortly after Eisenhower's inauguration, in which he called for a strong Federal program in the field of resource development. "Its major projects should be timed," he declared, "wherever possible to assist in leveling off peaks and valleys in our economic life. Soundly planned projects already initiated should be carried out. New ones will be planned for the future."

He urged that this program should not rest entirely on the shoulders of Federal bureaucracy, but rather should bring into partnership the States and local communities and private citizens, all working together. "This combined effort," he said, "will advance the development of the great river valleys of our Nation and the power that they can generate."

Reiterating the theme of partnership and joint responsibility in his state of the Union message in January this year, Mr. Eisenhower declared that the next fiscal year will see work started on 23 new projects which have met the Federal Government's requirements of economic soundness. Stating these would be built "with local sharing of cost wherever appropriate and feasible," he added: "The Federal Government will continue to construct and operate economically sound flood-control, power, irrigation, and water-supply projects wherever these projects are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, and consistent with the needs of the whole Nation."

This message also recommended enactment of legislation to strengthen agricultural conservation and upstream flood-prevention work, and to achieve a better balance with major flood-control structures in the downstream areas. It promised recommendations for the adoption of "a uniform and consistent water-resources policy."

In transmitting his economic report to Congress in January, President Eisenhower wrote that "our approach to a position of military preparedness now makes it possible for the United States to turn more of its attention to a sustained improvement of national living standards."

Pointing out that the backlog of desirable Federal, State, and local public works is counted in tens of billions of dollars, he emphasized that such programs should be so designed and executed as to contribute to economic stability, by being accelerated in slack times and restrained in boom times.

The report promised that effort will be devoted during the present year to "the large task of evolving truly integrated long-term programs of major Federal works in the fields of water and soil conservation."

With regard to the advance planning of public works, our own national vice president, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, has introduced a bill in Congress which would require the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Public Roads to report to Congress comparative figures on public works money for the year 1935 to 1941, and from 1945 to 1953.

The bill states that a massive public works program conceived to make war on a future depression would require years of planning to prevent loss of millions of dollars through the necessity for urgency and emergency action, in many cases authorizing public works which cannot be economically justified.

Great further encouragement in our aims is provided by the President's message submitted to Congress with the budget for fiscal year 1955. Here he speaks of budget provisions for helping to prevent the ravages of floods and soil erosion as one of the "constructive domestic purposes designed to strengthen the foundations of a stable and prosperous economy." Further, under the subject of tax proposals, it is recommended that deductions up to 25 percent of the farmer's gross income be allowed for soil conservation expenses on farms.

Under new legislative proposals, it is recommended that the sum of $3 million be authorized for cooperation with State and local agencies on watershed protection; and $10 million for aid for non-Federal development of water resources, with an added $400,000 for Federal projects.

The sum of $580 million is recommended to be obligated for civil functions of the Defense Department; in other words, for construction work of the Corps of Engineers. Net budget expenditures of slightly over $1 billion are estimated for 1955 in the category of "natural resources."

Here again it is pointed out that "a strong program of resource conservation and development is necessary to support the progressively expanding demands of our increasing population and to contribute to the economic growth and security of the Nation."

Budget recommendations provide for the continuation of river basin work now underway. Less urgent features of the projects, not required for operation of going or completed units, will be deferred. Budget expenditures of the Bueau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers include an estimated $443 million in fiscal 1955 to carry on construction of about 160 river basin development projects. A substantial amount of these expenditures is for multipurpose development for irrigation, flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power. During the year, 20 projects will be completed or substantially completed, including 9 flood control projects, 5 irrigation projects, and 6 multipurpose projects with power facilities.

The budget further recommends starting work on 6 irrigation and water supply projects, 8 local flood prevention projects, and 8 navigation projects. In addition, it provides for resumption of work on 2 flood control reservoirs and 2 river and harbor improvements. This work is estimated to cost a total of $184 million, with expenditures of $20 million scheduled for the fiscal year 1955. Together with the St. Lawrence Seaway, this totals 23 new projects and 4 resumptions in the budget.

I think you will agree with me this by no means is all that is to be desired. We need to make faster progress—but as long as our Projects Committee continues to hear as many applications as they had before them on Monday, however, there is no danger of a shortage of proposals to be considered by the Federal Government in the way of land and water resources development.

Additional work should be undertaken, the President's message said, with a view to strengthening our vital upstream conservation activities. Farmers increasingly realize that it is in their own interest to do more of this work. Because the Nation, as well as farmers and local communities receive benefits, this work should be a joint responsibility. Existing law, however, does not provide an adequate basis for cooperative upstread development.

The 1955 budget, therefore, includes $3 million under proposed legislation to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with local and State agencies in the planning and installation on small watersheds of the necessary protective facilities, and to provide for better conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water. This will supplement the $11 million to be spent under existing law for watershed protection and flood-prevention projects, but still this amount should be larger.

We approve and applaud the administration's policy toward public works construction, their permanent value to the national economy, their present value as defense spending tapers off to act as a deterrent to unemployment and recession, and the view that, wherever feasible, they should develop as a partnership of all responsible interests or those which may enjoy the benefits.

Improvements of internal waterways for navigation and for flood control not only have a beneficial economic effect to make our nation stronger, but they also effect beneficially the strengthening of our defenses. Particularly wise, we believe, is the resumption of flood-control works that are not completed, in order to avoid both the tragic waste from floods, and the loss of money already invested. Maintenance of navigation projects we consider foresighted action to provide water transportation to relieve congested railroads and highways, thus to prevent any future transportation delays which might adversely affect national defense efforts.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is pleased to find the administration in accord with its long-established policy favoring additional production of hydro-electric power, but opposing unnecessary Government competition with the private power industry in constructing such facilities. The budget report recognizes the "willingness of State and local groups to participate" in providing the power facilities, but states that where the necessary transmission facilities are not also being provided on reasonable terms, the Department of Interior will construct and operate them.

It is a source of great satisfaction to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to find itself continuing to work in the company of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. There seemed serious danger a while ago that civil functions might be removed from their roster of duties, and we would lose them as leaders, staunch allies and coworkers in this field. Fortunately, reason prevailed, and the Engineer Corps continues its supervision of navigation and flood-control projects, a job which it has done superbly for more than a century, a peacetime job much less spectacular but in the large sense as vital, as the great achievements of the corps in the works of national defense or helping to win a war.

We are greatly indebted to the distinguished Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Jr., for the interesting and valuable contribution he made to yesterday's program when he discussed the rivers-harbors and flood-control program.

Another Goverment agency with which we have learned to work together over many years is the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior, whose Secretary, Hon. Douglas McKay, honored us by attendance at this convention, and by his helpful presentation of his department's program of reclamation.

The great experience, expert techniques, alertness to improve their standards and methods in developing and utilizing our natural resources, of the Bureau of Reclamation, have certainly gained for them a reputation for competence which will reassure the United States Congress to believe that any moneys supplied to that Bureau will be completely justified and well expended. The same assurance should apply to any appropriations asked for the Corps of Engineers.

Another Cabinet officer who generously gave his time to appear before our Congress was the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, who discussed intelligently the soil-conservation program of his Department. This Congress has consistently supported the Agriculture Department's authoritative work on soil conservation, reforestation, and upstream watershed control. We support the future program in this field and oppose any change in it, unless perhaps it should come by way of expansion.

Foreign trade is much in the minds of nations throughout the world today, perhaps only secondary to the questions of war and peace. A vital factor in all considerations of expanding the trade of any nation is its merchant marine. A strong, effecient, modern American merchant marine is indispensable to development of our trade with world countries, to the preservation of our domestic economy at high peak in peacetime, but also it has been, and shall continue to be, an invaluable aid to national security in a national emergency, a vital factor to success in time of war.

We should like to urge upon the United States Congress that there appears united

sentiment throughout the country to support the development and mainetnance of our water-transportation facilities, as essential to our prosperity, with particular reference to the water carriers in the foreign trade, the domestic coastwise and inland waterways, the shipbuilding and repair facilities, and the maintenance of adequate harbors on our expansive coastline to service fully the commerce of our Nation.

The brilliant pages of history written by the American merchant marine during World Wars I and II were substantially augmented by further performance during the Korean emergency when American-flag vessels were available to serve the United Nations interests.

The United States, with its present world leadership in industry, finance, agriculture, and other fields, must continue to be a leading maritime nation. It must never have to depend upon foreign-flag shipping for bottoms to carry its exports, nor to aid its national defense.

Now, for a few moments before closing, I should like to talk about our organization and its future. After having served for 10 years as your president, I have not stood for reelection this time. This afternoon you will hear the names of your new directors. All 21 offices were vacant because we have not been able to hold elections for some time. With a wholly new board of directors in office, you shall be off to a flying start toward a richer and broader future. These directors shall meet and select a new president, and to him I wish to extend in advance my greatest good wishes, and a cordial pledge of cooperation, and the hope to be of further service to him and to the Congress whenever either shall call upon me.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is a body which moves quietly, avoids criticism, and performs wonders. It should have the unqualified and continuous financial support of all interests and individuals who realize the long-range vitality of America is measured by our evaluation of the land and water resources so generously given us by Providence.

Transportation depends in part upon our inland waterways, our barge lines; the harm of devastating floods can be halted by measures of control; soil erosion and the dust bowls can ruin agriculture or, by proper measures, can be brought under control; foreign trade depends upon navigable harbors and inland waters, as well as the open seas; irrigation can bring desert lands into production of food; impounding of flowing waters and building of dams and hydroelectric plants brings light and power for manifold uses to the city, and the farm dwellers.

All these, and many more, conservation activities are the zealous concern of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Their work is fortunately at present in general accord with expressed policy of the Federal Government. This is a time for forward progress on all fronts. I wish you all every possible success in your part of this tremendous program, for America's sake.

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill dealing with the use of chemicals in foods.

This bill represents an effort to modernize our Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act on a practical basis. The principal accomplishment of the bill is to close the loophole in the present law. This is done in two ways: First, by requiring the pretesting of food additives and food-packaging materials before they can reach the public; and second, by requiring the industry to submit a report of its pretesting to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare before marketing the new food additive or new packaging material. Although responsible companies follow the practice of pretesting, the present law is deficient in that it is legally possible for untested materials to reach the consumer.

The primary purpose of the bill is to protect the public health. I believe this has been done, and reasonable safeguards have been established. Other factors which vitally affect the national welfare have been given careful consideration. For example, although the bill provides for a reasonable degree of practical control over new products of the food, packaging, and chemical industries, it also sets up balances which will prevent the stifing of research and competition in these important industries.

This bill provides a different approach than the Insecticide Act which I introduced in the 83d Congress. The reason for this is quite obvious. Many insecticides must be highly toxic in order to be effective. Food additives, however, do not present the same toxicity danger, and the possibility of a seriously hazardous food additive reaching the consumer is somewhat remote. Industry, as a whole, has performed an excellent and conscientious service by observing high standards of scientific testing before placing new additives in commercial channels.

The procedures established in this bill adequately serve to protect the public health, without requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to write and issue licensing regulations covering the use of new food additives or new packaging materials. The bill provides practical control mechanisms for the Secretary, without permitting strangulation of industrial research by capriciousness in the Department.

Outstanding representatives of science, industry, and Government have devoted many hours of thought and study to the legislative problems posed by the tremendous progress being made in this field. The bill attempts to incorporate the commendable features of legislation that has been proposed during this session of the Congress. It also attempts to meet many of the more serious objections to these bills.

The bill applies to all new food additives. By definition, however, substances generally recognized among experts as being without hazard to the public health in their present uses are excluded from its operation. Pesticide chemicals are specifically excluded, and new packaging materials are treated separately.

Under procedures established in the bill, before marketing a new food additive, the industry or person must file a report of investigations to show safety with the Secretary. The report contains, generally, all pretesting data and all pertinent information bearing upon the new food additive. The Secretary must render an opinion on the basis of the data before him within 120 days after the report is filed. If the Secretary renders a favorable opinion or fails to act within the allotted time, the applicant may proceed to market the additive.

If the opinion of the Secretary is unfavorable there are several courses which may be followed:

(A) The applicant may request a public hearing in the Department. After the hearing the Secretary shall enter a final order based upon the evidence adduced. Appeal from this order lies with the circuit court of appeals.

(B) Either the Secretary or the applicant may request an advisory committee, to be selected from representatives of science, industry, and Government under procedures outlined in the bill. This committee is so composed as to combine scientific knowledge with the approach of commerce and government.

(C) The applicant may elect to market the additive at the risk of having an injunction proceeding brought against him by the Secretary.

Several courses remain open in the event an advisory committee is requested by the Secretary or by the applicant. If the report of the committee is favorable to the applicant and is affirmed in an order by the Secretary, the applicant may proceed to market the product. If the report of the committee is favorable but the Secretary does not acquiesce, the applicant may either request a public hearing, appeal the order to the circuit court of appeals, or place the product on the market at the risk of an injunction by the Secretary.

If the report of the committee is adverse, the applicant may use the public hearing and appeal remedy; or the applicant may, in the alternative, proceed to market at the risk of injunction, but here the bill gives to the Secretary the benefit of a presumption that the new food additive would present a reasonable likelihood of hazard to the public health, and the burden falls upon the applicant to prove otherwise.

It should be pointed out at this stage that the applicant may withdraw the report at any time, and the Secretary may likewise modify or withdraw any opinion for cause.

New packaging materials have been treated separately in the bill because the potential hazard from packaging materials is very much less in degree, in that only trace contaminations generally may be involved. The bill does provide, however, that a report of investigations to show safety must be filed and, if the Secretary is of the opinion that the material presents a reasonable likelihood of hazard to the public health, the main sanctions of the bill shall be applied.

This bill attempts to reconcile the many divergent and conflicting points of view relative to regulation of the use of chemicals in foods. It is my belief that this legislation will meet the needs of dynamic, growing industries, and will provide a system of adequate controls, with the public health paramount. It is in this interest that the bill is submitted.

Apple Blossom Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Adams County Fruit Growers Association, in Biglerville, Pa., is having its annual festival, Apple Blossom Time, this coming weekend. Members who wish to take a pleasant and enjoyable drive on Saturday or Sunday are cordially invited to come to Adams County, follow the special signs, and drink in great beauty by touring along the Apple Blossom Trail.

Within 8 miles of Gettysburg are located heavy concentrations of orchards. To reach the trail follow United States Highway No. 240 to Frederick, Md., and then follow U. S. 15 to Gettysburg. From Gettysburg follow any of several routes to the Apple Blossom Trail, all of which will be adequately marked.

Once you have reached Pennsylvania, however, the spring beauty will be well worth the trip, whether you find the formally marked trail or just tour the countryside.

As a part of my remarks, I include a brief history of the development of the apply industry in Adams County:

ADAMS, THE APPLE COUNTY

Adams County, with its 2 million bushel apple crop, is a vital part of the Nation's apple industry. Nestled against South Mountain, in the Appalachian Mountain range, the country's fruit belt is concentrated in a crescent-shaped area of approximately 80 square miles across the northern section and south through the western part of the county.

The first commercial orchards were planted near Arendtsville in the late 1880's, the largest of which was approximately 10 acres. Fifteen years later these orchards came into bearing and Adams County was on its way to becoming a fruit producing area. Pioneer growers were plagued with disease and blight, and in many cases entire orchards were wiped out by disasters which agricultural science had no way of combating.

But Adams County's orchardmen discovered one important factor that changed their farm operations completely—soil and climatic conditions were conducive to fruit production. The rolling slopes of the Blue Ridge Mountains provided natural protection from damaging frosts at blossomtime, and the fertile soils possessed natural drainage formations on which fruit trees thrive.

Early commercial orchards were planted with an eye on the rich European markets—a trade that continued to flourish until the early thirties when export tariffs made overseas shipment impractical for American producers. However, almost simultaneous with the maturity of county orchards came the establishment of commercial apple processing plants in Adams County to encourage orchardmen to increase plantings and to seek scientific assistance in the protection and development of healthy, highly productive trees.

MANY FORTUNES LOST

Many fortunes were lost in the fruit industry between 1920 and 1935 because of world conditions, but with the industry's concentrated program toward consumer-consciousness, markets became stabilized in proportion to orchard production.

Today, some 300 Adams County growers own about 15,000 acres of apple orchards, many of them planted in third generation trees. In the course of progress many so-called sport varieties of apples have been planted for greater consumer acceptance. Orchards are set according to public demands, and orchardmen frequently plan their building programs on a percentage basis which includes early varieties, eating varieties and processing varieties. Because of the very nature of the different varieties, harvests are constant from late August until late November when winter freezes make their appearance.

One of the many important facts growers have learned in the past 50 years is that trees must be set with pollination in mind, which explains why—at harvesttime in particular—an orchard may bear fruit of contrasting colors. Yet, while some varieties are self-pollinating, thousands of bee colonies are imported during the blossom season to insure successful pollination of blossoms.

FIVE POPULAR VARIETIES

Most popular varieties of apples produced in Adams County are York Imperial, Stayman, Golden Delicious, Rome Beauty, and Red Delicious. These are acceptable in either fresh or processing markets because of their versatility. The Red Delicious continues to be the Nation's favorate eating apple, while the Stayman is popular in both eating and cooking circles. Golden Delicious has a flavor that appeals to the most sensitive taste, yet, along with Rome Beauty, is also a fine cooking apple. York Imperial, used primarily for processing, provides whole firm slices for baking and cooking. Inasmuch as the popularity of certain varieties is more prevalent in some consumer areas than others, buyers temper their stocks to local eating habits.

An estimated third of Adams County's apple harvest is packed for fresh consumption; the other two-thirds is delivered to processors. As recently as 10 years ago, growers with substantial crops maintained their own packinghouses, where fruit was packed in barrels or baskets. The individual packinghouse, however, was crowded out of the local picture during the war because of labor shortages, and today only a few of the largest growers operate packing facilities. Several commercial packers serve growers for fresh market outlets, and commercial sales agencies market supplies in excess of private sales.

CHOICE FRUIT STORED

Thousands of bushels of choice apples are placed in the various cold storages in the county for distribution as late as April and May. Many of these are repacked by merchants and distributors in pliofilm, mesh, or custom-made paper bags to answer still another demand of the consumer—the demand for smaller, more convenient household packages.

INVESTMENTS HEAVY

As the agriculture industry goes, fruit growers have extremely heavy investments in their operations. Trees do not reach maturity in less than 15 years, but the grower devotes thousands of dollars to the development of these plantings, for they must be pruned, fertilized, fed and protected from disease and pest damage. Equipment necessary in the operation of an orchard is intricate and expensive, and growers estimate a minimum investment of $15,000 in machinery and equipment. Depending upon the size of the operation, this investment could easily triple. Rising costs have forced growers to greater efficiency of operation and management. In Adams County irrigation systems have made their entry as still another means of meeting consumer and industry challenges. Growers who have installed such systems have invested another $10,000–$15,000 in pumps, pipes and ponds to combat droughts.

So far, science has been unable to develop harvest equipment to replace the thousands of men and women fruit pickers. Many of these people are almost professional pickers, careful to protect fruit from bruises and handling damage. Extreme care is necessary in the orchard to protect fruit from sunburn. Harvested fruit is run over graders to provide uniformity of size before it is ready for market.

TWO-THIRDS PROCESSED

Adams County's 3 apple processing firms, with 5 plants located within a radius of 15 miles, process about two-thirds of the normal crop into slices, sauce, vinegar, butter, cider and prepared pie fillings. Different varieties are required for different commodities, thus consuming a part of each variety's harvest starting September 1. Each of these companies maintains cold storage facilities so that the processing season normally extends well into late winter, and all have national distribution of processed apple products.

Adams County is famed also for its cherries and peaches. About 5,000 acres are planted in these fruits. About half of the country's red sour cherry crop is packed in local processing plants for shipping throughout local and foreign markets. The Montmorency variety of cherry has been developed as the most acceptable sour cherry for this purpose. The county produces thousands of bushels of peaches, the large percentage of which are placed in fresh markets. A highly perishable crop, peaches demand more of the growers' attention at harvest than either of the other two fruits. Within recent years, processors have packed local peaches on a large scale.

While apple blossoms dominate the blooming season in the county, cherry and peach blossoms are a definite contribution to nature's unusual sight every spring, complementing the delicate coloring of apple blossoms with pure white and deep pink blooms.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 81st Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 9	do	Present.
3	Jan. 18	do	Present.
4	Jan. 19	do	Present.
		H. R. 5330, authorizing economic aid for the Republic of Korea:	
5	do	On recommittal to Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and hearings. (Defeated, 190 to 194.)	Yea.
6	do	On passage. (Defeated, 191 to 193.)	Nay.
7	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
8	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 161 to 255.)	Yea.
9	do	H. Res. 133, amending rules of House by repealing 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules. (Defeated, 183 to 236.)	Nay.
10	Jan. 23	Quorum call	Present.
11	do	do	Present.
12	do	do	Present.
13	do	do	Present.
14	do	do	Present.
15	do	Motion ordering the previous question, thus ending debate on H. Res. 217, providing for the consideration of H. R. 331, a bill to provide statehood for Alaska. (Passed, 373 to 25.)	Yea.
16	Jan. 25	Quorum call	Present.
17	do	do	Present.
18	do	do	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Jan. 27	do	Present.
21	do	do	Present.
22	do	do	Present.
23	do	do	Present.
24	do	do	Present.
25	Jan. 30	do	Present.
		H. J. Res. 398, increasing the cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended:	
26	Jan. 31	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 136 to 239)	Not voting.
27	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Present.
28	do	Motion that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with. (Defeated, 104 to 271).	Nay.
29	do	Quorum call	Present.
30	do	do	Present.
31	do	do	Present.
32	Feb. 2	do	Present.
33	do	do	Present.
34	do	do	Present.
35	Feb. 6	do	Present.
36	Feb. 7	do	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	do	do	Present.
39	Feb. 8	do	Present.
		H. R. 2945, increasing certain postal rates:	
40	Feb. 9	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 150 to 218.)	Yea.
		S. 2319, authorizing economic assistance to Korea and certain parts of China for a period ending June 30, 1950:	
41	do	On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce amount of authorization from $60,000,000 to $20,000,000 and limiting amount advanced by RFC from $30,000,000 to $10,000,000. (Defeated, 137 to 239.)	Yea.
42	do	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 134.)	Yea.
43	Feb. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
44	Feb. 15	do	Present.
45	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved, 257 to 82.)	Yea.
46	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 97 to 236.)	Nay.
47	Feb. 15	Motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday. (Defeated 94 to 238.)	Nay.[3]
48	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 109 to 218.)	Nay.[3]
49	do	Quorum call	Nay.
50	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 126 to 198.)	Nay.[3]
51	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under call of the House. (Approved, 243 to 102.)	Yea.[4]
		S. 2734, promoting the rehabilitation of the Navaho and Hopi Indian Tribes and provide for a better utilization of the resources of their reservation:	
52	Feb. 21	On amendment extending State laws to cover certain offenses to the Navaho and Hopi Reservations. (Defeated, 142 to 196.)	Yea.
53	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
54	do	do	Present.
55	do	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 127 to 278.)	Nay.
56	do	Motion to dispense with the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday and prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 121 to 285.)	Nay.
57	do	Quorum call	Present.
58	do	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Approved, 290 to 115.)	Yea.
59	do	Motion to adjourn and thus prevent consideration of H. R. 4453 (FEPC). (Defeated, 127 to 284.)	Nay.
60	do	Motion to consider H. R. 4453, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. (Approved, 287 to 121.)	Yea.
61	do	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 165 to 239.)	Nay.
62	do	Motion to consider H. R. 4453. (Approved, 270 to 134)	Yea.
		H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin (FEPC):	
63	do	On amendment inserting the text of H. R. 6841 providing for voluntary compliance and removing the compulsory provisions of H. R. 4453. (Adopted, 221 to 178.)	Yea.
64	Feb. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4453, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin:	
65	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 177 to 239.)	Nay.
66	do	On passage. (Passed, 240 to 177.)	Yea.
67	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	do	Present.
69	Feb. 28	do	Present.
70	do	do	Present.
		Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing point bill):	
71	do	Motion to send to further conference. (Adopted, 240 to 144.)	Yea.
72	do	Motion to table a motion instructing House conferees to insist on amendment of the House. (Adopted, 210 to 161.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5953, authorizing contributions of $1,229,240 to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc. (CARE), to supply educational and scientific equipment and material to European libraries:	
73	Mar. 1	Motion to strike out the enacting clause, thus killing the bill. (Adopted, 265 to 163.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4846, creating a National Science Foundation to support and initiate scientific research:	
74	do	On motion to recommit to the committee for further study. (Defeated, 134 to 240.)	Yea.
75	do	On passage. (Passed, 247 to 125.)	Nay.
76	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Absent.
77	Mar. 3	do	Present.
78	do	H. R. 331, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union. On passage. (Passed, 186 to 146.)	Yea.
79	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
80	Mar. 7	H. R. 49, providing statehood for Hawaii. On passage. (Passed, 262 to 110.)	Yea.
81	do	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 4406, establishing an International Claims Commission for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States and American nationals against foreign governments:	
82	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 209 to 165.)	Nay.
83	do	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 2023, regulating oleomargarine and to repeal certain taxes relating to oleo:	
84	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 262 to 106.)	Nay.
85	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 87, providing promotions for veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department. On passage (Passed, voice vote.)	
86	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
87	do	do	Present.
88	do	H. Res. 481, making in order the consideration of H. R. 874, providing a grant of $36,400,000 to the States for Public Library Service Demonstration. (Adopted, 209 to 140.)	Nay.
89	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 874, providing a grant of $36,400,000 to the States, for Public Library Service Demonstration:	
90	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 162 to 176.)	Yea.
91	do	On passage. (Defeated, 161 to 164.)	Nay.
92	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
93	do	do	Present.
94	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 3247, amending the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934 of the District of Columbia:	
95	do	On motion to consider bill. (Rejected, 69 to 241.)	Nay.
96	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
97	do	do	Present.
		Conference report on S. 1008, defining the application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing-point bill):	
98	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 175 to 204.)	Nay
99	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
100	do	H. R. 4703, relating to the internal security of the United States by tightening safeguards against espionage and sedition, on passage. (Passed, 368 to 2.)	Yea.
101	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing the cotton and peanut-acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938:	
102	Feb. 22	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. (Defeated, 116 to 225.)	Yea.
		S. 2105, to provide subsidies to certain mines for the exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals:	
103	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 155 to 161.)	Yea.
104	do	On passage. (Defeated, 144 to 166.)	Nay.
105	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7057, relative to deductions by land-grant colleges of certain estimates of cost presented to the Veterans' Administration:	
106	do	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 245 to 101.)	Yea.
107	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7402, to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate income families, and for other purposes.	

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950	H. R. 7402—Continued	
108	Mar. 22	On amendment deleting middle-income housing section. (Adopted, 218 to 155.)	Yea.
109	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 261 to 10.)	Yea.
110	Mar. 23	H. Res. 482, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 248 to 12.)	Yea.
		Conference report on H. J. Res. 398, increasing cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.	
111	...do...	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 197 to 156.)	Nay.
112	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
113	Mar. 24	...do...	Present.
114	...do...	...do...	Present.
115	...do...	H. Res. 518, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 7797, providing foreign economic assistance. (Adopted, 262 to 22.)	Yea.
116	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
117	...do...	...do...	Present.
118	Mar. 27	...do...	Present.
119	...do...	...do...	Present.
120	Mar. 28	...do...	Present.
121	Mar. 29	...do...	Present.
122	Mar. 30	...do...	Present.
123	Mar. 31	...do...	Present.
124	...do...	On motion to recommit with instructions to strike out title III. (Rejected, 150 to 220.)	Nay.
125	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 287 to 86.)	Yea.
126	...do...	H. Res. 531, providing for House agreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 1758, amending the Natural Gas Act. (Adopted, 176 to 174.)	Nay.
127	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
128	...do...	...do...	Present.
129	...do...	...do...	Present.
130	...do...	...do...	Present.
131	Apr. 4	...do...	Present.
132	Apr. 5	...do...	Present.
	...do...	H. R. 7846, authorizing Army, Navy, and Air Force to contract for plans and specifications and to take options on sites, to expedite construction of rental housing on defense posts. On passage (passed, voice vote).	Present.
133	Apr. 19	Quorum call	Present.
134	...do...	...do...	Present.
135	...do...	...do...	Present.
136	Apr. 20	...do...	Present.
137	Apr. 21	S. J. Res. 166, providing for posthumous award of appropriate medals to crew of plane who lost their lives over the Baltic Sea in performance of their duty. (Adopted, 333 to 0.)	Yea.
138	...do...	Quorum call	Absent.
139	Apr. 24	...do...	Present.
140	Apr. 25	...do...	Present.
141	Apr. 26	...do...	Present.
142	Apr. 27	...do...	Present.
143	...do...	...do...	Present.
144	May 1	...do...	Present.
145	...do...	...do...	Present.
		H. R. 7185, providing open competitive examinations for veterans for position of apprentice in the Federal service:	
146	...do...	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 209 to 93.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6354, authorizing District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia:	
147	...do...	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 194 to 87.)	Yea.
148	May 3	Conference report on H. R. 5472, authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. (Adopted, 210 to 137.)	Nay.
149	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
150	May 1	Conference report on H. R. 1243, amending the Hatch Act relative to penalties for violations of this act by Federal civil-service employees. (Adopted, 203 to 140.)	Nay.
151	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
152	...do...	...do...	Present.
153	May 6	Motion to adjourn. (Defeated, 98 to 170)	Not voting.
154	...do...	Quorum call	Absent.
155	May 8	...do...	Present.
156	May 9	...do...	Present.
157	May 10	...do...	Present.
		H. R. 7786, making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951:	
158	...do...	On Gore amendment increasing the funds for grants for hospital construction under the Public Health Service from $75,000,000 to $150,000,000. (Adopted, 258 to 131.)	Nay.
159	...do...	On Case amendment reducing funds for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration by $2,930,000. (Adopted, 222 to 163.)	Yea.
160	...do...	On Thomas amendment as amended by the Taber amendment specifying certain percentage reductions of nonmilitary operation expenditures effecting a reduction of $600,000,000. (Adopted, 274 to 112.)	Yea.
161	...do...	On Jensen amendment reducing number of Federal employees by not filling vacancies that occur in certain civilian agencies. (Adopted, 201 to 185.)	Yea.
162	...do...	On passage of bill. (Passed, 362 to 21.)	Yea.
163	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
164	May 15	...do...	Present.
165	...do...	...do...	Present.
166	...do...	...do...	Present.
167	...do...	H. Res. 567, providing for the consideration of H. R. 5990. (Adopted, 194 to 32.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5990, providing for construction, development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway as a part of the District of Columbia park system:	
168	...do...	On motion for consideration of bill. (Adopted, 192 to 29.)	Yea.
169	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7941, amending and supplementing the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for the construction of highways:	
170	May 19	On passage. (Passed, 246 to 34.)	Yea.
171	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
172	...do...	Conference report on H. R. 7797, extending the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 and authorizing program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. (Adopted, 247 to 88.)	Yea.
173	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
174	June 6	...do...	Present.
		H. R. 7468, omnibus claims bill, for relief of sundry claimants:	
175	...do...	On adoption of amendment deleting title III, for relief of Harry Tansey. (Adopted, 184 to 119.)	Yea.
176	June 13	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 143 to 227.)	Yea.
177	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 202 to 163.)	Nay
178	June 21	Conference report on H. R. 6567 increasing $2,000,000,000 the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. (Adopted, 235 to 81.)	Not voting.
179	...do...	Conference report on S. 3181, extending the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 by providing 6-month extension and giving local governing bodies the option of continuing rent control for another 6 months. (Adopted, 176 to 145.)	Not voting.
180	June 22	H. J. Res. 334, amending certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations by increasing United States share of expenses in 5 international organizations. (Adopted, 209 to 91.)	Nay.
181	...do...	H. Res. 649, making in order consideration of S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. (Adopted, 232 to 61.)	Yea.
182	...do...	S. 2269, providing for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. On passage. (Passed, 201 to 84.)	Yea.
		Veto by the President on H. R. 87, relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
183	June 26	On motion that bill and message be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed. (Rejected, 115 to 165.)	Nay.
184	...do...	On overriding veto. (Overridden, 213 to 72 (⅔ majority necessary).)	Yea.
185	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
186	June 27	...do...	Present.
187	...do...	H. R. 6826, extending the Selective Service Act of 1948 to July 9, 1951. On passage. (Passed, 315 to 4.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8920, reducing excise taxes:	
188	June 29	On recommittal to Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report it back as 2 separate bills, the 1st bill containing those provisions relating to excise taxes and the 2d bill containing the remaining provisions of H. R. 8920. (Rejected, 147 to 238.)	Yea.
189	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 375 to 14.)	Yea.
		S. 3550, extending import-control authority over fats and oils and rice and rice products for a 1-year period from June 30, 1950, but discontinuing authority to control import of coconut oil:	
190	...do...	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment to include import control authority over coconut oil and cheese. (Rejected, 72 to 264.)	Yea.
191	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
192	June 30	...do...	Present.
		S. 3336, providing for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico:	
193	...do...	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with amendment providing that an islandwide referendum shall be held in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. (Defeated, 1 to 260.)	Nay.
194	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
195	July 10	...do...	Present.
196	...do...	...do...	Present.
197	...do...	H. Res. 647, disapproving Reorganization Plan 27, creating a Department of Health, Education, and Security. (Passed, 249 to 71.)	Yea.
198	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8083, authorizing the Export-Import Bank of Washington to guarantee United States private capital invested abroad:	
199	July 12	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 156 to 184)	Yea.
200	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 195 to 151)	Nay.
		H. R. 7439, to protect the national security of the United States by giving power to summarily dismiss employees for security reasons to Attorney General, Secretaries of State, Commerce, Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force and Treasury, and Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:	

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950	H. R. 7439—Continued	
201	July 12	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing an additional right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission from any action by the heads of such agencies or departments. (Defeated, 144 to 193.)	Nay.
202	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 327 to 14)	Yea.
203	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
		S. J. Res. 2, proposing constitutional amendment abolishing Electoral College and apportioning count of electoral votes in proportion to actual vote in each State:	
204	...do....	On motion to suspend rules and pass the bill. (Defeated, 134 to 210 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 502, continuing until June 30, 1951, the exemption of certain import taxes on copper:	
205	...do....	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed, 283 to 58 (two-thirds vote necessary).)	Yea.
206	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
	...do....	H. R. 8763, giving Government right to sue for damages in violations of Clayton Antitrust Act and fixing statute of limitations at 6 years:	
207	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
208	...do....	H. R. 10, facilitating the deportation of undesirable aliens from the United States and providing for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of United States. On passage. (Passed, 325 to 15.)	Yea.
209	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
210	July 19	S. 3809, extending the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 and authorizing appropriations therefor through the fiscal year 1951. On passage. (Passed, 362 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 2822, amending the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and increasing the insurance coverage of individual deposits by the Corporation from $5,000 to $10,000 and simplifying the computation of the assessments charged insured banks:	
211	July 20	On amendment authorizing $15,000,000 for a site and a new building for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. (Defeated, 90 to 227.)	Nay.
212	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
213	July 24	....do....	Present.
		H. R. 6454, authorizing the appointment of 2 additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois:	
214	...do....	On motion to recommit to the committee with instructions to reduce from 2 to 1 the number of judges to be provided by the bill. (Defeated, 116 to 163.)	Yea.
215	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 110.)	Nay.
		H. R. 6240, authorizing the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana:	
216	...do....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to provide that the judgeship created by the bill be temporary. (Defeated, 102 to 171.)	Yea.
217	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
218	July 27	....do....	Present.
219	July 31	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 120 to 179.)	Yea.
220	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
221	Aug. 3	....do....	Present.
222	Aug. 4	....do....	Present.
223	Aug. 7	....do....	Present.
		H. R. 8396, authorizing President to grant financial assistance to States and local governments in major disasters:	
224	...do....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to report bill with an amendment providing for congressional approval of such grants. (Defeated, 25 to 232.)	Nay.
225	Aug. 9	On motion to recommit. (Defeated 145 to 233.)	Yea.
226	...do....	H. R. 7009, making permanent the temporary district judgeship in the eastern and western districts of Missouri. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 133.)	Nay.
227	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9176, to provide for defense production and economic controls:	
228	...do....	On Spence amendment providing authority to stabilize prices and wages by either voluntary controls or by establishment of ceilings. (Adopted, 393 to 3.)	Yea.
229	...do....	On Wolcott amendment exempting new construction from credit controls. (Adopted, 202 to 188.)	Yea.
230	...do....	On Wolcott amendment limiting control of credit to consumer credit and real-estate credit. (Defeated, 173 to 224.)	Yea.
231	...do....	On Cooley amendment deleting from the bill provisions relating to control of commodity speculation. (Adopted, 198 to 194.)	Nay.
232	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 383 to 12.)	Yea.
233	...do....	H. Res. 749, citing Julius Emspak for contempt of Congress by reason of failure to answer questions before Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 372 to 1.)	Yea.
234	Aug. 14	Motion to adjourn. (48 to 274)	Nay.
		H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services:	
235	...do....	On motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 667, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8195. (Adopted, 248 to 81.)	Nay.
	1950		
236	Aug. 14	S. 192, conferring jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties. On passage. (Passed, 295 to 4.)	Yea.
237	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8195, rescinding the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services:	
238	Aug. 16	On amendment directing that other essential postal services shall not be curtailed or terminated by reason of the bill and authorizing appropriation of sufficient funds to restore former postal deliveries. (Rejected, 159 to 213.)	Yea.
239	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 111 to 261.)	Yea.
240	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 264 to 108.)	Nay.
		Conference report on H. R. 6000, extending and revising the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system and amending the public assistance and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act:	
241	...do....	On motion to order previous question on motion to recommit. (188 to 186.)	Yea.
242	...do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 374 to 1.)	Yea.
243	...do....	H. Res. 716, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6277, giving military discharges to the members of the Russian Railway Service Corps. (Defeated, 91 to 242.)	Nay.
		H. R. 7570, providing for the appointment of 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio:	
244	Aug. 17	On motion to recommit to committee until such time as any vacancies existing in the northern district of Ohio have been filled. (Defeated, 142 to 146.)	Yea.
245	...do....	On passage. (Defeated, 133 to 148.)	Nay.
246	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
247	...do....	....do....	Present.
248	Aug. 23	....do....	Present.
	...do....	H. R. 8850, creating 2 additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:	
249	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 123 to 222.)	Yea.
250	Aug. 24	H. R. 3775, providing for an additional district judge for the 3d division of the District Court for the District of Alaska. On passage. (Passed, 196 to 147.)	Nay.
251	...do....	H. R. 9477, providing allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services and suspending certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. On passage. (Passed, 361 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8677, providing for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal and to reconstitute the agency charged with the civil government of the Canal Zone:	
252	...do....	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to amend bill to provide that no tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in coastwise trade of the United States. (Defeated, 20 to 330.)	Nay.
		S. 456, authorizing the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of an additional public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia:	
253	Aug. 25	On motion to recommit to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for further study and investigation. (Defeated, 124 to 226.)	Nay.
254	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 7786, making appropriation for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951.	
255	Aug. 26	On passage. (Passed, 311 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 868, providing for dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry.	
256	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3357 to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.	
257	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
258	...do....	H. Res. 826, making in order consideration of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 357 to 1.)	Yea.
259	...do....	H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, barring Communists from Government jobs, requiring labeling and identification of Communist propaganda, denying passports to members of the Communist Party and prohibiting contributions by Government officials to Communist front organizations. On passage. (Passed, 354 to 20.)	Yea.
260	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
261	...do....	S. 4029, providing for authorizations, through which the Armed Forces can meet the demands for additional personnel in the medical, dental, and allied categories to support the expanding forces without requiring the large scale call to active duty without their consent of Reserve officers who have had substantial periods of service in World War II. On passage. (Passed, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
262	...do....	H. Res. 834, citing Edward A. Rumely for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 183 to 175.)	Nay.
263	...do....	H. Res. 835, citing William L. Patterson for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to the Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 238 to 106.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 81st Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1950		
264	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
265	...do	...do	Present.
266	...do	H. Res. 836, citing Joseph P. Kamp for contempt of Congress for failure to furnish certain information to Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. (Adopted, 215 to 115.)	Yea.
267	...do	Quorum call	Present.
268	...do	H. Res. 818, providing for consideration of S. 784, for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Co. (Defeated, 139 to 159.)	Nay.
269	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
270	Sept. 13	...do	Absent.
271	...do	...do	Absent.
272	Sept. 14	H. Res. 842, providing for sending H. R. 8920, tax-revision bill, to conference: On motion ordering the previous question. (Rejected, 106 to 226.)	Nay.
273	...do	On Eberharter amendment requiring the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee to report a bill to levy an excess profits tax before the adjournment of the 81st Cong. (Adopted, 331 to 2.)	Yea.
274	...do	H. Res. 847, providing for sending H. R. 9490, Communist-registration bill, to conference. (Adopted, 324 to 9.)	Yea.
275	...do	Veto by President of H. R. 6217, providing out-patient treatment for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection: On overriding veto. (Overridden, 321 to 12.)	Yea.
276	...do	Veto by President of H. J. Res. 238, providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence: On overriding veto. (Overridden, 307 to 14.)	Yea.
277	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9646, amending the National Security Act to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army George C. Marshall to the office of Secretary of Defense.	
278	...do	On passage. (Passed, 220 to 105.)	Nay.
	Sept. 18	S. 2609, providing a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States:	
279	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
280	...do	Conference report on H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. (Adopted, 303 to 20.)	Yea.
		Conference report on H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1951:	
281	...do	On motion to concur in Senate amendment dispensing with bonds for imported seasonal agriculture labor. (Defeated, 160 to 172.)	Nay.
		S. 3437, to strengthen the Atomic Energy Act by increasing the salary of the Commissioners and by establishing 3-year term of office for General Manager and amending patent provisions.	
282	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
283	...do	...do	Present.
		Conference report on H. R. 9526, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1951—motion to concur	
	1950	Conference report on H. R. 9526—Continued	
		in an amendment of the Senate cutting off all aid to countries that ship commodities that may be used in manufacture of arms to Russia or its satellites with a House amendment providing that such aid should be cut off upon determination by the National Security Council that such trade is against the best interests of the United States:	
284	Sept. 21	On ordering the previous question. (Ordered, 167 to 149.)	Nay.
285	...do	On concurring and adoption of amendment. (Adopted, 286 to 30.)	Yea.
286	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
287	...do	Conference report on H. R. 8920, increasing individual and corporate income taxes and closing certain loopholes. On adoption of report. (Adopted, 328 to 7.)	Yea.
288	...do	Veto by President of H. R. 9490, protecting the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations. On overriding veto. (Overridden, 286 to 48.)	Yea.
289	Dec. 5	Quorum call	Present.
290	...do	H. R. 9827, Excess-Profits Tax Act of 1950. On motion to recommit with instructions to increase the average earning credit and to increase the corporate surtax rate by 5 percentage points. On adoption. (Defeated, 145 to 252.)	Yea.
291	...do	On passage. (Passed, 378 to 20.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9763, to extend and amend the Housing and Rent Act:	
292	Dec. 7	On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Defeated, 153 to 223.)	Yea.
293	...do	On passage. (Passed, 221 to 152.)	Nay.
294	Dec. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9853, to furnish relief policy assistance to Yugoslavia. On motion to recommit with instructions to furnish aid on a loan basis similar to that provided Spain. On adoption. (Defeated, 76 to 173.)	Yea.
295	...do	On passage. (Passed, 225 to 142.)	Yea.
296	Dec. 15	Quorum call	Present.
297	Dec. 20	H. R. 9798, to authorize a Federal civil-defense program. On motion to consider: On adoption. (Adopted 297 to 0.)	Yea.
298	...do	On passage. (Passed 247 to 1.)	Yea.
299	Dec. 21	Quorum call	Present.
	1951		
300	Jan. 1	...do	Present.
301	...do	...do	Present.
302	...do	S. 3295, to amend the Railway Labor Act relating to union contracts and agreements for deductions from wages of railway employees. On question of consideration. (Agreed, 286 to 48.)	Yea.
303	...do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3295 to amend Railway Labor Act. On motion to recommit with instructions.	
304	...do	On adoption. (Defeated, 61 to 284.)	Nay.
305	...do	On passage. (Passed, 292 to 52.)	Yea.
306	Jan. 2	Quorum call	Present.
	...do	H. R. 5244, for the relief of Charles J. Trees. (Conference report.)	
307	...do	On adoption. (Adopted, 219 to 127.)	Nay.

Reclamation Faces a Crucial Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., on Monday, April 25, 1955. This editorial indicates many difficult problems that are not adequately explained and offers excellent recommendations for further development of reclamation. The editorial is as follows:

RECLAMATION FACES A CRUCIAL BATTLE

Attacks on the upper Colorado River storage project—by southern Californians, by eastern advocates of government retrenchment, by various other groups—have reached a dinning crescendo in the last few days.

The motive of the southern Californians is easily understandable. They have grown rich because Government dams have enabled them to use vast quantities of water from the Colorado. If they can prevent the building of upstream dams, the use of water in the upper basin always will be small and more water will be left in the river for California's benefit.

Southern California's selfish attitude is not likely to win many votes in Congress. It is regretted even by some of the Congressmen from northern California.

More damaging, perhaps, are new attacks launched against reclamation in general which are being used in an effort to defeat the upper basin storage project in particular.

These emphasize a number of themes which Raymond Moley, the one-man gang of Newsweek magazine, has been harping upon: reclamation is a boondoggle; it takes money from eastern taxpayers for the benefit of favored localities in the West; it increases farm production when we already have surpluses; it is uneconomical and a fraud on the Nation.

It probably is no accident that just at this time the Reader's Digest has published an article, Dollars Into Dust, by Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, and Holman Harvey which takes the Moley thesis and goes on to reach the conclusion that reclamation, except the reclamation of southern brushlands and swamplands, should be ended now, once and for all.

Mr. Miller, who developed a myoptic view of reclamation while doing task force work for the first Hoover Commission, authored another article a few years ago in which he attacked the Colorado-Big Thompson project. One of his complaints—which the new article repeats—was that the Big Tom was supposed to cost $31 million and turned out to cost $159 million.

He may be able to impress eastern readers with arguments of that kind but Coloradans know there are good reasons for the increase in cost. They know, for example, that the $31 million figure did not include many features of the Big Tom project which it was found desirable to add to original plans. They know that a World war, with tremendous inflationary results, intervened between the planning of the project and its completion.

They also know that the Big Tom proved its worth, not only to Colorado but to the nation, in period of last year's big drought when it saved crops on hundreds of thousands of acres.

In Dollars Into Dust, Mr. Miller and his associate put their emphasis on irrigation phases of the proposed upper basin storage project. An uninformed reader might get the impression that irrigation is virtually the only purpose of the project.

The authors argue that water devoted to industrial purposes yields a monetary return 50 times greater than the return from water devoted to irrigation but they fail to mention that the storage dams are necessary regardless of whether the water behind them is used for industry or for farms.

They fail to say anything about the industries which are certain to spring up to use the power generated at the upper basin dams. They give no hint of the fact that the storage dams will provide more domestic water for the growth of cities.

Actually, Colorado is as much interested in developing water reserves for industrial purposes—such as the processing of oil shale—as it is in storing water for irrigation but one would never guess it from The Reader's Digest article.

Messers Miller and Harvey quote figures worked up by the Tax Foundation to the effect that if the upper basin storage project is built, New York taxpayers would have to pay $271 million "to subsidize food surpluses their population does not need," Illinois and Pennsylvania taxpayers would have to pay about $152 million each, etc., etc.

This, of course, is an attack on the entire idea of reclamation. It rests on the narrow view that ony the man who takes water from a reservoir benefits from the investment in the dam.

Theodore Roosevelt and other founders of reclamation policy, had a broader view and for that the Nation may be thankful. They saw that we had water resources that were being wasted into the sea and that we had land which was of little value to individuals or to the country as a whole unless it was irrigated.

"The reclamation and settlement of arid lands," Mr. Roosevelt said, "will enrich every portion of our country, just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States."

In approximately 50 years, about $2.4 billion has been spent by the Federal Government on reclamation in 17 States. It is a modest, though profitable, investment. We spend that much on national defense in a month.

The reclamation investment has created 7 million acres of new farmland. Most of the crops grown on reclamation projects are not among the surplus crops of which Mr. Miller and associate complain.

Reclamation lands have grown $10 billion worth of crops in 50 years. They have produced $225 million in electric-power revenues. The immediate areas which have been made to thrive because of reclamation have paid $3 billion in Federal taxes since 1916.

Retail sales in reclamation States exceed $40 billion a year. In 1951 reclamation States bought more than 1½ million railroad carloads of goods from the East. Since then purchases have increased. There is not a corner or hamlet of the Nation which has not benefited from western development and without reclamation many productive parts of the West would still be desert.

We who have seen the benefits—local, regional, and national—that reclamation has brought have not done an effective job of telling the story to the rest of the country. We have assumed, mistakenly, that everyone knew it. We must speak up, and fast, if the storage-project bill is to be saved in this session of Congress from assaults such as Mr. Miller and his associates have made.

Report on American Press and Radio Executives' Tour of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

BARSTOW PRINTER-REVIEW,
Barstow, Calif., April 1, 1955.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: We have returned from the American press and radio executives' tour of Europe, including parts of Asia Minor and Africa. We felt greatly honored when you gave of your busy time to receive us in Washington. We felt more than flattered when you asked for a report, including our opinion of reciprocity from the many European nations.

In general we talked only to the top echelon in the countries visited. We did not go out and interview the peasant in the field. However, we believe we obtained a fairly accurate and representative viewpoint. Ordinarily we were briefed by our American Ambassador and his staff of experts the first day, and by the host country's top officials the second day.

Germany is 100 percent for the United States, and will reciprocate in every way possible. They like the American occupation forces. They regard us not as dictators of a conquered country, but rather as liberators and preservers of the peace. They feel that should the occupation forces be withdrawn today, Russia will take over tomorrow. Chancellor Adenauer is opposed to neutralization even though it would mean reunification. The Russians would move in at once. This is no idle threat. Remember the American airlift, when Russia tried to take over Berlin?

Austria is also 100 percent for reciprocity with the United States. They are rebuilding their economy and hope to be self-sufficient.

Yugoslavia is an unknown quantity. We are assured by their Government officials that Yugo is very much appreciative of the aid that the United States has given. They have signed pacts within the Western Powers. However, Stalin believed that Yugoslavia was with him, but in 1949 Marshal Tito arbitrarily severed relations. This country is very important, both strategically and politically to the Western Powers. It is expected, hoped, and believed that Yugoslavia will side with us and the Western Powers, but it all depends on one man—Marshal Tito.

Turkey is 100 percent for us.

Egypt intends to stay neutral, regardless of whether she is attacked by Russia or other outside powers. Right now she is greatly annoyed about the Israel incident, and the part that the United States played or did not play in this. She realizes and frankly states that without United States aid she would have never pulled through.

Greece is 100 percent for us. She frankly admits that without United States aid she would have fallen to the Soviets. She also is annoyed, not seriously, because the United States has not taken a more positive stand on the Cyprus question.

Italy will do everything they can to reciprocate with the United States. After the war, the elections turned up a 40-percent Communist vote. Italy would have gone to Russian dominance were it not for United States aid, and she realizes and appreciates this.

France wants to be independent, but is appreciative of our aid. Their Governments are changing so fast and so often that it is hard to get a definite commitment.

England is 100 percent in accord with the United States. They faced three major crises since the war's end, and in each case they state they pulled through only because of the help they received from the United States.

We can vote you or any other elected official out of office at the next election. We are free to write what we choose and to express our views in our newspaper. In the United States we have had the four freedoms since 1776. Our American heritage is something that we take for granted. We have a democracy. We had never realized how the divine right of rule by kings was taken for granted in Europe. With a few exceptions democracy is unknown in Europe.

Yugoslavia is a dictatorship, where the voter may vote yes or no on one candidate. Austria and Germany will soon become republics in fact, but today their government is subject to the occupation forces. Turkey became a republic in 1923, but the first free election was not held until 1946. Egypt was ruled by King Farouk. Then on July 26, 1952, came the revolution and the military took over. There are no free elections in Egypt today and the press is under censorship. Greece is better off but is still under a constitutional monarchy. Italy had no free elections until 1949. The common people in these countries just do not and cannot understand the right of the people to rule. They have been accustomed for endless centuries to be ruled by the classes. We are taking movies of the trip. We feel a picturesque scene is that of a beautiful palace in the background with a poorly dressed and overloaded peasant in the foreground. Through the centuries there has been untold wealth among the classes and extreme poverty among the masses. The summer palace of the Austrian emperors is beautiful to behold. With its expensive tapestries, the marvelous paintings, its own chapel, the immense ballrooms, and the handcarved and gold plated furniture, it must represent a cost of some $100 million. But these palaces were built at the expense of millions of peasants living in sub-sub-standard living conditions. These peasants lived, and many of them live that way today, in straw huts with dirt floors. They are fortunate if they have an oil lamp. They earn anywhere from $120 to $300 a year. It takes them at least 5 months to buy a new outfit, including suit, shoes, shirt and underclothing. Consequently, they cannot buy clothes. Their money must go for food. Their clothes are patched and repatched from generation to generation. Suffering from malnutrition, with a background of centuries of divine right of rule, they have no ambition to rise above their existing level. Our slaves were far better off. When a southern plantation owner paid $500 for a male Negro, he had an investment to protect. He saw to it that his Negroes were adequately fed and housed and received adequate medical care. Such is not the case in Europe. In Egypt today, 1 out of 4 babies die before it reaches the age of 5, and those that survive may have eye and other diseases that stay with them for life. "But," one person asked us, "Why don't these persons rise above their surroundings? Abraham Lincoln did." Lincoln had a mother that could read and write. He had access to books. In Egypt 80 percent of the people

are illiterate. Their parents cannot teach them, and they may be hundreds of miles from any literature. In Turkey there are no railroads today and few roads. We were told that in Egypt there were only three schools. In Berlin the United States built and gave to the city the first public library in the country of Germany. There is an optimistic side. Egypt under its new 5-year program plans on 4,000 schools or 1 for every village. They plan on a high school in every town and also 6 colleges and 3 universities. King Farouk who cooperated with the British lived an immensely wealthy life. We asked to see his palace. "Which one?" they asked. "He had six of them." He also had 2 dozen Cadillacs, a marvelous Nile River steamer and a beautiful oceangoing yacht. The military took over July 26, 1952, and has been ruling the country since.

Turkey also gives promise of developing. They are planning on numerous schools, developing roads and railroads, making themselves self-sufficient and raising the standard of living.

How about American aid? One of our party was much incensed that the United States had spent $1¼ million for a library in Berlin. Others did not like the $4 billion figure spent on the point 4 program in Egypt or the $12 billion spent in Italy. There were, of course, additional billions spent in France, England, and Germany. A lot of American taxpayers' money has been spent. Has it been worth it? We have to go back to President Roosevelt's remark, "Our frontier is now on the Rhine." Then we should reread Wilkie's One World. We crossed the Atlantic Ocean in a civilian plane in 7 hours. Today, as you have realized long before this dawned on us, there are no boundaries. We are all one world. Having seen the extreme desolation and utter destruction in Berlin, we thank God that such a thing has not happened in the United States, but it could. Jet bombers with nuclear fission bombs could devastate our country easily. To be frank, Greece would have admittedly fallen to communism if it had not been for United States aid. With Greece in the Soviet fold, Yugoslavia would never haved dared to break with Russia. Italy was ripe for a change. It voted 40 percent Communist in 1949. The five satellite countries plus these three would have given Russia a tremendous hold on Europe. It is entirely conceivable that without United States help, the major portion of Europe would be under Russian influence. Austria and Germany certainly would have been under the Russian banner.

We think the United States money that has been poured into Europe has been repaid several times over, and the United States is leading the way to seeing that another world war will never occur, if it can possibly be prevented.

Europe has been a constant battleground for centuries, ever since it existed. In Germany, we saw many statues of Prussian generals extolling them for conquering France. In France, we saw many statues of French generals extolling them for conquering Germany. This is true of all Europe. It seems to have been the ambition of every country's leaders to conquer another country. So there was warfare back and forth. One country would conquer another. Then a generation later the other country would conquer the first. This was done at the expense of the masses, who were in a state worse than slavery. These monuments to us are sickening. We hope and pray that we never have them in this country.

We saw the pyramids. They are beautiful. We saw all the effects from King Tut's tomb. Not 1 gold casket, but 3, and not 1 beautiful box but 3 to hold these triple caskets. The furnishings were elaborate. Those rulers, even 4,000 years ago, lived in splendor and luxury while the masses starved. Thank God it cannot and will not happen in these United States.

Russia is going to be interesting to watch. Stalin was secretary-general of the party, which is the absolute ruler of the country. In addition, he was Premier. He had the secret police spying on the army, and the army spying on the secret police; he had a civilian, a good party member, at the head of the army. Stalin was unbreakable.

Malenkov took over and under some delusion that the premiership was all powerful, relinquished his control as secretary-general of the party. He also abolished the secret police but still kept the NKVD. The party was and is all powerful and Malenkov was deposed. Marshal Bulganin was appointed Premier, but Nikita Khrushchev as secretary-general of the party is still all powerful. However, something new has been added. The army is now headed by army officials. Stalin would never, never have permitted this. It is conceivable, and in Russia anything is conceivable, even though improbable that the army might take over, and the Russian army believes in peace.

There is no chance that the satellite countries will overthrow their Soviet domination. The Russians have increased their military strength from 40 to 80 divisions. They have intermingled Russian troops with satellite troops. They have an excellent spy system and are fully prepared to put down any insurrection before it occurs.

We feel you know all of this. It is like telling a professor that the English alphabet is composed of A, B, and C but there are our opinions.

We were impressed with everyone we met. However, there are a few that we believe stood above the rest and particularly impressed us:

Adenauer, Chancellor of Germany. He is some 79 years of age and the question is who will replace him. There is no one. He has been solely responsible for the success of the German republic. Almost single-handedly he put over the Paris peace pacts. He is responsible for the German Republic of today.

Nasser, President and Premier of Egypt. He is only 37 today. He engineered at the age of 34 the military revolution that deposed King Farouk. He is sponsoring the 5-year program for Egypt that will make Egypt self-sustaining. His tenure in office depends on the military.

Byroade, United States Ambassador to Egypt. He is young and deals with and has the confidence of the young men ruling Egypt today. He has a military background and can speak the same language that the military rulers of Egypt do. He made a special trip down the Nile and in spite of a previous dinner engagement took time out to receive us at 6 p. m. Sunday. The State Department is to be congratulated on his appointment.

Anthony Eden, now Minister of Foreign Affairs of Great Britain and slated to be the next Prime Minister. His informal attitude and his off-the-record talk made all of us feel that we had known him for ages.

We have some marvelous men in our State Department. We were vastly impressed with all of our ambassadors and their staffs. We met them at the briefings, but got far better acquainted with them at the inevitable receptions that followed.

In this world of today, what is happening? What is being done to secure world peace? Are the American dollars being spent in a worthwhile manner? We read about U. N., NATO, SHAPE, and other alphabetical symbols; what do they mean? Tie them all together, and we believe they mean a sincere effort toward world peace and possibly realization. First is U. N., or United Nations, which ties in all the leading nations of the world. Separate from this, but organized under the provisions of chapter 51 of U. N., is NATO, or North Atlantic Treaty Organization, consisting of 14 countries. Germany will be the 15th. NATO, with 100 divisions, 4,000 jet planes, and hundreds of airports, is organized to strike back immediately in case of aggression. They can hold for 30 days, during which time the nations affected will have time to mobilize. Now, all these pacts are for defense only, not aggression. Cooperating with NATO is the Western European Union. We were briefed on all these, and could write much more than this brief outline. Now the Honorable John Dulles is organizing Asia into a mutual-defense pact. Of interest is the Iron Curtain. The Russian sectors and zones of Austria and Germany are not behind the Curtain, and travel from the allied zones to the Soviet zones is unrestricted. The Iron Curtain is bordered by the five satellite countries and Russia itself. We did fly over it, and 18 members of our party continued on to Russia. The border is a cleared strip with all trees, brush, and obstacles removed. It is plowed in most cases every night and the strip watched for footprints. Many sections have electrically charged barbed wire. It is also planted with land mines and has holes like bear traps dug. There are towers along the Iron Curtain, and bloodhounds patrol the border. A neat trick of the Russians is to have a false border some 2 miles inland in certain parts of the area. The escapee crosses this false border and then rushes to the nearest uniformed guard to ask where the refugee station is. The guard, who is a Russian officer, turns him in.

The trip has been a great experience for us. We are trying to give you an idea of the tour and our opinions through this account, and we thank Heaven that we were born in the United States where we have freedom of speech, the right to vote, and have a standard of living that is unbelievable to the masses of Europe. There is a great deal more that we could tell you, but we have very briefly tried to cover the highlights.

Cordially,

CARYL KROUSER, *Publisher.*

Albert L. Hammer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in Grand Rapids, Mich., today they are celebrating Albert L. Hammer Day. Mr. Hammer has served as secretary of the Rotary Club there for 40 consecutive years. He was selected for that position in 1915 at the age of 32 and has held the office ever since. He has given unselfish devotion to this public service.

Mr. Hammer is actively employed as a certified life underwriter, and with his wife, Dora, has reared four children. He has been a member of a number of church choirs, and has conducted the choir of East Congregational Church. He is an ardent sportsman enjoying golf, fishing, and bowling. Mr. Hammer has been, and is, a good, solid American. He is the kind of citizen of which any community may be proud.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the proclamation issued by the mayor of Grand Rapids designating April 23 as Albert L. Hammer Day:

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas this month, April 1955, one Albert L. Hammer, a resident of Grand Rapids, Mich., is observing his 40th consecutive year as secretary of the Grand Rapids Rotary Club; and

Whereas Rotary International consists at the present time of more than 9,000 clubs situated in 89 countries and political subdivisions, with a membership exceeding 400,000 members of different races, creeds, and nationalities over the face of the globe; and

Whereas no other individual has ever served so continuously and for such a great length of time, thereby investing Albert L. Hammer with the distinction of being the oldest living secretary in point of service of the entire Rotary world, or any other service club; and

Whereas the Grand Rapids Rotary Club, organized in 1913, with charter No. 77, by taking cognizance of this unique fact by honoring their secretary at their regular meeting on Thursday noon, April 28, 1955, a recognition he so richly deserves:

Therefore I, George Veldman, mayor of Grand Rapids, do proclaim and set aside this day in said city of Grand Rapids, as Albert L. Hammer Day, and so do set my hand and seal.

GEORGE VELDMAN,
Mayor of Grand Rapids.

APRIL 28, 1955.

Boone County Pays Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week it was my privilege, along with many of my Hoosier colleagues, to attend a breakfast here sponsored by the REMC's of Indiana. A special feature of the breakfast, in addition to the appearance of Vice President NIXON, was the presentation to the Rural Electrification Administration of a check in final payment of United States Government loans to Boone County (Ind.) REMC.

The presentation, made to Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of REA, represented the final payment by the Boone County REMC of Federal loans totaling $772,926 over a period of 20 years.

This was, in my mind, somewhat of an historic occasion. Next month, we will observe the 20th year of operation of the Rural Electrification Administration. The question automatically presents itself: Has REA been worthwhile?

The Boone County experience convinces me that the answer must be a definite "Yes."

The Boone County REMC obtained its original loan from REA on November 4, 1935, in the amount of $567,926. Subsequently, additional loans were approved, totaling an additional $160,000. These loans have now been repaid in full. Interest charges totaling $182,937.14 also have been paid, so the Federal investment has been a profitable one. Meanwhile, the Boone County REMC has provided electrical service for a total of 3,528 individuals and firms, mainly rural. Source of the supply of power has been, I might point out, private rather than public and the REMC has found it both possible and profitable to maintain this relationship with private suppliers.

The Boone County experience, it seems to me, provides solid evidence of the soundness of the rural electrification program in this Nation. And certainly it proves, too, that the management of the Boone County REMC has been both provident and successful in its operation.

It is my privilege and pleasure at this time to call the attention of the Members of this House to two brief speeches by officials of the Boone County REMC, Mr. Paul Morton, board president, and Mr. H. E. Antle, manager. The speeches follow:

ADDRESS BY PAUL MORTON

The Boone County REMC directors and manager are here today for a somewhat unique reason. It is unique in the fact that we came to Washington not to ask for some definite consideration. I think you, as Members of the Congress, will agree that the lack of such is within itself at least a little unusual. We are here, though, to voluntarily give something to one of the departments of the Government—a check. This check is a payment that we are making without the least reluctance on our part, which is also somewhat unique. It is the final payment on the loan granted for our electric distribution system.

It is certainly not my purpose to bore you with a long list of events, dealing with the history of our cooperative, but would like to give a few highlights of the development. The original allotment was made July 22, 1935, in the amount of $567,926. This was to build 567 miles of line and serve 2,200 consumers. Since that time there were 5 other loans of $25,000, $54,000, $25,000, $32,000, and $24,000, respectively. That brought the total advance from REA to $727,926. Besides the advance from REA the members have invested from margins $508,292 back into the system. That makes a total of $1,236,218 that has been used in building the plant. At the present time there is a total of 770.74 miles of primary line serving 3,528 consumers. The first line was energized on May 22, 1936.

We are extremely pleased with the financial condition of the cooperative. Besides making the final payment of the loan, we have other investments as follows:

Invested in Government bonds to match the meter deposits made by the members	$34,621.00
Invested in Government bonds and Treasury certificates or almost one-fifth of the depreciation reserve	104,060.00
In bank deposits which is sufficient for normal operation of system	35,507.52

We have an ample and attractive home office and all of our mobile and other equipment is in excellent condition. There is a definite reason why this has all been possible. The average service bill in February 1955 was $12.32 for 508.9 kilowatt-hours, compared with $2.68 for 43.5 kilowatt-hours in January 1938. That is an increase of almost 1,200 percent.

Admittedly Boone County, Ind., has had some advantages which to some degree have helped in the marked accomplishment. It is a rich agricultural county. Density and power utilization are high. The major part of the construction was completed before the war while costs were lower. Climatic conditions are favorable for high consumption of electricity. Also, the rural people of Indiana are cooperatively minded. But I feel I would be lax if I didn't mention at least one thing that this cooperative has proved. First: Any appropriation you as Members of Congress see fit to make for rural electrification and any loan that REA chooses to make to rural people, under proper management, and capable supervision, should stand a good chance to be repaid. The Boone County REMC is definitely rural and almost strictly agricultural. The December billing included:

Farms	3,105
Nonfarms	207
Churches and schools (all rural)	33
Power users	2
Small commercial users (mostly agricultural)	70

About 90 percent of the $38,209 collected that month came from rural agricultural sources.

The second rather pertinent remark I would like to make—this loan has been repaid altogether on private power. In Indiana we do have reasonably favorable wholesale sources of electric power from private companies. I know, this has been considered impossible by some within our own ranks, but it seems that we have proved convincingly that rural electric cooperative does not have to have certain advantages offered by public power.

Not all problems are solved when a cooperative is out of debt. There come certain demands from the membership, such as: When are you going to reduce rates? And what recognition do I have of the portion of my service bill that has been used to retire debt or build the capital structure of the organization? As I said before, Indiana is not without some cooperative experience and we have some striking examples of how a good cooperative should be built and operated. We would like to build a sound businesslike utility—owned and operated by the farmers of Boone County, Ind. To do this we feel that there are a few principles we should follow:

1. Maintain plant in same top condition that it is now in and continue to offer best possible service.
2. Do all financing of future expansion with local (preferably members capital).
3. Maintain sufficient reserves in form of cash or bonds to meet unanticipated emergency.
4. Be very cautious about, and probably avoid, any drastic rate lowering policy.
5. Recognize capital that members have invested, probably to the extent of paying interest on the same.

Again, being somewhat unique, we would like to first thank you as Members of Congress for making an appropriation establishing REA, which has in turn made it possible for us to own and operate a rural electric distribution system. We have always enjoyed our association with REA, and only because we farmers have been taught that it is thrifty and sound business to pay off the mortgage, that we are happy to be able to sever legal relationships.

ADDRESS BY H. E. ANTLE

In reality this occasion has more significance than the mere assembly by a group of people representing our Government and the Indiana Rural Electric Systems. It is quite fitting and proper that we meet today. On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration became a reality and by Executive order was permitted to make loans up to 20 years to responsible agencies for the purpose of constructing rural electric systems for rural American farm folks. At that time less than 1 of every 10 of America's farmers had electric service. A few days from now REA will celebrate its 20th birthday. The presentation of Boone County's final payment here today is a fitting tribute to the foresight of the folks con-

nected with our Government and to our farm folks who shouldered the responsibility of seeing that this agreement was carried out, that the farm folks received electric service and that the loan was paid during its agreed time. Frequently we believe it desirable for all of us to take stock, to examine the promises that we have made to one another, to the farm folks, to the Congress who made the money available for the construction of the system, and to the administrative personnel who have administered the program. A short review shows today that the Boone system has met all of its obligations; that is, every farm family in Boone County who wished electric service has it today, and those same farm folks have contributed a sufficient amount by the use of electricity and their payment of reasonable electric service bills to enable the system to complete its obligation to the Rural Electrification Administration and to pay the final loan in its entirity.

It is our sincere thought that today is just the start of a series of systems on which the Rural Electrification Administration and the Congress have entrusted money on a loan basis to become self-liquidating and to begin repaying their obligations in full to our Government.

If I could be permitted to make two or three comments with respect to the Hoover Commission and its report on the Rural Electrification Administration, and more particularly to page 64 of this report. The report says, "The additional demand for capital by the REA cooperatives have been met wholly from additional REA loans." This is not a true statement. The total investments in the Boone system as of December 31, 1954 amounted to $1,236,218.49. The total demands for all time as loans by the REA amounted to $726,967. The mere subtraction of these two figures shows that our system consumers have invested $509,251.49. It certainly is evident that the additional demands for capital have not been met wholly from additional REA loans. Farther down on this same page we note a statement, "It is obvious that loans are not in fact, self-liquidating, when substantial subsidies remain in effect permanently." The check that has been presented today, together with the figures shown above of the amount invested by our own consumers certainly is evidence that this statement bears a further checking. We have no quarrel to pick with any Government commissions or agencies, in fact we have total respect for all. However we do believe that today, evidence has been shown that the report as submitted to our Congress should be reviewed very carefully before acceptance by the folks who will have to examine and accept or reject this recommendation.

Elizabeth Jane Hench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 2, Mrs. Elizabeth Jane Hench, of New Cumberland, Pa., will observe her 100th birthday anniversary.

This event will be marked by a celebration on Sunday May 1 when the Medical Society of Pennsylvania will present this splendid lady with a plaque, which reads:

The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania extends greetings and felicitations to Mrs. Elizabeth Jane Hench, born May 2, 1855, in recognition of one whose life span exemplifies healthful living.

The presentation will be made at the home of Mrs. J. Cover Sterline, daughter of Mrs. Hench, in New Cumberland, by Dr. Edward S. Kronenberg, Jr., president of the Cumberland County Medical Society. Later there will be a birthday party, at which there will be five generations of Mrs. Hench's family.

Doctors advise me that Mrs. Hench is in excellent physical condition and retains full use of all her faculties.

I am sure I express the sentiments of my colleagues in wishing this great lady a most happy birthday.

The Effects of Atomic Explosions on the Frequency of Tornadoes in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the oft-repeated statement that atomic explosions are believed to have a marked effect on weather conditions, the following manuscript written by Mr. D. Lee Harris, United States Weather Bureau, Washington, D. C., and published in the December 1954 issue of the Monthly Weather Review is timely and of informative value since it discusses the subject in detailed fashion:

EFFECTS OF ATOMIC EXPLOSIONS ON THE FREQUENCY OF TORNADOES IN THE UNITED STATES [1]

(By D. Lee Harris, U. S. Weather Bureau, Washington, D. C.)

ABSTRACT

The upward trend in reported tornades during the past few years has led many people to suspect that atomic explosions are responsible for the increase. Because there is no known physical reason for believing that atomic explosions should affect the tornado frequency, the records of tornadoes and atomic explosions are examined in considerable detail to find evidence which will support or contradict this popular hypothesis.

It is found that tornado reports have always been incomplete and that much of the recent upward trend in tornado frequency can be accounted for by improvements in the tornado reporting system. A comparison of the distribution of tornadoes and of debris from an atomic explosion in time and space does not support the hypothesis that atomic explosions tend to increase the tornado frequency.

INTRODUCTION

The 532 tornadoes reported in the United States in 1953 exceeded the next highest yearly total of record by more than 200. Of the 532 tornadoes, 294 were reported between March 17 and June 15, the period when atomic weapons were being tested in Nevada. The coincidence of this increase in the number of reported tornadoes with the increase in the frequency of atomic explosions in 1953 led many people to believe that atomic explosions caused an increase in tornadoes.

Because of its importance to the success of atomic tests and to the transport of the radioactive debris, the weather during periods of atomic tests has been studied in considerable detail (Cumberledge (1), Holzman (2), and List (3)). Any obvious effects of the explosions on weather should have been revealed by these studies, but no evidence of any effect away from the test site was found.

Machta and Harris (4) have investigated the possibility that the debris from atomic explosions might provide ice nuclei in regions having a natural deficiency, and thereby affect the rainfall regime for a short time after each atomic explosion; that the debris might interfere with the amount of solar radiation reaching the earth, and thereby change the temperature at the ground; or that the radioactivity of the debris might change the electrical properties of the atmosphere, and that this in turn might lead to some changes in the more observable weather. They found that none of these possibilities was likely to occur to any significant extent. They were unable to find any theory which is consistent with the known facts that would indicate that atomic explosions could alter the natural occurrence of tornadoes.

Since the true cause of tornadoes has not been firmly established, the failure of any of these theories to relate tornado occurrence to atomic explosions, is not in itself conclusive. However, an examination of the available observational data should show whether there is any reliable evidence of a relation between atomic explosions and tornado occurrence.

TORNADO RECORDS

The number of tornadoes reported to the Weather Bureau during the period 1916 through 1953 is shown by the bars in figure 1. The solid line shows the linear trend of these reports based on data for the years 1921–50. The dashed line shows the rate of population growth as determined from the last four census reports. The correlation between these two lines suggests that the linear trend prior to 1950 may be due to factors which are closely related to population, but some other factor must be found to explain the increase since 1950. In order to find this, we must examine the method of collecting tornado statistics.

Tornadoes are occasionally observed by Weather Bureau observers. More often, the first report of any tornado or suspected tornado comes from the public. Sometimes the first report is found in a newspaper account of the storm. Each reported tornado is investigated by a meteorologist, in person if possible, but it is often necessary to rely on detailed reports by laymen who live in the vicinity of the reported storm. These investigations sometimes disclose sufficient information to permit definite identification of the storm as a tornado, or to show that the initial report was in error in calling the storm a tornado. More often the data are inconclusive, and it is unlikely that all meteorologists engaging in the study of tornadoes would agree on the classification of every storm. However, no storm can be investigated much less classified, unless a report of it reaches the Weather Bureau and thus the first requirement that any storm must satisfy before it can be classified as a tornado and appear in the statistics, is that it be reported to the Weather Bureau. It is unlikely that all tornadoes are reported, and it appears probable that the percentage of tornadoes reported is greater in regions of high population density, and that it increases with the population and with the effort spent to obtain complete reports.

[1] Paper presented at 133d national meeting of the American Meteorological Society, Miami, Fla., November 17–19, 1954.

EFFECTS OF POPULATION DENSITY

The hypothesis that the percentage of tornadoes reported is a function of population density is difficult to check because the meteorological conditions which favor the formation of tornadoes are not equally common over any large region. However, if we select a small area of high population, say a county, and surround this with a group of counties with low population density, the meteorological conditions should be about the same in both regions, so that any observed difference in reported tornado frequency will be due to chance occurrences or to the population differences. The population and tornado statistics[2] have been examined in this way for six States in the Tornado Belt, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Missouri, and Arkansas. In figure 2, the 28 counties or groups of counties of these 6 States having a population of 50 persons or more per square mile in 1940 are shaded. The outlined unshaded areas denote the surrounding counties with lower population densities. The average tornado density for the period 1921–50 is higher in the high-population areas in 22 of the 28 regions. A summary of these data is given in table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Average tornado density per 1,000 square miles per year as a function of population density*

	1921–50	1951	1952	1953
Counties with more than 50 persons per square mile	0.304	0.234	0.466	0.633
Counties with less than 50 persons per square mile	.220	.169	.267	.645

The mean difference in the tornado densities in these two types of area for the period 1921–50 is 0.084, and the standard deviation of this mean is 0.041. The probability of obtaining a difference of this amount, when no true difference exists, is only about 0.04. Since there is no theoretical reason for expecting a correlation between tornado occurrences and population density, the true cause of the difference is probably the completeness or incompleteness with which tornadoes are recorded in the two types of area. Since the population is not evenly distributed throughout the high-population counties, it is also probable that even here tornadoes have occurred which were not reported.

The data for 1951 and 1952 are also biased in the direction of greater tornado density in the high-population regions. In the data for 1953, this bias disappears, suggesting that the reporting of tornadoes in rural areas may have caught up with that in urban areas. However, the tornado density was higher in the low-population areas in 9 of the 30 base years, and the results for a single year cannot be regarded as significant.

EFFECTS OF INCREASED EFFORT TO OBTAIN REPORTS

During World War II, at the request of defense officials, the Weather Bureau organized a large number of severe local storm warning networks around military bases and ordnance plants. Most of these were discontinued shortly after the end of the war. However a few, in the most storm conscious areas of the country remained active from the time they were first established.

In 1949, the weather bureau began to reactivate some of these networks and to establish others around weather-bureau offices, especially those east of the Rockies. State and county law-enforcement officers, and many other organizations such as the Red Cross and public-utility companies, as well as many private citizens were asked to report certain information concerning any severe local storms that came to their attention. The number of these networks was increased from 11 in January 1949 to over 100 in January 1953, and 170 in January 1954.

In 1953 and 1954, the weather bureau cooperated with Federal civil-defense officials and civic organizations in establishing community reporting and warning networks for protection from fast-moving storms such as tornadoes. Several hundred such networks have been established, and all tornadoes detected by them are reported to the weather bureau.

Developments in tornado research since 1950 have led to a need for an even greater improvement in the completeness of tornado reports. In 1951, contracts were negotiated with private press-clipping services to increase the completeness of tornado reports received by the weather bureau. This policy has been continued and extended since 1951. Tepper [5] has described the workings of the clipping service in 1951, and only a summary will be given here.

The clipping service was in effect from late April through August 1951 for the States of Kansas and Oklahoma in the region of maximum tornado frequency. The efficiency of this service is indicated by table 2 (from [5]). It is seen that in Kansas and Oklahoma the number of storms officially designated tornadoes during the 4-month period, May–August, was 126 compared to a 35-year average of 18. The number for the remainder of the country was 94 compared to a 35-year average of 61. This amounts to an increase of 600 percent in the area covered by the clipping service as compared to an increase of only 54 percent in the rest of the country, for the period the clipping service was in full operation. No other State having as many as 10 tornadoes during the year showed an increase comparable to that of Kansas and Oklahoma.

TABLE 2.—*1951 monthly and annual frequency of tornado reports for the entire United States and for the Kansas-Oklahoma area, after Tepper [5]*

	United States			Kansas-Oklahoma			United States less Kansas-Oklahoma		
	Reported in newspapers	Official record	35-year mean	Reported in newspapers	Official record	35-year mean	Reported in newspapers	Official record	35-year mean
January	3	3	4	0	0	<1	3	3	4
February	19	10	5	6	6	<1	13	4	5
March	12	9	17	4	4	2	8	7	15
April	39	27	24	27	19	5	12	22	19
May	86	76	33	64	55	9	22	21	24
June	125	90	26	77	51	6	48	39	20
July	32	25	12	9	6	2	23	19	10
August	35	29	8	20	14	1	15	15	7
September	9	9	7	2	2	1	7	7	6
October	3	3	4	1	1	1	2	2	3
November	12	12	5	0	0	<1	11	12	5
December	11	11	3	0	0	<1	11	11	3
Annual	386	300	149	210	158	28	176	142	120
4-month total	278	220	79	170	126	18	108	94	61

In 1952, the clipping service covered the same area for the period March through August. This time the number of tornadoes reported in Kansas and Oklahoma was 54, or an increase of 116 percent over the 35-year average. The number reported in the remainder of the country was 160 or an increase of 78 percent over the long-term average.

In 1953, the clipping service was extenedd to the 11 States within the heavy outline in figures 11 and 12 and was effective from February through August. Of the tornadoes in the United States in 1953, 86 percent occurred during this period so a satisfactory comparison can be made by considering only the annual totals. There were 292 tornadoes reported in the area covered by the clipping service compared to the 35-year average of 54. This amounts to an increase of 440 percent. There were 240 reported in the 37 States not covered by the clipping service. The 35-year average is 91, so that this increase is only 160 percent.

In 1954, the clipping service was extended to all of the United States east of the Rocky Mountains and a comparison between the rate of increase in the States covered and in the rest of the United States becomes meaningless.

The effect of the newspaper clipping service in increasing the total number of tornadoes reported to the Weather Bureau is obvious. However, this may not explain all of the increase. The advances made in tornadoes forecasting, in tornado research, and the publication of a great many popular articles concerning tornadoes since 1950, as well as the severe local storm warning networks mentioned above, have led to a greater interest in tornadoes among many segments of the public and this has led to an increase, difficult to evaluate, in the number of tonadoes that are reported directly to the Weather Bureau or to newspapers. One significant change in the character of tornado reports in recent years is in the number of reports of tornado funnels not reaching the ground. This is shown in figure 3. The rate of increase of tornadoes reports of this class (fig. 4) is much greater than the rate of increase of tornadoes doing heavy damage, and is believed to be an indication of the increased interest in tornado reporting, for it requires a greater interest in the subject to report a tornado of this class, than to report a damaging tornado.

The possibility of an actual increase in the number of tornadoes cannot be neglected. The synoptic weather patterns during the tornado season in 1953 were similar to 1933, the year with the maximum number of tornadoes before 1951, and it appears likely that 1953 would have been an unusual tornado year by any system of counting. Although more tornadoes were reported in 1954 than in 1953, there appears to be little reason for believing that 1954 was an exceptionally favorable year for tornadoes.

It is clearly established that tornado statistics were incomplete, at least before 1954, and that improvements in the methods of collecting tornado reports have been responsible for much of the increase in the totals reported since 1950. This improvement has been so great that it cannot be determined from an inspection of the tornado records whether or not there has been any increase in the actual occurrence of tornadoes.

CORRELATION BETWEEN DATES OF ATOMIC EXPLOSIONS AND TORNADO OCCURRENCES

To study the possible correlation between atomic explosions and tornadoes it is necessary to consider the distribution of both tornadoes and atomic debris in time and space. It will be recalled from figure 1 that in 1945, the year in which the first atomic bombs were exploded, the number of tornadoes reported in the United States was well below normal. The second group of atomic explosions, this time in the Pacific, was conducted in 1946, and this year also was below normal in reported tornadoes. Both the intense program of atomic weapons testing in the United States and the rapid increase of tornado reports began in 1951. Therefore, only the last 4 years have been studied in detail.

Although the total number of tornadoes reported has increased in recent years, due to increased emphasis on obtaining complete reports, this does not preclude the possibility that the atomic bombs may have had some influence on the development of tornadoes. In order to investigate this possibility, it is necessary to form a hypothesis concerning the manner in which this influence might be exerted. Since no evidence

has been found of any large-scale effect of atomic explosions on weather, it will be assumed that the influence, if any, must be confined to the time of the explosion, or to the location of the radioactive cloud. The amount of radioactivity from an atomic explosion decreases rapidly with time, and much of the debris is brought to the earth within a few days after the explosion, therefore, any effect due to the debris must decrease rapidly with time.

If atomic explosions have encouraged the formation of tornadoes, it is to be expected that the seasonal distribution will have been altered in the direction of relatively more tornadoes during and for a while after the period of the atomic tests than at other times. The trend toward more complete tornado reporting was more or less continuous between 1920–1950 and there is little reason for believing that the reporting system was improved more in one month than in another. Thus it is reasonable to assume that the relative seasonal distribution of tornadoes is better known than the total number that occur in any particular year. The data for 1921–1950 have been used to determine a 30-year average (normal seasonal distribution) of tornadoes.

Figures 5–8 show plots of the daily accumulated tornado reports for the years 1951–54. In order to make the reports for these later years comparable with the earlier years when the reporting system was less efficient, the scale on the right shows percent of the annual total; the actual number of tornadoes is given by the left-hand scale. The "normal" distribution is given by the dashed line. The actual numbers for the "normal" distribution are given on the left-hand margin in parentheses. The dates of all atomic explosions in the United States, and of all announced atomic explosions elsewhere are indicated on these graphs. In 1951 (fig. 5), the test periods in the United States were in January, February, October, and November, outside of the usual tornado season, and there is no indication that any of these explosions were associated with tornadoes. The Pacific tests were in April and May and the fraction of the annual total occurring during this period was below normal.

In 1952 (fig. 6), the first period of intensified tornadic activity occurred before the first atomic explosion, and, in general, an outbreak of tornadoes preceded rather than followed an atomic explosion. This certainly does not indicate a possible cause and effect relation. Again in 1953 (fig. 7), the first two groups of tornadoes occurred bofore the first atomic explosion, and the tendency toward a record year was established before the atomic test program was begun. There is some evidence of an increase in the tornado frequency a few days after some of the atomic tests in 1953. However, in view of the large number of tornado groups and the large number of atomic explosions in the spring of 1952 and 1953, this coincidence does not appear to be more than one might expect by chance. Once again in 1954 (fig. 8), the first group of tornadoes occurred before the first atomic explosion. None of the steep regions on this curve correspond to a pronounced increase in the amount of fission products in the areas in which the tornadoes occurred. The data for 1954 are provisional and some corrections are to be expected in the official records.

The above data are summarized in figure 9 which shows a comparison of the seasonal distribution of tornadoes in 1951–54 by months with the average value for the period 1921–50. The light line represents the average number of tornadoes for each month expressed as a percentage of the average annual total for the base years 1921–50. The heavy line gives the distribution for each month since 1950, expressed as a percentage of the annual total. The 1954 tornado data were brought into this scheme by assuming that the ratio of the number of tornadoes in the first 8 months of 1954 to the total for the year, would be the same as the average number in the first 8 months to the average annual total in the base years 1921–50. The vertical bars indicate the periods during which atomic tests were conducted. These are summarized in table 3. Each month is regarded as a bomb month if any bombs were exploded during the month or during the last 3 weeks of the previous month.

TABLE 3.—*Departure from the normal seasonal distribution of tornadoes in months with nuclear explosions*

	Nevada bombs	All bombs 1951–53	All bombs 1951–August 1954
Number of months above normal tornado frequency	4	6	7
Number of months below normal tornado frequency	6	9	11
Accumulated percent above normal	12	18	22
Accumulated percent below normal	22	36	46

Actually, the amount of data involved in this table is too small to permit the formation of any reliable conclusions or to justify any test of significance. However, the evidence presented indicates that atomic explosions may have a tendency to inhibit the formation of tornadoes, and that the effect is greatest when the bombs are farthest away. The data certainly do not support the theory that atomic explosions cause tornadoes.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF TORNADOES AND ATOMIC BOMB DEBRIS

If one could assume that the improvement in the reporting system has been about the same all over the country, a similar study could be based on the geographical distribution of tornadoes. However, the effort to improve the completeness of the reporting system between 1950–53 was concentrated in those regions in which tornadoes are most common, and this coincides reasonably well with the regions most frequently crossed by the atomic clouds from Nevada. Thus, one should expect an increase in the relative number of tornadoes reported from these regions irrespective of any effects from the atomic bomb. Although the sparseness of the data and the known lack of uniformity in the records form different States prevent an objective investigation of this effect, some information can be obtained by considering figures 10–12. Figure 10 shows the location and track of all tornadoes reported in May from 1916 to 1950. Figures 11 and 12 give the location of all tornadoes reported in the first and last halves of May 1953. The isolines give the relative cumulative amount of radioactive fallout in arbitrary units recorded by the Weather Bureau network during the period of the maps. In spite of the increased coverage of tornado occurrences due to the press clipping service, no tendency for a relative increase in tornado frequency in those areas most affected by the bomb debris can be found in these figures.

Daily maps of tornado locations have been compared with maps showing the movement of atomic debris for all atomic explosions of the past 3 years. These maps do not indicate any correlation between the location of tornadoes and the distribution of atomic debris.

SUMMARY

There has been a great increase in the reported frequency of tornadoes in the United States during the past few years. A study of the distribution of reported tornadoes indicates that the reports have been incomplete prior to 1950 and may still be incomplete. However, considerable effort has been spent in the past few years to improve the completeness of these reports, and much of the trend toward an increase in the number of reported tornadoes is due to this effort.

A study of the distribution of tornadoes and atomic explosions in time does not indicate any tendency for a relative increase in tornadoes during periods of atomic explosions. Furthermore, a study of the geographical distribution of tornadoes and the radioactive debris from at atomic explosion does not indicate any tendency for a relative increase in tornado frequency in the regions most affected by the atomic debris

Those "Quickie" Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Times News at Twin Falls, Idaho, April 6, 1955. This editorial most appropriately calls attention to the recent hearings which were held in the Northwest in connection with Hells Canyon Dam legislation:

THOSE "QUICKIE" HEARINGS

The "quickie" hearings at Boise, Lewiston, Pasco, and Portland to get grassroots sentiment on the new Hells Canyon bills recently introduced in Congress are turning out just about as would be expected.

When the Senate Interior Reclamation Subcommittee—stacked as it is with Democrats favoring Government construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon—opened its first hearing at Boise, it was obvious from the start how that committee's thinking is slanted.

The chairman as much as said the committee hoped these hearings would convince one and all that the Government, and no one else, should take over Hells Canyon.

However, when Gov. Robert E. Smylie, as first witness to testify, let it be known that Idaho wants no part in a Government deal for Hells Canyon, the committee got its eyes opened. The Governor not only suggested that Congress would do better by having the Federal Power Commission decide on the feasibility of a Hells Canyon Dam, but also expressed grave doubt that the proposal before the committee was seriously tendered.

No open-minded person in attendance at the Boise hearing can deny that the weight of testimony, although the number of witnesses was equally divided, leaned heavily toward opposition against a Government-built high dam.

Lined up against any such a proposal was the Governor, the president of the Idaho Reclamation Association, the master of the Idaho State Grange, a spokesman for the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, and the Idaho director of the National Reclamation Association.

The best the proponents could offer did not measure up by comparison. Their spokesmen included Secretary of State Ira Masters, several labor leaders, and a few farmers who took issue with the stand of the State's leading farm organizations. Secretary Mas-

ters, as usual dealt in such generalities as "smudge pots" and the "people's future."

But none of the proponents could minimize successfully the biggest stumbling block in all their arguments—that once the Government gets control of Hells Canyon any future Congress could place upper Snake River water users at a disadvantage to carry out all the functions of the Government-owned and operated downstream project.

At Lewiston, one of the most glaring of all the absurdities offered by those favoring a high dam, came from a National Rural Electric Cooperative Association vice president, who said:

"Most of Idaho's key people in the Government are opposed to public power because they are more or less controlled by pressure groups."

These key people, instead of being opposed to public power because they are controlled by pressure groups, are fighting Government intervention because that follows the majority thinking in Idaho—the majority that elected these key people in Government to the offices they hold.

These same Hells Canyonists have contended all along, and so testified before the congressional committee, that the farmers in Idaho are afraid of the power monopoly and that the newspapers, with few exceptions, are controlled by the same interests.

That is an outright misrepresentation that insults the intelligence of any sensible person and appeals only to those gullible enough to swallow such tripe. What newspaper, or what farmer if you please, is afraid of the Idaho Power Co.? The suggestion is ridiculous.

In Oregon and Washington, although the Governors of both States stand with the opposition, it's reasonable to assume that certain interests are rubbing their hands in eager anticipation of getting power generated by Idaho's Snake River waters. They'd be stupid to turn down any such a handout if we're saps enough to give it to them, as other States already have learned under similar circumstances.

Why wouldn't there be a world of support in Washington and Oregon for a Government-controlled Hells Canyon? Once the Government gets control of the lower Snake River, their preponderance of strength in Congress will have little difficulty in surmounting any weak protest our handful of Senators and Representatives might raise.

It's all so strange in Idaho. Even though the key people in State government, the key representatives of our major farm organizations, and nearly all of the State's newspapers are opposed to Hells Canyon, the combined opposition, if you are to believe the Hells Canyon enthusiasts, doesn't mean anything.

We're just afraid of some big, bad bugaboo, that's all. Or, as Secretary Masters tried to explain it, we probably don't know what's good for us because "we haven't been enlightened."

Mayor Wagner Submits Board of Estimate Resolution on Natural Gas Regulation to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of his excellent discussion today of natural gas issues while a witness before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mayor Robert F. Wagner submitted to us copies of the resolution on this subject adopted by the board of estimate of the city of New York on April 21.

This resolution pointed out the effects upon New York City consumers of natural gas of the proposal to exempt producers of natural gas from Federal price regulation. The Supreme Court, as we know, settled a long-standing argument on this question last year by declaring that the Federal Power Commission has the power, and has always had the power under the Natural Gas Act, to regulate the price of gas moving in interstate commerce.

The oil and gas industry which controls so much of the natural gas now moving through the interstate pipelines is determined to overturn this decision. They are hoping to lull the consumer into sitting quietly by while this exemption legislation is pushed to enactment, and are using every means available to them, which are indeed tremendous, to accomplish that purpose.

The citizens of New York, however, are becoming aroused over this effort to undercut effective Federal regulation of natural-gas rates, and we all owe much to our mayor for spearheading the fight and helping to form a national committee of mayors opposing this legislation.

Following is the resolution adopted by the board of estimate on April 21, as presented this morning to the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

RESOLUTION ON EXEMPTION OF INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS FROM REGULATION BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Whereas the millions of consumers of gas in New York City are dependent upon a supply of natural gas for cooking, and many of them for other domestic uses, such as water heating, refrigeration, and space heating; and

Whereas the Transcontinental Pipe Line Corp. is the sole supplier of natural gas to the six local gas companies in the city of New York, and the Transcontinental Pipe Line Corp. is dependent in great measure upon a supply of gas purchased from so-called independent natural gas producers who have heretofore been free to sell their gas at prices affected by competition between natural gas pipeline companies seeking a supply of natural gas to satisfy their respective customer demands; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently determined in the case of *Phillips Petroleum Company* v. *Wisconsin*, that independent producers are natural gas companies within the purview of the Natural Gas Act and are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission to prevent unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory prices for natural gas produced and sold in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the oil and gas interests in the United States have initiated a nationwide campaign through the press and other media for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission so that they may exact from those who supply gas for ultimate consumption in the homes of New York and elsewhere the highest price obtainable by the incidence of competition among the pipelines for their sources of supply; and

Whereas such competition and competitive prices will rapidly increase the cost of gas for domestic uses in New York and elsewhere and will inevtiably increase such cost as to restrict the nomal use of gas necessary for the health and comfort of residents of New York: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States be fully informed of the consequences of such legislation and that the corporation counsel be, and he is hereby, directed to use all proper means, and to make such representations to the Congress of the United States, to prevent the enactment of legislation exempting producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

The Value of a Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include a very valuable description of the evolution of a hobby, written by Homer P. Little, dean emeritus of Clark University, as a guest editorial for the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, edition of March 20, 1955.

The article follows:

THOUGHTS ON COLLECTING

(By Homer P. Little, dean emeritus of Clark University)

Many are those who collect. Among the items that attract are stamps, old glass, buttons, matchboxes, brass, antique furniture, coins, picture postcards, and works of art. College students sometimes gather such bulky objects as street signs and related objects, both public and private. The expense involved in collecting ranges from the sublime to the ridiculous—from hundreds of thousands of dollars to nothing. Fortunately, the fun involved has no relation to the expense.

Why do people collect? In part, at least, because of the acquisitive instinct. Certainly the competitive and artistic impulses enter the picture. And the need of relaxation surely plays its part.

Did not a Clark student indicate in a master's thesis that no stamp collector, so far as he could determine, had been confined in a mental institution?

The writer has indulged in a number of these hobbies. While they have not been important in keeping him out of an institution, they certainly have rested him when weary, and helped keep him on his chosen path when discouraged.

The most helpful hobby in this latter respect has been one begun a good many years ago—that of jotting down what seemed particularly worthwhile sermon texts or thoughts and developing them in accordance with the listener's (my) own thinking.

The beginning of the hobby apparently goes back to about 1915 when the Rev. Everett Herrick, now president emeritus of Andover Newton Theological School, spoke to the students of Colby College. Among the stories that he told very simply was one about a visitor to Boston. Wishing to see some of the city's famous winding, narrow streets, he picked his way without incident among the great vans unloading ferverishly at the sturdy platforms. Suddenly, near the end of his jaunt, the visitor stubbed his toe on a half

inch projection of the concrete pavement and sprawled flat.

Our readers may make up their own sermons from the incident. Probably they would include the thought that most of us are aware of the conspicuous things of life, but sometimes miss the little courtesies. They might even think of Michelangelo, who said, in effect, that it is trifles that make perfection, but that perfection is no trifle.

Most of the notes for the hobby have been made during the writer's 32 years of residence in Worcester. The first local addition was from a sermon that the Rev. Robert McLaughlin preached at old Piedmont Church, on whose site now stands a gas station. From the pulpit he read Oswald's supposed letter to Annabelle. "Dearest Annabelle," he wrote, "I would swim the mighty ocean for one glance from your dear eyes. I would walk through a wall of flame for one touch of your little hands; I would leap the widest stream in the world for a word from your lovely lips. As ever, Oswald. P. S. I'll be over Saturday night if it doesn't rain."

Subsequently, in another city church, young Robert Balfe, born and raised in Worcester, preached from the text, "And there was given me a reed like unto a rod; and the angel stood, saying 'Rise and Measure'." Obviously, one's thoughts are quickly led in other directions than measuring buildings. How about measuring people? And how about measuring yourself fist of all? What floods of gossip might thereby be stopped. Perhaps, even, racial and religious prejudice might be decreased. Rise and measure.

The Reverend Stuart Haskins, who recently left Worcester, was a frequent contributor to the hobby, as when he preached from the text "While Thy servant was busy about many things, he (the prisoner) was gone." Since the King had stated that, if the prisoner escaped, the guard would be executed, this matter of being busy here and there was of considerable consequence to him. Of almost equal consequence is to be busy here and there when opportunity knocks.

The problem, though, is not that simple. What would happen to volunteer services to the community in such activities as the Church, Community Chest, cancer and polio, heart, and arthritis drives, YMCA, and Boys' Club, if many citizens were not willing to be busy here and there? Truly, this is a complex world to live in wisely.

A partial answer to this last problem is to be found in the sermon in 1939, given in Worcester, by the chaplian of the Massachusetts senate. "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; and they shall walk and not be faint." Did you get the sequence—Mount up with wings; run; walk? Climax or anticlimax? The latter, it is generally admitted. The consistent plodder, constantly doing his best, tops the list. For the great majority of us this is a good place to stop.

Not bad for a hobby that never cost a cent.

Housing Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's newspapers carried the story that the Veterans' Administration is about to take steps to tighten credit on housing mortgages. In my opinion this action is unwarranted, unnecessary, and undesirable. The prime issues which are raised in this whole matter are stated most briefly in an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 30, 1955. The text of the editorial is as follows:

TOO MUCH HOUSING CREDIT?

A group of leading life insurance executives has called on the administration to tighten up on both Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration mortgage loans. This is not the first warning that 30-year, no-down-payment mortgages may result in damage to the economy. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, raised his voice some weeks ago against poor quality credit arrangements in this field. The life insurance executives, obviously concerned because of the heavy real estate investments which their companies have, said the long-term loans with no down payment or almost none are "an open invitation to a boom-bust situation in home building." They also are costly to borrowers.

Because it is difficult for most of us to realize that what is good for the economy one month may not be good the next, there has been a natural reluctance to do anything to check the housing boom. After all, housing has been one of the major sustaining forces of the postwar prosperity. Moreover, the need for housing, especially low-cost housing, still is substantial. But an all-time record in housing construction was set last year, and in January and February this year housing starts were up 25 percent.

Now that the economy is operating at a very high level a slight tug on the reins ought not to have an adverse effect on construction activity. But it might put the industry in a stronger position over the long pull. The insurance executives did not suggest a specific governmental program, but it was indicated that some of them thought the addition of a 5-percent downpayment on both veteran and FHA mortgages would have a stabilizing effect. Such a mild check ought to be seriously considered in the interest of stability in the construction industry.

Though the Republican Party most of all fears a depression in 1956, for whatever political repercussions it might bring, they seemed prepared nevertheless to yield to the bankers' pressure to reduce housing construction below present levels. The way the Washington Post and Times Herald editorial put it, there should be a slight tug on the reins of mortgage credit.

Those who do not have solely the bankers' interest at heart sharply disagree.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert statements taking issue with this whole pressure campaign against the American people:

First is a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald written by Leo Goodman, and dated April 5, 1955. It answers the editorial which I have previously mentioned. The letter is as follows:

HOUSING CREDIT

Deeply disappointed in the editorial position taken March 30 under the title "Too Much Housing Credit?" This question of credit goes to the heart of the availability of housing for the American people. Millions of families need more adequate housing. Only those who oppose the development of an adequate supply to meet the demand are advocating curtailment of housing construction. The Washington Post and Times Herald suggests "a slight tug on the reins," and then suggests that such "a mild check ought to be seriously considered in the interest of stability in the construction industry."

After careful study Senator Taft in 1945 advocated immediate expansion of the housing construction industry to 1,250,000 a year for a minimum of 10 years. Later, during the debate in the Senate on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and the subsequently enacted Housing Act of 1949, he raised his estimate to 1,500,000.

Competent students of housing have recently revised their figure upward and suggested the need of 2 million units a year for at least 10 years. Witnesses before the Congress, ranging from Walter Reuther to Prof. William L. C. Wheaton of the University of Pennsylvania, have urged 2 million units a year. Recently Public Housing Commissioner Slusser has pointed to the 8 million substandard homes in existence in the United States today.

The National Association of Home Builders in their monthly magazine Correlator, for February 1954, advocated, old and new, 2 million homes a year for the next decade.

All these competent sources reject, as now the building industry itself finally does, the thesis that family formation is the sole basis for calculating new housing construction. Economist Miles Colean, one who formerly used family formation primarily for first predictions, has now shifted. In last September's Architectural Forum he said: "Other influences are offsetting this bearish (decline in the rate of family formation) factor." He listed:

1. Increased security in old age.
2. The increasing propensity to spend.
3. The upward shift in average income.
4. Continued growth in personal income.
5. The continued high birth rate.

Millions now condemned to living in the slums would disagree that we need a mild check on building. Only when 10-year average of construction for a sufficient period exceeds the 10-year average of family formation do we need to consider credit restriction.

LEO GOODMAN.

WASHINGTON.

Next is a press release issued by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, dated April 14, 1955. It is as follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD SUSTAIN RATE OF HOME PRODUCTION, CONSIDER INCREASING IT, NAREB TELLS SENATE

The United States should sustain the current rate of home production and of purchase and consider increasing it—not cutting it down—Henry G. Waltemade, New York, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, yesterday informed the Senate Subcommittee on Housing.

This rate rests upon the healthy expansion taking place in the economy as a whole, he wrote to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the subcommittee, who had invited his views on the question of "whether there is excessive credit and overbuilding in the industry."

Mr. Waltemade warned that if the market for homes "should be curtailed through restrictive action, its decline would reverberate throughout our sensitively balanced economy.

"Last year's sustained healthy home market is credited by economists with turning general trends from decline in the early part of the year to a productive upward movement in the second half of the year. A similar cause-and-effect relationship in the other direction can follow any deliberately planned restriction on home production and home buying.

"The home market has none of the characteristics of an erratic or inflationary surge,

or of a building boom running out of gear with general economic movements," Mr. Waltemade added, listing the following points to demonstrate its stability:

"1. Today's home-mortage debt is sound and manageable.

"2. Current production is emphasizing home ownership in response to demand.

"3. Current home production is concentrating its output in the low and moderate price ranges.

"4. Goal of the private home production industry is to keep new production high and thus permit removal of unfit housing."

"Indications are," Mr. Waltemade said, "that we should expect to stabilize at the present rate of production while, in addition, increasing our supply of low-cost and low-rent adequate housing by stepping up the volume of rehabilitation and modernization of that part of our housing inventory that is susceptible to such treatment."

"This latter method of adding to our supply of good housing can be soundly stimulated by the new section 220 mortgage insurance provided in the Housing Act of 1954," he added.

Describing the soundness of today's mortgage debt, Mr. Waltemade said, "There is no parallel with the situation that prevailed 25 years ago. In 1954 mortgage debt represented only 37 percent of national income," he explained, "whereas it had equalled 62 percent of national income in 1930.

"Mortgage debt in the late twenties was expanded in financing hotels, apartment buildings, and office buildings. Today it is accounted for principally by purchase by families of homes of their own."

Mr. Waltemade contrasted the short-term loans accompanied by high interest rates and frequent second and third mortgages in the late twenties with the modern long-term amortized first mortgage geared to a monthly payment which the home buyer is qualified to meet.

"Whether home production may soundly be increased is a question worthy of study," he said. "Our population is increasing at the rate of 3 million per year. A larger proportion of our adult population is now in a married status compared to 1950. Last year there was a record total of more than 4 million births. Owing to a trend in marriages and births that began in the 1940's, a new high in housing demand is generally anticipated in the early 1960's. Our generally rising standards in housing and the ability to pay for them, largely account for today's housing demand."

Next there follows a press release issued by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, dated April 24, 1955, which contains quotations from a letter by CIO President Walter P. Reuther to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN:

CIO PRESIDENT REUTHER TAKES SHARP ISSUE WITH CRITICS OF RESIDENTIAL HOUSING BOOM—CALLS FOR A CONTINUED HIGH CONSTRUCTION RATE

CIO President Walter P. Reuther today took sharp issue with critics of the present residential housing construction boom and called for a continued high construction rate.

In a letter to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, responding to the Senator's inquiry as to whether CIO viewed present housing construction as excessive, Mr. Reuther said:

"It is our view that the well-organized and widely disseminated propaganda which depicts our present rate of residential construction as excessive because it exceeds the current rate of new-family formation either is based on ignorance or reflects a deliberate effort to deceive the American people."

The CIO president said that while present residential construction was at an all-time high "it still falls far short of meeting the housing needs of the American people."

He cited authoritative studies indicating the country needs an annual new home construction of 2 million units for the next 10 years. The reasons, he said, were to provide housing for new families, to meet normal replacement requirements, to rebuild units lost because of slum clearance and other public improvements, to accommodate families still overcrowded and to make it possible to vacate substandard dwellings which are not suitable for rehabilitation.

Mr. Reuther said the "rate of new-family formation could be conceived of as a major determinant of the need for new-home construction only if there were no need to replace existing substandard structures, no public or industrial programs, or acts of God, which destroy thousands of existing structures each year that must be replaced, and no preexisting shortages or overcrowding."

"If those who charge that the present building rate is excessive were forthright, they would admit that they are not concerned with housing needs at all but rather with housing prices. Actually, they fear that the value of existing properties will fall if the present rate of new-home construction is maintained. Their views are based on the false assumption that the Nation's economic well-being is preserved by scarcity, not by abundance," he continued.

Mr. Reuther said that "the American people fear a decline in economic activity, not an expansion of it. Only a handful of short-sighted individuals who cannot be persuaded that a constantly expanding and prospering America is possible fear rising production and look upon a decline in various segments of our economy as healthy."

The CIO president observed that America's concern "should be with a continuing program to aid and encourage home construction for sale and for rent and with the overall economic growth which these programs can so substantially stimulate. Submission to the fears of the prophets of scarcity will not avoid economic disaster; it will assure it."

The final insertion is a release from the New York State division of housing, by Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray, who was formerly chief of the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. It is as follows:

NEW YORK, March 17.—Recent predictions of a lessening of the housing need were attacked last night by State Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray as poor and short-sighted statistical forecasting.

Examination of all the factors involved point instead to a tremendous increase in need, he declared, in an address before the Real Estate and Mortgage Forum of the Savings Bank Women of New York, held at the Park Sheraton Hotel.

Commissioner McMurray cited as factors contributing to the need the huge increase to be expected in the early 1960's in the number of new families to be formed by the post-World War II babies, the great backlog of unfulfilled need which increases each year, the increased incomes of families which will continue, the formation of larger sized families, earlier marriages among our population, undoubling, the additional units required as a result of slum clearance and housing demolition for roads and other purposes, and the formation of households other than families.

Commissioner McMurray pointed out that the Federal Reserve Board's annual report published last week on consumers' buying plans shows more people, 9.6 percent, expect to buy homes this year than in any year since 1948. In 1950 it was 8.4 percent, in 1954 it was 6.6 percent. If the volume of construction in 1955 conforms to the volume of these previous years as compared to people's plans, 1955 construction would be at an all-time high of over 1,500,000 dwellings.

In New York State, Commissioner McMurray reported, the rate of construction is lagging behind that of the Nation. In 1950, when there was a national construction level of almost 1,400,000, the rate of construction in New York State was 124,000 units, or 8.85 percent of the national total. The year just completed, 1954, saw a rate of 1,220,000 nationally, while there were only 94,000 starts in New York State, or 7.70 percent of the national total.

In terms of the need in New York State, housing starts certainly should be in the same proportion, or greater than that of 1950. Certainly, as a goal, we should not count on less.

Aside from the FHA insured rental and cooperative-type housing and a relatively few projects financed by some of the large financial institutions, there has been practically no other rental-type housing built in New York State in the past 20 years.

Between 1950 and 1953, in New York City, the amount of money loaned by savings banks for mortgages of $50,000 and over (in which class new apartment house mortgages are found) declined by 29 percent on the average. By way of contrast, during the same general period, from 1949 to 1954, the mortgage portfolio of New York City savings banks increased by 87.5 percent from $4 billion to $7.6 billion.

The fact that New York City has so many urban renewal problems offers even greater opportunities for sound investment, he indicated to the savings bank women.

Commissioner McMurray described his philosophy of Government action to improve the welfare of the people as based on a reliance upon reason, knowledge, and truth. He indicated the many approaches he is making toward evolving a program of cooperation and coordination with the building industry, financial institutions, Federal and municipal agencies so that the State division of housing can better meet the needs of all the people.

Much of his attention, he said, is being devoted toward helping develop measures to stimulate the production of a large supply of good housing for the average wage earner and salaried person, the large group who are, for the most part, still in the no-man's-land of housing, ineligible for subsidized public housing because of incomes a little too high, yet earning too little to buy their own homes or rent available FHA housing at current high costs. He predicted the development of a number of such aids within a short time.

Commissioner McMurray also pointed out various ways in which deteriorating areas of the city could be redeveloped through a combined use of Federal urban renewal aids and those available under the State's slum clearance program. He indicted the role savings banks could play in this process and urged their assumption of their full share of responsibility in rebuilding the city.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the evidence which points to a growing need for home construction, we must all realize the attempt to cut back the volume of construction is obviously inspired by those who profit most on scarcity and who fear a housing program to meet the real needs of the American people.

I am sure that the members of the House Armed Services Committee will will want to study carefully the long-range implications of the announced intention of the Veterans' Administration to bar GI home mortgages which require no down payment or closing fees from the veteran-purchaser. If this is done, many veterans will be denied the opportunity to buy homes which they urgently need for their growing families.

Mayor Wagner Says Increase of Only a Penny Per MCF in Field Price of Natural Gas Will Increase New York Consumers' Costs by a Million Dollars a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct pleasure to me today as a member of the House Commitee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hear the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of our great city of New York, testify in a most able and illuminating fashion on the involved and somewhat technical issues surrounding proposed natural gas legislation now before our committee.

The mayor, who has been one of the leaders among city officials of the country in the formation of a mayor's committee to oppose legislation which would inevitably increase gas rates to the consumers, impressed the committee with the fairness and moderation of his testimony.

Nevertheless, it was hard-hitting testimony, showing that an increase of as little as one penny per 1,000 cubic feet in the field price of natural gas—the price paid by the pipelines to the producer in the field—would result in a $1,000,000-a-year increase to New York consumers in their monthly gas bills, under present circumstances.

Mayor Wagner urged our committee to reject bills now before us to remove these producers in the field from Federal price regulation. Otherwise, he said, "unanticipated, unbearable, and unwarranted" price increases were sure to follow.

Detailing the history of successive price increases to the utility companies servicing gas customers in New York largely as a result of increases in the prices paid in the field, the mayor said these price raises will shortly have increased the annual charge to these consumers by about $11,000,000 above the cost assumed at the time that the decision to introduce natural gas into the city of New York was made.

Mr. Speaker, following is the full text of Mayor Wagner's excellent statement today before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in opposition to the proposal to exempt the producers from price regulation:

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT F. WAGNER, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR BILLS TERMINATING FEDERAL JURISDICTION OVER THE FIELD PRICE OF NATURAL GAS SOLD FOR RESALE IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Robert F. Wagner. As mayor of the city of New York, I have joined with Mayors Clark and Lawrence of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh in organizing a conference, comprised of 50 mayors representing cities with a population of over 30 million, to present the position of the consumers in opposition to the legislation now under consideration by your committee.

Our position has been outlined generally by Mayor Clark and others who have already appeared before your committee. I propose to avoid, as far as possible, repetition of the arguments previously presented.

At the outset, may I present a resolution adopted on April 21, 1955 by the Board of Estimate of the City of New York, consisting of the seven principal officers of the city selected by direct popular election. The resolution expresses their unanimous viewpoint. I respectfully request that it be incorporated in the record. It reads, in part, as follows:

"Whereas the millions of consumers of gas in New York City are dependent upon a supply of natural gas for cooking, and many of them for other domestic uses, such as water heating refrigeration and space heating; and

* * * * *

"Whereas the oil and gas interests in the United States have initiated a nationwide campaign through the press and other media for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission."

The resolution concludes with the directive that all proper means be used to prevent the enactment of legislation exempting producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

The action of the board of estimate, of which I am a member, is prompted by consideration of the impact of any further increases in the cost of natural gas upon the consumers of the city of New York. Conversion of existing facilities for use of natural gas has been completed for approximately 2 million consumers and a continuing program is in progress for ultimate accommodation of all potential users. It is anticipated that within a year or two conversion will have been completed for at least 2,500,000 users.

There have already been several substantial and unanticipated increases in the cost of natural gas since its use in New York City was first contemplated.

The utility companies that service the city agreed on a price of 25 cents per 1,000 cubic feet in their first negotiations with Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line, the then sole supplier. This price was increased to 28 cents per 1,000 cubic feet by the time the pipeline approvals were granted by the Federal Power Commission. Between 1951, when service was initiated, and 1954, the price increased to 32 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. I am informed that increased costs, reasonably certain to become effective in the near future, will culminate in a cost of 36 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Thus, in the relatively short period since the use of natural gas was first taken under consideration for the city of New York, in the belief that its use would provide a more economical source of fuel, the cost has risen 44 percent. In the same period, the field price increased from less than 7 cents per 1,000 cubic feet to almost 11 cents, and field prices as high as 15 cents were reported in 1954.

I fully recognize that any increase in field price represents only a small fraction of the ultimate cost to the consumer. Nevertheless, we cannot lose sight of the fact that an increase of 1 cent per 1,000 cubic feet in the field will cost consumers in the city of New York approximately $1 million a year at the present time. In brief, an increase measured in pennies rapidly mounts to huge sums drawn from the pockets of the consumers.

The increase in the use of natural gas in New York City and the immediately adjoining Long Island area has been spectacular. According to current estimates, this area now uses natural gas to the extent of 100 billion cubic feet annually. The successive price rises to which I have referred will shortly have increased the annual charge to these consumers by about $11 million above the cost assumed at the time that the decision to introduce natural gas into the city of New York was made.

Increases which are certain to follow the removal of existing regulation of natural gas producers will therefore impose an additional unanticipated and unwarranted burden upon the consumer public which has turned to natural gas in recent years in the expectation of a reasonable saving in cost. If that expectation should be frustrated, the consumer may be compelled to revert to other fuels. The large number of consumers who have converted to natural gas in the city of New York, have done so at considerable direct or indirect cost to themselves and should not be subjected to the investment loss, additional expense and inconvenience entailed in reconversion to the use of other fuels.

In requesting that the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over gas producers be retained, the consumer in the city of New York does not wish to deprive the producer of a fair and reasonable return. However, he does need and does ask for protection from uncontrolled runaway prices. It is our firm belief that a price allowing a fair return to the producer of gas and at the same time protecting the interests of the consumer can best be achieved through appropriate and reasonable regulation of the producer by the Federal Power Commission. We urge that no action be taken to jeopardize the gains made for the protection of consumers of public utility service after many years of struggle.

Removal of the producers of natural gas from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, particularly after their regulation has been upheld by the Supreme Court and during a period of mounting natural gas prices, seems unwarranted and unreasonable. Certainly, such action is basically inconsistent with the continuation of regulation and control over transmission and distribution of this natural resource. While technical and artificial distinctions may be drawn, the fact remains that absence of regulation at any stage of the process—production, transmission or distribution—will lead to higher prices to the consumer. Effective regulation cannot be realized on a piecemeal basis. The necessity for regulation in some form is recognized, I am informed, by the Harris-Hinshaw bill. However, counsel advises me that the provisions of this proposed legislation will not accomplish their stated objective of ensuring just and reasonable natural gas prices.

In the absence of a more convincing showing than has been brought to our attention that the proposed legislation is required in the best public interest, I am convinced that it would be a serious mistake to amend the present law so as to exempt the producers from regulatory control.

Let me say, in conclusion, that I do not appear here as an expert on the problems of the natural gas industry. You have undoubtedly already heard a number of specialists in this field and will hear from others. I should like it understood that my opposition to the proposed legislation and that of my colleagues on the Board of Estimate, is in line with a long standing policy of our community to strengthen public utility regulation. It is based on the broad grounds that adoption of this legislation would result in unbearable increases in prices to the consumer public and that retention of regulatory jurisdiction by the

Federal Power Commission is required for the protection of consumers.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to appear before your committee. I am confident that your decision will be made in the exercise of your best judgment as to what is best for the people.

The Virtues of Old-Time Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 23, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include at this time a most interesting article describing the basic virtues of old-time farming, written by Richard C. Potter, director of the Worcester Natural History Museum, as a guest editorial for the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, edition of March 21, 1955.

The article follows:

OLD-TIME FARMING

(By Richard C. Potter, director; Worcester Natural History Museum)

The old-time family farm is disappearing. Looking back over the last few decades the decline can be followed step by step. Perhaps this may be for the better but it is always best not to lose the virtues of the past in order to gain some of the uncertainties of the future.

It is certain that the traditional customs of the family farm or family life are no longer understood or practiced. This is largely because the problems of food production and distribution have changed.

Fifty years ago the farmer, after a week of hard work, came to his day of rest, a large portion of which after chores was spent in his churchly duties. Usually his afternoons were free. This time was spent by him walking through his fields with a heavy, swinging gait, in many cases acquired by much walking behind his plow and his other tillage instruments. This gait indicated in a measure, his train of thought. It expressed a deep penetration into the processes of nature, for only by his understanding of these processes was he able to improve the quality of his crops, as well as their quantity over a period of his active farming life.

The creative work that he had accomplished during the week, was thought completely over, in terms almost to be compared with the lessons that he learned from his religion and his Bible. Back 50 years ago, the farmer was accompanied by his sons and these he initiated into the mysteries of nature. He described to his offspring in very simple words the manner of tilling the earth, the art of sowing, the ways of fertilizing. The lessons that he taught had been handed down by his forefathers from time immemorial.

From his observation and his knowledge of tradition, the farmer was able to use the course of nature like an almanac with its signs and symbols. The budding of this or that bush, indicated for him the time for the preparation of the seed beds. The development of wild growing plants became his guide for the right moment to do one thing or another. There was a sort of instinctive certainty, in the way in which the farmer of 50 years ago took the necessary measures at the right moment by observing the rules of nature's course.

Now this instinct has been engulfed by modernism. But what has been lost is the certainty of instinct. Uncertainty has arisen. Too often now the successful neighbor is frequently the only guide for the farmer's work, even though his neighbor may be a farmer of large-scale dimension, or a farmer who is more used to putting stimulating things into his soil than to following the course of nature; or it may be some learned institution that serves wholly as a guide.

In older times it was the custom to rotate crops with intervals between, during which the land was allowed to lie fallow for the sake of rejuvenating the soil. In looking forward to certain events of the family over which this farmer presided, he would sometimes say, "When this field lies fallow for the third time, we shall be ready for the dowry for our daughter," or "When this cow calves for the last time, then the son will be ready to leave school."

Diligence and orderliness insured a safe future. Fortunes, modest ones at that, were accumulated over the lifetime of the farmer, gleaned from the fields over which he presided and from the work which he tended carefully. There was in that type of land use, a certain feeling of comfort and satisfaction which spread over the entire field of farming activity.

It was an atmosphere created by abundant living interpolated with hard work, hard thinking and righteous and honest living. It was a diligence and an atmosphere created by a true naturalist who knew that the tools by which he made his living, or the tools by which he raised his family were those which were placed into his hands by nature and God, Himself.

This unity of farm life, this so-called one-family farm, is fast disappearing in favor of farms of greater extent, farms that are machine manipulated, farms that have lost the objective of following the laws of nature, and have sought the profit motive. Perhaps this must of necessity be, since the call for greater food production in the growth of our industrial nations is a must, but the farmer of 50 years ago had a fine feeling for nature and for the meteorological conditions surrounding his situation.

He even felt in his bones without the aches of rheumatism or arthritis, every change of weather, and was able to arrange his work accordingly. All these semiconscious treasures of knowledge of past times, and all these inheritances can still be found today, among the so-called oldtimers who tilled the farms 50 years ago.

Loyalty Day, May 1, 1955, Has Been Officially Designated by Congress and Proclaimed by President Eisenhower as an Occasion for Rededicating Our Love and Devotion to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the President on April 27 approved House Joint Resolution 184 to designate May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day and has issued a proclamation accordingly.

I had the privilege of introducing House Joint Resolution 184 in the House of Representatives and my good friend, Senator PRICE DANIEL of Texas, sponsored the measure in the Senate. This is the successful culmination of several years of effort to designate a special day when the American people will be given special opportunities to reaffirm and rededicate their loyalties to the ideals and institutions of our American way of life. We know and recognize that every day is and should be Loyalty Day, but in designating May 1, 1955, as the Loyalty Day, we are attempting to publicize and highlight at least one day on which the American people may give special emphasis and loyalty to our Government and its institutions.

The idea of designating May 1 as Loyalty Day originated among veterans on the Atlantic seaboard, who were disturbed by the traditional May Day rallies and parades of the Communists. These veterans decided that the best way to discourage and draw attention away from the Communist rallies and parades, was to organize a demonstration and parade emphasizing loyalty and support of the United States and the American way of life. The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization of which I am proud to be a member and past commander in chief, has acted as sparkplug in organizing Loyalty Day rallies and parades over the years, until Loyalty Day observances around the first of each May have become the outstanding events in many cities in the United States. It was at the request of the VFW that Senator PRICE DANIEL and I sponsored legislation to designate May 1 as Loyalty Day.

I want to express appreciation to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House; to the Senate and House leadership and to the membership of both bodies for their splendid cooperation in making it possible for the Loyalty Day bill to become law. I am grateful to all those who have assisted in the course of this legislation through the Congress.

On April 25, 1955, following approval of the Loyalty Day bill by the Senate and prior to the Presidential approval, the Hearst press, in an editorial printed in all of their papers, commented on Loyalty Day in the following manner:

The designation of Loyalty Day as a special observance, to be held annually on the 1s day of May, reflects the awareness of Congress of the great value of commemorative occasions expressing the patriotic enthusiasm of the American people.

There was a time between the two great wars when many of the American people were inclined to be somewhat timid about showing enthusiasm for their country.

When the enemies of America scoffed at all display of patriotism as flag-waving, the timid people let themselves be persuaded to look the other way when the beautiful flag of the United States went by, and to be silent when the stirring national anthem was sung, and to make a great show of tolerance when American traditions and history were disparaged and besmirched.

Loyalty and love for America were derided by our enemies as forms of narrow nationalism, and while very few Americans believed this, too many of them let themselves be intimidated and looked around to see if anybody was looking before they displayed their

emotions about the country, its flag, or the inspiration of its institutions.

But then the second of the two great wars came along, and millions of young Americans offered their lives in the fullest expression of loyalty and love, and thousands of them made the supreme sacrifice of life itself.

Since then there has been no timidity about patriotic enthusiasm in America, and our people are proud to express the sentiments that fill their hearts.

Loyalty Day is in keeping with the glad hearts of our people that sing and shout loyalty and love and pride, and it is good to have a special day dedicated to the patriotic ideals which dignify every day of our lives.

In addition to the Hearst editorial praising Loyalty Day, some of the great radio and TV networks are also extending an accolade to the purpose and intention of Loyalty Day. For example, on Monday evening, May 2, from 8 to 9:30 o'clock, the NBC–TV network will have a showing of the spectacular Darkness at Noon in color as well as in black and white. This special program, which deals with the issue of loyalty versus subversion, is an NBC contribution to the Loyalty Day theme. Commenting on the NBC–TV show Darkness at Noon, VFW Commander in Chief Merton B. Tice had this to say:

As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is tremendously gratifying to me to learn that the National Broadcasting Co. is planning to stage the great dramatic Broadway hit, Darkness at Noon, before the television cameras. This is one of the great plays to be done on the subject of anti-communism. When it was premiered on Broadway in 1951, the critics labeled it a "dramatic thunderbolt," and today we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars sincerely believe that the presentation of Darkness at Noon on television will be a potent force in the field of Americanism. We also feel that it will be a dramatic climax to the hundreds of VFW Loyalty Day celebrations that will take place April 30 and May 1.

Marine News Magazine Says Philadelphia Area's Fight for Delaware River Dredging Is "A National Issue, a Fight in Behalf of All Waterway Interests To Sustain the Historic Policy of Federal Responsibility for the Development and Improvement of Our Nation's Navigable Waterways"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions will shortly be holding hearings on the proposal in my bill and in others introduced by Philadelphia area Members of Congress to appropriate $25 million for a start on the dredging of the Delaware River Channel from Philadelphia to Trenton.

In pushing for this appropriation—without the strings which the Budget Bureau and the White House have attempted to tie to any funds for the work—we are only seeking to have carried out what has already been established as the will of Congress on this important project.

Congress said the full cost of this improvement should be a Federal obligation, in line with historic principles and policies dealing with navigable rivers. The Budget Bureau, in the authorization bill last year, attempted to require that local interests, in this case, the United States Steel Corp., be required to shoulder $18 million of the cost of the project.

BUDGET BUREAU PROPOSAL WAS REPUDIATED BY CONGRESS

Members of Congress from the Philadelphia area, including many of our colleagues from New Jersey, were instrumental last year in defeating that proposal. We succeeded in having enacted an authorization law which provided that the entire project was to be a Federal responsibility.

But in his budget this year, President Eisenhower has again insisted on the United States Steel contribution. He has said no funds should be appropriated for the project unless the $18 million contribution from United States Steel is put forward. This would not only negate the will of Congress but would for all practical purposes stymie the project.

We do not intend to permit this to happen. We intend to fight for the appropriation this year of an initial $25 million to begin work on the project, as called for in my bill, H. R. 3594, and in similar bills by other Members from the Philadelphia area.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members to an editorial which appeared in the April 1955 issue of Marine News, As the Delaware Goes.

This editorial points out that our efforts to have the Delaware River channel work prosecuted as a Federal project exclusively is "a fight in behalf of all waterway interests to sustain the historic policy of Federal responsibility for the development and improvement of our Nation's navigable waterways."

President Eisenhower Says Republican Defense Pamphlet Is a Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a news story which appeared in today's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Ike Flays GOP Book Blunder."

The article follows:

IKE FLAYS GOP BOOK BLUNDER

President Eisenhower said yesterday he thinks the publication of a pamphlet by the Republican policy committee giving data on American guided missiles and other weapons was a blunder.

Democrats have contended the document violated security—a charge the Pentagon denied Tuesday in praising it as presenting positive defense accomplishments.

But the President told his news conference the pamphlet "gave out information that I wouldn't have given out."

The GOP booklet was issued to Republican speakers to help them reply to critics of the administration's military manpower cuts.

Asked about the document, the President said he first heard about it shortly before the news conference. Aids "gave me some idea that made me think that there had been a blunder that occurred," he said, adding that "at least" he wouldn't have given out the information.

Ever since he took office, the President went on, "I have been plagued by inexplicable, undiscovered leaks in this Government." But "we mustn't be too astonished," he said, because "great numbers of people" in Washington necessarily know details of projects.

"I just don't believe that it is justifiable for any Government official to release anything that applies to the secret war plans, war policies, war purposes and war equipment of this Government," Mr. Eisenhower said. "That is the kind of thing that foreign intelligence systems spend thousands and thousands of dollars to get, unless we give it to them for nothing."

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson has objected to similar compilations of weapons data, declaring that even if individual bits of information in it were unclassified, putting it together was harmful.

But he made public a letter to Congress stating that while the GOP document contained "three minor technical items" that had not been cleared for release, it was not a breach of security. Democrats accused Wilson of doubletalk and political expediency.

Asked about the brownout of military news under Wilson's new restrictions on release of information, Mr. Eisenhower said he objected only to giving out "technical military secrets." He said such data should not be released at the Pentagon "merely because of the desire of one section of the Department or another to be the first to make such an announcement."

A trained intelligence system can get a "terrific source of information out of the combined documents that can be procured on the newsstands and the libraries of the United States," the President said.

"This is as it should be," he went on, because "to inform ourselves we have to be ready to inform others." But the President insisted that this did not make it necessary to release information about "an airplane able to fly straight up." He apparently referred to the Navy's vertical takeoff plane.

The 160-Acre Limitation on Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of April 19, 1955, which highlights efforts by the present administration to do away with the 160-acre limitation on reclamation projects that

has existed since the time of Theodore Roosevelt.

A very effective effort to retain the 160-acre limitation was made by Secretary of Interior Oscar L. Chapman and by Michael W. Straus, who served as Commissioner of Reclamation, but Secretary McKay is not supporting this basic policy which has endured for half a century.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAND OF THE PEOPLE

In Italy during the past few years a painful land reform process has been underway; great feudal estates which created a vast landless peasantry are being broken up to provide small family farms. In an illuminating letter from Rome which appeared on this page the other day, the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady told of the economic, social, and spiritual revitalization which has accompanied this land reform. America has been spared the kind of stratified society that grows inevitably out of concentrated land ownership in part by a consistent encouragement of small-scale land-owning—beginning with Thomas Jefferson's Virginia law abolishing entailed estates, progressing with Abraham Lincoln's Homestead Act of 1862, and moving forward toward conservation and development of the water resources of the West with the National Reclamation Act signed by Theodore Roosevelt in 1902.

But there are now signs of a serious reversal of the traditional land policy of the United States. They come in connection with the potentially rich Central Valley of California, where individual and corporate land speculators have amassed great holdings along the Kern and Kings Rivers and have for some time been bringing great pressure to have the acreage limitation provisions of the reclamation law relaxed or ignored. Land holdings in the area run as large as 12,000 and 15,000 acres each. In order to assure equitable use of resources developed through federally financed dam construction and to prevent monopoly, the reclamation law provides that no one may obtain more than enough water to irrigate 160 acres, or 320 acres for a married couple.

In the Central Valley, 320 acres is a generous allocation. With irrigation, it makes possible a prosperous family farm. It may be argued, perhaps, that in sparser and more arid regions, such as Montana, larger allocations would be in order. But this has no relevance to California. When Congress authorized construction of the Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River, completed last spring, and the Isabella Dam on the Kern River, now nearing completion, emphatic assurance was given that the reclamation law would be applied; the authorizations would not have been passed without such assurance. But now the speculators who have piled up immense holdings want the 160-acre provision set aside so that they can realize millions in profits on their holdings. And Secretary of the Interior McKay seems bent upon obliging them by interpreting a clause of the law authorizing construction of the Pine Flat and Isabella Dams to the effect that prepayment of the construction charges on the dams relieves excess lands of the reclamation law requirements.

The issue here is a momentous one for the Nation. Theodore Roosevelt argued for his reclamation law in terms that are applicable today:

"I wish to save the very wealthy men of this country and their advocates and upholders from the ruin that they would bring upon themselves if they were permitted to have their way. It is because I am against revolution; it is because I am against the doctrines of the extremists, of the Socialists; it is because I wish to see this country of ours continued as a genuine democracy; it is because I distrust violence and disbelieve in it; it is because I wish to secure this country against ever seeing a time when the "have nots" shall rise against the "haves"; it is because I wish to secure for our children and our grandchildren and for their children's children the same freedom of opportunity, the same peace and order and justice that we have had in the past."

Retail Food Prices and Modern Aids To Food Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mrs. Ted R. Banta, of Geyser, Mont., and published in the Great Falls Tribune of April 23, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA WOMAN SAYS BENSON MISTAKEN—DIDN'T DEMAND KITCHEN EASE BUT LIKES IT

(By Mrs. Ted R. Banta, Geyser, Mont.)

"Benson Says That Housewives Keep Food Prices High" was a caption in the Great Falls Tribune April 18.

It's hard for me to believe that the Secretary would venture such a remark, but if he did, he is badly mistaken. I feel certain that hundreds of housewives will agree with me.

The news item read in part: "Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson said retail food prices have not declined at rapidly as farm prices, partly because of the housewife's demand for 'built-in maid services'." There's a heap of built-in maid service in a lot of food products but the housewife did not demand it. She was faced with it and has been forced to purchase many items at an increase in price because she has no other choice.

Did the housewife demand that bread be sliced or that shrimp be breaded before it was packaged? Did she demand paper cartons for milk or that eggs be graded and packaged? Absolutely not, but she does demand good bread, clean shrimp, healthful milk and fresh eggs.

I recall when the first loaves of sliced bread first hit the grocery shelves, women, including myself, remarked, "What next?" We really didn't mind slicing our own bread—always had a good sharp knife in the kitchen drawer in those days. Selling sliced bread was a competitive idea which quickly spread to all bakers. Naturally the housewife liked the idea and found it convenient, but she did not demand it.

As for the breaded shrimp, she didn't ask for that either. Most housewives save stale bread for just such purposes. But one day, to her surprise, there it was—shrimp already breaded in the package.

Any homemaker took pride in making her milk bottles shine with cleanliness before returning them. She had no idea of paper cartons for milk until they suddenly appeared. Everyone will agree, however, that it was an excellent idea and a lot less bother for the housewife, but she did not demand it.

As for eggs, if the housewife could get good, fresh eggs from a big box in the store, she wouldn't mind taking them home in a paper bag. Most people are particular about eggs, I'll admit. No one wants a spoiled egg for breakfast and every housewife needs fresh eggs for good baking; yet she didn't demand grading, candling, packaging and refrigeration for eggs. But if that's the only way in which she can buy good eggs, then naturally she goes for it in a big way, although few understand the meaning of the stickers placed on egg cartons.

Take cereals for instance. It's amazing all the things that one finds inside a cereal box. Once I bought a box of cereal with a real good phonograph record attached. Now, I certainly would have bought that box of cereal without the record.

I have cited only a few of the numerous built-in maid service ideas which have added to the cost of food and please don't blame the housewife or the farmer for the spread between farmer and consumer prices.

Now, since the housewife has enjoyed all of the added helps, brought to the market, she wouldn't want to go back to the simpler ways—but she did not demand them.

Secretary of Defense Wilson Blunders in Bailing Out a Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial entitled "Bailing Out a Blunder," which appeared in this morning's—April 28, 1955—issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

BAILING OUT A BLUNDER

Consistency obviously is no virtue to Secretary Wilson, but he and his friends must be having a hard time keeping a straight face. What they have said, in effect, is that a compilation of military information published by the Republican Policy Committee does not constitute a violation of security even though it includes some items not previously released; but if anyone else should disclose such data, off to the dungeons with him. President Eisenhower demonstrated both a more acute sense of smell and a nicer sense of propriety yesterday by labeling the release a blunder.

How serious were the affronts to security, if any, we do not know. The brochure, entitled "National Defense Under the Republican Administration," contained descriptions of Air Force and Navy guided missiles—descriptions of the sort that the services themselves have been forbidden to give out. Possibly, however, the disclosure was not very important in itself. What is significant is that Mr. Wilson apparently has developed a double standard. It is not hard to imagine the screams that would have emanated from Mr. Wilson's office if a Democratic committee had undertaken a similar disclosure for political purposes.

All of this illustrates again the ineptness with which Mr. Wilson is approaching the information problem. The danger is that the present blunder will serve as an excuse for clamping down even more on information in which the people have a legitimate interest and which they need to judge public affairs. No one can object when responsible defense officials decide, on grounds of military security, that certain information about weapons and plans ought to remain

classified. Some of the breaches of security in the past have resulted from the vying for publicity among the services. It is wholly proper that this kind of information should be controlled as an administrative matter. But there is a vast difference between the sort of control based on security considerations and Mr. Wilson's effort to bottle up information that does not make a "constructive contribution to the primary mission of the Defense Department." This may be an appropriate formula to apply in General Motors, but it is an indefensible standard for the conduct of public business.

Fears on this score will not be relieved by the appointment of R. Karl Honaman, lately head of the misnamed Office of Stratgic Information in the Department of Commerce, as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Mr. Honaman is an able man who no doubt was a very good director of publication for the Bell Telephone Laboratories. Here again, however, there is a great difference between a private company's interest in putting out information to its advantage and what ought to be the responsibility of the Defense Department in making available all information that does not bear on security. The burden of proof ought to be on those who would withhold information. Instead, it seems to have been transferred to those who would release it.

By the way, what ever happened to the Defense Department's promise to make public General MacArthur's World War II messages to the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

GOP Kicks Farmers Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, even the Republican editors out in Minnesota are deeply concerned about the way the Republican Party is treating America's farmers these days.

In the friendly spirit of bipartisanship, I pass along for my Republican colleagues the view of one of our good Republican editors, Donald J. Olson, publisher of the Marshall Daily Messenger.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from Mr. Olson's newspaper entitled "Was This Republican Editor Right?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAS THIS REPUBLICAN EDITOR RIGHT?

Shortly after the last off-year election, when Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY defeated Val Bjornson, a prominent Minnesota Republican editor remarked that he had called the turn because he noted a dramatic unawareness of the facts of life among the old-line Republicans.

The Republican editor shocked this writer a bit when he stated: "We have kicked the farmer out of the Republican Party."

This is not completely true. Never before has the farmer been more closely associated with business and industry. The farmer, first, last, and always, is a businessman. But this Republican editor's statement is not completely false either.

While the Republican Party has not kicked the farmer out the door the party has, in a sense, treated him like a second-rate party member—sort of poor relation—a problem. Why do we say this?

Many Republicans will cheerfully admit—at least in private—that a guaranteed annual wage may be in the offing for organized labor. The hard-hitting, brilliant Walter Reuther, chief of the United Auto Workers, is respected as well as feared in Republican circles. Reuther has made no bones about it; he wants a guaranteed annual wage.

The same Republican leaders who grant all of this for organized labor talk in a different tone about a farm support program. While they willingly or unwillingly consider Reuther's ambitious plans, they scorn the leaders of the farm groups for doing the same things and talking the same way in behalf of their constituents, the farmers.

This all gives the impression that the farmer is considered to be poor relation. No one apologizes for the aims, the goals of organized labor. No one has heard a Democrat say that Walter Reuther is a parasite on the American economy. But when talking about a farm support program it is different.

Even the farmer's friends apologize for him. They ask his fair share with a sort of guilty expression—as if for some peculiar reason he is entitled to something less than the laborers of the big unions.

We don't believe the Republican Party has kicked the farmer out the door. But we believe that he hasn't received the treatment or consideration he should have been accorded. It is not too late to make amends.

Neither is it too late for the farmer to take a more active interest in the Republican Party and see to it that his voice is heard.

Dr. Frank Bay, of Albia, Iowa, Typical Iowa Family Doctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, recently the Des Moines Register and Tribune published a pictorial review of the busy life of a typical Iowa family doctor. They selected as their subject the life and character of Dr. Frank Bay, of Albia, in Monroe County. They could not have selected a more deserving subject.

I have had the honor of knowing Dr. Bay intimately for many years. He and I attended the same Iowa high school. Although Frank was just ahead of me in high school, we played on the same football team. I have long admired him, both as an athlete and as a scholar.

During the years which have passed since our graduation from Albia, Dr. Bay has translated his high school leadership to his professional and community life. Certainly he stands for the ideals that we should recognize as worthy and important. I am more than proud to count him among my closest friends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article concerning the wonderful civic life of Dr. Frank Bay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Of Iowa's approximately 2,400 physicians, some 800 practice in towns of 5,000 or less, and about 700 of those 800 are general practitioners, or family doctors. They don't have any trouble in keeping busy. The busiest man in all Monroe County, for example, is Dr. Frank Bay, and it is probably safe to add that he is also the most beloved.

He has been treating Albia's aches and pains since 1922 except for 17 months he spent in the Navy during World War II, and in that third of a century he has had just 10 days vacation.

The 62-year-old physician averages from 4 to 6 hours sleep a night, and that has been his average ever since he opened his office. His wife, who regards Dr. Bay as the most unselfish man she has ever known, once plugged the telephone so it wouldn't ring on a night when she felt he desperately needed a good sleep. When he learned what she has done, he told her "Don't ever do that again."

Once the busy doctor had two hobbies—gardening and wood-working—but there is no time left for that now. He is president of the Albia School Board, president of the Monroe County Medical Society, chief of staff of the Monroe County Hospital, a member of the medical staff of the Ottumwa Hospital and of St. Joseph's Hospital in Ottumwa, a steward of the First Methodist Church in Albia, and except for 3 years he has been county coroner since 1929.

It is no surpise that, as he says, "Time sure flies in this business. They used to bring a calendar around one a year, but now it seems like they are bringing them around every month."

You can't live as full a life as Dr. Bay has enjoyed without experiencing a certain amount of excitement and adventure, and he has had his share. Twenty years ago he was overcome by gas when he went down into a mine after an explosion. Not long ago he had to squirm on his stomach to push a stretcher along in another mine accident. In 1933 he was a member of a posse following a Bussey bank holdup, and the following year his car was struck by a bullet after a holdup in Hiteman. Dr. Bay was driving the sheriff on that occasion. About 7 years ago, the doctor dived into the river to hook a chain to a car that was under water so it could be hauled up. A flash flood had washed out a bridge and drowned four persons trapped in the car.

NO MORE HORSES

The energetic physician formerly kept a horse in his garage during bad weather so he could make his country calls, but now he uses a jeep. He has made calls by horse, car, jeep, railroad handcar, steam engine, boat, tractor, bobsled, and on foot.

"I just keep plugging along," he philosophizes. "That way I stay out of trouble. My father used to say, 'Mom, keep the boys busy,' and she would reply, 'But the woodbin is full,' and he'd say, 'Well, tell them to empty it, then.'"

HOUSE CALLS $2

Once Mrs. Bay wondered why a certain patient always called the doctor late at night. He never told her, but she found out later the patient had cataracts and called him when she was lonely, whereupon he would go read her a chapter from her Bible. Dr. Bay never turns down a house call, and his fee is an old-fashioned $2 "if they have it." "No sense in charging high fees," he comments. "The people haven't got the money, and the Government would take it, anyway."

In all other ways, the friendly physician is up to the minute. He even has installed a television set in his office waiting room. "I had to," he explains. "The kids were wrecking the place."

Albia always has been home to Dr. Bay. He was born there September 24, 1892, and

was graduated from Albia High School in 1910. He then went to Penn College to study engineering, but left there after a year to work for the Maple Block Coal Co. near Albia. After a spell there he made the decision that changed his life and proved to be one of the most fortunate things that ever happened to his hometown. He quit engineering and took up premedical training at the State University of Iowa. After 7 months in the Army during World War I, he completed his medical studies at Iowa and at St. Louis University, and served an internship at Wheeling, W. Va. It was in Wheeling he met his wife.

"I'VE BEEN LUCKY"

"I've been lucky," he confides, speaking of Mrs. Bay. "My wife was a nurse and knew what the life would be like. She taught and brought up the girls and did a wonderful job. Three of them were straight 'A' students."

The Bays have four daughters: Mrs. Charles Coon, 31, of Lovilia; Mrs. Donald Daniels, 29, of Morton Grove, Ill.; Ciella, 24, and Calia, 20.

The President's Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Engineering News-Record of March 31, 1955, page 128.

It will be noticed that those who criticized the report of the Clay committee and the pending legislation for carrying out the President's plan for building better roads in the United States now offer no constructive substitute. The necessity for building better roads in this country is not a debatable question. It is conceded by all people who know the facts. The method of building such roads or financing them is the only question involved.

The views expressed by the Engineering News-Record are worthy of consideration whether you are for or against the building of better roads. I commend it to the Members of Congress for reading:

NO BETTER ROAD PLAN YET

Opponents of the President's road plan so far are woefully short on counter proposals that meet the road problem squarely, or offer even a fair chance for success. From the hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Roads have come numerous criticisms of different parts of the President's plan as embodied in the administration bill, but almost nothing that can be called constructive.

In this connection the testimony of Senator BYRD was particularly disappointing because he, too, chose criticism as his contribution, without suggesting any alternative that would provide the Nation with the roads it so desperately needs. He expressed fear that Federal financing of the interstate system would mean Federal control. He called bond financing outside of the Federal budget "financial legerdemain." And he thought it was wrong to pledge the Federal gas tax to a "single specified purpose." What is the alternative? Continued road inadequacy. Unfortunately, Senator BYRD did not say.

To date, therefore, it must be concluded that no one has a better road plan to offer than the one the Clay committee developed for the President. Unless Congress can come up with something better, it should pass the administration bill with whatever constructive changes it deems desirable.

Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two columns by May Craig, Washington correspondent for the Guy Gannett newspapers in Maine, written from Moscow during her recent trip to Russia, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, April 23, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—FIRST MERRY REDS SEEN AT THE CIRCUS

(By May Craig)

MOSCOW.—Most fun I had in Moscow was at the circus. This is a small intimate one-ring circus, in the middle of town, in a building, not a tent. The front row of seats is so close to the ring that the horses kick sand right into your lap. I was in the second row, and glad of it, when the horses were going fast, with bareback riders, men and women, recklessly jumping on their backs, standing three high on shoulders, riding tandem.

This circus lasted 3 hours and had a great variety of acts. Clowns came in between acts; there was slapstick comedy; animal acts; music; acrobats, aerial performers. The master of ceremonies was dressed in white tie and tails and was most dignified, with a resonant voice, and announced each act. The ring was surrounded by a low wooden railing, about 2 feet wide, covered with red velvet, and some of the animals raced on this. For some acts they put down carpets on the sand of the ring, and young stagehands brushed this off with fagot brooms between acts, and rolled it up and took it away for animal acts.

The act that really brought down the house was a moose reined to a small donkey. They raced around the ring and over hurdles; never did I expect to see anything funnier than this moose, with his face flapping, clambering over hurdles with his clumsy legs. The little donkey kept him in the ring, but I expected every moment he would flop over and come ambling up the low seats into my lap. It was pretty frightening when the horses were really racing around, because the front aisle was only 2 feet wide, then the front row, and then me.

The animal acts were the funniest—squirrels, foxes, a rabbit riding a small donkey, dogs and cats, even an eagle. There were some excellent Chinese jugglers; this was a shock to me, because I had seen them at the Intourist (Russian travel agency) Hotel National where I am staying, had been impressed by their dignity, and imagined they were some high Red Chinese delegation here plotting the violent overthrow of the free world with the U. S. S. R.

Incidentally, the written words here are very confusing. They do not use our alphabet, and the letters look strange to us. If you see CCCP engraved on a building or monument, it means U. S. S. R.—Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

First time I had seen anybody behind the Iron Curtain merry was at this circus. We were really among the Russian people there. There were whole families together. The children applauded wildly when a "family" of acrobats came on, including three boys, the youngest not a day over 5 years. During the intermissions, everybody went out into the lobby, jammed the aisles, talked and visited. I have not seen one Russian woman dressed stylishly. Hardly any have lipstick or visible powder. One of our guides had lipstick; quite a few have curled hair; on the lobby floor of the hotel, in a cubbyhole plainly visible from the lobby, I saw a lady getting her hair set in what looked like a permanent.

Some of the aerial acts at the circus were hair raising. And the slapstick comedy was good enough so we knew perfectly well what was going on.

Russians are strong for theater; they always have been. There is a square of theaters dominated by the great State Bolshoi Opera, but this was completed in 1824, so the Reds cannot take credit. There are many children's theaters. People wait months to get tickets to some popular production. We told our guide we were fortunate to get tickets for a ballet at Bolshoi the following evening and she said that this was "a privilege we show our guests." There are many movie houses, with wide screens too, but there are no American movies as we saw in all but Iron Curtain countries.

One thing the United States must soon decide, is whether to participate in international contests, sports, music, chess, and so forth. The Communists are determined to show they are better than the capitalist world, in everything, as part of their propaganda. Sports especially, since that typifies force. They take children and train them rigorously, whether it be music, sports, chess, ballet; train them all their lives—train them to be better than any capitalist competitor. This is a policy, a design; they must win, they are subsidized while they do it. Free countries do not do that. Can we develop winners, without this planned and ruthlessly enforced lifetime training? And if we do not win, if we do not even participate, the Reds make capital of it, either way. One pressing question is, Do we participate in the next Olympic games? All the satellite countries are coming into this design of the Communists to excel non-Communists. We face an important policy decision on this. Shall we come in when we know we have little chance to win against the subsidized competitors?

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of April 25, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—OLD MOSCOW HAS DISAPPEARED

(By May Craig)

MOSCOW.—Moscow is an ancient city, founded 800 years ago. The Communists, while saving the ancient monumental churches, palaces, walls, have ruthlessly demolished "old Moscow," the firetrap old wooden houses. There have been many fires which have destroyed these, too. Some are left, and on a guided tour we saw some.

A guided tour in Moscow, as in the satellite countries—is exactly that. The tour is planned and, come hell or high water, the guide is going to follow the pattern. Being Americans, we tried several times to get

off the track, do something else on the spur of the moment—but no luck. It is part of the frustration of traveling behind the Iron Curtain—they are set in a rigidity that come partly from the organized, bureaucratic system, and partly because they have orders not to deviate from whatever their schedule is.

There is a guard in uniform outside our hotel—maybe he is just a doorman—and when we asked the guide if we could take his picture, she said she would ask him. She said something and he said "No."

In the square, opposite our hotel, called the Big Square, though its name is Manesh Square, nearby Red Square, is the old Moscow University with students from 64 countries. Our guide told us there are 57 million persons studying in Russia, of all grades including postgraduate. The Communists are making a great effort to educate their people as an asset against the capitalist world, and to aggrandize the Communist world. Education is necessary to win hot or cold war, they believe, and with dictatorial power they can educate, and they are doing it.

Just as ruthlessly they have widened streets—Leningrad Avenue is about 380 feet wide, with trees and planting down the middle. To widen and straighten streets, they have torn down houses, moved others which are historic or beautiful. They construct new cellars and move the whole building in one piece. Monuments are moved in one piece. Everything is subordinate to the plan.

Before 1917, the date of the revolution, 70 percent of Moscow was wooden; now the city is spotted with tall, modern skyscrapers, rising in pinnacled tower style typical of new Russian architecture. There are rows of apartment houses. Rent is determined by salary of the head of the family.

Much of the new construction is now good, however, perhaps too hastily built, and for effect, to show the world that the Communists could outdo the capitalist world, catch up in a few years, for the centuries they are behind. It is a fascinating city, in the ancient buildings.

The editors were taken to see the new Soviet Hotel. It is monumental. The editors were appalled by the "waste space" in the wide marble lobbies, pillars and royal staircases of marble, with red carpet. I was appalled to see the hardwood parquetry floors, only 2 years old, already chipped and splintered and the individual inlay sprung apart as though they were green when laid. The joints of the parquetry did not fit, showing poor workmanship.

We saw the prize suites, $50 a day, and though I allowed for the odd furnishings, unlike ours, I could not help seeing that the plumbing in the bathrooms was poorer than in the cheapest housing at home; and the same poor workmanship on the wooden floors. Much of the construction was of the same caliber, though it looked magnificent from a distance—I must say for the Russians—they do have magnificent concepts, big and bold.

I saw the same poor construction in Poland and Czechoslovakia. The workers housing was often of reclaimed brick, for which I do not blame them, because they didn't have new—but there was scanty mortar between the bricks, which means they will loosen and fall out. The stucco is already peeling from some of the new housing. The wooden inlaid floors in this hotel, which is 50 years old, is in much better shap than in the new Soviet Hotel.

Spelling really gets you down. At the airport, the sign said "Mockba", which is the way they spell Moscow. In Yugoslavia some of us stayed at the Moskva Hotel. Russian is hard to learn, for westerners, because of the pronunciation. Some of the Americans here have learned it enough to get around, and order a meal. There are only five Americans in all Moscow except the American Embassy staff and us. These five are the correspondents of the New York Times, the Associated Press, the United Press, the International News Service, and the wife of the latter—and us.

There is pretty nearly every other nationality in the world—except the Western World, who are about as restricted as the United States, though all the official Communists blame us for shutting out visitors and complain of restrictions on Russians in the United States and the U. N. With due care against spies and saboteurs, I think we should let more Communist visitors come to us.

Boris Sirpo's All-Girl Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon's Little Chamber Orchestra of 14 outstanding young girl instrumentalists will tour Europe as ambassadors of musical good will.

The Portland Little Chamber Orchestra, with the youngest member only 15 and the eldest only 28, was founded by and is under the able direction of Boris Sirpo. Sirpo is well known to Oregon music lovers as professor of music at Lewis and Clark College, and director of the Portland Chamber Orchestra and the Hood River Music Festival Association.

Sirpo came to the United States in 1940, fleeing the Russians as they invaded his native Finland and destroyed the fine conservatory of music he had founded at Viipuri in 1918. The highlight of the European tour will be the dedication of the newly completed Boris Sirpo Hall at Viipuri Music College, in Finland.

Mr. President, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I offer this well-deserved tribute to Boris Sirpo and to the talented 14 young Oregon girls who are members of Portland's Little Chamber Orchestra.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the Sirpo tour by Ann Sullivan from the Oregonian of Sunday, April 17, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BORIS SIRPO'S ALL-GIRL ORCHESTRA
(By Ann Sullivan)

Mid-May will mark departure time for 14 feminine ambassadors of musical good will—14 young Oregon girls Europe-bound.

They are Portland's Little Chamber Orchestra, 14 charming, vivacious, pretty instrumentalists—quite capable of showing Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, France, England and perhaps Italy that American teen-agers are not entirely coke-drinking, jive-talking hot-rodders.

The youthful group—youngest only 15, eldest only 28—is a dream brain child of an adopted Portlander, grandfatherly, portly Boris Sirpo, "Mr. Music" of the Hood River Music Festival Association, the Portland Chamber Orchestra and now the Little Chamber Orchestra.

Professor of music at Lewis and Clark College for 10 years, 10 years director of the Chamber Orchestra and a stern but kindly taskmaster to hundreds of young musicians in this area, Sirpo thought up the idea of this trip about 5 years ago and formed the orchestra about 2 years ago.

Sirpo came to America in February 1940, when the Russians overran his native Finland and destroyed the fine conservatory of music he had founded at Viipuri in 1918, when he was quite a young man. He was for 15 years conductor of the Viipuri Symphony Orchestra, and that was gone, too.

After a short while in New York and a year at Paramount studios in Hollywood, he finally elected to live in the Northwest. He taught at Marylhurst 4 years, during that time helping develop the Hood River symphony and the Hood River music festival.

He organized the Portland Chamber orchestra, a good-sized orchestra of musicians from a variety of walks of life who like to play together, and finally the Little Chamber, composed of some of the fine young girl musicians who have come under his tutelage.

The Little Chamber orchestra is an affiliate of the Portland Chamber orchestra and Lewis and Clark College.

There has been some turnover in the Little Chamber during the 2 years of its existence but, roughly, it comprises 14 young girls who are among this area's top musicians.

They were chosen first for their music, second for their culture, third for their friendliness, and possibly for their looks, too—because they are all beautiful.

Already a rigorous concert schedule is set up for their 2-month trip, which will include Sirpo's native land for the Jan Sibelius festival in June.

Sirpo intends also to take his girls to play for the 89-year-old music master in his home.

The first concert is set for May 18. At the moment there are 11 others already scheduled in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark alone. The girls will appear on a half-hour television program in Paris, France, and also go to London and several smaller cities in England. At the last moment it looks as if they will include Italy, too.

They will play all their concerts from memory.

Whenever possible the girls will stay at homes rather than hotels in the cities where they will play. They want to learn how Europe lives and acts, just as much as Sirpo wants to show off the grace and charm of his pretty charges.

The trip, expected to cost about $25,000, is already half subscribed and pledged by friends and supporters, according to Sirpo. Some money will be realized by the concerts, but the group does not intend to "make money" on the trip. Anything over expenses will go to Rotary clubs of various countries to help young Europeans study in America.

To Sirpo the trip is vision soon to come true, his first trip home, where a concert hall in his honor has been named for and dedicated to him.

The 14 young instrumentalists will be accompanied also by Mrs. Sirpo, a couple of mothers, and the husband of one of the girls of the group who is married.

These are the young musical ambassadors: Claire Hodgkins, 25, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James L. Hodgkins, 4746 Northeast Flanders Street, is a violinist and concertmaster of the chamber orchestra. She has soloed with the Hood River symphony, the Portland symphony, the chamber orchestra, and the Lewis and Clark symphony, and has been playing since she was 4 years old. She is a young artists auditions winner.

Jean Nesbit, 17, violinist, senior at Cleveland High School, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. Wallace Nesbit, 3675 Southeast Crystal Springs Boulevard, has been playing 5 years with the Portland junior symphony, chamber orchestra, and Lewis and Clark symphony.

Ann Kafoury Tremaine (Mrs. Norman Tremaine), 25, 316 Northeast 60th Avenue, violinist, concertmaster of the University of Oregon orchestra for 3 years and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Allen Kafoury, teaches the violin to a few students. She has played with the Portland chamber orchestra, the Lewis and Clark symphony, and junior symphony.

Susan Lathrop, 16, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. T. G. Lathrop, Oregon City, violinist, a junior at Oregon City High School, has been playing 8 or 9 years. Her physician-father plays the clarinet, her mother the organ and piano, one brother the bass, another the clarinet, and a sister the piano.

Joyce Annala, 20, part-time student at Lewis and Clark College, is a cellist, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Arvin O. Annala, Hood River, and third cousin to Claire Hodgkins (both are of Finnish descent). She has been playing 9 years, including concerts with Hood River symphony, chamber orchestra, Lewis and Clark symphony.

Jo Ann Kaden, 15, violinist, Jefferson High School sophomore, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Boardman, 634 North Winchell Street, is the youngest of the orchestra. She has played with the junior symphony, chamber orchestra, and Lewis and Clark symphony, and she was concertmaster of her school orchestra.

Gloria Wawrinofsky, 22, violinist, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Wawrinofsky, 1337 NE. 52d Avenue, attended Portland State last year. Now working as an operator for the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., she has been playing since she was 7, with the Grant High School orchestra, junior symphony, chamber orchestra.

Tana Bawden, 20, pianist, daughter of Mrs. Monte Bawden, 3080 SW. Spring Garden Street, is now attending Portland School of Music after 2 years at Lewis and Clark. She wants to be a concert artist. She won a junior symphony contest at 10 and has been "picking out notes" since she was 3½.

Hope Jaquith, 25, violinist, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Jaquith, Salem, is from another musical family. Two brothers play the piano, and her father, who owns the music center, plays most musical instruments. He once toured Europe with a musical group. She has soloed with both chamber orchestra and Lewis and Clark symphony, has played concerts in several northwest cities.

Muriel Fitts, 26, violinist, former University of Southern California student and graduate of Lewis and Clark College, lives at Brooks, near Salem. She teaches violin and viola, has played with the Lewis and Clark symphony and chamber orchestra. Although she recently underwent a hip operation, she plans the European trip anyway.

Eunice Watson, 23, cellist, head resident of the gatehouse at Lewis and Clark College, where she graduated last year, is the daughter of Mrs. Theo Watson, Denver, and Roy Watson, Boise. She has been playing 10 years and performs with the Lewis and Clark symphony, and Portland chamber orchestra. A philosophy major, she will probably teach.

Ann Thompson, 24, string bass, 3400 S. W. Veterans Hospital road, is a music teacher at Lane elementary school. A University of Oregon gradute in music in 1952, she has played the instrument 12 years, including 4 years with the University of Oregon symphony. She plays now for the Portland Chamber Orchestra. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Matthew R. Thompson, of Monmouth.

Patricia Steen Olsen (Mrs. Ralph), 28, now making her home in Seattle, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Norman Steen, 10126 S. E. Stanley avenue. A graduate of Lewis and Clark College, she is now working for a master's degree in music education at the University of Washington.

She plays both the violin and the viola, was concertmistress of the Lewis and Clark symphony and is charter member of the Portland Chamber Orchestra.

Kathyrn (Kay) Hardwick, 18, a senior at St. Mary's Academy and daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Clifford Hardwick, 2645 Southwest Davenport Court, plays both the violin and the piano. She started the former when she was 5½. She plays in the St. Mary's Orchestra, the Lewis and Clark Symphony, and the Portland Chamber Orchestra.

A Resolution To Designate April 30 of Each Year as Presidents' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a House joint resolution today which I commend to the attention and consideration of all our colleagues.

My resolution would designate April 30 of each year, the anniversary of the inauguration day of George Washington as first president of the United States, to be known as Presidents' Day. This resolution stems from a suggestion made to me by Mr. David McDonough, of Miami, Fla. He has long been active in community affairs and has a great sense of civic responsibility. This idea of his for the commemoration of our past Presidents is but one of the many fine civic endeavors on which he has worked.

I am hopeful that this Congress, during this session, will adopt this resolution in order that proper plans may be made throughout our country to officially honor our past Presidents by April 30 of next year.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....The Capitol Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Buchanan, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Davidson, Bell, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, ———, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Fine, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Machrowicz, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Machrowicz, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Dingell, Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Harold M. Stephens, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 4-6420
	Circuit Judges	
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee, 3550 Springland Lane.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, 1500 Massachusetts Ave.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 1868 Columbia Road.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Washington, 4912 Brookway Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Paul W. Brosman
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*—1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—7304 Bradley Blvd. Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*—The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Granahan, William T., *Pa*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*—125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*—1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—The Coronet

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*.
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*.
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Long, George S., *La*.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*.—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa*.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*.—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*.
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.—3130 Wisconsin Ave.
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.—3250 T St. SE.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*.
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*.—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
Meader, George, *Mich*.—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*.
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*.
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va*.
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*.
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.
Morrison, James H., *La*.—4420 Dexter St.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*.
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*.
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*.
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.
Natcher, William H., *Ky*.—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*.
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*.
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*.—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass*.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*.
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*.—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*.
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*.
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.
Phillips, John, *Calif*.
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*.
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*.
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*.—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.
Quigley, James M., *Pa*.
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*.
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill*.—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.
Richards, James P., *S. C*.
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*.—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*.
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*.—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*.
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*.—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*.
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*.
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*.—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*.—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*.
Short, Dewey, *Mo*.
Shuford, George A., *N. C*.—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*.
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*.—The Dorchester
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*.
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*.
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*.
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*.—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*.
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*.
Thompson, T. A., *La*.—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*.
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*.
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*.
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.
Tuck, William M., *Va*.
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*.
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.
Utt, James B., *Calif*.
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*.
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*.—The Senate Courts
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*.—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.
Watts, John C., *Ky*.
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*.
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*.—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*.
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*.—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J*.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*.—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*.—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*.
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*.—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*.—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*.—3202 So. Stafford St., Arlington, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*.
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii*.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Moundsville, W. Va., April 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held the evening of April 30, 1955, in Moundsville, W. Va., and conducted by the Marshall County Democratic Executive Committee:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the clergy, my valued friends and colleagues in Congress, Senator MATTHEW NEELY, Congressman ROBERT MOLLOHAN, and Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, distinguished and invited guests, ladies, and gentlemen, with more than one-half of the present administration over, we now have an opportunity of appraising it objectively, whether or not it has kept it promises, of evaluating its policies, as well as the kind of government the present Republican administration has given to our country and our people.

In connection with the conduct of the Government, we must always bear in mind that the first domestic duty of our Government—as so eloquently stated in the preamble of the Constitution is to establish justice.

This means that the powers of government are dedicated and should be utilized to bring about justice to our people.

With the depressed economic conditions of West Virginia, with the large number of unemployed in your State, do you think the present Republican administration is performing the constitutional mandate of our fathers and bringing justice to the people of West Virginia?

Despite the efforts of the high-powered public relation representatives of the big corporations of the country who are operating in Washington for the Republican Party in an effort to sell President Eisenhower and the Republican Party to the people, in the same manner as they sell coffee, cigarettes, or some other commodity, the people are commencing to catch up with the broken promises of the present administration, of its control and domination by big business, and of its failures.

The record of the Republican administration, for which President Eisenhower is responsible, is such that I predict with confidence, the election in 1956 of a Democratic President—of a Democratic Congress—and convincing Democratic victories in the several States and political subdivisions of the Nation. For there are millions of Americans who voted for the Republican candidate for President in 1952 who now wish they had Harry S. Truman, or some other Democrat in the White House.

Despite the efforts of the high-powered public relation representatives of the big corporations to pressure the American people by organized propaganda, that President Eisenhower occupies a lofty, elevated position, immune from criticism or any kind or of unfavorable comment; and thereby to attempt to create in America a political vacuum—the people are awakening and are properly holding President Eisenhower, as the leader of his party and as Chief Executive, responsible for the policies of the present administration—and properly so, because President Eisenhower is responsible—and should be held responsible by the people.

As the President claims credit for any good policy, so is he responsible for any unwise and harmful policy.

In the last campaign in a speech in Boston, Vice President NIXON, whose political shifts are well known, said, "a political party is to be judged by the premises it keeps."

I agree with that statement, Mr. Vice President, but I go one important step forward—that, a political party is also to be judged by the promises it does not keep.

And the Republican record of broken promises—for which President Eisenhower must accept full responsibility—is one that is subject to justifiable severe criticism.

Let me refresh your memory and call the roll of some of the broken promises.

1. To balance the budget.
2. To reduce the national debt.
3. The great crusade.
4. Instant and massive retaliation.
5. The new military look.
6. The liberation of enslaved peoples.
7. Cooperative peace.
8. Peaceful coexistence.
9. Peace through trade.
10. Agonizing reappraisal.
11. Trade, not aid.
12. To unleash Chiang Kai-shek.
13. To meet the problems of distressed labor areas.
14. To assure equitable distribution of Government contracts to small and independent businesses.

And there are many others.

On the question of lack of coordination—and of confusion and irresponsibility on a high level—all any one has to do is read the newspapers of the past few days.

It is only a few days ago that the Under Secretary of State, Herbert Hoover, Jr., after a telephone talk with the President—issued a statement that our Government would not negotiate with the Chinese Reds unless four conditions were met—one of which is the release of American prisoners—and another that Chiang Kai-shek's government would have to participate in any negotiations.

A few days later, Secretary Dulles indicated our willingness to negotiate without Chiang Kai-shek or his representatives being present.

These two statements clearly indicate that they are inconsistent with each other.

Prepared by the Republicans was a complete compilation of our military strength, directly in violation of the position and wishes of President Eisenhower and Secretary Wilson. It is the most complete compilation that I have ever seen. While not so intended, it is a most valuable document for any potential enemy of ours to possess, such as the Soviet Union or Red China.

If this document had emanated from a Democratic sources, the Democrats would be accused of everything under the sun.

And yet, while it violates the position of Charles Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, and also of General Motors fame, as well as other fame—as Charles Wilson, the Republican, he undertook to defend the publication, which he knew, or ought to know, was not for the best interests of our country.

It was so bad that even the President, at his press conference a few days ago, termed this compilation as a blunder.

Is this evidence of coordinated and responsible leadership? It clearly shows lack of coordination, which leads to irresponsibility.

And that has been the situation that has existed quite generally throughout the past 2½ years.

These two happenings of current nature clearly show the lack of leadership of the Republican Party in Washington.

You will remember that last year we were told that the Navarre plan to save Indochina from the Chinese Reds was foolproof, and that it could not fail. In other words, that the Communists could not win in Indochina. We know, to our sorrow, the results.

We know that a good part of Indochina is now lost to the Communists; that Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are threatened; in fact, all of southeast Asia.

In the national interests of our country, we cannot afford to see all of southeast Asia dominated by the Communists, for this could result in our own Far Eastern defenses being outflanked.

In other words, one statement one day, and the opposite the next day or the next month.

It is no wonder that the people are commencing to catch up with such inconsistent and irresponsible leadership.

It is not difficult to understand why the people last fall again turned to the Democratic Party in Congress, and in many States of the Union, for leadership.

Is it any wonder that the people are going to turn to the Democratic Party again for complete leadership in 1956 by the election of a Democratic President, and the reelection of a Democratic Congress.

In dealing with the gang of international brigands in the Kremlin and in Peiping we must realize that we are dealing with Communist leaders who are possessed of the minds of world killers. They are dedicated to world revolution and world domination.

Until they renounce such objectives, despite their soft talk from time to time, they are determined to conquer and enslave the world.

For the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear; and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

We cannot negotiate or deal with them on a moral plane, for they have no spiritual values. They not only deny God, but they are fighting Him by attempting to conquer and enslave peoples throughout the world who believe in Him and His law. They know that as long as there is any place in the world free from Communist domination, where people believe in God, His law, and His word, that the Communist ideology will be constantly threatened. They are the prisoners on an ideology that, in order to succeed, forces and compels them to attempt to conquer and dominate the entire world.

We cannot negotiate with them on any idealistic level, for they have no ideals. But, there is one level on which we can deal with

them, and that is on the basis of the law of self-preservation.

For even the Communists cannot deny the existence of the law of self-preservation, that it applies to them and their country—just the same as it applies to all others and their countries.

And it is only through military strength, which they respect through fear; that negotiations on this level can be conducted with them.

It is only military strength which they fear, that can deter them, because of the fear of the consequences to themselves.

And yet, despite the opposition of General Ridgway, we are sharply reducing our Army, with reductions in our Navy and our Marine Corps.

In the world of today it is better that we have too much military strength, and not need it, than to have too little, and need it.

When one talks as I do the stock-form answer one receives is that President Eisenhower is a great military leader, and that he knows better than anyone else what military strength we should have.

Respecting as I do his military knowledge and experience, my judgment tells me that it is dangerous to rest the safety and security of our Nation on the judgment of one man, for he is human, and it is human to err.

Suppose the President guesses wrong?

Let me remind you that he guessed wrong in 1953, when he ordered the Truman air program of 143 air wing groups reduced to 120 air wing groups.

We Democrats opposed it. We were ridiculed, despite the fact that the late General Vandenberg, Chief of the United States Air Force, took the same position, for putting our judgment against that of President Eisenhower.

And yet, one year later, in 1954, President Eisenhower recognized that he had erred; and changed his mind, and recommended appropriations for 137 air wing groups. He could not be right both years.

He erred only 2 years ago on the strength of our Air Force. He could be wrong now in the reductions he has ordered in other military components. And if he is wrong, and a conflict comes, the consequences could be dreadful to all of our people.

In Washington, we know that at least three of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a majority of the National Security Council have recommended against the reductions of our Armed Forces. So we have plenty of competent military leaders, who have led armies in time of war, differing from the President.

In any event, to the Communists this is evidence of weakness and not of strength.

And remember—there is only one thing they heed and that is military strength and its relationship to the laws of self-preservation.

If they are afraid of us they will not attack.

If they are not some day they will.

The lack of direction and the uncertainty of the Republican administration in the field of foreign affairs is most noticeable. A reader of the newspaper can detect that fact.

Is there any one of you who can tell me what the foreign policy of our country is? We started out with (1) "The Great Crusade," (2) liberating of enslaved peoples, (3) agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy, (4) massive and instant retaliation, (5) threatening utterances. And in less than 2 years we ended up with (A) peace through trade, and (B) peaceful coexistence.

In other words, we have gone from one extreme to the other.

But in this crisis the country was fortunate that last year it elected a Democratic Congress. For in the field of foreign affairs the Democratic Party is united. The Republican Party is badly split with bitterness existing in their ranks.

And frequently in recent months it has been the Democratic Party in Congress, under the leadership of Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and of Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—both Democrats, speaking with logic, wisdom, and experience—who have saved our country from serious embarrassment.

When the Republican administration does not know what to do and is manifesting uncertainty bordering at times on confusion—when the Republican administration appears to listen to the voices of both the appeasers and those who would hurl the world into another world conflict—it has been the logic, the judgment, and the voice of these two legislator-statesmen speaking out with firmness and strength in the national interest of our country that has led the way.

The leadership of the Democratic Party in Congress, as a minority party during the past 2 years, and in this Congress as the majority party, has been one of supporting and fighting for all measures, both in the field of foreign and domestic affairs, that are in the best interests of our people.

Might I say that our people need have no fear of the united Democratic Party cooperating in the field of foreign affairs in a real, effective, bipartisan manner. The problem of President Eisenhower on bipartisanship is not with the Democratic Party—it is with his own Republican Party in Congress.

In this respect the President's problem is to try and establish bipartisanship between himself and the conflicting and fighting factions of his own party.

In his efforts to harmonize the differences within his own party, the President has had to frequently compromise his views—based on political considerations involving the different factions of his own party.

The Nation is witnessing the inability of the President to get the support of his own party in Congress. In the field of foreign affairs this could result in great harm to our country.

For the record indisputedly shows that President Eisenhower does not command the support and allegiance of at least one-half of the Republican Members of Congress.

Another matter of concern to the people of the country is the big-business control of our Government, as well as the giveaways of the resources of the people by this administration to certain vested interests.

As we view the Dixon-Yates contract; as we view the change in the wise public power policy of the past 20 years; as we view the intense concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, through giving to some corporations far more than their share of defense contracts, through an inequitable tax bill of last year, through lax enforcement of the antitrust laws, it is well that the people of America might feel gravely concerned about what the present Republican administration has done and is doing.

Outside of the few beneficial pieces of legislation, such as increased social-security coverage, and which was saved by the Democrats because they were extensions of Democratic measures, every action done by the present administration has been to give preference to big business and the big bankers.

Under this administration the situation of the small and independent businessmen, who are the backbone of our economic strength, has weakened tremendously. Very little consideration has been given to protective and strengthening this important segment of our national economy. When the present administration terminated the RFC, which had done a lot of good for small and independent businesses, it established in its place the Small Business Administration. But the Republican Congress put limitations into the law which makes it difficult for any real benefits to flow to this important element of American business.

In the extending of this law, which expires in a few months, the Democratic Congress will strengthen it so that real service will be rendered to our small and independent businesses.

One thing is also certain, that so far as the Democratic Congress is concerned, the passage of legislation for the benefit of big business and big bankers will not take place, and under a Democratic Congress there will be no more legislative giveaways.

So that despite the efforts of the press to cover up, the people are commencing to realize that the present administration is not representative of the people, but essentially is representative of big business.

In 1954 the people returned in part, through the election of a Democratic Congress, our Government to the people.

In order to stop further damage which is taking place through Republican administrative action, not by legislation, the people will have to complete the job in 1956 and return the Government to the people. For a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress means a people's Government.

On the cold record of this administration, of its broken promises, of its failures, of its domination by big business for the benefit of big business, of its inability to be a party of responsibility, all of which comes under the leadership of President Eisenhower, the people of the country are again turning to the Democratic Party for that leadership in which the Republican Party has failed.

There is no question but what the Democratic Party would win if we had had a Presidential election in 1954.

There is no question but what the party of stability and responsibility is the Democratic Party. With the bitterness existing among the Republicans in Congress, it is most fortunate for our country that the Democratic Party is in control of the Congress. With the constructive record of the Democratic Party—dedicated to the national interests of our country, and the inability of the Republican Party in Congress to assume responsibility, I confidently predict that the people in their wisdom and in their sound judgment will again turn to the Democratic Party in 1956 for leadership in both the White House and in the Congress.

In conclusion, I want to pay my special tribute to the delegation from West Virginia in the Congress, both in the national House of Representatives, and in the Senate of the United States. The delegation from West Virginia in both branches is one of the ablest and strongest, the most respected delegation of any of the States of the Union. West Virginia has sent to Congress a solid delegation of Democrats. Each and every one of them is truly a people's representative. The people of West Virginia and of the different congressional districts are justified in feeling proud of the members of their districts in both branches of the Congress.

I am particularly proud to see my good friend, Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, here tonight. I deeply respect him. He is one of the most courageous Members of our national legislative body.

I am particularly pleased to come here at the invitation of Congressman ROBERT MOLLOHAN. In his second term in the National House of Representatives, Congressman MOLLOHAN has already made an outstanding record for himself. He is a member of the important Committees on Government Operation and Armed Services. Both Speaker RAYBURN and I have profound respect for him. Like Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY and the other Members of the House and Senate from West Virginia, Congressman

MOLLOHAN enjoys the confidence of the Speaker and myself.

As you well remember, our "Mr. Democrat," who is Speaker RAYBURN, of the national House of Representatives, addressed you last year. I know that you will always remember his visit to your midst. When I told him I was coming to Moundsville to address a Jefferson-Jackson Day rally he asked me to particularly convey to you his highest regards and fond recollections of his visit here last year.

No Advantage to America in Trade With Communist-Dominated Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following letter I have received from Mr. John Sedlacek, 1321 North 13th Street, East St. Louis, Ill., condemning trade with Communist countries:

East St. Louis, Ill., April 24, 1955.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The peoples of the United States do not appreciate the magnitude of the defeat the West has suffered since 1945. This defeat cannot be blamed on stupidity, it is brought about by a small group of pro-Communists, pseudeo-intellectuals, with full deliberation.

We continue to retreat and by yielding to those who cry for more trade with Iron Curtain countries, we are building up the economy of our avowed enemy, who, time and time again, has declared that their objective is to eliminate the United States as a world power.

Why should we help the Communist countries in power? Every report we receive from released victims of Communist aggressors indicates that a push in the right direction would encourage the people to rise up against their Red oppressors. Besides we receive no credit for our largesse. Anything the countries behind the Iron Curtain receive through trade with the West is labeled before distribution as coming from the Communist Peoples Government of the U. S. S. R.

The support for trade with Communist countries, whether originating in Britain or in the United States, cannot be written off as mere stupidity. It is deliberate. No one could be so colossally stupid.

Some person or groups of persons are pulling the strings. Sentiment for trade with Communist countries or countries behind the Iron Curtain is a deliberate policy inspired by Communist sympathizers right here on the home front. That must be evident to anyone who studies the record.

We just can't get over the gullibility of the people here on the home front that fall for the line of the quasi-intellectuals who are sounding off on every opportunity in a concerted drive to win support for trade with the Communist and countries that they control.

This all going on while hundreds of Americans are still languishing in Communist prisons—as one atrocity follows upon another; colossal lies are spread against the United States and the most monstrous being that of germ warfare and still members of the executive branch of Government and legislators in Washington talk of trade with Communist.

To us that have relatives in the Communist concentration camps cannot accept the peoples governments of Communist countries as civilized nations—to us it's like doing business with a bandit who has kicked you, maligned you, beaten you and robbed you. Would you invite such a bandit to your home and contemplate dealing with these evil men?

Therefore we would appreciate that you use your office to impress upon the Congress and the Nation, that trade with Communists—these evil people, with hands reeking with the blood of ours soldiers, is beyond comprehension.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. SEDLACEK.

Causes, Effect, and Preventive Treatment Methods of Dust Storms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, dust storms in the Great Plains recently attracted national attention and prompted Secretary of Agriculture Benson to tour the area for first-hand information. The Secretary and our United States Congress have recognized the gravity of wind erosion to farmers and to other industries of the Great Plains. I should like to point out that there are great hopes for controlling this damage in the future.

Eight years ago the Federal Government, working with the Kansas agricultural experiment station, starting studying this problem scientifically. At that time, Austin W. Zingg, engineer, and W. S. Chepil, a soil scientist, were brought to the Kansas station to seek scientific answers to the problems of dust storms. Zingg was given larger responsibilities with the soil and water branch of the Agricultural Research Service. Dr. Chepil has remained in Kansas on a cooperative basis between the United States Department of Agricultural and the State experiment station. (Incidentally, the United States Department of Agriculture, I am convinced, is wise in using existing State experiment stations. We get a lot more mileage from the tax dollars by using these existing facilities. Dr. Chepil and his coworkers, stationed in Kansas, have had the cooperation of land-grant colleges in Colorado, Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and California in their studies. Using these great land-grant institutions speeded the work and saved money.)

Research is slow and tedious, so we could not expect the scientists to have the dust storm problems solved by now. However, they have made remarkable progress in their research and already can make some definite recommendations on how to reduce dust storms.

In the 8 years, the researchers have found scientific proof that farmers can apply in the Great Plains to reduce dust storms:

First. Vegetation and/or vegetative cover are the best protection against soil erosion from wind.

Second. Strip-cropping wind reduce erosion by trapping soil near its origin.

Third. There are different tillage practices suitable for different soils to roughen the surface, to bring up clods, and to maintain stubble, straw, or other residue on the soil.

Soil particles most easily blown are about the size of fine sand—sugar, poppy seed, or salt. That is one-tenth of a millimeter in diameter. Tests in a wind tunnel at Kansas State College and in a portable wind tunnel taken into fields have shown that these particles are bounced along the surface of the ground and start the soil eroding. These bouncing particles also start the dust to lifting in the air. Tillage and crop practices that do not get the soil in a loose, finely granulated condition keep the land from blowing.

The scientists have found that dryland sands require at least 4 tons per acre of wheat stubble to "tie it down" during strong winds. The sands—as opposed to sandy soil—normally will not produce that much wheat stubble, so the sands should be "tied down" with permanent vegetation, Dr. Chepil said.

Sandy soils require from 1 to 2 tons per acre for almost complete portection from the high plains winds. Nearly always this amount of wheat or sorghum stubble and straw can be produced.

From one-half to 1 ton per acre of stubble will almost always protect hard lands from soil erosion during high winds.

The USDA researchers, working with their wind tunnels, derived a formula that indicates how to reduce the erodibility of a field to an insignificant amount. With the formula the scientists, studying three major factors, can predict quite accurately what is needed to prevent erosion. For example, if land has no vegetative cover, its surface must have 60 percent or more clods to resist wind erosion. If the land had 1,000 pounds of wheat stubble and straw—about the amount from a 6-bushel crop—it would resist strong winds with only 30 percent to 40 percent of its surface composed of clods.

Likewise, roughening the soil's surface with ridges will prevent wind erosion. Lister ridges 10 inches high will prevent soil erosion by wind, even if the surface of the soil has only 20 percent to 30 percent clods with virtually no vegetative cover. In practice this means that almose any soil that is not pure sand can be "tied down" against the wind. Exploratory tests with V-blade cultivators have been highly successful in the dry soils of the high plains area. The V-blade works beneath the surface, undercutting and killing weeds, but it leaves the stubble standing to protect the surface from winds.

A recent discovery by the USDA scientists at K-State is that a farmer can make his soil more erodible to wind by pulling his "chisel" either too fast or too slow. N. P. Woodruff and Dr. Chepil recently found in tests that speeds 1 and 2 on a caterpillar are too slow and that speed 5 is too fast. Soil "chiseled" in

speeds 3 or 4 resisted the wind considerably better.

I should like to emphasize that all this scientific information has come from the work of only a few scientists. At present two are on the wind project at Kansas State College. The cost of obtaining this information is now less than $25,000 a year.

Kansas' share of the emergency funds recently allotted this year to alleviate dust and drought conditions is 85 times that amount—$25,000 compared with $2,125,000.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the Government could wisely invest more in research and education aimed at permanently controlling the dust, stabilizing great plains economy, and reducing the frequency of such emergencies.

More research is needed to determine the effects different tillage implements have on different soils and under different moisture conditions. Information on this subject is fragmentary and inadequate.

Whether deep plowing is beneficial or not needs to be determined scientifically.

More information is needed on the influence of type, quantity, and position of crop residue.

Virtually no information is available on the relative effectiveness of standing stubble compared with stubble that has been knocked down by tillage.

An expanded research program is needed dealing with climatic factors. We need to know more about wind velocity and direction, temperatures, and rainfall. They are the principal factors that influence erosion. Many of the presently unsolved mysteries of winds, temperatures, and rainfall as they apply to farming conditions in the Great Plains and elsewhere can be solved in research laboratories and fields.

A Victory That Contains the Germ of Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the townsfolk of Nutley, N. J., express simply but sincerely the sentiments of a grateful Nation to a man of greatness—Dr. Salk—through the following editorial tribute which appeared in the Nutley (N. J.) Sun under date of April 21, 1955:

LET NUTLEY TRIBUTE JONAS SALK

Jonas E. Salk is a plain name which befits a plain man, a self-made man whose entire professional career, surprisingly short thus far, has been devoted to research, dedicated to the discovery of a vaccine which will curb polio as one of the most destructive of human miseries. It is particularly fitting, in the opinion of the Nutley Sun, that, as Dr. Robert Citrino, public school physician, and the Columbus Club have, jointly, proposed, Nutley should honor Dr. Salk on May 7, the day the school doctors start the injection of Salk vaccine among the children of the two lowest grades of our public and parochial schools.

As a scientist, Dr. Salk asks no tributes, expects none. He stands to reap no rich profits from his discovery, except the priceless gratitude of an entire world which, through his genius, stands now to banish the iron lung and to eradicate one of the great killers, the great cripplers of our generation. His dedication to that one purpose establishes him as one of the great benefactors of the human race.

It will be fitting that by dedicating a day to his honor, Nutley expresses from its heart its appreciation to the man who will give our children protection against a scourge which, each year, has stricken several of ours.

R. E. H.

Technological Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement on mechanization in the textile industry, which is a thought-provoking article for each Member of Congress:

PRODUCTIVITY CHANGES IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

(By Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America)

Technological displacement is taking place at at more rapid rate in the textile industry than in American industry as a whole and in the most advanced American industries. As in American industry as a whole, employment is contracting despite high production, presenting the American economy and our country with the challenge of developing social and economic policies capable of dealing with the problem of technologically displaced and permanently unemployed.

The failure to meet this problem during the twenties gave birth to the term "technological unemployment," and is a basic explanation for the depression of 1929–33. We cannot repeat this costly experience.

The reasons for the stepped-up rate of technological change in the textile industry are three in number.

First and most important has been the investment in new equipment. Since World War II, the industry has spent over $4 billion on new equipment and expansion. Most of the expenditures has been for new equipment and relatively little on new buildings. There has been a revolution in the types of machines on the floor of the American textile industry. It is estimated that well over 70 percent of the machines are of post-war construction.

New equipment, in all cases, is faster and requires less manpower. Processes are telescoped so that entire operations have been eliminated. The machines have been made more automatic and packages have been made larger so that they run longer with fewer people to tend them. The surrounding working conditions have been improved so that yarn breaks occur less frequently. Automatic controls are being substituted for human inspection and supervision.

But these expenditures are only part of the reason for the rising productivity. The second major cause is the acceptance by the textile industry of the management technology of other industries. Centralized controls are being instituted over scheduling and production and systematic quality controls are being introduced. Plant layouts are being revamped for straight-line production. Materials handling is being reduced to a minimum, and where actually necessary, mechanical means are being substituted for labor. Technically trained supervisors and time-study engineers are combining to tighten labor standards.

A third force is the substitution of new fibers for the older ones, and in each instance, the transfer of production is to plants with lower labor content per yard of output. This is indicated by the fact that whereas a worsted mill might require one-third of a man-hour per yard of serge, a cotton mill would require less than one-tenth of a man-hour per yard of cloth.

Moreover, we are on the threshold of further innovations. An industry accustomed to slow change is now being swamped by an avalanche of innovations originating both at home and abroad. The developments in other industries are truly revolutionizing it. What autmation pretends to do for other industries, the current technical developments are already effecting in this industry.

The nature of the change is suggested by the following rough calculation: Textile employment in February 155 stood at 995,100 production workers, which was 20 percent below the average employment level of 1947–49. According to the Federal Reserve Board, textile production for the month was actually 8 percent above the base period of 1947–49.

Another approximation is available from a comparison of employment trends and total textile woven yardage in the cotton, wool, silk, and synthetic fabric industry.

	Production workers [1]		Production (millions of linear yards)				Yard per man-hour
	Employment (thousands)	Man-hours (millions)	Total	Cotton	Silk and synthetic	Woolen and worsted	
1947	768.7	1,589	12,371	9,817	2,039	515.8	7.8
1948	784.3	1,603	12,405	9,640	2,267	498	7.7
1949	680.9	1,322	10,923	8,406	2,086	414	8.3
1950	718.5	1,490	13,091	10,013	2,578	471	8.8
1951	707.9	1,438	12,887	10,136	2,350	375	9.0
1952	654.3	1,329	12,160	9,514	2,294	351	9.0
1953	645.1	1,313	12,946	10,203	2,410	338	9.9
1954	575.6	1,140	12,283	9,763	2,238	281	10.8

[1] Covers scouring and combing plants, yarn and thread mills and broad-woven fabric mills.

Another index of rising productivity is supplied in the annual report of a southern cotton textile mill, Graniteville Mills of South Carolina. It shows that for the 10-year period from 1945 through 1954, it spent $18,028,000 on plant additions and replacements and the pounds of cloth produced per 1,000 man-hours rose from 5,838 to 8,981, or 54 percent. In the last year alone, the pounds produced per thousand man-hours rose by 10.84 percent, which is the largest productivity rise scored in any 1 year.

A recent report on the Harriet and Henderson Mills of Henderson, N. C., offers the same striking testimony of rapid rates of increase in actual productivity. From 1938

through 1954, the Harriet Cotton Mills report an increase of man-hour output of 124 percent and the Henderson Cotton Mill of 118 percent.

A comparison of the range of productivity at mills producing print cloths reflects on the growth in productivity. A most modern mill built in Greenwood, S. C., apparently requires 143 man-hours per thousand pounds. A survey of five average mills by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that they require from 139 to 203 man-hours per thousand pounds of print cloth. During a recent survey of another print cloth mill now operating in North Carolina, we found that it required 221 man-hours per thousand pounds, a range of 70 percent between the lowest and highest producer. These differences indicate the potentials for higher productivity effected with the modernization of equipment, plant, and improved management.

The American Textile Machinery Association reports that a modernization program in a mill of 30,336 spindles would effect an increase in output per manhour from 4.9396 pounds to 9 pounds, or 82 percent. In another mill of 34,704 spindles, a modernization program of a modest type would increase its output from 4.720 pounds per manhour to 7.6316 pounds, or 62 percent. The same organization reports that the modernization of a mill in the production of combed broadcloth would effect a reduction in manpower per shift from 70 to 43 employees, or 63 percent.

The Whitin Machine Works, Inc. reports that the modernization of the production of a 20,000-spindle combed cotton knitting yarn mill would reduce costs by 36 percent, from 15.24 cents to 9.72 cents per pound. Most of the reduction would be effected through lower labor cost. This item would be cut from 14.3 cents to 6.2 cents per pound, or by 57 percent. The labor schedule, which required 217 employees before modernization, would be reduced to 124 persons, or by 43 percent. This company indicates that a reduction of 6.2 cents in labor cost and .08 cents in power will be offset by an increase of 0.2 cent in taxes and insurance and 0.6 cent in depreciation charges, so that the reduction in labor costs would have also to carry these larger tax and depreciation charges.

The above study of the available information shows that the rise in manhour productivity in the post-war years has been at the rate of at least five percent per annum. This is far in excess of the national average and the claims which are being made as to the likely effect of automation on the entire economy. The current period of business recovery has not spelt more jobs for textile workers.

More far-reaching economic and social programs than have been hitherto adopted are required to stimulate our economy to provide jobs for those millions who still have no jobs at a time when our industrial system is meeting previous peak production records.

The 82d Airborne Division

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in company with 23 other Congressmen and a number of Department of Army officials including Under Secretary Charles C. Finucane and Assistant Secretary Chester R. Davis, I went to Fort Bragg on Friday, April 22, to see the airborne troops of the XVIII—18th—Airborne Corps display their prowess. The world-famous 82d Airborne Division demonstrated to us the training, religious, recreational and other influences that go to make up the present-day airborne trooper.

We hear a lot about "morale" and "esprit" in our dealings with the Armed Forces. I was tremendously impressed by the obvious pride of belonging which exists among the troopers at Fort Bragg.

We saw demonstrations of the rugged physical training that goes into the making of a paratrooper and noted the stress on mental alertness which permeates all phases of training. We were shown how, in the 82d's basic airborne course, the swinging harness was used to simulate the oscillating of a parachute as it comes to the ground; troops executed landing falls from a 4-foot platform; the 34-foot tower from which the trooper actually leaps into the air, riding a cable to the ground some 150 yards distant was utilized; wind machines blew the troopers along the ground in the process of teaching them how to collapse a parachute in high winds.

The light aviation and helicopter elements of the XVIII—18th—Airborne Corps Artillery and the 8th Helicopter Battalion showed us their versatility in equipment drops, wire laying, and message pickups. The "Whirly-Birds" demonstrated their specialty of troop movement and evacuation, as well as the hauling of supplies.

We saw the Army's giant atomic weapon, the 280-millimeter gun. We were also impressed with the 155-millimeter gun, the 8-inch howitzer, and the 240-millimeter howitzer.

Saturday morning, April 23, at exactly 9:00 a. m. more than 1,000 troopers from the 504th Airborne Infantry Regiment and the 456th Airborne Artillery Battalion parachuted into simulated combat before our gathering. Fifteen tons of heavy equipment—jeeps, three-fourth-ton vehicles, artillery pieces, and resupplies—were dropped within moments of the initial assault landing.

Later on in the day, 504th Airborne Infantrymen teamed with troopers of the 44th Tank Battalion and the 456th Airborne Field Artillery Battalion to demonstrate the shock power of the coordinated infantry-artillery-tank team. Their regimental exhibits were excellently presented.

The 2-day visit was climaxed with a review of the entire 82d Airborne Division and elements of the XVIII (18th) Airborne Corps Artillery, a thrilling sight which graphically depicted the power, might and mobility of the United States Army.

I was greatly impressed with the physical demonstrations which I witnessed. The Army is doing a magnificent training job at Fort Bragg. The demonstrations we witnessed were awe-inspiring in their sheer tactical impact.

Capt. Paul W. Hamblin, headquarters, 82d Airborne Division, gave our group a short narration on the mission of the infantryman. I cannot remember ever having previously heard a more lucid or succinct explanation of the role of the fighting soldier. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD Captain Hamblin's talk titled "The 82d Trooper—Epitome of Fighting Men." I recommend that you not only read it, but that you retain it for future use. It will properly orient you on the individual soldier's role in warfare.

THE 82D TROOPER EPITOME OF FIGHTING MEN

(Narrated by Capt. Paul W. Hamblin, headquarters, 82d Airborne Division, at Field House on April 22, 1955)

The mission of the 82d Airborne Division is destruction of the enemy on the ground. The only effective way to completely destroy the enemy and his will to fight is to seize and hold his real estate. And the only way to completely accomplish this mission is by the use of the ground combat soldier—the infantryman. The advancement in arms and machines has exceeded man's wildest expectations. The modes and methods of warfare, for all services, have been greatly changed by these advancements. With each successive development of these arms and machines, man has had to adapt himself in order to survive. That we, as a race, do survive, is proof that it is man, not the machine, that constitutes the force for final success. For ultimate victory it is the individual soldier, with his skill, his courage, and his mental strength that we must look.

The infantryman's mission is threefold: First, to carry the fight to the enemy on the ground. Second, to close with the enemy and destroy him. Third, to hold what he has seized and force the enemy to his knees. This is the infantryman's task.

Basically, an infantryman is a soldier trained, equipped, and organized to fight on the ground. He is a dismounted, close-in fighter. His advances are characterized by relentless pushing, elbowing, and clawing inch by inch, yard by yard, mile by mile. He hangs on to his gains with bulldog tenacity. On the battlefield he moves in small, hard-to-see formations, taking advantage of routes which provide concealment—at times only enough for a single man.

No war has been won until the infantryman imposes his will on the enemy infantryman. No land is conquered until the man on foot plants his muddy GI boot on the enemy's homeland and holds it.

The sole purpose of all the marvelous machines of war, regardless of whether they travel on the water, in the air, or on the ground, is to enable the infantryman to come to grips with the enemy and to support him in this effort.

The men who fly over him, the tankers that thunder by his side, the sailors who buck the seven seas, the men who build bridges in the face of enemy fire, the artilleryman firing his missions, these and his many other comrades-in-arms sweat only in support of the infantryman fulfilling his mission. Every weapon, from the awful awe-inspiring new ones to the blackjack and trench knife, is conceived in his behalf so that, with the guts and skill that are his, he can carry the fight to the enemy, destroy him, seize the ground, and hold it.

It is an irrevocable fact that our most precious commodity is the individual trooper. We—you and I—are derelict in our duty if we do not do all within our power to insure that he is the ultimate fighting man.

Here, this evening, our displays stress the many activities and functions needed to satisfy the requirements—mental, physical, and psychological—of the fighting infantryman. All that you will see this evening—the equipment for training, the supplies, the supporting elements—all have as their sole reason for existence, the development of the individual soldier into the fighting soldier.

The Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, of Ohio's 11th District, has called my attention to a series of timely articles on world events written by Robert C. Dix, publisher of the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier, and his wife, Helen, who have just returned from an extensive tour of Europe and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, has been ill for the past several weeks. I am happy to report that he is now feeling much better and it is expected, by his physicians, that he will soon be back with us again carrying his full share of our important responsibilities in his usual able and conscientious manner. His illness was caused and precipitated by the complete and full way in which he dedicated himself to the service of his congressional district and our entire Nation. We will all be glad to welcome him back and wish for him a lifetime of good health and opportunity for service. In the meantime, I consider it a privilege to join with Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON and in his behalf to point out the following to the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, these stories, exceptionally well written by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dix, out of their own personal and keen observations furnish us, as Members of Congress, extremely helpful information in our quest for knowledge about the threat of communism. They prove all over again, Mr. Speaker, that it may well be much later than we think and that it behooves all of us to leave no stone unturned to protect the rich heritages, the freedoms, and the rights of all our American citizenship that have been gained for us by the clear thinking, hard work, dedicated service, patriotism, and even the supreme sacrifice of life itself by our forefathers.

Mr. Speaker, Robert C. Dix and his wife, Helen, have written many stories for their newspaper as a result of their extensive tour of Europe and Russia. Each of these stories is well worth reading. I am happy to join my good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON in requesting unanimous consent that the attached three stories by Publisher Robert C. Dix and his wife, Helen, be printed herein for the information of the Members and also as illustrative of their keen observations of these important situations.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of April 7, 1955]

CZECHOSLOVAKIA UNHAPPY LAND UNDER TIGHT COMMUNIST RULE

(By Robert C. Dix)

PRAGUE, March 29.—I am writing this article in the seclusion of my room here at Hotel Alcron and I shall not mail it until I am outside the Iron Curtain area. As it unfolds, you will see why.

This is an unhappy land. Everybody eats here. Everybody works. But the standard is low in this one-time high standard country and hope of better things, a little economic independence perhaps, has all but faded away.

People can listen to Voice of America and Radio Free Europe in spite of the rather complete jamming. And the police don't object if you do listen, but they do object if you talk about it or in any way pass on the information. But many have quit listening anyway. It's like passing in front of a candy store every day with no money in your pockets. Finally you come to the deadening realization that the candy is not for you. Then you quit looking. Finally you go to the other side of the street. Maybe some day you'll even forget that it's there.

Political control is complete. If you're young and coming up in the world, it doesn't take long to learn that getting ahead means playing the game. And if you really want to get ahead, it means getting into or close association with the party somehow.

But membership in an area already taken over is low and exclusive. If you have any kind of a record—like if your parents were bourgeoisie—it's almost impossible.

Leaving the country now is exceedingly difficult. Some do. Some die trying. Others are just sitting it out, making the best of it and trying to get along. On them the heavy propaganda is, if it isn't penetrating, at least anesthetizing in its effect.

Travel is, of course, restricted to Czechoslovakia. A person can't travel even between the satellites. He must remain within his own "concentration camp," as one person described it to me.

Some day, perhaps, everybody will be sufficiently conditioned to be trusted.

What effect the latest turn to heavy industry will have on this little satellite, no one knows. At present consumer goods are fairly plentiful, by Iron Curtain standards, but nowhere close to the standards that this once highly developed area knew. Prices are high. But since there is no incentive to save anything, people spend what little they have.

Book stores, carrying their propaganda message, stand out in the downtown shopping district. There were at least 6 or 8 within a 4-block area.

The people converse in Czech. They all know German. A large percentage understands and speaks English. But it may not be many years until Russian is the second language here. It is a "must" in the schools. And it is a language that a person will have to learn if he wants to get anywhere in this particular sphere under present conditions.

All trade that amounts to anything is with the East. Skoda at present is making a large number of powerplants, big and little, for Red China. Grains are coming back in return.

All of America's 48 States are making their contributions to our fine foreign service. I met a person, Albert Sherer, here with a Wooster, Ohio, background.

He came to the foreign service from the Air Force after the war and has specialized in the satellite countries. All of these career men know the language of the area in which they are to serve before they go there.

Rather descriptive of the situation here was the way in which we held a conference with our ambassador at the embassy. We all entered the spacious living room. Aides closed the doors and stood guard in front of them. And then, just before we began to talk, another aide turned on a sound jamming machine that would negate the effectiveness of any listening device that might be planted there.

All of the native employees at the embassy come from a central source. And they all are approved by the Communist government before they are permitted to work there.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of March 30, 1955]

ALONG THE WAY

(By Helen Dix)

ATHENS. — Gracious Queen Fredericka winked at my husband, and like any tactful woman, probably though "how I love that man for changing the subject." The subject was "Cyprus" a red-hot but embarrassing question here in Athens and one which this editor's tour, having been, as they say, "brain-washed," wished it could forget.

All this happened during the most exciting moments of my life or, as other members of the party agreed, the most exciting moments of the trip so far. Those moments stretched to more than 1 hour and 15 minutes while we were being received by their royal majesties "King Paul and Queen Fredericka, rulers of the Hellenes."

The wink, now famous especially in the Dix family, was a result of Bob's quick thinking in changing the subject from Cyprus when one editor blundered into the subject in a conversation with the queen. Her wink betrayed her gratefulness to my gallant husband for saving her from the Cyprus situation.

What does a mousy little midwestern housewife do when she goes "to visit the queen"? First she has misgivings about her clothes • • • but assured that street attire is correct she dons her best "party-go-to-PTA-meeting gown," makes sure gloves are white and spotless, takes a couple of doubtful extra glances in the mirror, then because her husband screams she is late, rushes from her hotel room convinced this whole trip is a mistake.

With the 28 other tour members (seven women) the housewife walks past the gaily dressed guard at the palace gate for about 200 feet. Here is the palace entrance, unassuming door, tiny vestibule where we deposit our coats and cameras. Up one flight of blue carpeted circular stairs, across a formal marble hall to an anteroom, also carpeted with royal blue and furnished in lovely beige Americanish furniture.

The little tinkling chimes of a clock had not completed their twelfth stroke when the "master of ceremonies" beckoned to the Queen's lady-in-waiting, the King's naval attaché, United States Ambassador and Mrs. Cannon, then our group to follow. Across the white marble hall, up the broad blue carpeted stairs to the first landing. There we were literally overcome by the most heavenly fragrance I ever expect to smell • • • the hall is apparently kept perfumed and we seven women couldn't sniff enough.

At the door of the royal apartment stood Ambassador Cannon, who shook our hand then eased us to the Queen. We had been instructed to shake hands with their Majesties (don't curtsey, you might fall) then state your name, hometown, and State, verly clearly. I took a deep gulp of air as I took the Queen's hand and my name came out beautifully but with the King I didn't get the deep gulp of air and it just squeaked out. (The Illinois editor's wife in front of me later confessed that nothing came out of her mouth to the King • • • the saliva just stuck, she wailed.)

From then on it was a lark, many uniformed waiters served a delicious little beverage and trays and trays of heavenly tidbits, the King and Queen moved with ease from group to group and within seconds we were all old friends, laughing, chatting and loving their Majesties.

The Queen is all charm, beauty and brains. She is thinner than pictures in the United States showed her, due no doubt to the two severe ear operations she has undergone this winter. Both were successful.

Her stories, her humor, her timing • • • all were excellent. She has a most eager and

exciting catch to her voice as she tells of "kidding" the doctors about her "thick skull" during her ear operations, or telling of the wonderful work done by Boy Scouts during the war or talking of her three children or of America.

Both she and the King hope to bring their children to America for a summer vacation tour soon.

What did the Queen wear? Her dress was a simple green jersey with a small black leather cord detail at the neck held by gold buckles at each side. She wore black alligator pumps. Around her neck was a single strand of large pearls which held a large diamond-studded pendant and an uncut ruby. She wore 4 bracelets, 2 gold and jade on the right arm, 2 gold and diamond, matching her necklace on the left. She wore 5 rings, 2 matching her necklace. Her hair cut informally is black and brushed into a short mass of curls.

The King, a handsome man (tall enough to come from Texas, one Texan in the party told him) wore a uniform with five rows of decorations and a large gold cross hung midway on his coat. He talked of sports and good times in America and sorrowfully of communism.

When after more than an hour and 15 minutes elapsed the King and Queen walked down the stairs with us to pose for pictures and when the photographer motioned us closer the Queen chuckled, "Shall we sing for you, too?"

As we filed past to shake hands again in goodby Their Majesties repeated time and again, "Do come back to see us," and we, like next-door neighbors, begged them to come to America to see us all, too.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of April 11, 1955]

RUSSIAN PEOPLE LIKE AMERICANS—KREMLIN HAS TIGHT GRIP

(By Robert C. Dix)

STOCKHOLM.—It's a relief to leave Russia. And that's nothing against the Russian people. Individually, so far as the ones we met are concerned, they're just ordinary human beings like you and me. Same hopes and same fears.

It's the system. And even that is difficult to put into words. Perhaps the best way to understand it is to use their own words.

Government, to them, is a thing, an institution, apart. At Leningrad on the way out we picked up a couple of American students who had had a better opportunity to talk to the average Russian than we had. Always the Russians expressed affection for the American people. Too bad, they would always say, that our Government is so warmongerish and so imperialistic.

They would always look bewildered and unbelieving when a person would try to explain that our Government was the people.

At Intourist one day, I was trying to explain to Mr. Rogov, the head of that department, that we would like to meet some Russian officialdom, that we would like to see something besides a works project, something human. We got onto the same subject. Too bad, he said, that our Government was delaying on an exchange of farm experts.

The American people wanted the exchange, he was sure. But the Government would never permit it.

I told him that if the American people wanted it, the exchange would take place. The Government is the servant of the people, I tried to explain.

But the thought didn't make a dent. Thirty-seven years of obedience and conditioning in a complete public opinion vacuum leave their mark. They have resulted in the evolution of a tremendous human force under the unchallenged authority of nine men in the Kremlin.

No other place does human history record so much power in the hands of so few.

Those were almost the exact words of our Ambassador, Mr. Bohlen, who briefed us himself on the country.

If you can imagine a group of nine men in the United States running everything here, including the United States Steel Co., the auto factories, all of the other great industries, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the newspapers and the radio, all Government functions and everything else, you might come close to some comprehension as to the power, the aloofness and the necessary ruthlessness of the government.

There is also nowhere a tighter security in the world than at the Kremlin. There are no leaks there.

Their Achilles heel so far is their agriculture. They have industrialized their country at the expense of the peasantry. They are trying now to get agriculture back on its feet. One of their biggest gambles is putting to the plow 66 million virgin acres of prairie land, which in size is as large as all of the arable land in France and Italy.

If their gamble works, look out.

Russia has a dictatorship without a dictator. The experts seem to think that a new one will, in time, emerge. Probably Khrushchev.

Something like this takes a lot of policing. That they have. One of the highlights of my visit in Moscow was meeting Joyce Marshall, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Leon Marshall. An old hand at being arrested, she was detained once for several hours. She told me she would show me what a member of the police force looks like. So we went for a walk in some of the little streets away from the wide boulevards. It wasn't long until our follower was visible to the discerning eye.

He stopped when we stopped, always about a half a block behind. She is often followed when she goes out. Most embassy people are. They get used to it.

But if a person is inclined to let things like that worry him, he ought not to accept an assignment in Moscow.

Whether or not any of our newsmen were followed, I don't know. We were mostly shepherded around in a group anyway. We probably were not.

One thing I kept looking for was some evidence of civil defense. War, if it ever comes, will obliterate a populace that has no civil defense program.

There may have been some. I didn't see it. But, of course, the Moscovites have their subway system. It's over 65 kilometers long and is as much as 200 feet below the surface at points.

Besides being a good transportation system and having civil defense possibilities, it's also sort of an art gallery.

Each of the 41 stations tell at story. At the Station of the Revolution, the entire struggle of the Russian people is told in pictures on the ceilings.

What are my conclusions to all this? Even the fuzziest of thinkers must have a few after an adventure of this type. They are:

1. On the possibility of change, nothing at the people's level. At the palace level, changes will continue until power gravitates to one person again.

2. The future? Well, the system holds close to a billion persons within its iron grip. Only Tito has successfully broken away. He did so because he had the strength to ward off an initial blow and because we stepped forward to provide him with needed assistance.

Other satellites do not have the strength or the will of a Tito. And all of the means of implementation of any such ideas are within the control of the faithful.

Unlike the absolute authorities of old, these modern ones don't ignore the people completely to the point that they will face guns with pitchforks. They try to mold the force, keeping it above subsistence level and then working constantly on its mentality, winning it over completely or deadening it to the inactive stage.

3. What about war? It's on now. It's at the propaganda stage. Very hot there. They will try hard to win it at that level. We must not only counter but try to win it there, too. There's also the economic phase. They would like to break us by developing all the world's resources and people. That we can't allow to happen either.

4. The length of the struggle? A long one.

Seventh Anniversary of Israel's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1948, the State of Israel proclaimed its independence, and today, April 27, 1955, her people are celebrating this momentous event.

I am proud to count myself among the many American supporters and well-wishers of Israel who join on this occasion in felicitating its people upon attainment of another milestone in their thrilling history.

In an area no larger than the State of New Jersey, Israel's 1,600,000 inhabitants, surrounded by enemies on three sides and the sea on the fourth, have written in these 7 years an epic of indomitable courage and inspiring ingenuity that parallels the early struggles of our own Republic.

There, at the ancient crossroads of the Old World, men women, and children who fled from tyranny, persecution and concentration camps, have made new headway in their mighty efforts to build a bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

From the streams and mountains of Galilee, through the stony hills of Judea and the arid area of the Negev, to the fertile coastal plain these pioneer people have labored to wrest a living from soil which yields mainly citrus fruits, but nothing of mineral wealth or fuel.

It has been well said that Israel's greatest natural resource is its people. They have developed industry where none flourished before, utilizing the mechanical and inventive skills of craftsmen from all parts of Europe. Industry and crafts, indeed, have become the leading economic factor; agriculture second.

But the new nation's greatest need—its exports boycotted by its immediate neighbors—is for trade abroad to bring an inflow of dollars to buy raw materials for its own necessities and for processing and resale to others.

The progress Israel has made so far, be it remembered, has been achieved in the midst of an uneasy truce with the

Arab nations which, after all these years, are still unreconciled to its existence.

It is to be fervently hoped that the United Nations, which is struggling with the issues, may yet find a solution that the contestants may ere long agree upon the proposal for harnessing the lifegiving waters of the Jordan.

Then Israel would not need to work with one hand and a gun in the other; peace would indeed settle upon the Holy Land; once more would milk and honey flow there, and the vision of a Promised Land, now spiritually and politically fulfilled, could become an economic fact.

This is my anniversary wish for Israel.

Los Angeles Harbor Commission's Resolve for Reduction in Panama Canal Tolls on Commercial Cargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to present herewith text of a letter to me from the board of harbor commissioners, city of Los Angeles, Calif., dated April 25, 1955, together with the text of their resolution 2070:

BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 25, 1955.
The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the board of harbor commissioners held on April 20, 1955, resolution 2070 was adopted by the board of harbor commissioners urging—

(1) That the Congress recognize the national-defense value of the Panama Canal and adopt legislation to effectuate a reduction in tolls on commercial cargo moving through the Panama Canal;

(2) That the Congress alter the financial and fiscal policies now in effect at the Panama Canal to the end that commercial cargoes be no longer burdened with excessive cost items; and

(3) That the Congress amend the present treaty so that commercial cargoes will not be required to carry the burden of any increased annuity payments that may be arranged with the Republic of Panama.

I am forwarding you herewith copy of resolution 2070 for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

M. G. ROUSE,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION 2070

"Whereas the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles is charged with the operation, management, and development of Los Angeles Harbor, one of the large harbors on the Pacific coast of the United States; and

"Whereas said board is vitally concerned with the future development and progress and with the general economic welfare of Los Angeles Harbor and the Southern California area served by said harbor; and

"Whereas the ships of the United States merchant marine contribute greatly to the economic growth and development of Los Angeles Harbor and are a vital part of our national defense; and

"Whereas the stabilization and promotion of the United States merchant marine, especially in the intercoastal trade between the east and west coasts of the United States, should be encouraged and fostered; and

"Whereas tolls paid by ships of the United States merchant marine transiting the Panama Canal are an important factor in the continued development of maritime commerce, especially intercoastal: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles as follows: That the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles urges, (1) that the Congress recognize the national-defense value of the Panama Canal and adopt legislation to effectuate a reduction in tolls on commercial cargo moving through the Panama Canal; (2) that the Congress alter the financial and fiscal policies now in effect at the Panama Canal to the end that commercial cargoes be no longer burdened with excessive cost items; and (3) that the Congress amend the present treaty so that commercial cargoes will not be required to carry the burden of any increased annuity payments that may be arranged with the Republic of Panama; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary is hereby instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to such Members of Congress and to such other interested parties as the president of the board may direct."

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles at a meeting held April 20, 1955, by the following vote: Ayes: Messrs. Menveg, Kingman, Spires, Cosgrove, Tanner (5); Noes: None.

M. W. ROUSE,
Secretary.

The Commission for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I know all of us are interested in the work of the Commission for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, headed by our distinguished former President, Herbert Hoover. As evidence of public interest in my own community of San Francisco, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from three of our great metropolitan daily newspapers. These editorials were sent to me by the regional director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, with the request that they be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the other Members of the House:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of April 8, 1955]

BACK ON THE TRACK

The Hoover Commission report on the wasteful abuses attending Federal transportation operations, both in the air and at sea, will serve a useful and profitable purpose if it helps to get these activities back on their original track.

The Federal Government went into the maritime and air transport fields to supplement, not supplant, public carriers.

But as in all cases where the Government finds it necessary to get into business, opportunists have tried to take over the business altogether.

Again as in all such cases, it is only when the Government operation provides essential services private carriers are unable to supply that a useful purpose is served.

Shipping operators do not question, and in fact welcome, the supplementary services of the military air and sea carriers.

But when private shipping and airlines are able to perform necessary service, and are compelled to stand by in idleness while competing Government ships and planes take over the business, the operation is far afield from the original and sound intention.

In duplicating existing facilities of American transportation enterprises, according to the Hoover Commission, the Federal Government is annually spending $150 million wastfully and with great injury not only to competing business interests but to the Nation's taxpayers.

The Congress never intended to get the Government into the transportation business, as the politicians seemingly have contrived to do.

The Congress should take note of the comprehensive report of the Hoover Commission on this vital matter, and promptly get the whole air and sea military transport project back on the track of its original intentions.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of April 20, 1955]

HOW UNITED STATES SURPLUS ADDS TO DEFICIT

The Hoover Commission issued a report this week on prevailing waste and confusion in the Government's disposal of surplus property which, if corrected, would "go a long way toward eliminating the annual deficit in the national budget."

Any such promise from the Commission obviously deserves the lively and serious interest of Congress and the public. This is the problem the Commission found:

1. The Government has a mountainous accumulation of assets, scattered throughout the world, amounting to some $155 billion. The figure does not include the value of land in the public domain, surplus farm commodities, or strategic stockpiles.

2. With proper inventory control and more realistic stock levels, from $10 billion to $25 billion of supplies now in storage could be eliminated.

3. For the next several years the Government will be getting rid of huge quantities of supplies from its warehouses. At original cost these surpluses were acquired at a rate of $2 billion worth a year. Only 5 to 7 percent of this cost will be recaptured by present methods of sale. With modern, expert techniques of selling the Commission is convinced the Government could recover more than that.

4. The Military Establishment accounts for more than 99 percent of all goods bought and stocked by the Government. Vast savings would flow from more efficient management of this property.

The task force that looked into Government surplus property was headed by Gen. Robert E. Wood, former chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co. By random selection of supply items in common use and easily obtainable from manufacturers it found that military depots stock as long as a 20 years' supply of these items. In one case the supply was 128 years' worth. The Army Signal Corps had an authorized stock level of 1,426,000 dry cell flashlight batteries, enough for 8½ years. Yet dry cell batteries on the shelf deteriorate in months, let alone years.

Instances like this could be multiplied; the story is unvarying. Congress should insist that the Defense Department, as the principal contributor to this burden, get busy on the adoption of Hoover Commission recommendations and any other promising

procedures to save the billions of tax dollars now being lost.

[From The San Francisco News of April 25, 1955]

LET 'EM EAT HAMBURGERS

Everybody, we suppose, is against sin—except sinners.

And every one, we imagine, is against waste and deuplication and plushiness in the Way Uncle Sam runs much of his business. Every one, it would seem, except the wasters and duplicationists and plus spenders.

The Hoover Commission is out today with another of its penetrating reports. * * * This one has to do with the way Uncle's bureaucrats fritter away taxpayer millions in the purchase, shipment, storage, and use of food and clothing.

The Navy, for instance, has a 60-year supply of canned hamburgers.

While the Army was shipping 897,000 pounds of tomatoes from California to New York, the Navy was shipping 775,000 pounds of tomatoes from the east coast to California.

That type of nonsense might be amusing, in a clumsy kind of way, if it didn't filch so many dollars out of every taxpayer's pocket—dollars he otherwise could use for his own needs.

You hear there things all the time, in one branch or another of the Government. The Hoover Commission, moreover, not only does a factual job of reporting, but recomments effective ways of plugging the leaks.

This is the recond round of such reports by the Hoover Commission, and dozens of congressional committees, department committees, newspaper reporters and others have exposed and denounced the waste. Yet the waste continues on a horrible scale. The bureaucrats even ignore the laws Congress passes.

Nobody seems to have found a way to compel bureaucrats to do what any one plainly can see they ought to do. It must be in the nature of Government. Just the same, we'd like to see the guy who stocked up all those hamburgers have to eat every single can.

Confidence in Anthracite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Confidence in Anthracite" which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record on April 1, 1955. The anthracite industry is, and has been for generations, the heart of the economy of northeastern Pennsylvania, and particularly in my district, Luzerne County. Presently, it is weathering severe competition from outside fuel sources and it is vitally necessary to send out a rallying cry now to those who are directly affected by its current, but only temporary I know, recession. The God-given natural resources, upon which this great country has so long depended, cannot be cast aside and tragically ignored. It must be cared for and appreciated as anything of value in this world should. Anthracite coal has served this country well—in times of peace and most certainly in war. We cannot permit it to perish. That would not only be sinful but a national economic disgrace.

The editorial follows:

CONFIDENCE IN ANTHRACITE

With respect to the future of anthracite mining as a vital factor in our economy, we had evidence of positive thinking at the annual interstate solid fuel conference in New York City yesterday.

Francis O. Case, Glen Alden Coal Co. president, while not discounting the future potential of anthracite for use in chemical, industrial, and metallurgical operations, placed heaviest stress on the importance of protecting and augmenting our share in the home-heating market.

Some 700 members of the New York State Fuel Merchants Association and the Fuel Merchants Association of New Jersey, fuel middlemen whose places of business are in key anthracite markets, were told by Mr. Case that by properly exploiting the inherent qualities of anthracite, a large part of the remaining market can be saved, and in the long run the present down trend of the industry can be reversed.

From Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, came a renewed pledge that the union will give its fullest cooperation to the producers and retailers.

We must never forget that anthracite is still our largest single industry. It is the means of distributing more money in our valley through payrolls and otherwise than any other segment of our economy. With a negative approach it would never get anywhere. The call is for many others to join such spokesmen as Mr. Case and Mr. Kennedy on the active firing line.

The Prairie Grouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 26, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which a conservation-minded constituent of mine, Don Berg, of Black River Falls, wrote to Charles Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, with reference to the plight of the prairie chicken. Mr. Callison, who has cooperated with me to the highest degree on this and other conservation matters, has sent me a copy of his answer to Mr. Berg. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to Mr. Callison's answer to the suggestions set forth in Mr. Berg's letter. The letter follows:

APRIL 27, 1955.

Mr. DON BERG,
Black River Falls, Wis.

DEAR MR. BERG: Your conservation-minded Congressman JOHNSON wrote to me about your letter of April 20 in which you expressed the hope that something could be done to assure management of a part of the so-called central Wisconsin conservation area for prairie grouse. I also talked to Mr. JOHNSON about this matter in his office and have since followed up with inquiries among some of my friends in the Department of Agriculture.

This 54,700-acre area is known in Federal circles as an LU–6 (land utilization) area. It has been under long-term lease to the Wisconsin Conservation Department and as long ago as June 1953, the Federal Department of Agriculture and the Wisconsin Department agreed to conditions of a transfer of title to the State. The transfer of title has not been technically completed, but apparently it will be consummated at the State Conservation Commission meeting on May 6, as mentioned in the P. S. of your letter.

The conditions of transfer, as agreed upon by the Federal and State agencies, are essentially that the tract is to stay in public ownership and be managed for purposes consistent with the original purposes for which the land was acquired by the Federal Government, namely, conservation and sound land management to prevent soil erosion, etc. Beyond that, and at this late stage of the negotiations, I am informed it would be impossible for the Federal Government to impose any more restrictions or conditions of management upon the State agency.

The foregoing means that the Wisconsin Conservation Department will have freedom and authority to manage the lands as they see fit so long as the management is for conservation purposes. The State Department could upon its own authority reserve part of the area, as you suggest, for prairie chicken management. If an attempt were made to sell the conservation department on such a program I am sure you would have the wholehearted support of the National Wildlife Federation affiliate in your State, the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs. I feel reasonably certain also that the game section men of your conservation department would be on your side. I cannot, of course, suggest how to cope with the problem of the dominance of the Forestry Division which you suggest may have the power to dictate management of the area.

Thanks very much for writing to us. We sincerely appreciate your interest and good work in behalf of the prairie chicken as well as your support of other sound conservation objectives.

Cordially yours,
NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
CHARLES H. COLLINS,
Conservation Director.

Canal Zone: Panama's Best Customers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an informative editorial in the April 4, 1955 issue of the well-known Latin-American newspaper, the Star & Herald of Panana, Republic of Panama, presents some highly pertinent facts concerning business relations between the Republic of Panama and the Panama Canal enterprise, the military establishments on the Isthmus and residents in the Canal Zone. It is thus shown that the United States and its citizens have been magnificient customers of Panama and its people, and we are glad that this is true.

Because of the bearing of this trade on maintenance of Isthmian economy, and particularly in relation to current

discussions concerning the operation of the canal enterprise, under leave accorded, I quote its full text:

PANAMA'S GOOD CUSTOMERS

This column remarked not long ago that good traders are good neighbors. Reference was made to the high figure paid by the Panama Canal to Panama over a 6-month period for beef, coffee, foodstuffs in general, materials, and services—other than employees'—over a period of 6 months. The total approximated a million and a half dollars. That, accepted as an average, seemed a pretty fine income for the Panama firms dealing in these commodities.

Yesterday's Star & Herald carried a still more imposing figure released by the Public Information Office of the Caribbean Command at Quarry Heights. It covered the same period as that mentioned in the Panama Canal release, the last semester of 1954. The total was $2,612,554, over a million dollars more than the amount spent in Panama by the Panama Canal. Between the two organizations, Pan-Canal and Caribbean Command, Panama is thus receiving approximately $4,057,297 every 6 months from the Canal Zone, over $8 million annually for goods sold in the Republic.

All of which means that the Canal Zone is Panama's best customer as of now, may well continue to be, possibly in increasing figures, in years to come. Nor do these figures include the prices paid by both civilian and military groups for personal supplies or purchases in the Republic.

In other words it seems to prove that these near-in tourists from the Canal Zone exceed in actual sums expended the total spent by transient tourists arriving for a day's stay and devoting most of their time to sightseeing, lunching or dining and dancing at El Panama, occasionally buying a Panama hat (made in Ecuador) or a madeira tablecloth, then rushing back to their ships.

While these benefits do not flow directly into the National Treasury they do keep local merchants' heads above water and able to pay their taxes, rents, and employees.

We lack figures on the total of military personnel stationed in the Canal Zone as against the civilian population residing there. But we do believe that, so far as personal purchases are concerned, the United States Armed Forces spend infinitely more in this Republic than the Pan-Canal population.

The colonel's lady is often seen shopping in Panama's best shops and buying the best there is. She is discerning enough to appreciate the high quality of goods local mercants import. And those goods are imported from all over the world. Being in the luxury class, duties are low, and wisely so. Both the colonel's lady and possibly the admiral's lady fall hard for genuine Turkish rugs, sterling silver, diamonds and some semiprecious stones, European novelties one has to seek on the side streets of New York but seldom finds in the big department stores.

All of which proves that, if merchants were to get together and compare notes without equivocation, they would find the United States military forces constitute the top flight tourist trade for this Republic.

Furthermore they (the military) are ever ready to do a mercy job, fly relief to devastated areas or an emergency appendix case out of an isolated interior town. They have done it time and time again, continuing to do it although lives and planes have been lost in the doing.

Which is probably why Foreign Minister Octavio Fabrega said last week "We would gladly grant use of a hundred bases to the United States if such were needed, all in the spirit of friendship and understanding with which we work together.

Loyalty Day, May 1, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the occasion of the observance of Loyalty Day, a day set aside by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States to enable Americans everywhere to rededicate themselves to the fine ideals and spiritual values inherent and practiced in the greatest Nation in the world—the United States of America. Moreover, it is a day designed to offset the May Day rallies held under Communist auspices.

The address follows:

LOYALTY DAY, MAY 1, 1955

(By Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD)

The Congress by joint resolution has designated May 1, 1955, as the date for the observance of Loyalty Day here in the United States. In so acting, Congress is giving recognition to a custom which has become prevalent in recent years throughout almost the entire Nation. Every year since 1950, the governors of 47 of the 48 States have officially designated May 1, or a day very near to it, as Loyalty Day.

Patriotic organizations from time to time have urged an even more wide-spread recognition of this day. In many places throughout the United States, May 1 has been chosen as the particular day for the celebration of Loyalty Day to offset the many May Day rallies held on May 1 under Communist auspices.

The real purpose of Loyalty Day, it seems to me, is to provide an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the American way of life, to reaffirm for all the world to see our devotion to the principles underlying that way of life, and to deepen our loyalty to the principles set forth in the American Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

Seldom if ever in the history of the United States has our way of life been as seriously threatened by an alien philosophy from beyond our shores. This alien philosophy, of course, is world communism. It is the sworn enemy of every principle which has undergirded our national life in all of our history. It is implacable, malevolent, and unrelenting in its determination to destroy us. The United States is at one and the same time the greatest objective in communism's program of world conquest and the greatest barrier in its path to domination of the world.

What are some of the qualities and principles which characterize the American way of life and the American Bill of Rights—qualities and principles to which I urge every citizen to rededicate himself this year on Loyalty Day?

Our American way of life rests on two fundamental principles which guide our day-to-day thoughts and actions, and which clearly distinguish our system from all totalitarian systems, whether they be Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or any other.

The first of these principles is the importance of the individual, the foundation of all our other beliefs. It guarantees to each person the undisputed right to personal freedom and dignity, and to equality before the law. In the words of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable right, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These ringing words leave no doubt as to how the Founding Fathers felt about the worth and the dignity of the individual.

Since the drafting of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution, the American people have been wise enough to realize that although under our system the worth and the dignity of the individual are fully recognized, certain rock-bottom rules must be established to give life and meaning to the concept of the individual's worth and dignity. Accordingly, in the Bill of Rights to our Constitution, and in other important documents as well, there are laid down certain basic rights to accomplish this purpose. These rights are the mainsprings of our American way of life. They can be summarized briefly in the following paragraphs.

Every person is free to worship according to the manner dictated by his conscience.

We enjoy freedom of speech and freedom of the press, including the right to criticize our Government and our public officials.

The right of the people to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, whether fancied or real, is guaranteed.

We have the right to keep and to bear arms, though this right is frequently limited by Federal, State, or local laws and regulations.

We are protected against unreasonable search and seizure of person and property by the Government without proper authority and good cause.

No person shall be held to answer for any major crime without review and indictment by a grand jury.

No person shall ever be placed in double jeopardy for the same crime.

No person shall be compelled to act as a witness against himself in any criminal case.

If a person is accused of crime, he has the right to a speedy trial; the right to the help of a lawyer; the right to trial by jury, impartially selected; and the right to call witnesses in his favor.

No wife may be required to testify against her husband, or vice versa, in any criminal proceeding.

Private property may not be taken for public use without just compensation and due process of law.

Excessive bail may not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

Every person is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty.

The right of the individual to vote, and to vote secretly, cannot be abridged.

Every person has the right to the protection of habeas corpus, which gives anyone who claims to be unlawfully held by an officer or private person the right to have a hearing at once so that he may know the reason why he is being held. This means that the Government of the United States cannot either secretly or openly arrest persons as individuals or groups, throw them into prisons or concentration camps, hold them there indefinitely and do what it pleases to them.

Congress can pass no ex post facto law. This means that in our daily living and thinking we can enjoy the liberty of doing and saying all that the existing law permits. Even if at a later date our Government makes these things illegal, it cannot date back the law to make illegal anything that was done before the law was passed.

Treason against the United States consists only in levying war against our country, adhering to her enemies, or giving them aid and comfort. No person can be convicted of treason except on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or upon

confession in open court. This precise definition in the Constitution prevents any possibility of the slightest criticism of the Government being branded as treason, as well as prohibiting secret trials and giving accused persons no opportunity to confront witnesses.

These then are the rights which we enjoy as citizens of the United States and which are part and parcel of our American way of life. It is altogether right and proper therefore, that we should review their significance in the observance of Loyalty Day. A discussion of our rights as individuals, however, of necessity must take into account our responsibilities to the group, and these responsibilities are the second fundamental principle which guide our day-to-day thoughts and actions.

In a large society such as we have here in the United States, the interests of individuals are bound to clash from time to time. It is at this point that responsibility to the group enters the picture. The individual, while exercising his own freedoms, must not deprive others of their freedoms. Freedom does not imply unrestrained or irresponsible action. Group responsibility requires that no individual be permitted to bring harm to other people. Freedom of speech, for example, gives no one the right to shout "Fire" in a crowded theater or restaurant.

Group responsibility means giving full obedience to the laws under which the individual lives, since they were made by duly authorized representatives of the group. If a particular person dislikes a certain law, he can criticize it and make every effort to change or repeal it by constitutional means. But while that law remains in force, no person can break it without expecting to incur whatever penalty is involved.

Group responsibility means that each man is responsible for his family and loved ones. He must provide for them and ensure their well-being. It means, furthermore, that the individual bears responsibilities to his community, his church, and other groups which work for the good of all. Lastly, but perhaps of paramount importance, group responsibility means the willingness of all of us to bear arms in the defense of our country.

These, then, are the rights and responsibilities which are the warp and woof of the American way of life. They are the bulwark which protects our way of life from such abuses and totalitarian excesses as are suffered by the oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain by governments imposed upon them by force.

Loyalty Day presents a splendid opportunity for all American citizens once again to pledge themselves to the principles which have made our Nation the finest example of freedom, justice, and opportunity the world has yet seen. If we do pledge ourselves and continue to do so, we, as our Founding Fathers did in 1787, will also "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The Late Dr. T. Ryland Sanford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an address I delivered at Hargrave Military Academy, Chatham, Va., on April 23, 1955, at the unveiling of the portrait of the late Dr. T. Ryland Sanford.

Dr. Sanford was a devoted and consecrated churchman, an outstanding educator of great note who wielded a wide and wholesome influence in Virginia. For more than one-half century he was prominent in the work of the Baptist denomination and distinguished himself in the ministry. He was an alumnus of the University of Richmond, where his athletic prowess, his manly traits, and nobility of character are the source of legends and will ever be appreciated. Under his leadership Chatham Training School, at Chatham, Va., was established in September 1909. It later became and is now known as Hargrave Military Academy. It is a fine Baptist institution, and I was privileged to be a student there while Dr. Sanford was president. He enjoyed the high admiration, the confidence, and the esteem of all who knew him. I had for him the warmest personal affection.

Col. A. H. Camden succeeded Dr. Sanford as president of Hargrave Military Academy and served eminently in that capacity for approximately 40 years. He is now connected with Hargrave on an emeritus basis. Colonel Camden is an outstanding southside Virginia educator, a solid, substantial, and dependable citizen. Upon his retirement, Col. Joseph H. Cosby became president, and he is carrying on in the finest and highest traditions. I take this opportunity of publicly commending the services of these distinguished Virginians as well as those who are now and have been associated with them.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK DELIVERED AT HARGRAVE MILITARY ACADEMY AT THE UNVEILING AT THE PORTRAIT OF THE LATE DR. T. RYLAND SANFORD APRIL 23, 1955

Colonel Cosby, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for the invitation to be here today and to have the privilege of participating in this merited tribute to the late Dr. Thomas Ryland Sanford, the founder of Hargrave Military Academy. I have come in obedience to that invitation to pay this public tribute of respect to one who has answered that final summons to which every ear shall some day harken and all mortality obey, a beloved schoolteacher and preacher to whom I am greatly indebted, and a long-time friend whose memory I shall ever cherish.

Dr. Sanford was born 75 years ago in Westmoreland County, Va., near Montross. His unfortunate and untimely death occurred on April 8, 1952.

Although I had first met him at my home in Halifax County where he had come to enroll me as a student in this institution, it was here at Hargrave Military Academy (then Chatham Training School) that I first knew him.

From that time on, until he delivered his last sermon after more than one-half century in the Baptist ministry and came to the end of his labors here on earth, I was among the many thousands who held this devoted educator and consecrated churchman in the highest esteem and affections. Few men in the history of Virginia have wielded a wider and more wholesome influence over the lives of their contemporaries. It was a high privilege to have come under his beneficent influence and guidance, and to have the opportunity of basking in the warmth of his great mind and radiant personality on many occasions through the course of the long years which intervened during our acquaintance.

Dr. Sanford was the son of the Reverend and Mrs. Millard Fillmore Sanford. His father was a distinguished consecrated Baptist minister, and his mother was a lovely lady of the highest character and attainments. I likewise had the privilege of taking classes under both of them and through those and later associations became to know, understand, and appreciate the sterling qualities so characteristic of the entire Sanford family.

Early in his boyhood, he left the Northern Neck when his father moved to a pastorate in Burkeville, and it was only in the sunset of life that he finally came back to reside in the midst of the memories he had nurtured from childhood. During the long interval, he frequently returned for visits and the fishing trips which he enjoyed to the fullest. But he once remarked he never would have gotten back to stay had it not been for the affliction which forced him into partial retirement. However, that affliction never diminished his interests or dimmed the broad horizon, encompassed by his exceptionally active mind.

Much of his colorful career and certainly many of his principal interests were associated with this academy, the University of Richmond, and the Baptist Church. His athletic prowess at the University of Richmond is the source of legends which rightfully should never fade. But it was not as an athlete alone that he won the hearts of his fellow students, his teachers and the thousands who came to know him. It was primarily the spiritual magnetism of the man, the exuberant spirit that shown in his countenance, in his handclasp, and in his every word.

Like many a student since, he took delight in healthy competition—and no doubt tremendously enjoyed contributing to the 42–0 football victory over my alma mater, William and Mary, in his first game back in 1899. He had the same enthusiasm for baseball and basketball, in which he also excelled.

In fact, there was no activity in which he engaged that he was not enthusiastic and intensely interested. But the underlying theme of his life early became apparent and he was still a student when he began preaching at Branch's Church in Chesterfield County. He solved the transportation question by commuting between campus and church by bicycle—another typical example of his self-reliance and ingenuity in meeting problems as they arose. Dr. Sanford was ordained in 1902 and left school to serve three Chesterfield churches—Branch's Gill Grove, and Second Branch. Needless to say, the salary of the pastor was not excessive. But Ryland Sanford knew his economics as well as his religious teachings and saved enough to complete his education. Dr. Sanford possessed in a preeminent degree all of the qualities of a successful businessman. Had he turned his attention in that direction no doubt he would have also made a splendid success in that field.

He was a lifter, not a leaner. He believed in giving, not receiving. He believed in honest pay for a day's work, and vice versa. He was not spoonfed or pink pilled. His powers came from struggle, effort, and determination. He was reared in the atmosphere of that period of our history known as the "tragic era" when our southland had been overrun by an overpowering army; our fields impoverished; our resources exhausted; and our manpower depleted. Despite the handicaps imposed by such conditions and others unspeakably horrible, men of his generation rebuilt Virginia and made it the great Commonwealth it is today, standing as she does—proudly at the top of the sisterhood of States—able to chart its own course, unencumbered by bonded indebtedness and contributing its full share to the support and

maintenance of the national structure. It is worthy to note, too, that this was accomplished without the aid of any Marshall plan, Federal aid, giveaway programs, or technical assistance.

In 1903 he accepted a pastorate in Buckingham County where he first became widely known having conducted a great revival at Old Sharon Church. In addition to his other outstanding qualities, Dr. Sanford was blessed with an impressive and commanding personal appearance. He was tall and strong and robust. He was handsome. His face radiated those intangible but incalculable values which constitute courage, character, and manhood. He looked and acted the part of a leader. He had a complete knowledge and use of the English language. He enunciated clearly and beautifully. His words flowed freely and with facility and ease. He was a speaker of great force and when he released the full powers of his oratory, which seemed at times to be unbounded, he could stir, move and control his congregation. These were natural talents and blessings with which he was endowed and which enabled him to be such an effective influence for good in every community in which he labored.

From Buckingham County he moved to the Memorial Baptist Church at Hampton, and then to Chatham in 1908. It was here that he contributed 10 fruitful years to his church and the people of Virginia.

When he heard the Warren Training School might close, Dr. Sanford with his customary energy and enthusiasm, decided that the Baptists should have a school of their own. Under his leadership they established one and in September 1909 Chatham Training School opened its first session with 18 students and Thomas Ryland Sanford as founder and first president. Mr. J. Hunt Hargrave, a deacon in the Chatham Baptist Church, and his father were coleaders in this undertaking and it was the younger Hargrave's great contribution to the school which led to the change in name in 1925 to Hargrave Military Academy.

Dr. Sanford, who saw the school grow from that modest beginning to essentially its present status, was more than president. He was a teacher, coach, and companion to his boys, of whom I was privileged to be one. He supervised and worked with the boys—in those early days in clearing the 28-acre site for the expansion which he was sure would come.

I shall never forget the experience of my student days here. I learned many valuable lessons the hard way. In those days demerits were positive, tangible things, and some of the most lasting lessons I have ever learned came about by the impartial and firm discipline dispensed by this great man who recognized that knowledge and character were not to be instilled and cultivated by association alone, but by hard work, discipline, self-denial, and determination. These principles were inculcated by the methods he applied and the example which he set.

South Boston, Fredericksburg, Norfolk, and Luray were subsequent pastorates for Dr. Sanford before arthritis seriously handicapped him in 1941. Six years later he returned to his beloved Northern Neck to serve four more churches and finally to conclude his more than 50 years of outstanding service to his fellow man.

It was characteristic of the man that he never considered himself, but only those he was in position to help, whether in spiritual guidance, educational development, or physical health. Often he preached three times a Sunday, paid many visitations to the sick and those shut it, and still found time for a rich family life and a myriad of other activities.

His stature in church and educational affairs was such that he yielded much of his time to the demands upon him. He served as a member of the board of trustees of Hargrave and of the University of Richmond, the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Virginia Baptist Board of Missions and Education, and held various district and State offices in his church. The University of Richmond awarded him the degree of doctor of divinity in 1922 in recognition of his many contributions not only to the institution but to Virginia generally.

While participating in these extensive activities, Dr. Sanford was guiding his own family to fruitful maturity. I need not recount for this audience the story of the Sanford boys whose athletic, academic, and postgraduate accomplishments are in themselves a dramatic and entrancing story. Hargrave Military Academy has shared the benefits of this younger generation of Sanfords.

Such leaders as Dr. Sanford are responsible for the strength and durability of our free institutions in America. Our Nation was built on the foundation stone of respect for the rights of man and the dignity of the individual. Education has been an important factor in building and perpetuating this great heritage. Dr. Sanford exemplified the characteristics that thoughtful and patriotic citizens admire and shall ever champion, because he represented in wisdom, vision, and action the epitome of good citizenship. He not only was a minister, educator, and leader; he was a man steadfastly devoted to making the world a better place in which to live—and he went about this task by seeking to elevate the thoughts and aspirations of the people themselves.

It is highly appropriate that his portrait should be hung here, the scene of so much of his valuable labor, and from whose sheltered walls so many young men have gone forth with unbounded hope and opportunity to meet the challenging problems of life made strong and confident because of the principles instilled in them here. A great philosopher once said that the founding of an institution is like the well spring of a stream—the small beginnings of which are indeed plain to all, but the full, ultimate and expansive powers and influence only the omniscient can discern. We know that Hargrave Military Academy has deepened and expanded its influence everywhere, and it is the fervent hope and prayer of many that it may never wane.

Joy and sorrow are closely intermingled in this busy world of ours. Sometimes the happinesss incident to the birth of a precious baby is shadowed and saddened by the death of its mother. And frequently on the highway of life the bridal procession must tarry while the funeral train passes by.

Today we come with grief and sorrow that a life fraught with so much good should be so suddenly cut off from amongst us, but in our chastened reflections we can discern echoes of counsel and encouragement because we are filled with gratitude and appreciation for the example of such a life as that of Thomas Ryland Sanford, which should animate us all to a higher and renewed consecration to worthy and unselfish devotion to the principles which he espoused and for which he stoutly stood.

Through the lives of many individuals who came within the great expanse of his influence, the people of Virginia have reaped an enormous benefit. And through them and the unnumbered generations to follow his magnificent contribution to his people and to the general advancement of mankind will live forever.

At such a time as this when our thoughts are turned to a loved one or a friend to whom the grim messenger with the inverted torch has beckoned onward, it is good to have the sweet assurances of our religion that though dead, he yet liveth.

"He is not dead, but sleepeth, well we know.
The form that now lies mute beneath the sod
Shall rise when time her golden bugles blow,
And pour its music through the courts of God."

Austrian-Russian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following front-page editorial which appeared in the Polish-American Journal, Saturday, April 30, 1955, on the recently signed treaty between Austria and the U. S. S. R. This newspaper, which serves the interests of Americans of Polish descent, goes on record as issuing a warning that certain provisions of the treaty will endanger the lives of many thousands of Polish people now living behind the Iron Curtain. Most certainly, with this in mind, the Austrian Treaty bears closer scrutiny before this country goes on record as approving it.

The editorial follows:

CHALLENGE TO POLONIA—LET US SAVE POLISH REFUGEES IN AUSTRIA FROM SOVIET SLAVERY

The Austrian Treaty which the Soviets and the Austrian Government just agreed to sign—pending the consent of the American, British, and French Governments—may well result in a great tragedy for about 3,000 Polish refugees in Austria.

For some strange reason, the American press did not publish the text of the Austrian Treaty. However, Julius Epstein, of the Katyn investigation fame, secured a copy of the treaty and discovered that it contains great danger to Polish and other refugees from behind the Iron Curtain, numbering about 30,000.

Article 16 of the Austrian Treaty provides: "Austria undertakes * * * to take all necessary measures to complete the voluntary repatriation of displaced persons within its territory * * * to permit the accredited representatives of any Allied or Associated Power [Communist government of Poland is an Allied and Associated Power] to visit freely such camps or centers for the purpose of conferring with its nationals * * * to prohibit in such camps or centers any propaganda hostile to the interests of the Allied and Associated Powers and any activities designed to induce such displaced persons not to return to the countries of which they are nationals * * * to dissolve immediately any 'committee,' 'center,' and other similar organizations existing in those camps and assembly centers that may be found to be engaged in activities opposed to the interests of the Allied and Associated Powers."

Moreover, paragraph 5 of article 16 provides:

"No relief shall be given by Austria to persons who refuse to return to their native countries * * * [who] are engaged in hostile activities against their countries of origin * * * or are members of organizations and groups which encourage displaced persons not to return to their countries of origin."

Insofar as 3,000 Polish refugees in Austria are concerned, none of whom, of course,

wants to be repatriated to the Communist-ruled Poland, the above-quoted excerpts from article 16 mean that they will be completely at the mercy of the Communists and will have only a choice to surrender to the Reds and become their slaves or face death for lack of relief.

Strange as it may seem, the American Government which fought against article 16 for about 8 years, suddenly accepted it on February 13, 1954, at the Berlin conference, it was revealed by Mr. Epstein.

However, not everything is lost yet.

The Austrian treaty must be approved by Britain, France, and the United States before it will become operative.

We must take advantage of this and do everything in our power to eliminate the refugee provisions from the treaty and thus save 3,000 Polish and 27,000 other displaced persons from the prospective Soviet slavery or death.

Time is of utmost importance in this matter, as the talks between the Western powers, the Soviet, and Austria on the validation of the Austrian treaty may commence any day. Therefore, immediate action is needed.

Specifically, we suggest that the Polish American Congress, all other Polish American organizations, our leaders, and the rank and file of the American Polonia immediately protest to the State Department against the acceptance of refugee provisions of article 16 of the Austrian treaty and contact our friends in Congress to raise the issue there. We should tell the Senators and Representatives that instead of giving us compliments on the occasion of the anniversary of Poland's 3d of May Constitution, they should take action to save the Polish and other refugees in Austria. Of course, the Congressmen of Polish descent should lead the crusade.

Finally, it should be understood that this is not only the fight to save Polish and other refugees in Austria.

This is, first of all, the fight to prevent a tremendous Soviet victory and the defeat of the United States in the cold war of ideas and morals. For if the refugee provisions of article 16 of the Austrian treaty will be accepted by the United States, our anti-Soviet propaganda will become worthless, as our action will do irreparable damage to our reputation as defenders of liberty and human rights.

P. S.: The free Poles in Great Britain and France should also take steps to prevail upon the British and French Governments not to accept the refugee provisions of article 16 of the Austrian treaty.

Willis W. Bradley and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the finest memories of my congressional career are associations, during the 80th Congress—1947 to 1949—and subsequently, with the late Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California. His stature as a statesman, naval officer, and Government administrator has been extensively portrayed in the annals of the Congress by others and requires no emphasis from me.

There is, however, one facet of his congressional career that I feel ought to be described in greater detail. This concerns the Panama Canal of which he was a discriminating and objective student. As qualifications for his inquires in this field he had the background of a lifetime of study, an extensive naval experience, and a wide knowledge of the merchant marine. Moreover, it was through Representative Bradley that I first became seriously interested in the canal subject, for which service I shall always be grateful.

As a fellow member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, we worked in close association. Early in 1947, he became keenly aware of the Isthmian Canal studies under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, then in progress. In his search for information he did not restrict himself to routine officials temporarily serving as administrators of the canal enterprise, but sought advice from all responsible sources. For example, he arranged with Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal for a presentation on the operational problems of the Panama Canal held in the Navy Department on March 14, 1947, for the entire Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Later, as a leading member of a congressional visitation in the Canal Zone in April of that year he was most effective. Thereafter, he rapidly assumed the status of congressional spokesman on canal matters, and had the opportunity of consulting many independent experts.

Among the most comprehensive treatmeants of the interoceanic canal problem in the records of the Congress is a notable address by Representative Bradley before the Cosmos Club of Washington on April 19, 1948, entitled "What of the Panama Canal?" Published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, April 21, 1948, page A2449, this address, by its forthright and objective clarification of key issues, contributed materially toward preventing hasty action by the Congress on a then pending report of the indicated investigation and formed a solid basis for much that followed in the consideration of the canal problem. The principal sections of this address of Representative Bradley are still applicable.

In the course of his membership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, its distinguished senior minority member, the late Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, and Representative Bradley became close friends and collaborators, with a great common interest in the Panama Canal. Thus, these two leaders formed an effective nonpartisan team in securing proper consideration by the Congress of important canal issues before acting on recommendations of administrative agencies—a policy that the Congress has continued to follow.

Toward the end of the second session of the 80th Congress, Representative Bradley published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, June 15, 1948, an extensive bibliographical list on the Panama Canal question—the first time, as far as I can determine, such a list was ever published in the RECORD. Since then I have prepared additional comprehensive lists, the last having been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, No. 52, March 23, 1955, page A2049, under the title "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation." For this effort Representative Bradley's original contribution in 1948 was my inspiration.

With the convening of the 81st Congress in January 1949, Representative Bland resumed his chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, over which he had presided so long before the 80th Congress. One of his first official actions was to secure authorization for an inquiry into the financial operations of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, 81st Congress. For this task, he appointed me as chairman of a special subcommittee.

As part of his preparations, Chairman Bland conferred as to procedure with Captain Bradley, who in 1949 left the Congress. Captain Bradley suggested that the chairman of the subcommittee visit the Panama Canal exhibit in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy Department.

With the authority of Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, I visited this exhibit on February 10, 1949, and was accompanied by Captain Bradley, and Gen. James G. Steese, distinguished engineer and former Engineer of Maintenance—Chief Engineer—of the Panama Canal. We were received by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, who, at the time, was Panama Canal liaison officer and Coordinator of Isthmian Canal Studies of the Navy Department.

Using terrain models of the canal and other exhibits in that office dealing with its marine features, Captain Bradley explained the problems of operations; and General Steese, those of engineering.

The explanations by these two authorities gave me a deeper insight into the nature and magnitude of the principal problems involved in the canal question. They started me on a search for knowledge that has never ended.

Later, on the evening of February 24, 1949, in company with Representative—now Senator—THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa, I attended a comprehensive presentation by Captain Bradley before the Engineers' Club of Washington in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce, entitled "The Why's of the Panama Canal."

The proceedings of that evening, which I included in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, March 4, 1949, page A1303, were a further important contribution of Captain Bradley toward the increased understanding of the canal problem, especially in legislative and executive circles.

At this point, it is pertinent to mention that at each of Representative Bradley's notable canal addresses, he was introduced by the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, a former member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and later a Member of Congress, lifelong student of Panama Canal problems and an early and long continuing advocate for the creation of an unbiased and independent canal commission representative of all the major interests involved

as offering the best means for their resolution.

At the present time adequate means for the objective handling of the canal question do not exist. To supply such means, Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN and I, early in the present session, introduced identical measures, S. 766 and H. R. 3335, respectively, to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission. These bills are modeled after a measure introduced in the 80th Congress by Representative Bradley.

In the perspective that is now possible, the constructive leadership of Representative Willis W. Bradley with respect to interoceanic canals, in and out of the Congress, firmly establishes him as one of most outstanding authorities on this gravely important subject. His statements in regard thereto are accordingly indispensable sources for study not only for students and historians but as well, and more particularly, for engineers and navigators, and all the legislators and administrators charged with direct responsibility for operation, maintenance and improvement of the Panama Canal.

No one who has attempted to make an objective study of the problems of interoceanic canals can fail to note how intensely the proponents of various plans defend their ideas. They have reached their conclusions and they are apparently unwilling to consider any deviations. Sometimes they are even unwilling for Congress to appoint a commission to report on all phases of the controversy. To these partisans, each one of whom is an able and patriotic man, I suggest that if his program is sound, he need not fear to have it carefully scrutinized by an independent commission. To refuse to submit it to such an impartial group is to suggest that perhaps it lacks the merit which would insure its approval by such a group.

Irish Freedom Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very interesting and enlightening article written by one of the leading barristers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, namely, Attorney Charles H. McGlue, on the subject of Irish Freedom Trail.

Mr. McGlue is the most outstanding and learned member of the bar in Massachusetts on the subject of primary and election laws, and has been recognized nationally on his ability in that direction.

You will note he has an unlimited knowledge of a subject that is close to the hearts of many Americans dealing with the Irish people and their contributions in the art of free government.

A student of many years in this field, I know that many of our colleagues in the Congress will be interested in his views:

IRISH FREEDOM TRAIL—MCGLUE TELLS OF BATTLE FOR LIBERTY AND FREEDOM

My good friend over the years, the Hon. James A. Farley, of New York, once said that Patrick of Tara, Saint and Apostle of Ireland, by force of the very qualities of his saintliness, had made himself for fifteen hundred years the ruler of the hearts of the Irish people, and that it was no accident that the Irish people in turn should develop an unrivalled genius in the art of free government.

Let that thought set my theme and let us go along with the words of that great musical composer, the Dublin-born Irishman Victor Herbert. "It's a great, great day for the Irish, tonight," and so in memory, we will be with the ghosts of the galloping Gaels who fought their way, through six continents in order that all people everywhere might enjoy freedom from oppression and liberty to enjoy life as their Creator intended.

IRISH IMMORTALS

The pages of Ireland's fight for freedom has been illuminated by such names as Rory O'Moore in 1576, and Roger O'Moore in 1641; in 1778, Henry Grattan; the valiant Wolfe Tone in 1798; in 1803, the martyr Robert Emmett, and then came the great leader Daniel O'Connell, who secured Catholic emancipation for the people of Ireland; John Mitchell in 1848; James Stevens in 1865; the great parliamentarian Charles Stewart Parnell in 1881; and in 1916, the Easter Sunday martyrs Sheehy Skeffington, Thoms McDonough, Patrick Pearce, James Connelly, and Sir Roger Casement.

Very few are the countries on whose rolls of honor do not appear the names of Irish heroes and fighters for freedom. Although the Irish missionaries of religion and learning carried the torch of civilization and culture to all parts of Europe during the Dark Ages, following the fall of the Roman Empire, very little publicity has been given to the role of the Irish in the history of other nations.

IRISH FLEUR-DE-LYS

From 1692 to 1792, there was an Irish Brigade in the French army and over 500,000 Irishmen died in the service of France during that time. When King Louis XVIII dissolved the brigade in 1792, so as not to offend his English allies, he presented each regiment with a farewell banner, embroidered with an Irish harp, surrounded with shamrocks and fleur-de-Lys, and the motto inscribed thereon, "'Semper et Ubique Fidelis" (always and everywhere faithful) a rare tribute!

During Napoleon's first empire, Henry Clarke, Duc de Feltre, and an Irishman, was the minister of war. Later, Marshall MacMahon, a member of a famous Irish family, became the President of the French Republic, and to complete the French-Irish history, let it be stated that at Waterloo, it was an Irishman, the Iron Duke of Wellington, who defeated Napoleon and his armies.

SPANISH SHAMROCKS

Hibernia and Iberia have always been kin to each other ever since the reign of King Milesius, as well as the time when the Spanish Armada was sunk in the 16th century, and many Spaniards found the welcome mat awaiting them in Galway and the Aran Isles.

Not so well known, however, is the fact that Richard Wall, an Irishman, was Prime Minister of Spain under both King Ferdimand VI and King Charles III.

MIXED BOUQUETS

The Irish, however, were always good mixers and they appeared in many countries and in many causes. Naples was the base of an Irish brigade. The Austrian Army had hundreds of Irish recruits, many of whom reached the highest rank. Count Taafe, a member of a very distinguished Sligo family, played a very important role in Austro-Hungarian politics. In the olden days of the Russian Czars, Peter Lacy of Limerick, became a brigadier general in the army of Peter the Great and later was made governor of Livonia.

LATIN AMERICAN GAELS

In the civil as well as in the military life of the 20 Latin-American republics which lie to the south of our continent, the Irish have played a very prominent and important role. When the Latin-American wars of liberation got underway early in the 19th century, the two great Latin military leaders were Simon Bolivar and Jose San Martin.

CHILE AND O'HIGGINS

Gen. Sam Martin's right hand man was Bernardo O'Higgins, son of Ambrosio O'Higgins, born in County Meath, Ireland, and the last viceroy to Chile and Peru by appointment of the King of Spain. In the chief square of Santiago, capital of Chile, stands a statue of Bernardo O'Higgins, the liberator of Chile. The second brigade of O'Higgins was led by General MacKenna, another fighting-for-freedom Irishman, General O'Higgins good right arm in political matters was another Celt by the name of John McNamara. In October of 1814, a movement for the complete independence of Chile from Spain was headed by the same Bernardo O'Higgins. He joined forces with Gen. Sam Martin and they routed the Spanish Royal Army near Chacabuco. A cabildo abierto was held at Santiago and San Martin was elected governor of the country. The Wars of the Liberation were still unfinished. San Martin declined the honor and asked that it be given to O'Higgins, one of his chief officers in the liberating army. General O'Higgins was made supreme director of Chile in 1818.

ARGENTINA AND ADMIRAL BROWN OF COUNTY MAYO

Cross the high Andes from Chile and you come upon the fair country of Argentina. The freedom trail there was followed by many Celts. Admiral Brown, born in County Mayo, Ireland, has often been called the saviour of Argentina. The Gaels, Brown, Fleming, Gahan, Haggerty Morris and Shannon greatly contributed to the liberation of Argentina. The Irish people have always been affiliated with the life and the times of the Republica de Argentina. There are many Irish societies in Buenos Aires and Rosario and you may be sure that St. Patrick's Day is properly celebrated in the Argentines.

COLOMBO AND O'LEARY

In the struggles for independence of Colombia, Gen. Simon Bolivar was aided by many Irishmen. One of them was the son of the great Irish patriot and fighter for Irish freedom, Daniel O'Connell. Daniel O'Connell's wife presented a tricolor to these Irish expeditionnaires. Another interesting fact about Colombia's fight for freedom is that General Bolivar's own aide-de-camp was Daniel F. O'Leary. In the capital at Bogota, a historical painting of him hangs there for all Colombians to remember the debt they owe to the spirit of the Irish.

PERU AND O'CONNOR

One of the great national heroes of Peru in its struggle for independence was a Colonel O'Connor who more than a hundred years ago found his way up into the highest part of the Andes and did his part in bringing freedom to the white man and the Indian in that section of Latin America.

MEXICO AND O'DONOJU

Our last stop in Latin America on the Gaelic Freedom Trail will be Mexico. The very last viceroy to Mexico from Spain was

named Juan O'Donoju (here we would call it John O'Donohue). Viceroy O'Donoju arrived in Mexico from Spain in 1821 but was intercepted at Cordova by Agustin de Iturbide, a leader of the Mexican revolutionary forces. O'Donoju's signing of the treaty of peace, paved the way for Iturbide's triumphant entry into Mexico City as liberator of Mexico on September 27, 1821.

AMERICAN FREEDOM TRAIL

Space does not permit me at this time to extoll the great Irish leaders who contributed so much to the development of Australia and Canada, but the leaders in the crusade for freedom and liberty in these United States of America must be given proper recognition.

The birth of our Republic was sparked by the fiery utterance of a very distinguished Irishman, when as a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, Patrick Henry said: "As for me, give me liberty or give me death."

It was Capt. John Sullivan whose daring capture of Fort William and Mary in December of 1774, provided the arms and ammunition which compelled the British to evacuate Boston on March 17, 1776, and also gave the Colonial troops the wherewithal to put up armed resistance at Bunker Hill on June 17, 1775.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Don't forget that it was Michael O'Brien and his six sons, of Machias, Maine, who captured an English convoy, and for this act of great gallantry, the Continental Congress ordered that the first ship of the American Navy be chistened *Liberty*, under command of Jack O'Brien, and the second ship be called *Hibernia* and captained by his brother, Jerry O'Brien. Remember also that the first commodore of the American Navy was John Barry.

Keep in mind that Gen. George Washington, father of our country and Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, placed General John Sullivan in command of the Continental forces at Dorchester Heights on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, 1776, and gave the password for that memorable occasion as "St. Patrick" Such prominent figures in the siege of Boston as Morgan, Knox, Stark, and Moylan were of Irish ancestry or birth.

Let it not be forgotten that the Secretary of the First Continental Congress was an Irishman named Charles Thompson; that 10 of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were of Irish blood, including John Hancock, of Massachusetts, and Charles Carroll, of Maryland; that at the Battle of Lexington and Concord, 142 of the Minute Men were of Irish extraction; that 228 of those who fought the British at Bunker Hill had Irish blood in their veins.

Also keep in mind that the White House at Washington was designed by William Hogan; that the present site of our Government in the District of Columbia was originally the farm of Daniel Carroll, brother of Charles Carroll of Carrollton; that the Irishman Crawford designed the Statue of Liberty which surmounts the National Capitol; that an Army engineer named Casey was the designer of the magnificent Library of Congress Building.

So it can truthfully be said that in the planning stages, as well as in the fighting areas, and later in constructive beginnings of our American Republic, men of Irish blood and Irish ancestry, gave every assistance in furthering the cause of liberty and freedom.

AMERICAN HISTORY

In every war since the founding of our Republic, wherever the freedom of men was at stake, whether it be the War of 1812, Mexican War, Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I or World War II, the fighting Irish were always in there on the side of the oppressed. It was Gen. Andrew Jackson, later President, who drove the British out of New Orleans. A distinguished line of Irish heroes followed the pattern of Jackson through the generations until in the recent World War II, we became familiar with such outstanding Irish fighters as Rear Adm. Daniel J. Callaghan, Comdr. John J. Shea, Capt. Richard E. Fleming, Lt. "Butch" O'Hare, Flight Comdr. "Paddy" Finucane, Capt. Mike Moran, Capt. Colin Kelly, Sgt. Charley Kelly, Lt. Col. Thomas Lynch, Chaplain Arthur C. Lenaghan, the 12th chaplain of Irish extraction to die in action, as well as thousands of other Irish fighters for freedom. It sure is a grand and glorious record of courage, loyalty, and devotion to freedom.

A GREAT HERITAGE

So while we mediate about the chaste, humble, and Christlike life of St. Patrick and his teachings, let us also remember what a great heritage that we of Irish blood and ancestry possess. Let us take an inventory of the leadership that our group has demonstrated in our own Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Our men and women are making their mark in all the professions. Whether it be in the legal, medical, educational, business, religious, or political fields, the Irish have a way of rising to the top of their profession.

POLITICAL SCORECARD

We have United States Senator John F. Kennedy; 3 constitutional officers, Buckley, Cronin, and Kennedy; and 6 Congressmen, Boland, Donohue, Lane, McCormack, O'Neill, and Philbin; the minority leader of the State senate is forceful and resourceful Senator John E. Powers of South Boston. He has Senators Hogan of Lynn, Donahue of Holyoke, Walsh of Lowell, McCann of Cambridge, Corbett of Somerville, McDermott of Medford, Quigley of Chelsea, Hennigan of Roxbury, Beades of Dorchester, Stanton of Fitchburg, Gibney of Webster, and Fleming of Worcester, to assist him in governmental problems, and they make a great team.

ROLLCALL RECORD

In the house of representatives, the distinguished speaker of that body is the able, competent, diplomatic Michael F. Skerry, of Medford. He is the second Democratic speaker of the house in the 175 years of our history as a Commonwealth. He is the leader of 127 Democrats, of whom 72 are of Irish extraction. Here is a good sample of the rollcall record as it appears in 1955: O'Brien, of Fall River; David J. O'Connor, of Roxbury, John H. O'Connor, of Worcester; Thomas J. O'Connor, of Springfield; O'Dea, of Lowell; O'Farrell, of Malden; O'Loughlin, of West Roxbury; O'Rourke, or Northampton; and O'Sullivan, of Dorchester. They sure are a fine broth of boys.

MAYORALTY FIELD

When it comes to the mayoralty level, you have to take your hat off to the following: Mayors Hynes of Boston, Brennan of Attleboro, Lucey of Brockton, Foley of Cambridge, Quigley of Chelsea, Crowley of Everett, Kane of Fall River, Buckley of Lawrence, Frawley of Lynn, Carr of Medford, Cahillane of Northampton, O'Donnell of Peabody, Capeless of Pittsfield, White of Revere, Collins of Salem, Donovan of Somerville, Mrs. Alice Burke of Westfield, Murray of Woburn and O'Brien of Worcester.

There are only 10 city managers in Massachusetts, but the first 8 are Barrett, Curry, Deegan, Hart, McGrath, McLean and Monahan.

JUDICIAL COURT

Justices Edward A. Connihan, Jr. of Cambridge and James Joseph Ronan of Salem are members of the Supreme Judicial Court.

There are 31 Justices of our Superior Court. The Honorable John Patrick Higgins graces the court by his learning and his administrative genius as Chief Justice. Among his colleagues, you will find the following Justices: Walter L. Collins, Daniel T. O'Connell, Frank J. Donahue, John E. Swift, Joseph L. Hurley, Thomas H. Dowd, Francis J. Good, Paul Grattan Kirk, John V. Sullivan, Eugene A. Hudson, Edward J. Voke, Frank J. Murray, Daniel D. O'Brien, David G. Nagle, and John H. Meagher.

The Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Land Court is John E. Fenton, and the Chief Justice of the Boston Juvenile Court is John J. Connelly.

ERIN GO BRAGH

So be proud of your Irish blood and ancestry. You have a high mission to perform. Do honor to your Gaelic heritage and lineage in your every endeavor. Let me conclude this article with a few lines sent to me recently by the Columban Fathers of Milton, Mass., entitled "An Irish Wish":

"May the road rise to meet you,
May the wind be ever at your back,
May the good Lord ever keep you in the hollow of His hand,
May your heart be as warm as your hearthstone;
And when you come to die, may the wail of the poor
Be the only sorrow you'll leave behind.
May God bless you."

Legislation Amending the Natural Gas Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement made on April 27 before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by Hon. John J. Moloney, mayor of Covington, Ky., in regard to legislation amending the Natural Gas Act:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. MOLONEY, MAYOR OF COVINGTON, KY., REGARDING NATURAL GAS BILL BEFORE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, IN OPPOSITION TO BILLS H. R. 3703, H. R. 3902, H. R. 3941, H. R. 4168

The Natural Gas Act became law on June 21, 1938. Since that time the Supreme Court has passed on the act to settle two important cases: *Federal Power* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, and the more recent, *Phillips Petroleum* v. *State of Wisconsin*. In both cases this High Court has had this to say: "The primary aim of this legislation was to protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural-gas companies." The cities of this Nation that are served by natural-gas companies, believe that this legislation was not only necessary in 1938, but the need for protection "against exploitation at the hands of the natural-gas companies" becomes more acute each year.

Since 1947 there have been five major bills presented to the Congress, all designed to relieve sellers of gas in interstate commerce for resale, from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction. They are: (1) The Moore-Rizley, S. 734 and H. R. 4051, 80th Congress, 1st session; (2) the Priest bill, H. R. 4099, 80th Congress, 1st session; (3) Lyle-Harris bills, H. R. 79 and H. R. 1758, 80th Congress, 2d session; (4) Kerr bill, S. 1498, 81st Congress, 1st session; and (5) Lyle bill, H. R. 3285, 82d Congress, 1st session.

Each of these bills have been defeated despite the terrific pressure exerted to effect their passage. One failed only when it was impossible to muster enough votes to override a Presidential veto.

The question is again before the Congress; this time with renewed vigor, probably instigated by the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips case. The public is being bombarded with large ads in periodicals and important newspapers, stating the case of the gas producers. Every effort is being bent toward relieving the gas producer of Federal Power Commission regulation.

The ads are so designed to give the consuming public such informations as to lead them to believe that regulation at the wellhead destroys the principles of free enterprise and competitive markets. Much is made of the regulation of producers, variously estimated as numbering between 4,000 and in excess of 5,000. Also that gas produced at the wellhead and delivered to a processor or a carrier, is not in interstate commerce.

The gas taken from the wells is intended for interstate delivery. It was for this purpose that the processing companies were formed and for this reason the large pipelines were laid over great distances to reach markets in cities far removed from the wellheads. This is the reason that many wells were opened and the reason that many oil companies went into the gas producing business. Without these facilities they would have no market and these facilities are strictly interstate in character.

An act of Congress could remove this commodity from the jurisdiction of interstate agencies by law, but no act can remove it from interstate movement in fact. The gas is being brought out of the earth to be sold beyond the State line in which the well exists.

While it is difficult or impossible to conceive, as it is being produced of gas, considered other than an interstate product, it is even harder to consider the producers market free or competitive.

Whether the number of producers is 4,000 or in excess of 5,000 is relatively unimportant at the moment. The fact still remains that less than 100 producers supply at least 85 percent of the gas produced and 7 companies supply 35 percent of this same total. This hardly looks like a free market or one in which prices seek their level through competition.

By far the greater number of producers are left with but 15 percent of the market while a relative few absorb 85 percent of the consuming public's demands. With such a heavy balance in the hands of a very few in any other commodity field, this would constitute a monopoly—and it also constitutes a monopoly in the gas producing fields.

Monopolies are not conductive to free enterprise or competitive markets. This monopoly was formed by the gas producers themselves. They now seek, not a free market, but a market free to exploit the consumer by a very few producers. The Natural Gas Act of 1938 was designed to prevent such exploitation and should for this reason be retained in its present state.

How the price at the wellhead affects the consumer is easily exemplified in my own community, i. e., in northern Kentucky, surrounding the city of Covington, and known as the northern Kentucky cities, spread along and south of the south bank of the Ohio River and directly south of Cincinnati, Ohio, on the north bank of the Ohio River.

The northern Kentucky city group is comprised of 22 separate municipalities, with a total population of approximately 175,000. Covington is the largest city in this group, accounting for approximately 65,000 of the total population.

The Union Light, Heat & Power Co. is the local retail gas company serving this area. This is a subsidiary of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., operating in and serving Cincinnati and adjoining cities in Hamilton County, Ohio. It is locally owned.

The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co. and the Union Light, Heat & Power Co. buy their gas from the Kentucky Central Gas Co., who, in turn, receive their supply from United Fuel Co. Both Kentucky and United Fuel are a part of the vast Columbia system. United Fuel is supplied by Gulf Interstate and Tennessee Pipe Line, neither of which are a part of the Columbia system. From this point I do not know the identity or the number of lines that carry this supply, as they follow a devious route to the wells in the distant Southwest.

The northern Kentucky cities enjoy a rate lower than the national average. The local market also differs in that the residential use of gas accounts for a larger portion of the total sales than is generally the figure in other cities. In 1954 the average residential rate was 64.85 cents per thousand cubic feet against a national average of in excess of 83 cents per thousand cubic feet; but the residential sales accounted for about 70 percent of the local market, against a national average of approximately 55 percent.

In 1948 our rates were low, lower than they had been for some time. They did not begin to rise until 1952. Prior to 1952 most of our supply came from the West Virginia fields, but since 1952 practically all of the gas is brought in from the wells in the Southwest. The increase in rates that followed is nothing more than a reflection of the increase in rates at the wellheads.

The Public Service Commission of Kentucky has allowed little or no increase in consumers rates over the amount of increase in wholesale rates. Yet since 1952 they have allowed three increases.

Kentucky Public Service Commission case No. 2452, bearing an order date of January 24, 1953, permitted The Union Light, Heat & Power Co., to increase rates that would gross $349,200 more annual revenue; case No. 2640, order date July 22, 1954 allowed a $455,814 annual increase; case No. 2750, with an interim order date of March 21, 1955, grants an increase up to $376,794 annually depending on the outcome of cases now pending before the Federal Power Commission.

Comparing the low in 1948 with 1954 (after 2 increases) the effect on the consumer is readily seen. In 1948, 39,547 residential customers paid $1,965,214.97 for 3,243,187 thousand cubic feet; this is a yearly average of $49.69 for 82 thousand cubic feet per customer.

In 1954, 44,311 residential customers paid $3,993,073.81 for 6,157,345 thousand cubic feet or $90.11 for 139 thousand cubic feet per customer. Each customer therefore paid 81 percent more for 70 percent more gas in 1954 than in 1948.

The incease in the amount of gas used per customer is due to a more wide spread use of gas for space heating. The interim order in case No. 2750, Kentucky Public Service Commission, may or may not increase this amount by $376,794 in 1955, depending on the outcome of the cases before the Federal Power Commission.

Thus is the residential customer affected, and the local retailer has also felt this change. In 1948 the Union Light, Heat & Power Co., paid 28.64 cents per thousand cubic feet for gas; in 1954 it was 39.11 cents per thousand cubic feet. Although some other factors affected their rate of return, it dropped to 3.15 percent in 1952 and to less than 3 percent in 1953. Due to the increases granted in 1953 and 1954 it rose to 5.31 percent in 1954. However no dividends were paid from April 1952 until December 1954.

During the period from 1951 to 1953, the price at the well-head rose from 7.3 cents to an estimated 8.3 cents.

So the wholesaler, the retailer and the consumer are all vitally affected by the price at the well-head. Should you remove the regulations at the source you only pass an unregulated product into a regulated market. Those regulatory bodies that must control prices beyond these wells are left no other alternative than to pass whatever price is fixed at the well on and on until it reaches the consumers, the greater number of which are ordinary American residences. Thus the price is left to the will or the whim of the owners of the wells, too few of whom control too much of the market to leave it either free or competitive.

A Southerner Looks at the Textile Tariff Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communication and article I received from the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass.:

THE STANDARD-TIMES,
New Bedford, Mass., April 29, 1955.

DEAR SIR: The future of the textile industry in the United States will be determined by the action that the Congress takes on the foreign-trade bill.

This is not a matter that concerns the textile industry in New England, or the North, alone; it concerns the South just as much or more.

Under the provisions of H. R. 1, the country may be flooded by cheap imports that might deal a blow from which the textile industry in the United States could not recover for many years, if ever.

The seriousness of the situation was presented in the clearest possible language by Mr. William H. Grier, the general manager of the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., of Rock Hill, S. C.

The New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times published Mr. Grier's statement in full and we enclose page containing it for your consideration.

Unless H. R. 1 is amended, the United States textile industry may be lost.

Yours very truly,

THE STANDARD-TIMES.

A SOUTHERNER LOOKS AT THE TEXTILE TARIFF CUT—WHY IS UNITED STATES TEXTILE INDUSTRY CONSIDERED EXPENDABLE?

(Why are America's textile industry, the towns it supports, and the industries with which it is allied, all considered expendable? This question is asked by William H. Grier, general manager of the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., Rock Hill, S. C., a division of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., new owners of Wamsutta Mills here. In his talk, prepared for delivery in Rock Hill, Mr. Grier cites the fallacies and errors inherent in the trade policies the new tariff cut exemplifies. He calls for a positive approach in building up the industry of Japan rather than the negative approach of destroying the United States textile industry to let Japan prosper.)

(By William H. Grier)

What I propose to talk to you about, gentlemen, is something which—like our very freedom—is something that is so much a part of our existence that we are inclined to take it for granted. I am going to talk about the textile industry, the economics and

makeup or structure of the textile industry, if you please, particularly from the standpoint of whether any significant part of it is expendable. For that is the issue, or question, with which we now seem to be faced.

To you, there is no need of diluting what I have to say. For one thing, it saves time. So I want to give it to you straight, lay it on the line.

Today, 175 years after its founding, textile manufacturing easily is our most competitive major industry, yet it is also our oldest manufacturing industry. It laid the foundation of our modern industrial age, and has been a partner and participant in most of the industrial progress since 1790. Today the United States textile mill industry employs well over 1 million men and women who are actually engaged in transforming raw fibers into cloth. The garment-making industry employs another 1 million persons; there are actually many millions concerned in the production of raw materials—fibers and chemicals—used by the mills, and millions more employed in related industries.

But, to go back a bit by the time of 1812 quite a few small mills had been built in our Atlantic seaboard States. History tells us the blockade of American ports by the British did much to stimulate interest in the manufacture of cotton textiles as well as other products. After the Treaty of Ghent and the Battle of New Orleans, commerce with Britain and other countries was resumed. But so heavy were imports of cotton goods that most American mills were forced to shut down.

TARIFF SPURED GROWTH

However, the American industry managed to obtain tariff protection, and from then until the outbreak of the War Between the States the growth of the industry was steady. Just about all of our textile industry and other manufacturing industry, however, was in the Northern States. The South, with its predominantly agricultural economy, was our strongest believer in free trade. It seemed quite good economics to exchange cotton and tobacco for manufactured goods from abroad.

Yet the South's grim experience in the War Between the States is the classic example in our history of what happens when a country at war is cut off from the sources of essential materials and has little capacity of its own to fill the gap. It must be recognized that the Confederate States in 1860 certainly had about as unbalanced an economy as existed anywhere in the world. And, as always, it was the strategic materials that proved most scarce, and priced sky high.

Since we have chosen to turn the pages of history for a moment, let's note here, too, that the defeated and economically ruined South of 80 years ago had no international loans, no lend-lease, no food relief, or anything else to turn to. But it did work like blue blazes. And it went to work under the formula which was then, as it is now, the secret of our growth as a nation and of our capacity to produce—the dedication to individual opportunity and free enterprise. This we take as a matter of national right—if not indeed as a matter of course.

SELFISHNESS CITED

Now—and I am giving it to you straight—it is the people who have selfish reasons of their own who are the main ones who have hit upon the idea of blaming the United States tariff for the slowdown in world trade. They say tariffs should be cut more to help trade get back on its feet.

The so-called free traders openly say that an industry ought to go where its products can be made cheapest, and good riddance if it can't stay healthy without tariff help. In the long run, they claim the country would be better off without it. Sure, they even go so far as to offer their sympathy to those who would lose their jobs.

The sadly inarticulate opponents of tariff abolition are, in general, those industries and sections of agriculture whose products are such that their costs are necessarily tied to the high domestic wage level. These interests foresee great harm and possible extinction for their business if they must compete in the American market with a flood of imported goods similar to their own but produced by workers so poorly paid that these goods can be made at very low cost and dumped in the United States at unmeetably low prices.

Yet, I think it is undeniably true that there is general agreement that the soundest bulwark for the free world at the present time is a prospering and healthy economy in the United States. In the long run it can't help Japan or any other part of the free world if our tariff policy is permitted to sell down the river a basic and vital industry like textiles.

Conceding that we have a stake in the prosperity of other nations, they have an even stronger need for our economic well-being here. It should be remembered that our purchases of foreign commodities rise and fall with our domestic economy. To deplete our own resources and weaken our own defenses in pursuit of an economic fallacy or booby trap is no answer, either to ourselves or to the free world.

Why is the textile industry so gravely concerned? It's as simple as A B C—in the textile industry wages constitute a very high proportion of the value of the product. It's not difficult to understand why there are some United States industries which profess to side with the so-called free traders or at least to take a lukewarm attitude. If you look closely enough, you'll find these industries are protected by patents—completely protected. Or else they are industries in which the labor cost is a relatively insignificant part of their total cost.

If they do not fall into either of these categories, then they are industries which have foreign plants and could do just as well or better by transferring their production to such foreign plants.

Now let's suppose that in the middle 1930's we had succumbed to the fallacious theory that a slightly lower price, based on much lower wage rates should prevail without regard for national needs. Where indeed, I ask, might we be now?

MARKETS FLOODED

Those of us in the textile industry can't easily erase from memory the fact that back then our markets were beginning to be flooded by an avalanche of bleached goods and other textile products from Japan. This was a major contributing factor to creating in 1938 the deepest depression the United States industry has ever known.

After more than a year's study the Tariff Commission determined that insufficient tariff protection for textiles was a serious hindrance to employment and maintenance of American living standards. The Roosevelt administration had to take quick action to prevent a mounting catastrophe from which the domestic textile industry might not have recovered for many years indeed, if ever.

Now, I ask you—if we had permitted liquidation of our industry then, where might we have been at the outbreak of World War II?

During World War II, when the textile industries of our allies were out of operation, the American industry bore the brunt of supplying textile equipment to their armies and civilian populations as well as our own. More than half the entire output of the American industry went to direct or indirect requirements of war. The United States Army Quartermaster Corps alone purchased more than 11,000 different items of cotton textiles.

Upon the outbreak of the Korean war, American cotton goods production was stepped up by 25 percent in a period of 4 months, to the phenomenal annual equivalent of an 11,500,000-bale consumption of raw cotton.

CONSUMPTION HIGH

America is unique because it grows more cotton than any other nation, manufactures more cotton than any other nation—because its people consume cotton on a per capita basis six times the world average, Japan, Britain, and India are now the world's leading exporters of cotton goods in order named.

Should another worldwide conflict ever break out, we could expect once again to see the textile industries of Great Britain, India, and Japan cut off from their sources of raw supplies. Again the United States would be forced to supply the armies and population of its allies.

So, I ask, is the United States textile industry expendable, as our free traders would lead us to believe?

Now I am not dealing with a hypothesis or something remote from reality. In two decades under one-way reciprocity, the United States has cut tariffs on cotton textiles some 37 percent and has given up most of its export trade. The current flow of Japanese goods into the United States exceeds those of all other countries combined and in the last few months has spurted to a level approximating the peak level of the 1930's. A great bulk of the imports this time are furnished goods and wearing apparel.

INVITATION GIVEN

Undoubtedly this invasion of the United States market has stemmed from recent United States Government statements which are an open invitation for the Japanese to do this. And further tariff concessions to Japan are contemplated at the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) at Geneva this month as the United States sponsors a move to try to bolster the Japanese economy. The conspicuous thing about this is that our tariff-cutting policy as now set up seems to envision textiles as our one major expendable industry.

Virtually the whole range of our cotton textile production is on the negotiable list for potential concessions. Not only that but nearly all the industry's customers—the people who make the consumer products—are on the list too, which compounds the competitive disadvantage. The products of other major industries are either notably absent from the list or are treated very tenderly.

The list also includes many special cloths and articles whether they are wholly of cotton or are a blend of fibers. It embraces rayon and other synthetic yarns and filaments. As you know, the textile industry today isn't strictly a cotton-textile industry such as it once was. The single-fiber mill has increasingly become a multi-fiber mill. From the standpoint of fibers, the industry is divided about as follows: Some 69 percent on cotton, 24 percent on man-made or synthetic fibers, and 7 percent on such fibers as wool, flax, and silk.

WHY THE SINGLING OUT?

Now, don't get me wrong. We in the textile industry do not dispute for one moment that the economic plight of Japan is serious, and that she must export to live. But the question the textile industry poses, and would like to have answered, is this: If Japan's economic plight creates an emergency which the United States as a whole is trying to remedy, why single out 1 basic industry or 1 segment of the economy to bear the brunt of the burden—especially when no other industry of comparable size has given up already more of its business at home or abroad to Japan, or contributed in a more practical way toward helping the Japanese textile industry get back on its feet after World War II?

Raw-cotton supplies, often American-type and usually American varieties fresh from our best breeding stocks, are available to foreign industries at the same prices as are paid by American mills, owing to the low cost of ocean transportation. Thus with manufacturing processses the same and with the raw material the same, the labor cost factor emerges as the only real area of competition. In the United States textile industry, as contrasted with other major industries, labor costs run high—about 40 percent—in the manufacture of products.

United States average hourly wage rates are 3 times those of Great Britain and western Europe, and 10 to 12 times those of Japan and India. The advocates of tariff reduction assert that higher American wages are offset by greater efficiency in production. This assertion implies that American cotton mills are or can be 3 times as efficient as British mills and 10 times as efficient as Japanese mills. There is no known evidence to support so fantastic a notion.

The question of relative efficiency between American and foreign competitors is usually meant to imply either 1 of 2 questionable things: That greater American efficiency has created so wide a margin of profit that prices can be lowered to meet foreign competition tariff-free, or that the level of efficiency can be raised at will to meet such foreign competition if necessary.

PROFIT NOT ASSURED

For competitive industry, higher efficiency does not necessarily mean higher profits. Its results may take the form of higher wages, lower prices, and small profits. Since it is one of the most highly competitive industries internally, textile manufacturing is typically a low profit industry, as borne out by Government figures, and any substantial curtailment of volume is quickly translated into depressed prices and financial losses. It has no unexpended margin which can be drawn upon to meet the lower prices of foreign countries on competitive goods.

In the building of its own structure and its own related economy, the one big reason why the cotton textile industry has been successful is that it has supplied to the American people the most incredible abundance, variety, and quality of textile products that have ever catered to human wants; and at prices which, relative to wages paid, are the lowest in the world. That is why the American people on a per capita basis consume about six times more cotton than the world average.

American mills operate within the American wage-and-price structure. This accounts for the industry's strength and growth here at home; but this is the textile industry's greatest weakness when facing foreign competition. Unlike other large American industries, textile manufacturing in this country has no patents or processes that are its own.

Spinning and weaving are universal processes indeed, sometimes contrary to good economic horsesense. Foreign countries can and do use the same machinery that American mills use. The industries of competing countries, rebuilt and modernized with American funds, are rapidly matching if not already exceeding the technical efficiency of the United States mills.

CONTRIBUTING SUPPORT

The United States textile industry, on the average, consumes about two-thirds of the domestic cotton crop. It is not only the major support of the United States cotton economy but a tremendous contributing economic support to numerous other domestic industries.

The transfer of any sizable United States textile production to foreign industries via the route of still lower tariffs could easily touch off a chain reaction of destruction in the American economy due to the fact that the textile industry is so closely interlinked with the chemistry industry, power, transportation, fuel, machinery, and scores of other industries. And the social disintegration in the wake of mill liquidations or migration poses the greatest danger that could come of a tariff-lowering program.

The thousands of communities now dependent wholly or largely on the textile-cotton economy of the United States could become, in large measure, a region of deserted villages and abandoned farms. The tragic thing is that there is no alternative agricultural commodity or manufacturing employment in the areas where cotton farming and textile manufacturing are most concentrated.

Even more tragic would be the fact that it would all be needless, in that it would be only a stopgap expedient which would never help world trade. This is due to the simple fact that the world today is confronted by the startling paradox of a condition of overcapacity and production surplus existing in the major manufacturing countries and a condition of extreme scarcity in the underdeveloped countries where the goods are needed most.

Many underdeveloped regions of the world, where living standards and consumption of textiles are lowest, have barred trade by artificial devices imposed by nationalistic governments.

SNARED BY OWN RULES

Providing the manufacturing countries with a "substitute market" in the one area of great abundance, the United States, while much of the rest of the world goes unclothed, isn't the answer. How could that help the plight of Asia, Latin America, Africa, Oceania, and the Near East? Those have traditionally been the areas of tremendous cotton imports which over the course of time have served to keep alive the textile industries of Europe and Japan. Today they are areas of scarcity and high prices because they are trapped in their programs of trade restrictions and nationalism.

In some countries even within our own hemisphere cotton fabrics are truly scarce and are from 2 to 3 times higher than for equivalent fabrics in the United States. Many countries, aiming to protect their small and inefficient textile industries, have reduced imports by exclusion practices so drastic that the per capita volume of cotton goods available for their domestic consumption is actually less than in prewar days.

The textile industry—and it has long been concerned with the problem of declining world trade to the extent of participating in several international textile conferences—feels the only sound course for United States foreign-trade policy to take is to strike at the heart of the problem; that is, the many different kinds of restrictions to commerce which other nations have imposed under so-called reciprocity—and thus open up great areas of consumption around the world.

BASIC TASK CITED

It considers that the basic task of world trade reconstruction requires the restoration of multilateral trade and industrial advancement of underdeveloped nations. The first of these two requirements assumes the taking of steps which lead to the reestablishment of convertibility among the world's major currencies. Only as such steps are taken will the meshwork of trade and exchange restrictions fall. The second requirement assumes the adoption of programs of economic development correlated with the material and manpower resources of industrially backward countries. It assumes likewise the cooperation of other countries in carrying out such programs.

Our industry would like to see far greater effort directed toward removal of trade barriers which almost all foreign nations, scoffing at GATT, have erected—walls which in the form of quotas, exchange controls, exorbitant tariffs, and outright discrimination are far higher and more restrictive than the United States tariff structure. We have seen American exports drop off two-thirds—our reward as the most generous nation in granting textile tariff concessions. We have seen the theory of reciprocity perverted to the point where foreign textile manufacturing nations are invited to send their goods to the United States—the one region of supreme abundance—while destitute areas of the world are bypassed.

It would be very much to the interests of the industries of all textile nations if ways are opened up for the ill-clothed nations to have a minimum of comfort and decency in their living standards.

If per capita consumption throughout the world could be raised to only one-third of what the average American enjoys, there would not be cotton fields enough, nor enough spindles and looms, to meet the needs. Is not this a worthy objective, meriting every ounce of our energy and all possible resourcefulness on the part of our Government in bringing it about, through a truly revitalized foreign-trade policy?

And in view of that, I leave you with the thought—is the American textile industry expendable?

Foreign Aid Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, when "G. Washington, Thos. Jefferson, Benj. Franklin" and those other patriarchs of the long lost days of America were writing America's genesis in the early history of this new Nation, no one ever thought about setting up a constitutional authorization about taxing American citizens to aid foreign lands around the world. But somehow we drifted into that unique practice under New Deal radicalism and now the foreign-air rut seems to be still holding us tight. Down in southeastern Kentucky, Jeff Abbott, the coal miner, works hard in the blackness of the underground caverns and has little above cornbread and occasional chuck roast for his meager table. Yet Jeff, as an American, pays some of the necessary tax that goes forth to aid Turkey, Belgium, and Brazil. Then there is Cora Bunch, a mountain schoolteacher, and Jim Meadors, a country merchant, and neither knows aught but consistent hardship and normal scarcity. Yet Cora and Jim, as Americans, pay some of the necessary tax that goes forth to promote Germany and Spain under our various foreign-aid schemes.

As the emerging picture of this present enlightened hour takes form, it would now be sheer folly to grant more aid to these various countries in far-off places. Why does this statement make sense? Surely our past experience with foreign aid since 1945 is ample enough proof of this observation. Since the inception of the Marshall plan in April 1948, it will be remembered that about $35 billion has been spent for economic and military aid abroad—about $20 billion for military

and $15 billion for economic assistance. A complex labyrinth of economic-aid programs has existed since the end of World War II, but each has had the same purpose—to give away some of the hard-earned substance of Jeff, Cora, and Jim. During World War II we gave away billions of dollars worth of goods as lend-lease. That program was justified, as we all concede, since we and our allies were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the force of tyranny. It might be said that we gave our wealth and substance rather than suffer the devastation befalling other parts of the world.

But since the end of World War II we have continued to finance one aid program after another. And let the average man question one proposal for aid or try to reduce the amount of aid in any proposal and someone proclaims that communism will be aided. The big, bad Russian bear has been a handy whipping-boy to make us toe the line for more foreign aid. And while it is not to be denied that the Soviets are out to do the free world all the harm possible, yet little evidence has emerged that our aid to other countries has made any difference in the behavior or accomplished ends of the Soviets. In fact, they regard such aid, which are sacrifices for us, as only further evidence of our so-called imperialism.

And now we are confronted with a current demand for still more aid. This year the emphasis is on Asia. This latest request is for $3.53 billion for economic and military aid in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Two-thirds of this sum, $2.14 billion, is for aid to Asia. Only $712.5 million of this total is for economic aid.

It seems that Miss Europe does not now need further aid. In 1954 her trade within Western Europe was 128 percent above that of 1948 and 69 percent above that of 1938. Imports from the outside world were 24 percent above those of 1948 and 11 percent above those of 1938. Exports were 83 percent above those of 1948 and exports to the dollar area were 130 percent above 1948, while imports from that area were 7 percent below 1948.

Consumption per capita in Western Europe reached the 1938 level by 1950. By 1953 it was 7 percent above that level, and in 1954 it jumped to 12 percent above prewar. The United States was 45 percent above the 1938 level.

Industrial output was about 50 percent higher than in 1938. Agricultural production was 30 percent greater.

In 1951 the countries of Western Europe planned for an annual increase of 4.5 percent in gross national product during the next 5 years. This increase was not realized in 1952, but it was realized in both 1953 and 1954.

Granted that foreign aid did promote the economic progress of some of the countries of Western Europe, it is soundly logical that any such aid anywhere has now outlived its usefulness. Countries receiving aid have become less and less reliable as allies. We need only to point to the Korean war and the fiasco of the European Defense Community to realize that our allies are little interested in a genuine attempt to unite for common defense. Selfish interests have either killed or emasculated most attempts at collective defense. Obviously the change from Marshall plan to mutual security shows little relationship of the one to the other. There is no mutual security unless we finance it. Our insistence on some compliance with promised objectives has caused United States popularity throughout the world to reach an alltime low. Despite our bungling attempts to become the big brother of the world, the mere spreading of dollars has not and will not bring popularity or good will. The sooner our Government realizes this simple truth the sooner have we reached maturity in our contemporary statesmanship.

Perhaps the most patent result of foreign aid has been the enforced postponement or rejection of necessary social and economic projects here at home. It is a well-known fact that our highways are inadequate; that new hospitals and schools are needed; that reclamation and flood-control projects have been postponed for lack of funds. How can we justify spreading money abroad for aid when we do not have sufficient funds to undertake such programs at home? We must wake up to the fact that we cannot carry the financial burdens of the free world on our backs. Why should an American shrink from being called an isolationist when his desire has been to make his own country a better place in which to live? Our neglect of highways, to cite one example, has contributed materially to 38,000 traffic deaths a year and has cost much time in travel. The disastrous floods of our river valleys could be eliminated by correct methods of flood control.

Continuation of our program of broadcasting billions will cause us eventually to face one of these two "ins"—insolvency or inflation. Who then is likely to come forth to bail us out? Certainly no European government will come to our aid. It should be considered that our Federal debt was 74 percent of our gross national product in 1953. But let us take a look at the debt of those nations we are aiding; the relationship of debt to gross national product of selected countries was as follows: Norway, 53.3 percent; Spain, 26 percent; Belgium, 67 percent; France, 37.5 percent; Germany, 32 percent; Turkey, 22 percent; Japan, 12 percent; the Philippines, 10 percent; Brazil, 7 percent; and Mexico, 4 percent. Truly we are burdened when compared with nations who are receiving our largesse; yet they claim that they cannot finance their own economies.

Foreign aid has not contributed to an increase in our real wealth. As one author has said:

> Admittedly the foreign-aid program, financed by the United States taxpayer and purchaser of Federal securities, has contributed to the striking postwar growth of this country. Yet it is a fair question whether the expenditure of equivalent resources on domestic development might not have led to an equal growth, even though of a different type. For it can hardly be argued that the export of very large quantities of goods for which the United States has not been compensated has increased this country's real wealth.

The French and Italian tax structures seem hopeless to American eyes. They fall heavily on consumers and permit flagrant violations by the wealthy. Yet little has been done toward remedying these conditions. True, at American insistence, new and more stringent tax laws have appeared on statute books, but they appear to have been evaded. Numerous disinterested persons who have traveled abroad have attested to the fact that wealthy people pay for less taxes than we do in the United States; yet that they refuse to invest in the economic development of their own countries. Why should American citizens be taxed to aid foreign nations when their own wealthy people evade taxes?

Much of the foreign aid money expended in other countries has gone to help export industries which now compete in world markets with our industries.

Communism has not been stopped by foreign aid. About 1 Frenchman in 4 is a Communist despite our expenditures of billions of dollars in rebuilding France. In Italy parties of both the left and the right have grown in power despite Marshall plan aid. Yet we are told whenever we question increased subsidies to European nations that they will fall to communism unless we continue to finance them.

Other examples of the folly of foreign aid could be cited. But it should suffice to say that our aid program has been used to finance socialistic governments in Europe and is now suggested as a bulwark of socialistic governments in Asia. That is a facet of the aid program that deserves special treatment, and so there will be no more than mention of it here.

The foreign aid program has been characterized by a proliferation of conflicting offices in many countries. Departments of our Government have worked at cross-purposes, frequently denying each other and working directly contrary to each other. In Paris until recently there were four individuals with the rank of Ambassador. In many European and other overseas areas, American Ambassadors must work with representatives of the United States Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, and Foreign Operations Administration. What a field that creates for misunderstandings and difficulties. Congressional committees have called attention to this anomalous situation and let us hope it is now on the way out.

These are some of the reasons why further foreign aid is futile. Certainly, such a program will not now contribute to anything like substantial furtherance of the economic rehabilitation of the world.

As of December 31, 1954, net foreign aid had cost each individual in the United States $298.52. If one were to consider the figures on a gross basis it would probably have cost each person in the United States far more than that. For my native State of Kentucky that would mean a contribution to foreign countries of about $904 million. How much improvement could be undertaken within the borders of Kentucky with a sum of that size. Truly, we could make it a far better State that it is today.

This latest request for $3.53 billion more for the next fiscal year would increase each person's contribution by $21.51, or about another $65 million from Kentucky. This means that Kentucky has contributed nearly a billion dollars for aiding foreign countries. It seems to me that we have already done far too much. Considering the aid we have given since 1940, it is no wonder that we are regarded as an impractical Santa Claus of immature judgment.

James Haskell really hit the nail on the head in reciting what we could do with the money which has been expended and is to be spent for foreign aid through June 30, 1957. He believes that by that date our postwar foreign aid to Europe alone will have totaled $60 billion. Graphically, he shows what could have been done with that tremendous sum:

1. It could have saved the average American taxpayer $1,000 in taxes.

2. It is 2½ times the total amount of the United States farm program in a decade.

3. It is nearly 4 times as much as the Government spent for public works during the New Deal.

4. It could have paid for all the new highways that America needs; also schools, hospitals, and other institutions.

Henry Hazlitt aptly expressed the contrast between foreign aid and assistance for needy domestic programs when, in discussing point 4 above, he stated:

The Government has nothing to give or lend to anybody that it does not first of all, or ultimately, take from its own taxpayers. By at least as much as it adds to the purchasing power of Paul, it must reduce the purchasing power of Peter.

Charity and mercy are admirable, desirable qualities of the human heart, but that is not so of a political machinery which should have only the function to govern for its own people and not a semblance of any function to tax those same people to further Formosa or promote Pakistan. Wake up "G. Washington, Thos. Jefferson, and Benj. Franklin" and see what we, the people, have been doing to your country through foreign aid folly. Wake up Jeff, Cora, and Jim, write your Congressmen, tell them how well you like being taxed for Turkey.

Eisenhower's Peace Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Fred Othman, columnist for the Washington Daily News:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH A PEACE SHIP?
(By Fred Othman)

I've been hearing some snide remarks here about President Eisenhower's atomic peace ship; the idea of his critics is that such a merchant vessel belching scientific steam through her whistle is bald-faced propaganda.

Maybe so. The snarlers claim that such a beautiful, white-painted vessel tooling passengers and cargo around the world on an almost inexhaustible supply of fuel in a package the size of a cracker box would boomerang. I swear I don't see how.

If everybody wants peace around the globe, then what's wrong with advertising the boons that atoms hold in store for mankind? The sooner the better, I'd say, and as of now we may be seeing this marvel of steam navigation even sooner than Mr. Eisenhower hoped.

When he announced before the newspaper publishers' convention in New York the other day that he had such a wonder ship in the works, he didn't say exactly when he hoped to have it gliding across the Atlantic.

The trouble was that atomic steam engines, as demonstrated by the submarine *Nautilus*, needed so many miles of stainless steel plumbing with appropriate sheaths of lead to keep from atomizing the crew that it literally took years to design and build them.

Now come a pair of experts who have designed at the General Electric atom works at Schenectady, N. Y., an atomic engine that does away with the pipes. This cuts in half the weight per horsepower, does away with most of the lead sheathing, and puts the whole works in a smallish package that can be installed deep in the hold near the propeller.

As explained by Dr. E. A. Luebke, the physicist who developed the powerplant with Engineer L. B. Vandenberg, their idea was a simple one—or at least as simple as anything atomic can be. Whether I can explain it is something else, but if you'll bear with me:

The conventional atomic reactor as used in our incredible submarine gets so hot that it melts down metallic sodium to a liquid which flows through the shielded pipes to a "dingus" known as a heat exchanger. This really is a kind of stove, wherein the hot sodium heats water into steam, that then is piped to the turbines. Such an arrangement involved a never-never land of valves, gears, dials, and thick chunks of lead.

Dr. Luebke said he and Mr. Vandenberg merely built their heat exchanger around the reactor. He meant they put the hot stuff in the middle and surrounded it with the steam generating equipment. This did away with most of the pipes and those that were left became short ones. The heat exchanger itself helped to shield the people from the radiation and cut down the number of lead plates needed. This is oversimplification of course. The two experts were particularly proud of the fact that they'd arranged it so that the hot sodium pipes in contact with the cold water tubes automatically generated enough electricity to run the pump that kept the liquid circulating.

The details need not concern the rest of us. Let's just get going on our atoms-for-peace propaganda ship, is all, and it would please me if she were christened the S. S. *Mamie*.

Flexible and Rigid Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 19, 1955.*
Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am interested and concerned about matters that affect all, and of course, the farmers of my district. You will recall that in the 83d Congress it was my privilege and honor to be chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives and that at that time it was our responsibility to examine into and devise the increase of the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation in order that it could play its part in the mechanics of commodity support which is a part of the law.

I am no longer burdened with the responsibility of the chairmanship of this important committee, but I am still the ranking minority member of this committee which has jurisdiction over Commodity Credit Corporation authorizations of the House of Representatives. However, I am concerned about the situation in support prices that may or may not affect the farmers in my district and in other areas of the United States.

I would appreciate your informing me at your earliest convenience of the following:

(a) What is now the commitment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in dollar valuation for all agricultural goods, either by purchase or by loan?

(b) In the judgment of you and your experts, what will be the commitments of the Commodity Credit Corporation for purchase or loan in the forseeable future in dollar volume, based on the present law?

(c) Will you please give me your best estimate of the commitments by Commodity Credit Corporation under the projected situation if the law should be amended to give to the basic commodities 90 percent of parity as is contemplated under H. R. 12?

Believe me, Mr. Secretary, I ask these questions because it seems to me that the farmers of my district and others should be fully familiar with the situation as it now exists and as it may exist if H. R. 12 should become law. I am,

Yours most respectfully,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 22, 1955.
Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLCOTT: I appreciate your interest in the financial operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, expressed in your letter to me of April 19.

We have made projections showing by months the status of our statutory borrowing authority, based on economic assumptions set forth in the 1956 budget estimate of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Using these projections, I shall do my best to answer your very pertinent questions.

(a) Currently (April 1955), we have in use approximately $8,400,000,000 of our $10 billion statutory borrowing authorization. This includes funds invested in commodities owned and under loan, as well as the investment in accounts and notes receivable, fixed assets and the unrestored capital impairment of the capital of the Corporation.

February is normally the seasonal peak in the commitment of CCC funds. In February 1955 we had $8,396,000,000 in use. This amount is very close to our estimate of last July, when Congress was considering the proposed increase in the borrowing authority of the Corporation from $8.5 to $10 billion. At that time we estimated our use of CCC borrowing authority in January and February of 1955 at $8.4 billion.

(b) Based on the present law, we expect to have in use in February of 1956 approxi-

mately $9,465,000,000 of our $10 billion borrowing authorization. This estimate assumes average yields, some rise in the level of economic activity, present price levels, some increase in exports, and acreage allotments for the basic crops. It is believed that these projections represent conservative rather than liberal projections of the volume of price support activity.

Based on present law, we would expect the peak in CCC of borrowing authority to be reached in February of 1956. Thereafter, we would expect CCC financial commitments to decrease as a result of reduced acquisition and increased disposal.

(c) H. R. 12 would make price support for the basic crops mandatory at 90 percent of parity. We estimate that the enactment of this law would increase the peak use of the Corporation's borrowing authority in the fiscal year 1956 by $247 million. On the basis of assumptions indicated in (b) above, this would put us within $300 million of our $10 billion statutory borrowing authorization—a margin of safety that could easily be wiped out by better than average yields, a drop in exports, or a decline in prices and economic activity.

I share the concern which your letter expresses about the increase in financial obligations which will result if H. R. 12 or other such legislation is passed by Congress. Even without a return to mandatory high rigid price supports the present $10 billion borrowing authorization may not be adequate.

I enclose a brief report which gives some of the above data in tabular form. This statement does not reflect the probable effects of H. R. 12 if it were to be enacted.

The Crop Production Report for July 1955 will contain the first most reliable source of information regarding production from 1955 crops. At that time the Department will be in a better position to appraise the potential use of the Corporation's borrowing authority and whether or not any legislative action need be proposed.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes for the week of April 28, 1955, on the subject of our Capitol Building:

KEENOTES

(By Hon. ELIZABETH KEE)

The Capitol of the United States is much more than a building; to every American, it is a strikingly beautiful symbol of our Nation's strength.

Probably no architectural feature in all of the United States is as well known as the Capitol dome rising majestically above the Washington horizon—visible from almost any part of the city, a thing of breathtaking splendor when lighted at night.

The clean, straight, vertical lines of the main portion of the structure, when topped by the gentle, graceful curves of the huge dome, provide a picture of deep serenity in the midst of national controversy—of solidity and calm and reason no matter what the issue which might divide us in debate.

So it is only natural that our Capitol is everyone's business—that what happens to it inside or outside is a matter of national interest and personal concern. Therefore, I know there will be general interest among West Virginians in the newest proposal for "completing" the Capitol—for, literally, giving it a "face-lifting."

Former President Truman once said the dome would fall someday if the east central front of the building were not extended outward. Others have said the dome sits on top of the main structure like a derby hat without a brim. Architects say the facade is incomplete, because the central portion was not brought forward in keeping with the two wings which were added to the original building to provide the present House and Senate Chambers.

The architects may be correct that extension of the facade is an "architectural necessity" but I'm sure that most of us who are not architects would have gone right on thinking the building beautiful indeed just as it is.

Nevertheless, the space requirements of the Congress have provided a practical stimulus to accomplish an architectural objective which has been discussed since 1863. The House has finally approved—after many years of refusing to act on the matter—a resolution calling upon the Architect of the Capitol to draw up plans for the "completion" of the facade.

The additional space added to the east central front of the building, besides bringing it closer into line with the House and Senate wings, will provide much-needed space for committee rooms, for restaurant and other facilities, and for a through-passage on the gallery level between the House and the Senate sides of the building.

The decision to proceed with the planning of this improvement came shortly after a very significant improvement was made inside the building—the opening of an impressive, nonsectarian prayer room to which Members of the House and Senate can go at any time for quiet meditation.

Before a beautiful stained glass window depicting George Washington kneeling in prayer, Members can find inspiration in the Bible, or in our own quiet prayers as we seek Divine guidance in carrying out our heavy responsibilities. It is good to have this tiny chapel available in the Capitol. And, best of all, it is being used every day.

Am I My Brother's Keeper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 1, Oddfellows from many of our States, and from Canada, were in Washington for the annual Oddfellows' pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Heretofore, the pilgrimage has been on various dates, but is now scheduled for the first Sunday in May, of each year.

Texas is signally honored in that the honorable Tellie F. Aston, of Sherman, Tex., is serving as sovereign grand master of the Sovereign Grand Lodge of the I. O. O. F.

His address at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier was able and impressive. I am happy and honored to make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that others may profit thereby:

AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

(Address by Tellie F. Aston, sovereign grand master of the Sovereign Grand Lodge, I. O. O. F., at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, May 1, 1955)

We have this day gathered together here in this sacred and hallowed Arlington Cemetery to pay a tribute of love and respect to the ones who have rendered military service to our country, many of whom sacrificed their lives that we may have the privilege of living in a free world, to live and to love, and to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." To lay down one's life for friends, for humanity, for country, for a principle—that is a most glorious deed.

The one whose memory we honor today obeyed the teachings and exemplified the lives of our illustrious forefathers when he gave his life that you and I might live in a land of freedom. World War I seemed a cruel sacrifice and we were saddened by the wanton destruction of human life. Time, with its blessed healing touch, has dimmed the sorrow, but has left vivid memories of the bravery of these men, their idealism, and their willing sacrifice that the cause of right might prevail. Truly no man has given more than this brave one who sleeps so peacefully today. There is another question which must search the very depths of our hearts, "Am I my brother's keeper?" ever since the day when the Lord said unto Cain, "Where is Abel, thy brother?," and the first murderer replied: "I know not, am I my brother's keeper?," the question of responsibility for the lives of others has rested upon man. The Lord set a mark upon Cain, and we bear the responsibility today. We are our brother's keeper and as such it is our duty to give freely of our time and talents in helping share the affairs of the world so that at some time in the future the nations throughout the world may live peaceably together forever. Yes, we stand here today almost 41 years after that calm day in June 1914, when a pistol shot rang out in a quiet little Serbian city. The sound was faint at first, but later it was heard around the world, growing louder and louder until the rattle of machineguns and the roar of cannons resounded in every ear. Not until seven and one-half million men, the pride of many nations, had laid down their lives, and hospitals had claimed many millions more, did the world finally desist from a catastrophe almost greater than the mind of man could grasp. For over 4 long years the world was mad, while the struggle between liberty and imperialism went on. Then suddenly there was silence on the battlefields, and the roar of the cannon was heard no more, and then came that glorious, mad day in November 1918, when in every city, town, and hamlet in the world, men and women shouted and sang, with choking voices and streaming eyes, that the war was over. And so we all hoped and believed at that time. But history records that since the beginning of time men have fought and died for certain inalienable rights, for self-preservation, for love of their fellow man, and in the defense of their country, and for liberty and freedom; and as long as there exists freedom-loving people, others will die when necessary to preserve that heritage, each one with the hope that after this, we shall have peace.

Poets have sung in glowing numbers and orators have proclaimed with prophetic wisdom of the courage, bravery, and valor of our people, of their ideals and hopes, of sacrifices for loved ones, of love for home and country, of liberty, and of our glorious flag of America, and what it means to live in

the land of the free and the home of the brave. But these are not all of the things this soldier who lays here before us today was thinking of. Of what was he thinking? Probably of his home, his loved ones, his normal way of life, whatever that might have been—rich or poor—famous or unknown. He was not fighting for honor or renown. He was fighting for the privilege of returning home and taking his normal place in a free and peaceful world. He did not live to see his hopes and his dreams fulfilled. He left that for us to do, and just how much have we done to carry on for him?

The threat to freedom-loving people was not as great when this man gave his life for his country as it is today. The threat of communism is spreading throughout the world more rapidly than most of us realize. The time is at hand when every one of us should be alarmed at this dreadful threat to our American way of life. So far, we have not been materially affected by war. Our homes, our cities, and our industries have not been destroyed, nor our people persecuted and slaughtered, or placed in concentration camps; but today's deadly weapons, improved equipment, speed of travel, and all the inconceivable means of warfare that modern science has developed since World War I has placed the entire world to within a few hours' time from one remote part of the earth to another, and has made all nations equally vulnerable to annihilation and destruction.

From the earliest recordings of the history of man, assaults have been made against the spiritual and moral forces which existed at that time. Today we are faced with a like attack, and Odd Fellowship holds within its hands a most important weapon with which to combat the evil forces that plague the peoples of the world. It is our deep and abiding faith in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. If as much effort had been put forth in this world in years gone by to have spread these teachings and practices, as the proponents of communism have exerted in spreading its propaganda throughout the world, then the principles for which this Unknown Soldier fought and died might have been realized, and his sacrifice would have inspired greater faith of mankind in each other.

Yes, there is an urgent need in this confused and unsettled world today for renewed faith and confidence of man in man, and nation toward nation.

How can we have a part in this great reformation? We must go back to the basic principles upon which this Nation was founded: the right to worship God according to our individual desires; an acknowledgment that all men are entitled to enjoy the blessings of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in order that we might live and work together in a land free of tyranny and despotism.

Shall we pause a moment and review our American creed which we have all read or memorized at one time or another?

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic: a perfect union, one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

The principles of Odd Fellowship go hand in hand with those contained in the creed of our Nation, and each in its rightful place is indispensable. But if we are to spread the gospel of brotherly love to a war-weary world, we must do so, not by loud and exalted praise of what Odd Fellowship does—or has done, confining our charities and sympathies to our own membership. Such a practice would declare us to be selfish and might even breed distrust by nonmembers. Let us at this time determine to indoctrinate ourselves with the spirit that reaches far above the forms and ceremonies of the lodge room, to detect the important principles and adhere thereto—to go forth with a fraternal love for everyone, and to practice in our daily lives that great rule: "Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Such a man would need no regalia to be recognized as an odd fellow. He would need no pictured symbol of heart and hand—he would use his own, and his life and good deeds would then follow him.

Let us cherish the true spirit of Odd Fellowship and give it full sway in our minds and hearts. It is the spirit of the ages—of victory—of regeneration, so let us strive to bring about a new age wherein the earth's weary millions can feel their lives refreshed with the hope of peace.

As we stand here today at this tomb which bears the inscription: "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier, known only to God," may we use this occasion to reconsecrate ourselves as Christian men and women to a better and more useful life, that we will render a more sincere service to our fellow man, and that we will not forget that we are "our brother's keeper." Let us earnestly and fervently rededicate our lives to the principles for which this order stands, and solemnly renew our obligations as Odd fellows and Rebekahs.

May we be ever mindful that Odd Fellowship requires us first, to be grateful to our Creator: second, to be faithful to our country; and third, to be fraternal to our fellow man. Let us hereby steadfastly resolve that we will keep the teachings of friendship, love and truth just as pure, as true, and as beautiful as the red, the white, and the blue in our flag which we love so dearly.

The Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Significance of Thomas Jefferson For Our Day," delivered by me, on Friday afternoon, April 29, 1955.

The meeting at which the address was made was held on the steps of the beautiful Jefferson Memorial, in a setting befitting the occasion. It was held under the auspices of the Washington Pilgrimage, ably assisted by Dr. and Mrs. Harold Dudley. Gen. Willard Paul presided, and the occasion was favored with selections by the Oxen Hill, Md., High School Band, and a wonderful chorus from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School.

The Washington Pilgrimage is an organization of clergy and lay church people dedicated to the preservation of our Nation's religious heritage. Annually they select and present awards to the outstanding clergy churchman, the lay churchman and churchwoman of the year. This year the awards were as follows:

Clergy churchman of the year 1955—Dr. Ralph W. Sockman:

In recognition of his outstanding service to the Nation, as an eloquent preacher of God's word, the minister for more than 20 years of the National Radio Pulpit, a valiant guardian of world peace, the director of the Hall of Fame, an inspiring teacher, and the author of many volumes of practical religious truth.

Lay churchman of the year 1955—President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

In recognition of his outstanding service to the Nation in his leadership for peace, spiritual devotion, and inspiring example of steadfast attention to religious values as President of the United States.

Churchwoman of the year 1955—Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON:

In recognition of her outstanding service to the Nation as a spiritual interpreter of public life in the Halls of Congress, in the field of international affairs, the ministry of nursing and public health, and the advancement of educational institutions and values.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE, JEFFERSON MEMORIAL, 4 P. M., FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1955

Mr. Chairman, we meet here today to remind ourselves of our goodly heritage. As we stand here before the great Jefferson Memorial, we can also see the monuments of Washington and Lincoln. They remind us again of not only our great heritage, but the fact that religion has played a vital part in the development of our great Nation.

They remind us, too, that religion is not only necessary, but is vital to the existence of a virile democracy. It would be a sad day indeed for our Nation should our people forget the basic fundamental principles of the Christian religion, which, after all, is the foundation stone of this great democracy—a democracy that is on trial at the present time in the conflict of the ideologies of Christianity and paganism.

Our Nation has been blessed by having leaders with a Christian faith and a firm conviction in the continued welfare of this Nation and the preservation of its ideals.

I am pleased today to read to you a telegram from the President of the United States:

"The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

"Please convey my greetings and good wishes to all participants in this year's Washington pilgrimage. I am glad that on April 29 you will speak on 'The Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day.' I hope that everyone in the pilgrimage will return from his visit to Washington with increased knowledge of Jefferson's life and thought and increased determination to uphold the principles of liberty in which Jefferson believed.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Thomas Jefferson may well be called the apostle of liberty. He expressed his attitude emphatically when he declared: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." His life was the fulfillment of this vow.

Jefferson was given the supreme opportunity to express his dedication to the principles of freedom when he was asked to draft the Declaration of Independence. Those memorable words will ring forever in the hearts of men through every age and clime. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain

unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Some petrified minds and withered hearts have tried to demonstrate their superiority by libeling Jefferson and labeling this statement a lie. They remind us that some men are born weak and sickly and others are born strong and rugged, and some are born morons and others are born geniuses—as if Jefferson didn't know this too, or was referring to any of this!

No. Jefferson's statement must not be taken from its literary and historical context. His declaration, in the only sense that it can be understood, means that all men stand equal before the law.

The wealth of the rich shall not shield him from the same penalty a pauper would suffer for the same crime. Priests are not to be tried by a different code or before different courts than laymen. The accident of birth does not automatically make a man the ruler of his fellow men, whether he is a Tudor, a Stuart, a Hanover, or a Roosevelt. This equality is predicated on the fact that all men receive their life from the same Creator, who endows them also with the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

These benefits flow reasonably from belief in a Creator, and it is only what might be expected that those who are atheists are the foremost in denying to their fellow men "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The contrast between countries dominated by atheistical communism and those countries blessed by faith in God is an existing proof. Jefferson's concern was that abomination called the "divine right of kings" and that other abomination, a fixed and immutable social and economic stratification.

Even here, in God's America, Jefferson's ideals have not met complete fulfillment, but to the extent that they have, this has been, and still is, the land of opportunity for the oppressed of earth.

Perhaps no other statements made by Jefferson demonstrate his right to be called "Apostle of liberty as do those selected for the marble memorial in the Capital of our Nation. Of religious liberty he wrote:

"Almighty God hath created the mind free. All attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens * * * are departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion * * * no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship or ministry or shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief. But all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion."

Thisis from an Act Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia. Its authorship is one of the three things which Jefferson wanted to be remembered by and asked to have mentioned on his tombstone.

Jefferson was against slavery of all kinds, whether of body or mind, and he believed in education for all as a bulwark of freedom. In the stately marble memorial erected to his honor by a grateful nation one may read his words:

"God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slave is despotism. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free. Establish the law for educating the common people. This it is the business of the state to effect and on a general plan."

Jefferson was in France when our Constitutional Convention was meeting. He approved in general of the work done by the Convention, but greatly deplored the absence of a Bill of Rights. He wrote to Washington, Madison, Monroe, and others, earnestly advocating a Bill of Rights. To Madison he wrote:

"I will now tell you what I do not like. First, the omission of a Bill of Rights, providing clearly, and without the aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land, and not by the laws of nations. Let me add, that a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference."

Many others agreed with Jefferson, and the Bill of Rights, comprising the first 10 amendments, was quickly adopted. The putting of these essential freedoms on an undeniable legal basis owes much to the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the bill for establishing religious freedom in Virginia.

Jefferson's service as our Minister to France during the several years just before the outbreak of the French Revolution, extended his influence as an apostle of liberty to that land also, and increased the already strong effect which our own successful Revolution had upon the French.

Throughout his long life, whether as Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet, as President for two terms, or as the retired sage of Monticello, Jefferson ever and always was able to say as an apostle of liberty, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

We who are privileged to gather here today can well take to heart the admonitions of our third President and rededicate ourselves to the preservation of the Christian principles that must guide this Nation if we are to be the Nation that God intended us to be.

May Day: United States Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made yesterday in Burlington, Wis., on the celebration of May Day: United States Way.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MAY DAY: UNITED STATES WAY"
(Address by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND in Burlington, Wis., May 1, 1955)

Fellow Americans, it is fitting today that the citizens of Burlington, Wis., a typical American community, demonstrate May Day, the United States way. The theme chosen today to symbolize this patriotic ceremony appropriately sets forth the difference between our way of life and that offered to the world by international communism. "Faith shall make you free," is not a slogan for Americans; it's the very foundation on which our country and Government are based.

Ten days ago, the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued through its official news service, Tass, 69 annual May Day slogans. These slogans were broadcast to their satellites in Europe and in Asia and, bearing the official stamp of the Communist rulers in the Kremlin, represent communism's May Day sentiments to the world.

I want to quote you just two of the 69 official May Day slogans of the Communist Party. One reads as follows, and I quote: "Fraternal greetings to all the peoples fighting for peace, democracy, for socialism." And I might say, socialism is in capital letters.

The last slogan reads, "Under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin; under the leadership of the Communist Party, forward to the victory of communism!"

Fellow Americans, contrast those slogans with the sentiments which are in your hearts today. Contrast them with our spiritual theme today, "Faith makes men free."

Communism which is stalking over the world today, is the denial of religious faith and at the same time a denial of human freedom Communist is godless. It is also a system of slavery based on contempt for, and oppression of, the common man.

But there is that which will defeat communism. It is just the twofold vital quality which all people of courage have wielded as their weapon—faith in God and faith in human freedom. These are indestructible and while we cling to them we are indestructible, too.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist iron curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most Godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Societ Union is supporting the admission of the aggressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen; 11 of these have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held, I shall not remain silent.

What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

Based alone on the Soviet Union's failure to support the United Nations action in Korea and to abide by its charter obligations the Soviet Union should have been expelled from membership.

Have we forgotten the biblical injunction in Second Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what

fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Communist Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless Marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

There will never be peace in our time in any real sense until the people of Russia and China have thrown out their Communist masters and established justice in their political system, freed their economy from the dead hand of statism concentrated on armament production and, more important than all, reopened their churches so that the guidance of the Father of us all may replace the godless teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

The crucifix is a more potent force than the clenched fist of communism.

When the people of Russia and China gain their freedom from the tyranny which temporarily rules them we should make it known that our friendship and our assistance will be available for the establishment of peace with honor in a truly free world of freemen.

We seek not 1 foot of their territory nor control over a solitary one of their people.

We only want for them the cherished freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience; to have in the hands of a truly free people the right of self-determination on who shall constitute their government and the right to change it by the decision of 200 million people rather than a cabal of less than a dozen power-mad men in the Kremlin who threaten the peace of the world; and to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor and a rising standard of living.

We should look upon the people within the Iron Curtain as our friends and allies. Indeed, should their totalitarian masters embark upon further aggression the temporarily enslaved people may turn out to be among our stoutest allies.

Such a policy does not contemplate aggression on the part of the free world. But it does require that we never by word or deed give our moral or legal blessing to the enslavement of the 800 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Such a policy would contemplate the application of moral, economic, and diplomatic sanctions against the international Communist conspiracy which is dedicated to the destruction of the free way of life. Human freedom is a God-given right beyond the power of dictatorships to permanently destroy.

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and membership in the United Nations.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States, are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou En-lai.

I, for one, do not believe the Communist leopard has changed its spots. Their objective has been, is, and will continue to be the destrcution of human freedom.

Unless there is some formula regarding which I have not been advised and which is difficult for me now to envision, I find it hard to comprehend how we could enter into direct negotiations with Communist China without the interests of the Republic of China being deeply involved.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, and to Yalta and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China.

Patrick Henry, on March 23, 1775, in the Virginia Legislature, said: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God: I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

In his day, Lincoln understood that this Nation could not continue "half slave and half free."

In 1865 at his second inaugural, Lincoln expanded this doctrine when he said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history—we here have the power and bear the responsibility—in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This I believe: Under the divine guidance that made us and kept up a free nations, this generation of Americans will not sacrifice principle for expediency; nor cringe in the face of brutal naked aggression and we will not barter friends and allies in the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, Africa, or Asia, in a dishonorable appeasement at a Far Eastern Munich or a second Yalta.

With the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat as Philadelphia and gave us, first, our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution there, are none of our domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Loyalty Day Celebration at Burlington, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to address an outstanding patriotic celebration at Burlington, Wis., which was part of the Nation's wide observance of May Day—Loyalty Day.

I commented on various phases of the challenge to America's patriotic citizens, including our need for upholding our end in the battle of ideas throughout the world.

I also referred to the problem of the impact of American motion pictures overseas.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address which I delivered and the text of a pertinent editorial which was carried in the April 28 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "The Celluloid Ally," being printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES "365-DAY DEDICATION TO UNITED STATES"; URGES HOLLYWOOD SIFT OUT OBJECTIONABLE MOVIES FROM OVERSEAS SHOWINGS

Many years ago, when the first telegraph message was clicked out, the message read, "What hath God wrought?"

Today, we proudly see and hail what faith—faith in America has wrought. We see that faith has "moved mountains," mountains of fear and despair and other limitations to bring into being and to preserve the greatest country on earth.

And so, I am thrilled to be with you today at this historic ceremony.

I am delighted that it is the patriotic leaders of my own State—you here in Burlington and surrounding areas—who are stirring this Nation by your great patriotic demonstration.

The eyes of all America are rightly upon you—and with deepest of pride.

DEMONSTRATING AMERICANISM

Here, today, you are expressing the finest in American ideals.

You are showing by the flags that wave aloft and the flags, so to speak, that wave in your hearts and shine in your faces—you are showing by these beautiful floats, by the magnificent bands and marching groups—what it means to be a dedicated, loyal, reverent American.

And what a contrast Loyalty Day here is to May day abroad—particularly in the fear-filled, hate-filled centers of our godless enemy, in Moscow and in other headquarters of the atheistic Communist conspiracy.

Today, here, in Godloving America, you are showing what it is to be a real Yankee Doodle Dandy. You are recapturing the devotion, the enthusiasm, the giving of one's self, which has helped America through all its severest crises.

This was the spirit which saw us through Valley Forge; it was the spirit of Gettysburg, and San Juan Hill, and the Argonne Forest, Iwo Jima, and Heartbreak Ridge. It is the spirit of Burlington, Wis., May Day-Loyalty Day, 1955.

INSTILLING PATRIOTISM IN YOUNG PEOPLE

I am particularly thrilled by what you are doing today—the example you are setting—for the young people in our midst.

Every parent among you who has a child at his side or a child in his arms or a child at home, can feel a well-justified glow of pride.

You are showing the children of Racine County and surrounding counties and of all America, what it means to be an American.

You proved in the houses of worship earlier today that love of God is a sinew of love of our country and all that it stands for.

And, too, in the great patriotic demonstration which we have been witnessing, you have been showing that we must prove in deeds, as well as by our words that we are faithful to this land—the finest, freest, most magnificent country ever to exist on the face of the earth.

You are proving your allegiance to your Government, to our constitutional Republic, the longest-lived major Government on earth today.

You are showing how May Day has been restored as a hallowed day, after years and years in which May Day had been taken over by the enemies of America for their own propaganda purposes.

You are establishing a basis for rededication to America, not just on one day a year, but 365 days a year.

And, too, you are today showing the full splendor of the American heritage.

It is the heritage purchased for us by blood and tears of heroic generations gone by.

It is a heritage of unparalleled wealth, not just material wealth, but, far mort important, wealth in things of the spirit.

AMERICA'S MATERIAL WEALTH

In material wealth, we are the envy of the world.

Our abundance-producing agriculture, our humming factories, our crowded, thriving stores, the happy faces of our contented people—these are the admiration of the world.

We are but 165 million people out of 2½ billion on earth. But we have one-half of the wealth of the world today in our own country. The total production of all our goods and services amounts to over $367 billion; 49 percent of our families enjoy an income of $5,000 a year, or more.

And income is becoming distributed ever more equitably among our people.

OUR PRICELESS FREEDOMS

But we possess an infinitely greater wealth. I refer to our freedoms, the tangible and intangible freedoms guaranteed to us under our sacred Bill of Rights, the freedoms which make the state the servant of man, instead of man the servant of the state.

I refer to freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly, freedom to own property, freedom to work at a place and under conditions of our own choosing.

And greatest of all our wealth is the wealth of the human spirit, of free men under God who are able to worship as they please—as you and I have worshipped today—in the faith of our fathers, and freedom to grow, to develop.

And there is the wealth of American culture, of our great literature, our music, our art, our poetry, to which you and I are heir.

No land in the world today enjoys wealth or a standard of living such as this, particularly the countries from which many of us here in Wisconsin and from which many of our forebears have come.

A PLEDGE OF FRIENDSHIP TO POLAND

I point out to you, for example, that next Tuesday, May 3, is the national holiday of a great land from which many of Wisconsin's people and their forefathers had come.

I refer to Poland—devout, faithful, gallant Poland, now enslaved under the heel of the Communist aggressor.

On this Loyalty Day, we pledge to Poland our continued warm friendship. And to all the other lands under the yoke of the Red tyrant—to the people of Eastern Germany, the people of the Baltic and Balkan States—we pledge they shall yet be free.

We shall never accept their condition of enslavement. We shall never recognize their domination under the heel of the godless tyrant.

WE PLEDGE VIGILANCE AT OUR RAMPARTS

We pledge, today, moreover our vigilance against the armed aggressor who has enslaved these people. We pledge our strength to be on the alert against this Communist enemy.

We pledge our awareness of our own danger to enemy attack, our awareness of the danger of an atomic Pearl Harbor—which must never occur.

For you and I know that man's ingenuity has contracted space and time. Wisconsin is now next-door neighbor to all the world in this age of supersonic speed.

We are but 3,500 miles away from Soviet airbases and launching sites.

By means of the great circle aerial route, Milwaukee and the other cities of the Middle West are nearer to attack than are the cities of the East. That is why our defense authorities have made Milwaukee a "Nike" guided missile site.

As a matter of fact, we of America today are imperiled basically by three types of possible long-range attack:

First, by intercontinental bomber;

Second, by intercontinental guided missile (guided to its target by electronic devices); and

Third, by intercontinental ballistic missile. (Such a missile can be shot from a launching site like a bullet from a gun or a shell from a cannon.)

Such a ballistic missile, unlike the guided missile, could not be "jammed" by counter-electronic devices. Once it is shot from its site at a speed of perhaps 10,000 miles per hour, nothing now known could stop it, except perhaps another missile or other device to ram it. Such an intercontinental missile, when it is developed 5 or 10 years from now, might be able to reach Burlington or any other city of Wisconsin—just one-half hour after it might be shot from its Soviet launching site. That is why it is we who must develop an intercontinental ballistic missile—an IBM—first, not second. We dare not be second-best. We must be first in this technological race. We must have the strongest possible deterrents to aggression.

It is of these facts that we must be aware. This is a part of intelligent, thinking citizenship—not just 1 day a year—but all 365 days.

We must be aware that the American continent has already been crossed by jet plane in 3¾ hours, and that the Atlantic Ocean has been crossed from Newfoundland to Ireland in less than that time.

We must be aware of the fact that we have wisely erected a worldwide chain of ramparts, defensive air bases in Greenland, Iceland, Britain, North Africa, Turkey, Greece, and elsewhere. These bases grimly tell the Kremlin in the only language it understands, the language of potential force, that we are on the alert.

WE HAVE FAITH WAR WILL NOT COME

These facts do not mean that we believe that war will come, or that war is inevitable.

On the contrary, it is our firm faith that war is not inevitable, that it can be avoided, provided we are strong.

We must, of course, be invincible in relation to Red Russia. We must be invincible in relation to Red China, strong and firm in our insistence on concrete demonstrations on her part that she means peace, not war. Chou En-lai and Mao-Tse-Tung cannot be trusted any more than Krushchev or Molotov can be trusted. Deeds still speak louder than words.

If the Reds really mean peace with regard to Formosa, as we hope they do, then let them prove it by acts.

As for ourselves, we truly want peace in the western Pacific and everywhere else.

We will talk over issues, but we will not cringe; we will not abandon principle nor our Nationalist Chinese ally; we will not appease. The rule of reason in negotiation will prevail, but never the rule of surrender.

We want those 15 United States airmen—totally unjustly imprisoned—back; and we demand the return of all the other imprisoned Americans, as well. We do not propose to abandon a single United States serviceman or civilian.

The righteousness, strength, and faith which made us free will keep us free.

This faith which can move mountains can also move the course of world events.

WINNING WAR OF IDEAS

But guns and steel alone will not protect us in this world today. We are in a critical worldwide battle of ideas, of free ideas against slave ideas.

And it is on this last point that I should like to make these concluding remarks.

It is up to us as loyal Americans to tell and sell the American story to the peoples of the world. We have made great progress toward this end. The leading patriotic organizations of America—the church, fraternal, veterans', labor, business, and other groups—have acquainted the rest of mankind with much of the true meaning of America.

In particular, a great many Hollywood motion pictures have been shown throughout the world which have thrilled audiences to the fine meaning of America. These films have faithfully shown the real America of the grassroots—the America of devotion to God, the America of wholesome individual enterprise, of building great and everlasting and universal values.

SOME FILMS DO US HARM ABROAD

On the other hand, I say very sincerely and frankly that one of our serious problems today is that some of the motion pictures being sent abroad by private firms depict a distorted kind of America. Such films—in the name of so-called realism—have portrayed an America of sex, sin and sadism, of gangsterism, corruption, filth, and degradation.

Such films—few in number—but powerful in effect, have literally been poisoning the minds of some people in the world against us. These films are causing the very opposite of the friendly effect which should be created, if we are to defeat Soviet propaganda.

While the United States Government will be spending some $80 million of your taxpayers' money for a worldwide program of truth, a few films produced privately in Hollywood or elsewhere have been undoing, in part, the very objective for which we, as a people, are striving.

And so I want to issue this word of caution, frankly and emphatically, to the motion-picture film companies.

It is not a new word of caution. I have consulted with them in the past in connection with the work of our Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Overseas Information programs. I have advised the companies as to the seriousness of the problem. I had met with some of their outstanding leaders, and I am glad to say I found in those leaders, a deep patriotic awareness of their international responsibilities. Certainly, for example, too, the president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Mr. Eric Johnston, has proven his tremendous devotion to this country both in that capacity and in many other roles in which he has served America long and well.

The major film producers themselves have done a fine job for America by and large at home and abroad. They and the theatre owners have contributed abundantly to all sorts of charitable and good-will causes. Ours is the only nonsubsidized motion picture industry in the world, and it is the envy of the world.

But a small minority among the film companies seem occasionally more interested in greedy profit, in squeezing the last possible dollar from the overseas market, than they are interested in contributing to an accurate picture of America by withholding some possibly misleading films.

The American people—or some of them—may be able to stomach some of these sin-strewn films. An American can ordinarily interpret such films in proper perspective. He will know that this is not the real America, although it may characterize a very small part of America.

But foreign peoples—who know very little of our country, who don't have a sufficient background properly to interpret these pictures, can be utterly confused by this type of misleading film.

MORE VOLUNTARY FILM SELF-REGULATION NEEDED

What is the answer? The answer is intensified voluntary self-regulation by the film industry. It must sift out more of these misleading films. It has already sifted out many such films and prevented their distribution in countries where they could do harm.

But the fact of the matter is, and it is attested by leading authorities of the industry itself, that some motion pictures have been shown in some countries overseas which very definitely should not have been shown.

Even so renowned and universally respected a trade publication as the newspaper, Variety has just recently headlined the deep concern of many industry people, themselves, over some types of films which are going overseas.

I, of course, do not believe in Government censorship. I fought against Federal censorship of Hollywood when it was proposed.

But I say that the American people will insist that we not be misrepresented in the eyes of the world.

The Reds are pouring out enough filth about us without our adding to our own problem.

It is up to Hollywood, therefore to demonstrate its further loyalty—loyalty which I know to be a fact, by taking the appropriate voluntary action. An unscrupulous few should not be in a position to tarnish the good name of the overwhelming mass of deeply responsible industry leaders.

CONCLUSION

Meanwhile, it is up to you and to me at the grassroots or in Washington to do our part in telling and selling the American story right here at home. We must reaffirm our gratitude for our American blessings. We must demonstrate dynamic, active citizenship—365 days a year.

We must demonstrate our gratitude for the unexcelled privileges and rights which are ours—"the jewels of great price."

We must demonstrate our faith that this Nation, "of, by and for the people," shall not perish from the earth.

And by our faith, this objective shall be fulfilled. Our Government shall remain the light of the world and the beacon for all mankind.

THE CELLULOID ALLY

"Poor patriotism is bad business." Thus speaks the chairman of the Motion Picture Producers' Association. Mr. Y. Frank Freeman's declaration is a welcome sign of a sense of responsibility in the film industry for the effects of American movies on the United States' world prestige.

But application of patriotism to production of films to be shown throughout the world is a complex and often exacting requirement.

It involves, indeed, the challenging artistic problem of presenting American life as it really is. This is an exercise in selectivity and emphasis guided by a sense of cultural, social, and moral values which not only Europeans but Americans themselves often feel is wanting in film entertainment.

One often hears it said that Europeans "must like our films, they patronize them enough." Undoubtedly the resources, the photography, direction, and other aspects of technicial finish make American movies relatively attractive even when story content is poor or misleading. But it is one thing for mass audiences abroad to like the pictures as sheer entertainment and quite another for them to like the country they believe these films portray.

Europeans who know America well often remark the disparity between their own first-hand impressions of American life and those they receive from films. They note that Americans do not spend most of their waking hours in cocktail lounges, that they are not all glamorous mannequins or limousine-ensconced racketeers.

They note that there are families in America as in Europe, and that they live in quiet, cozy, modest little houses, planning the children's education, how to plant the new garden, where to spend a holiday.

Films that show this side of American life are sometimes seen in other countries. And when they are first-class films their audiences like not only the films themselves but the country they represent.

Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Safety Signs of Mental Health," published in the New Beacon, of Provincetown, Mass., on Wednesday, April 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFETY SIGNS OF MENTAL HEALTH

We were glad to read this week that the National Association for Mental Health had taken a step to acquaint the public with what the organization's medical director, Dr. George S. Stevenson termed "the positive side" of mental health.

The negative side has been amply shown to the public through recent television plays, many of them quite morbid, and through magazine articles and books. Seeing these plays and reading the published material might lead one to think that nearly everyone, including himself, was either an active or potential mental case.

Now, with Mental Health Week to be observed throughout the country from May 1 to 7, the National Association for Mental Health has issued "Safety Signs" to help you prove to yourself, at least, that you are still sane. Here they are. You might have fun checking them for yourself and the members of your family:

A tolerant, easy-going attitude toward yourself as well as others.

A realistic estimate of your own abilities—neither underestimating or overestimating.

Self respect.

The ability to give love and consider the interests of others.

Liking and trusting other people and expecting others to feel the same way about you.

Feeling as part of a group and having a sense of responsibility to your neighbors and fellowmen.

Acceptance of your responsibilities and doing something about your problems as they arise.

The ability to plan ahead, setting realistic goals for yourself.

Putting your best efforts into what you do and getting satisfaction out of doing it.

The ability to take life's disappointments in stride.

The last of these characteristics seems to us almost the most significant. Colette, the great French writer phrased it another way when she spoke of "the art of adapting oneself to anything, even to the ruin of one's own existence." If you can honestly say that you can take life's disappointments in your stride, and if you can also say that you possess to a pretty high degree the other characteristics listed, you can relax. You'll probably never have to make that visit to the psychiatrist.

The United German Hungarians Honor Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The United German Hungarians Honor Senator LANGER," which was published in the column entitled "Here and Abroad, a Weekly Chat," by Austin J. App, published in the Nord-Amerika, Donnerstag, of April 7, 1955. The article concerns one of our colleagues, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE AND ABROAD

(By Austin J. App, Ph. D.)

THE UNITED GERMAN HUNGARIANS HONOR SENATOR LANGER

On Easter Sunday, April 10, the 10th Easter after the infamous Yalta agreement, which plotted the most tragic expulsions in history, the United German Hungarians of Philadelphia and vicinity are honoring with a dinner and plaque the man who did most in the United States Senate to make known and to alleviate the plight of the ethnic German expellees—Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. The dinner, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph Wolf, will be at 3 p. m. in the hall at 2007-2013 North Second Street.

For Senator LANGER, coming to Philadelphia will be revisiting familiar scenes, for he was twice honored here before. On March 26, 1949, at a testimonial dinner at the Adelphia Hotel, sponsored by the Pastorius Unit, Steuben Society of America, he was presented with a magnificent portrait of

himself painted by Mr. Conrad Linke, outstanding artist of Philadelphia. On February 19, 1950, under the joint sponsorship of the United Action Committee for Expellees and the United German Hungarians, he was honored with a purse and dinner in the United German Hungarian Hall as the courageous champion of the cause of the German expellees. In those years the so-called Langer amendment had finally succeeded in making possible the first immigration to America of people of German ethnic origin, who had before been totally discriminated against. Since then the full German quotas have been restored, many thousands of new German immigrants have come to America and can look gratefully upon Senator LANGER's pioneer efforts in their behalf, and West Germany has been given sovereignty and admitted to a nearly equal partnership with America, Britain, and France in the defense of Europe.

Senator Langer still on the job for justice

By a strange irony when the Senate on April 2 ratified the Paris Pact, by a vote of 76 to 2, one of the dissenting votes was that of Senator LANGER. The first voice in the Senate which from 1945 on was raised against the criminal Allied policies of dismantling, perpetual disarmament, dismembering Germany was now once again almost a lone voice to protest the most shameful provisions of the Paris Pact, the Saar Statute. It was a shameful choice which the Western Big Three had given the Bonn government: either to sacrifice the Saar and its people to France, or to suffer denial of sovereignty and self-defense. In such an alternative, what could Bonn and the West German people do but accept the betrayal of the Saar in return for sovereignty and self-defense, both inalienable rights which it had been a crime in the first place to take away.

But what the German people had to accept in silent desperation, an American Senator had the right and the courage to protest. When he saw that the Paris Pact, the best bone Germany could get from the dogs at her throat, was sure to pass, he rose to register his protest against their flagrant anti-German injustice of the pact. As the Philadelphia Bulletin reported it (April 2, 1955):

"Senator LANGER who voted with Senator MALONE against the treaty predicted that 'the Saar question will rise up and haunt the signatories of this treaty and in my opinion will be one of the causes of a world war'."

God bless Senator LANGER. Of all the men in the Senate Senator LANGER most courageously and farsightedly has from the beginning and even now seen the German problem steadily and seen it whole. He alone seems fully to understand that the only thing wrong with the Germans is that the power politics of envious neighbors has not permitted them to form that more perfect union of all German lands which is their inalienable right.

Senator Langer on the German expellees

Senator LANGER fought the brave fight to get the mails opened to Germany, to get relief allowed for the Germans, to stop dismantling, to get confiscated private German property returned, to get justice for German soldiers accused of war crimes at Malmedy and elsewhere, to have German prisoners of war sent home, and to remove the IRO and UNRRA discriminations against German immigration.

But what the whole world will probably longest thank him for is his championship of the 12 million surviving German expellees, victims of the greatest of the many crimes imbedded in the Yalta and Potsdam pacts. Here are just a few excerpts on the "Inhuman Mass Deportations" from his great speech in the Senate on April 5, 1949, entitled, "Germany and the ECA: If Western Civilization Is To Survive in Europe It Must Survive in Germany."

Referring to a directive entitled "Population Transfers," Senator LANGER says it concerns "one of the greatest crimes against humanity in all history," and declares:

"Nowhere in recorded history has such a grim chapter of brutality been written than in the account of what has already taken place in eastern Europe. Already, from fifteen to twenty million people have been uprooted bodily from their ancestral homes of a thousand years and thrown into the torment of a living hell, to perish, or be driven like cattle across the wastes of eastern Europe. Women and children, the old and the helpless, the innocent and the guilty alike have been subjected to cruelties which have never been surpassed, even by the Nazis themselves."

Langer first in the Senate to prove expulsions a war crime

Senator LANGER then cited count 3, section J, of the Nuremberg indictments and boldly declared: "as far back as November 17, 1944, President Roosevelt agreed in principle to the very procedure which is now listed as a war crime by the Nuremberg tribunal."

He then also cites Churchill's statement in the House of Commons on December 15, 1944, in which Churchill likewise proposed this crime of expulsion, urging (in Churchill's own words) "the total expulsion of the Germans from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and the south." Churchill at that time added, "For expulsion is the method which, so far as we can see, will be the most satisfactory and lasting."

Well, while Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin were plotting the expulsion of millions of East, Sudeten, Balkan Germans, in the greatest mass crime of history, they were also blueprinting how to hang Germans for having committed a few minor expulsions involving thousands of people, not many millions, as behooves master-criminals who at Yalta presumed to remake the world in 5 days.

We resolve: the expulsion must not prove satisfactory and lasting

It was Senator LANGER, who more clearly than anyone else in the Senate, recognized the mass expulsions of Yalta and Potsdam for the enormous crimes that they were—and who spoke out against them. He was one of the first to help prove Churchill wrong in making these criminal expulsions satisfactory and lasting. It is up to all of us to see to it that these expulsions will not last, that the expellees will get their homes and homelands back. We must dedicate ourselves to proving that this greatest of all international crimes, the expulsion of 15 million Germans, will not pay.

Let the Langer dinner this Easter at the United German Hungarian hall both honor Senator LANGER for his great work and also strengthen our resolve to carry on what he started. The United German Hungarians, their president, Mr. Joseph Ball; the chairman, Mr. Joseph Wolf; their helpers; and the Ladies Auxiliary—all deserve our support and thanks for this dinner in honor of Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

Hoover Commission's Report on Federal Medical Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a criticism of the Hoover Commission's report on Federal medical services by the American Legion was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 8. Under date of April 19, 1955, the Christian Science Monitor published a statement by Mr. Edward A. Sherman, regional director of the citizen's committee for the Hoover Report, which sets forth the committee's answer to the Legion's criticisms. I ask unanimous consent that the statement appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of April 19, 1955, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED CUTBACK IN VET MEDICAL CARE DEBATED—LEGION'S CRITICISM OF HOOVER REPORT DRAWS REBUTTAL

An American Legion resolution assailing the Hoover Commission's report on Federal medical services is said by Commission backers to be based on 11 allegations that are either untrue or undocumented.

Edward A. Sherman, regional director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, said this Legion blast contains 12 whereas clauses setting forth 11 allegations. "Of these 11 allegations, 5 are untrue, 2 lack a factual explanation, 1 is redundant, and 3 are matters of opinion," he said.

The Legion resolution, adopted at a conference on medical services in early March, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 8. It followed by several weeks the Hoover Commission report which recommended a cutback in free medical care for veterans. The Commission was studying the need for a general revision of the Federal Government's health programs.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

The text of Mr. Sherman's statement follows:

"Let's set forth each of these 11 allegations—and to the extent that such allegation refers to any specific matter, let's see what the Hoover Commission actually did or said on the subject.

"1. The Legion says: 'Whereas said report contains many vicious, unwarranted, and unjustified attacks on the sick and disabled veterans of America.'

"The Commission report does not bear out this statement. It says: 'There cannot be the remotest doubt that the Federal Government has a continuing obligation to care for veterans who have incurred disabilities in service and that they have a right to the highest obtainable quality of medical services.

" 'The commission * * * believes that the sentiment of the American people is that a sick and really indigent veteran should be provided care in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Recommendations are made to limit the burden on the public arising from this source.

" 'The Veterans' Administration operates 17 homes for aged veterans. Preventive health and rehabilitation programs can do much to help these older men to lead healthier and happier lives. Such programs tend to keep men going and prevent their reduction to chronic bed patients. Programs similar to some now in operation on a limited basis should be extended both for humanitarian and for economy reasons.' "

TOTAL OF 1,085 PAGES

"2. The Legion says: 'Whereas, in addition to the official report, the accompanying task force report contains misinformed discussions and presentations critical of the existing structure of veterans benefits and services.'

"The commission's task force was composed of 16 experts—12 of whom were veterans and 15 of whom were doctors. The

task force's staff and consultants included an additional 40 persons of training and experience.

"The task force's reports comprised 135 printed pages and 950 pages of appendixes, or a total of 1,085 pages of facts and discussion.

"Since the Legion mentions no facts from these 1,085 pages specifically, it is impossible to discuss their allegations on any reasonable basis.

"3. The Legion says: 'Whereas the report would form a Federal advisory council on health, another superagency, which, among its other duties, would exercise indirect control over the Veterans' Administration.'

"The commission's report points out: '26 Federal departments or agencies engage in one or more of these health functions—2 units of the Executive Office of the President, all 10 executive departments, 12 independent agencies, and 2 quasi-governmental agencies. Within these agencies 66 administrative units have health functions.'"

OVERALL POLICIES

"It goes on to say: 'Our task force points out that there is no one point where Federal medical policies and activities can be reviewed in order to further coordination, eliminate duplication, and develop overall policies. There should be an agency within the Executive Office of the President charged with these responsibilities.'

"[NOTE.—This resolution apparently represents some inconsistency in Legion policy. Legion Resolution 13, Los Angeles, 1950, is as follows: '*Resolved*, To urge the President and the Congress to immediately reactivate or reestablish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, cloaked with full authority to coordinate utilization of Federal hospitals within and between the Veterans' Administration, Department of Defense, and the Public Health Service, with a view toward making additional beds for veterans promptly available.']

"4. The Legion says: 'Whereas the report would transfer the cost of disability compensation, pensions, and military retirement from their proper place as a delayed cost of war and make this an added charge to the Nation's health program.'

"The Commission recommended that the determination as to disability be transferred to the Department of Medicine and Surgery, but still right in the Veterans' Administration, as follows:

" 'Recommendation No. 13: (a) That the responsibility and authority to establish and maintain medical criteria for disability, both initial and continuing, should be transferred from the compensation and pension branch of the Department of Veterans' Benefits, to the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

" '(b) That the Department of Medicine and Surgery should also develop and maintain a mechanism for review of disability allowances based on the possibility of increase or decrease in disabilities'."

DISABILITY ALLOWANCES

"5. The Legion says: 'Whereas the report contains direct attacks on disability compensation of those who received their disability in service and are entitled to the greatest consideration which the American public can offer.'

"These attacks cannot be located in the Commission's report. The strongest statement which is critical of the statue quo follows:

" '(a) Compensation for partial disability from service-connected injuries: These disability allowances for service-connected injury or disease are presumably equated to impairment of earning power. The existence of the service-connected disability of a veteran and the extent of that disability are determined by rating boards. There is a tendency to assume that disability is continuing and progressive, and to avoid reexamination.' "

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

" 'Another difficulty in these allowances arises from the low percentage disability ratings (30 percent or less) which are not being realistically related to loss of earning power. An example of a 30-percent disability is amputation of a great toe. For this disability the veteran is entitled to a minimum of $50 per month regardless of his other income. We urge that disability ratings be based on true medical criteria and be more realistically related to loss of earning capacity.'

"6. The Legion says: 'Whereas the commission recommends the closing of 20 hospitals when at this time there are thousands of eligible veterans certified for hospitalization unable to secure proper medical care and treatment because of the lack of beds.'

"The Commission did not approve a task force recommendation that 19 (not 20) specific Veterans' Administration hospitals be closed, as follows: Outwood, Ky.; Aspinwall, Pa.; Erie, Pa.; Beckley, W. Va.; Clarksburg, W. Va.; Amarillo, Tex.; Bonham, Tex.; Marlin, Tex.; Boise, Idaho; Fargo, N. Dak.; Minot, N. Dak.; Grand Island, Nebr.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Fort Thomas, Ky.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Iron Mountain, Mich.; Lake City, Fla.; Miles City, Mont.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

"The Commission did state: 'There are more veterans' hospitals than are necessary. Many are uneconomic to operate; some because of size, location, or inadequate number of patients. The task force recommends the immediate closing of certain hospitals, and in its report gives the reasons for its recommendations.

" 'Surplus hospitals recommended for closing should be disposed of through the General Services Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, subject to recapture in a national emergency, as we have suggested in chapter II.

" 'Recommendation No. 5: That the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration consider the recommendations made by the task force as to closing of certain hospitals and obtain the advice of the proposed Federal Advisory Council of Health on these recommendations; that all hospitals determined to be surplus be closed immediately'."

EXTENT OF DISABILITY

"7. The Legion says: 'Whereas the Commission believes that authority to evaluate the extent of disability should be vested in the Department of Medicine and Surgery when the complicated laws, rules, and regulations governing rating are a joint legal, occupational, and medical matter now exercised by the VA Department of Veterans Benefits.'

"This allegation is practically the same as in No. 7 above. It is discussed there.

"8. The Legion says: 'Whereas the Commission has disregarded the health needs of our disabled veterans as established by the Congress and the people of the United States and recommends that authorizations to construct and money which is already appropriated for the construction of badly needed beds be rescinded.'

"Table XV on page 32 of the Commission's report estimates that in 1955 there will be 128,622 VA beds, of which 22,952 will be unused, or 18 percent. The Commission goes on to say:

" 'There are more veterans' hospitals than are necessary. Many are uneconomic to operate; some because of size, location, or inadequate number of patients.'

"9. The Legion says: 'Whereas this Commission has branded the Nation's veterans as goldbrickers and implies that our sick and disabled veterans are a group of perjurers to our country which they defended and which they patriotically uphold and support.'

GOLDBRICKING

"The word 'goldbricking' occurs twice in the Commission's report, in the following context. 'The various national veterans' organizations have denounced and are opposed to "goldbricking".

" 'Recommendation No. 9: That the veteran should assume a liability to pay for care of his non-service-connected disability if he can do so at some reasonable time in the future. Such a debt should be without interest. Congress should pass appropriate laws providing for the collection of such obligations.

" 'This recommendation has very substantial importance not only in eliminating "gold bricking" but also because many veterans with non-service-connected disabilities carry health insurance.

" 'The Veterans' Administration does determine whether incoming veterans with non-service-connected disabilities have health insurance. If so, they are asked to execute an assignment in favor of the Veterans' Administration. Because no payment is made for treatment in veterans' hospitals, some insurers refuse to reimburse the Veterans' Administration on the basis that there has been no personal loss to the veteran.

" 'Also the policies of some insurers have clauses specifically excluding liability for care in veterans' facilities. The Veterans' Administration does not even bill either of these categories of insurers.

" 'The total actually billed to insurance companies in 1954 amounted to about $15,700,000. The amount collected was $3,300,000.'

"10. The Legion says: 'Whereas they have recommended that a system of socialized medicine be instituted in the United States by permitting veterans to use the VA hospitals and outpatient medical services and pay at a later date when, and if able, and this program is an expanded, uneconomic, and costly program to the American taxpayer and unworthy of serious consideration by informed people.'

"The Hoover Commission has not been previously characterized as advocating any form of socialism. It is hard to see socialism in making a man (when he can afford it), or his insurance company or group (when he is privately insured), pay for medical care—when at present he need not pay, and his insurance company or group may refuse to pay. The allegation is untrue.

"11. The Legion says: 'Whereas the Commission's proposal to require our service-connected disabled veterans to file an economic statement in order to secure hospitalization for disabilities other than their service-connected disabilities.'

"The Commission says: 'A random sampling examination in 1952 by the General Accounting Office showed that out of 336 of such declarations from veterans with annual incomes of $4,000 or more, 1 had an income of $50,000; 25 had assets of $20,000 or more; 4 had assets between $100,000 and $500,000'."

Reclamation: The Nation's Wisest Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, there are before the American people at this time a great number of impassioned reports, pleas, speeches, and articles which have been sired by both the proponents and opponents of reclamation. Some of these have been helpful in gaining a better understanding of the reclamation

program. Many have been completely the opposite—inspired by a small group who are waging a vigorous campaign against the program. I do not propose to waste time in answering those few who have evidenced deliberate intent to misinform and misrepresent. If the value of reclamation to a sound national economy is known and understood, then I have no fear of the program being hurt by a few misrepresentations. My concern then is to produce proof as to the value of irrigation to the West and to the Nation. If the Nation is to continue to support an expanding economy and become economically stronger then the Nation must develop its land and water resources.

Agriculture is most important in my home State of California. And, considering American eating habits, California agriculture is mighty important to the entire Nation. You use California fruits, nuts, vegetables, and agricultural produce to balance your diets and to give you a seemingly endless variety of delightful health-giving foods. Most of this bounty comes exclusively from irrigation and virtually all future expansion must come from extending irrigation.

The value of California crop production when measured in the more usual monetary terms rounds out at a staggering billion and a half dollars annually.

History is full of stories of the fabulous California gold rush beginning with the discovery of gold in 1848. Perhaps no single event had a more profound effect in the settlement of the West; yet all of the gold produced during the first 10 fabulous years of that epic amounts to only one-third of the present annual value of crops produced in the State. Two years of California crops exceed the total of all gold produced in California since 1848. Gold is important to the economy of California, the West, and the Nation as are the products of the other great industries of my State. But none is more important than our agriculture. Every schoolchild learns of the gold-rush days but few of us take notice of the continuing bounty and wealth created through irrigation agriculture.

Since the days of the sourdoughs of 1849, the population of California has increased to almost 12 million persons. Retail sales total almost $15 billion each year, an amount equal to $1,295 for each man, woman, and child. This is $200 per person or from $600 to $800 more per family than the average per capita retail sales in the whole United States. Federal taxes paid in California last year total over $5 billion and State taxes exceed $1 billion. Total taxes paid will equal about $550 per person. The high level of retail trade and taxes paid in California cannot of course be credited to irrigation alone. However, the phenomenal growth and stability of the State could not have been attained without irrigation nor may we expect further expansion without additions to irrigation. This is important to the entire Nation. If you question it, consider that California retail sales represent an all-American market equal to or greater than the value of all United States exports.

Now as to Federal reclamation we may take pride in the wisdom of our predecessors in Congress who enacted the original reclamation law more than 50 years ago, and pride too in the accomplishments of the program they set in motion which has made possible many of the flourishing and prosperous valleys and cities of the West as we know them today instead of the endless desert of jackrabbits and sagebrush.

Some of the uninformed critics of the Federal reclamation program would have us believe that projects such as the Salt River project in Arizona, the Yuma project in Arizona and California, the Minidoka project in Idaho, the Yakima project in Washington, the North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska, and the other reclamation projects are on the verge of bankruptcy, but let us look at the record.

The Federal Government has spent on the Salt River project about $24.6 million for plant, property, and equipment in development of this project. More than 300,000 acres now are under irrigation which provides about 25,000 family-size farms and small suburban units.

The valley supports a population of more than 400,000 people and each year crops produced exceed 3 times the Federal expenditure. A total of almost $1.2 billion in crops or about 50 times the Federal expenditure have been produced on this project since its construction.

Federal taxes paid from the area last year which stem from the development of this irrigation economy are estimated at more than 3 times the total of Federal project funds spent, and the cumulative total of all Federal taxes is estimated at more than 22 times the Federal investment.

In addition to these contributions to the growth, strength, and stability of the local, State, and national economies we should not lose sight of the fact that the Federal funds spent on the Salt River project, as well as all other projects, are being repaid to the Federal Treasury.

Similar evidence of the real and lasting value of Federal reclamation is presented on the Yuma project in southeastern California and southwestern Arizona. Plant, property, and equipment provided with Federal funds total less than $6 million, of which more than 90 percent has already been repaid directly to the Federal Treasury. The project has produced crops valued at more than 40 times the Federal expenditure, and each year this production is about 3 times the Federal funds spent.

On the Minidoka project in Idaho, the Federal investment in plant, property, and equipment totals approximately $26.6 million. This area also produces a harvest each year which exceeds three times the total Federal expenditure. Over the years this project has produced crops valued at more than $1.5 billion, an amount 60 times greater than the Federal investment in the project and an amount equal to about three-fifths of the total Federal investment in all reclamation projects built during the 53-year history of Federal reclamation.

Keep in mind also that many of these projects, in addition to irrigation, provide flood control, hydroelectric power, and serve other useful purposes.

The Yakima project in the State of Washington represents a Federal expenditure in plant, property, and equipment of almost $50 million. The two older divisions, the Tieton and Sunnyside, have already repaid to the Federal Treasury the entire initial expenditure. Of the two new divisions, the Roza is essentially completed while on the Kennewick construction is in progress. Crops produced through 1953 aggregate about $1.3 billion, an amount 26 times greater than the Federal plant cost for both the old and the new divisions. This is just another example of the true worth of western irrigation. No one of us would suggest the Yakima Valley is not a real national asset.

In the arid region east of the Rockies, an equally impressive record of reclamation accomplishments can be found. The North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska produces annually more crops than the total Federal cost of plant, property, and equipment and over the years these values have accumulated to 16 times the project-construction cost. This production will continue year after year and will provide opportunities and the means of livelihood for many people both locally and in distant States through the trade-creating aspects of this basic production. The steers raised on this project may be fattened in Iowa, butchered in Chicago, with the steak eaten in Washington or a dozen other cities, with the leather and other by-products consumed in any of the 48 States.

The story of the true value of Federal reclamation is further revealed in a recently released dramatic story on one of the newer and more expensive Federal projects, the Colorado-Big Thompson project. Just 1 year ago the daily newspapers were reporting the disaster of duststorms throughout much of the West. Northern Colorado, east of the Rockies, experienced the worst drought in 20 years, and therein lies a dramatic episode in the history of Federal reclamation. Streams normally fed by the mountains' melting snow pack dwindled to trickles, and disaster lurked over hundreds of thousands of parched acres. The Colorado-Big Thompson project was the one hope to save the land and the farmers of the region. This project, a dream of 75 years, 16 years a-building, was about ready to deliver water.

The area served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project represents a substantial, thriving economy with its many cities and towns and its numerous small manufacturers firmly dependent on agriculture as the basic industry. Practically all manufacturing, trade, and transportation involve agricultural commodities, and irrigation water shortage affects the entire local economy.

Into this drought-stricken area more than 300,000 acre-feet of water, accumulated on the western slope of the moun-

tains, was delivered through project facilities for use on the farms. With the aid of this water nearly normal farm production was attained. In terms of dollars the water meant $22 million of additional crops for 1954. Gross crop values in recent years averaged $46 million. In 1954 it was $41 million. Without project water the value would have been $19 million. Thus, the water made available through the Colorado-Big Thompson project made it possible to more than double the return in this drought year. The use of project water also provided stability to the livestock industry of the area. Without project water roughtly one-half of the available feed supply would have been produced, resulting in the proportional reduction in numbers of lambs and beef cattle fattened for market.

Business failures, anticipated earlier in the year in the local area, did not occur. Furthermore, project farmers were able to continue to contribute through normal trade relations to the welfare and stability of the local economy and, in turn, to the strength and stability of the entire United States. Who were the beneficiaries? Well, take folks living in Moline where tractors are made; Chicago where fertilizers are synthesized; Port Arthur where insecticides are produced—or almost anywhere else you can name.

The critics of Federal reclamation would attempt to have us believe the Federal Treasury is being emptied to build worthless boondoggles. Again let us put this program in perspective. The total cost of plant, property, and equipment in 53 years of Federal reclamation history totals less than $2.6 billion. This is less than 6 percent of the proposed fiscal year 1956 budget for national security. The proposed budget for reclamation construction in 1956 is less than one-third of 1 percent of our national budget. We are committed to spend about $1.7 billion for irrigation and power developments in foreign countries under the foreign-aid programs since 1948. This compares with the $2.6 billion investment in plant, property, and equipment of all the Federal reclamation projects built in the United States in the past 53 years.

By these comparisons I do not imply in any sense that appropriations for national security or foreign assistance should be reduced; however, we should take stock of the accomplishments of the past and the contributions that Federal reclamation has made to the development of this great Nation and provide sufficient funds to provide opportunities through further development of our own natural resources in the West. Investment of funds for reclamation is investment in the future of our Nation.

The dramatic story of the Colorado-Big Thompson is repeated time and time again in varying degrees and in different localities. I am sure there are many inspiring facts that could be presented if only we had the information. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House in particular, and in fact all Members of Congress should be acquainted with the true facts about reclamation. Accordingly, I am requesting the Commissioner of Reclamation to assemble brief but cogent reports on other projects, such as the Central Valley project and the Columbia Basin project, which may be used as a guide in appraising the value of this program and as a means of presenting the true facts to the American people.

The "Olympia" and the 57th Anniversary of the Battle of Manila Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, yesterday was the 57th anniversary of the battle of Manila Bay, when Admiral Dewey's fleet effected one of the most glorious victories in American naval history. Yesterday in the city of Philadelphia, services were held on the old *Olympia*, which was Admiral Dewey's flagship. I hold in my hand an account of the exercises, which was published in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer, and it is of such interest that I ask that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"OLYMPIA'S" GLORY MARKED AT FETE

The 57th anniversary of the battle of Manila Bay, in which the American fleet scored a smashing victory over Spanish naval forces, was observed yesterday at the Philadelphia naval base with a brief ceremony aboard the cruiser *Olympia*, Admiral Dewey's flagship in the historic engagement.

The exercises may have been the last ever to be held on the cruiser, which lies rusting and badly in need of repairs in a back channel at the base. Sponsored by the Committee to Save the *Olympia*, a feeling of gloom mixed with the spirit of patriotism as it was pointed out the ship will be scrapped within 12 weeks unless funds are raised to preserve it as a shrine.

DAYS SEEN NUMBERED

Dr. Henry Dexter Learned, a Temple University professor and governor of the Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, who is serving as chairman of the group trying to save the vessel, said "the *Olympia's* days are numbered unless we can rescue her."

Dr. Learned announced that the city had offered the south side of pier 4, at Market Street, as a temporary site for berthing of the ship, but added that a large sum of money would be needed to pay for dredging the location. The committee held a meeting after the ceremony to discuss plans for obtaining financial support for the project.

"OLD HAND" ABOARD

Capt. Frederick J. Ilsemann, United States Navy, who was a midshipman on the *Olympia* when it was decommissioned in 1922 after carrying the body of the Unknown Soldier home from France, and Arthur T. Lou, whose father participated in the Manila Bay battle on May 1, 1898, also spoke during the program held on the ship's deck.

SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS NEEDED

The exercises opened with invocation by Lt. Paul C. Hammerl, a naval chaplain, and closed with the playing of the Star Spangled Banner and "tapt" by the base band. Comdr. William B. Jackson introduced the speakers and guests.

Dr. Learned said the committee was unable to accept the city's offer until the necessary funds are obtained for the berthing and renovation of the ship. An act of Congress has stated that delivery of the vessel must be accepted before July 23 or it will be scrapped. The Navy estimated the cost of restoration at $650,000, and the group would need at least one-tenth of that amount to contract for the ship.

The committee had hoped to establish the *Olympia* as a nucleus of a marine museum and a spot on the west bank of the Schuylkill, above University Bridge, was advanced as a permanent location.

Police Edition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial which does not deserve the fate it is destined to receive: Printed in a community weekly and then reprinted here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This editorial deserves greater recognition than that.

This editorial should be printed in every newspaper in the Nation—weekly and daily.

This editorial should be reprinted in pamphlet form and distributed in every section of the country.

This editorial should be read by every individual able to read.

Here is an editorial, the like of which comes along once in a long time. It is one of those editorials which really rings the bell and sounds a call to everybody regardless of age, color or creed; regardless of position in life or rank in society. This editorial is as personal as the individual who wrote it and the individual who will read it.

Here is an editorial that lives and breathes, an editorial that is warm and human.

This editorial came from the pen of Robert Stewart, editor of the West Bank Herald, of Algiers, La., a progressive community just across the Mississippi River from New Orleans.

Bob Stewart is no stranger to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His editorials have been placed by me in these pages many, many times.

Bob Stewart is no stranger to the Nation's press. Only last year one of his editorials received a Freedom's Foundation Award.

Bob Stewart has merited a special place in journalistic achievements as well as a position of honor and respect in his community. This editorial is one of his finest works, because to each of us it has application.

POLICE EDITION

You, Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, you're all a bunch of queer ducks; that is, the way you think and act about law enforcement.

Every neighborhood, every subdivision has a civic organization. You want playgrounds, you want sewerage, you want streets paved, you want schools, and you want traffic laws to protect the lives of your loved ones, friends, and neighbors. You mean well, you are sincere—by organizing you get the public improvements your neighborhood needs; you realize the constant, increasing danger of motor traffic, you know that day in and day out many of our citizens are maimed and killed because of the laxity of laws; the carelessness of drivers or because a motorist violated a law. You want to protect yourselves and family, your neighbors and friends. You want to save a family, the sorrow and tragedy of an accidental death. You realize that gruesome traffic deaths can be avoided if people drive sanely, obey traffic signs and laws and give consideration to others. You also realize that most people don't behave themselves unless there is a pattern of established conduct. That is when you and your civic club demand that stop signs be put up; traffic lights installed and warning signals placed at vantage points. The city and State authorities do this job to protect your life. These officials know the danger, also. They agree with you, they cooperate with you, they do what you ask. Then what happens? They send me out to see the signs are obeyed. I'm a cop.

A man drives up to the stop sign, looks to the right and left, he doesn't spot me, he keeps on going. I pull him over to the curb. He is indignant. He is mad, he tells me so. He angrily gives his name. He denies not stopping, he says he's got friends. He doesn't like me, he doesn't like the idea of a ticket. By this time he hates me. I give him a ticket.

I'm a cop. My duty is to enforce your laws; to protect your life even if it cost me mine. Oh, yes, the man I gave the ticket belongs to the civic club that had the signs put up.

He thinks that traffic laws were made for everybody but Mr. Average Man. He thinks he can sneak across stop signs and not get caught; he thinks he can park in no parking zones; he thinks he can run a red light if no cop is around. Sometimes he gets by with it, sometimes we catch him, or he is caught in the switch of traffic and goes to a hospital or the morgue. He thinks he can get by without a brake tag, a driver's license or handle an automobile under the influence of liquor. If we don't catch him sometimes we read about him next morning in the newspapers.

Yes, this fine respected citizen thinks the laws were made for everybody but Mr. Average Man. That is why hospitals maintain emergency accident rooms that are always crowded with maimed, screaming, cutup and bleeding citizens. Statistics show that some of these die from crushed skulls and smashed limbs. They thought, too, that the laws were made for the other fellow—not them.

I'm a cop, I know. I'm the guy you hate, that is when you violate the law and get caught. But its different when you hear your wife scream in the middle of the night, and you find a burglar in your home. It's different when the bank gets robbed, a teller killed—you call the cops.

Yes, when the little boys down the street drowns in an open canal; when a cat gets caught in a chimney; when little Johnny falls out of a tree; when men are needed to keep crowds back from fires, parades and other hot spots; when a stranger slugs you; when a man is found dead in the gutter; when you are mugged, attacked, threatened, defrauded—you call a cop. I'm the guy you send for, my job is to protect you—to enforce the laws. You make those laws, I'm the guy you hire, who is on call 24 hours a day, to see that your wishes are carried out.

I'm the man who lives next door to you, with a wife and kids, living on a modest income, being a good neighor. I'm the guy whose kids go to school and church with your kids. I'm the man you meet at neighborhood affairs, who lives no differently from any other hardworking citizen except when you need me I'm there—even though I must give my life to save yours. I'm a cop.

You like me when you need me, but when you violate the law, and don't want to see me, that is when you really need me the most. I may save your life.

There are names of other cops engraved on a bronze tablet in our courthouse. You have forgotten these names, but we haven't. They died to uphold law and order in this city. That was their job. They died so that you can live safely in your homes; walk down the street unafraid. They died so that you can live useful, happy, law-abiding lives in a decent community. Some of these guys may have given you a ticket. They were cops.

The Case Against the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Peter Edson which appeared in the Washington News last week. We may not agree with what Mr. Edson says but certainly he has pointed out some gross deficiencies against the United Nations. I commend this article to the membership of the House:

CASE AGAINST THE U. N.

(By Peter Edson)

UNITED NATIONS.—From the constructive view of seeing what is wrong with the United Nations to make it work better, a dozen major shortcomings may be listed.

Out of 63 U. N. vetoes in the last 9 years, 61 were cast by Russia. France and Russia both vetoed consideration of the Spanish question. France alone vetoed a Russian proposal to send a cease-fire inspection commission to Indonesia.

Soviet vetoes have made the U. N. Security Council of 11 members increasingly ineffective. The General Assembly of all members has become increasingly important. What this suggests is charter amendment to redefine functions of the two branches in dealing with threats to peace.

The U. N. has been unable to create a police force. This was supposed to have troop contributions from member countries to act under Security Council direction in maintaining peace. Eight years of negotiation could not break the deadlock on troop quotas, their location, armament, command, and state of readiness.

The closest thing to it has been the U. N. forces assembled to defend South Korea under American command. But the U. N. has not effected a permanent solution to the Korean question.

Communist China was declared an aggressor, but no punitive action has been enforced against this aggression. The U. N. has so far failed to secure release of all Americans held prisoner of war, wrongfully tried and sentenced by communist China. The U. N. truce supervision team has been unable to observe and enforce cease-fire violations in North Korea.

The U. N. has failed to make any progress on disarmament, though a special commission is still at work on this question in London.

The U. N. has been unable to reach any agreement on control of atomic energy and atomic weapons. A new international conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy will convene in Geneva this year.

Maintenance of peace since the end of World War II has developed largely through regional defense alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Organization of American States, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and the Communist bloc of nations under Russia. Such regional arrangements were authorized by the U. N. Charter. But it was not foreseen that they would become more powerful than the U. N. itself.

Decisions of the International Court of Justice at The Hague are advisory only, unless both sides agree in advance to accept its decisions. There is no provision for enforcement of world-court decisions. Only 10 contentious cases have been submitted to the court. Eight requests have been made for advisory opinions.

The United States has filed claims against Russian, Hungarian, and Czech Governments for shooting down American aircraft, as a matter of policy. But these cases will never come to trial, because the Communist countries don't accept the court's jurisdiction.

In a number of regional disputes, U. N. commissions have arranged cease-fire agreements, but they have not been able to achieve permanent solutions, except on the Indonesian question.

Such cases include the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan, and the Arab-Israeli dispute in the Middle East.

The final test of the U. N., which is still to come, is whether it will be successful in preventing world war III.

It was inability to prevent World War II that wrecked the League of Nations.

The statesmen who drafted the U. N. Charter at San Francisco 10 years ago thought they were correcting the faults that made the old league a failure. As the record now stands, they were not completely successful.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the first session of the 82d Congress.

The record indicates all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

(Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan, 82d Cong. 1st sess.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
1	Jan. 3	Call by States	Present.
2	...do	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn, 231—Martin, 192.)	Martin.
		H. Res. 7, providing that the rules of the House of Representatives will be the same as those of the 81st Cong.:	
3	...do	On previous question. (Defeated, 179 to 247.)	Yea.
4	...do	On substitute repealing the 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules in bringing up legislation. On adoption. (Adopted, 244 to 179.)	Nay.
5	Jan. 17	H. R. 1001, authorizing the construction of 500,000 tons of modern naval vessels, conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels and the construction of an aircraft carrier. On passage. (Passed, 365 to 0.)	Yea.
6	Jan. 19	Quorum call	Present.
7	Jan. 23	H. R. 1724, providing for the creation of a 5-member board to renegotiate contracts that are made by certain Government agencies exercising functions in connection with the national defense. On passage. (Passed, 377 to 0.)	Yea.
8	Jan. 24	H. R. 1, authorizing the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service. (GI insurance bill.) On passage. (Passed, 390 to 0.)	Yea.
9	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
10	...do	...do	Present.
11	Feb. 7	...do	Present.
		H. R. 1612, extending for 3 years the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements:	
12	...do	On amendment providing for congressional notification by the President prior to any reduction of tariffs below a level determined by the Tariff Commission to be prejous to domestic industries. On adoption. (Adopted, 225 to 168.)	Yea.
	Mar. 5	H. R. 2615, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, relative to peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas:	
13	Mar. 7	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 174 to 212)	Yea.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 13	...do	Present.
16	...do	H. R. 1545, amending the Reorganization Act of 1949 to authorize emergency reorganizations. On passage. (Defeated, 170 to 227.)	Nay.
17	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
18	...do	H. Res. 142, rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, relative to the RFC. On adoption. (Defeated, 200 to 197, not having received a constitutional majority of 218.)	Yea.
19	...do	H. Res. 166, providing for the consideration of H. R. 2988, a bill to provide housing and community facilities and services in connection with national defense. On adoption. (Defeated, 170 to 219.)	Nay.
20	Mar. 21	On amendment cutting $22 million from the money provided for postal operations. On adoption. (Defeated, 136 to 138.)	Yea.
21	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
22	Apr. 4	...do	Present.
23	Apr. 5	...do	Present.
24	Apr. 9	...do	Present.
25	Apr. 10	H. R. 2612, authorizing District of Columbia Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia. On passage. (Passed, 278 to 116.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3587, third supplemental appropriation for certain Government agencies for the remainder of fiscal year 1951:	
26	...do	On amendment reducing the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $750,000. On adoption. (Defeated, 159 to 250.)	Yea.
27	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
28	Apr. 12	...do	Present.
29	Apr. 13	...do	Present.
30	...do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 121 to 292)	Nay.
31	...do	On passage. (Passed, 372 to 44)	Yea.
32	Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
33	...do	On amendment permitting covered agencies to fill only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 208 to 145.)	Yea.
34	...do	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 25	...do	Present.
36	Apr. 26	...do	Present.
37	May 1	...do	Present.
38	May 2	...do	Present.
		H. R. 3790, appropriating funds for Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1952:	
39	...do	On amendment deleting language providing $3,400,000 for Southeastern Power Administration construction. On adoption. (Adopted, 247 to 149.)	Yea.
40	...do	On amendment reducing by $550,000 the funds for construction by the Southwestern Power Administration. On adoption. (Adopted, 222 to 173.)	Yea.
41	...do	On amendment preventing the use of funds for developing the western Missouri project. On adoption. (Adopted, 247 to 152.)	Yea.
42	...do	On amendment cutting $5½ million from funds allotted for Bonneville Power Administration construction. On adoption. (Adopted, 225 to 167.)	Yea.
43	May 2	H. R. 3790—Continued On amendment cutting $800,000 from funds allocated for management of lands and resources and to earmark $1,200,000 for use in soil and moisture conservation. On adoption. (Adopted, 249 to 148.)	Yea.
44	...do	On amendment reducing by $10 million the funds provided the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 160.)	Yea.
45	...do	On amendment preventing use of funds to construct duplicate power transmission facilities where wheeling service contracts have been entered into. On adoption. (Adopted, 226 to 165.)	Yea.
46	...do	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department of Interior in 1952 with certain exceptions. On adoption. (Adopted, 224 to 169.)	Yea.
47	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
48	...do	H. Res. 220, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 220 to 159.)	Yea.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952:	
50	...do	On amendment limiting to 5,000 the public dwelling units to be started in fiscal year 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 181 to 113.)	Yea.
51	...do	On amendment fixing the emergency fund for the President at $1 million, plus certain unexpended funds from 1951. On adoption. (Adopted, 160 to 128.)	Yea.
52	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 9	H. R. 3576, amending the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 by extending program for 6 months to Dec. 31, 1951, with no increase in number of authorizations for admission and no extension of the term of office of Displaced Persons Commission. On passage. (Passed, 312 to 63.)	Yea.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 15	...do	Present.
56	May 17	...do	Present.
		H. R. 3096, requiring congressional approval relative to certain defense land transactions by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration:	
57	...do	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 312 to 68.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1952:	
58	...do	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 216 to 153.) On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
59	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 23	...do	Present.
61	May 24	...do	Present.
62	...do	H. R. 3791, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On passage. (Passed, 293 to 94.)	Yea.
63	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
64	...do	...do	Present.
65	...do	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 9 to 224.)	Nay.
		H. R. 4141, providing more effective prevention, detection and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia:	
66	...do	On motion that House resolve itself into Committee of Whole to consider bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 231 to 3.)	Yea.
67	...do	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 5	...do	Present.
69	...do	...do	Present.
70	June 6	S. 872, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 250 to 82.)	Yea.
		H. R. 314, providing for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans in Franklin County, Va.:	
71	...do	On motion to strike enacting clause. (Adopted 223 to 117.)	Yea.
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
73	...do	S. 1, authorizing universal military training and service and amending Draft Act. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 339 to 41.)	Yea.
74	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
75	June 13	...do	Present.
		H. R. 4386, appropriating funds for Department of Army civil functions for fiscal year 1952:	
76	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 170 to 165.)	Nay.
77	June 15	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 75 to 161.)	Nay.
78	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
79	...do	S. J. Res. 70, suspending application of certain Federal laws with respect to employment of attorney by Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. On adoption. (Defeated, 120 to 164.)	Nay.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
80	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
81	...do	...do	Present.
82	June 21	...do	Present.
83	June 22	H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951: On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 171 to 220.)	Yea.
84	...do	On passage. (Passed 233 to 160)	Yea.
85	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
86	...do	H. R. 4431, extending rent control in the District of Columbia until Mar. 31, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 171 to 120.)	Nay.
87	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
88	...do	S. Con. Res. 11, reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 351 to 6.)	Yea.
89	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
90	...do	H. R. 3283, amending the Agriculture Act of 1949 relative to recruitment of agricultural workers from foreign countries on the mainland of the Western Hemisphere. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 139.)	Yea.
91	...do	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 28	...do	Present
93	...do	H. Res. 287, a closed rule providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills: On ordering the previous question. (Adopted, 196 to 192.)	Nay.
94	...do	On adoption. (Adopted, 195 to 191.)	Nay.
95	...do	H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills: On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate certain amendments to effect a 10-percent reduction in funds of departments and agencies. (Defeated, 190 to 200.)	Yea.
96	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
97	...do	H. Res. 294, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 278, on adoption. (Adopted 297 to 85.)	Yea.
98	...do	H. J. Res. 278, extending the Defense Production Act of 1950 through July 31, 1951; the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; and certain import control authority: On amendment preventing roll-backs or the lowering of price ceilings below those on enactment date of resolution and prohibiting any new price ceilings on materials or services during the period of the temporary extension, except for the placing of price ceilings on agricultural commodities if they exceed their parity price. On adoption. (Adopted, 232 to 159.)	Nay.
99	...do	S. 1590, extending rent control in the District of Columbia for 1 year. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 242 to 126.)	Nay.
100	June 30	H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 256 to 12.)	Yea.
101	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
102	...do	do	Present.
103	...do	...do	Present.
104	July 6	...do	Present.
105	July 9	...do	Present.
106	July 10	...do	Present.
107	July 11	...do	Present.
108	July 12	...do	Present.
109	...do	H. R. 3709, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security agencies for fiscal 1952: On motion to recommit to committee on conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952 in the offices, bureaus, etc., covered by this bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 223 to 170.)	Yea.
110	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
111	July 16	...do	Present.
112	...do	...do	Present.
113	...do	...do	Present.
114	July 17	...do	Present.
115	July 18	...do	Present.
116	July 19	...do	Present.
117	July 20	...do	Present.
118	...do	H. R. 3871, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950: On Andresen amendment restricting until June 30, 1953, imports of fats and oils, cheese, dairy products, peanuts and rice. On adoption. (Adopted 266 to 147.)	Nay.
119	...do	On Davis (Wisconsin) amendment establishing 1 Government agency through which all claims of municipalities for materials, etc., would be channeled. On adoption. (Defeated, 164 to 251.)	Yea.
120	...do	On Hope amendment preventing the placing of quotas on livestock slaughtering. On adoption. (Adopted, 249 to 167.)	Nay.
121	July 20	H. R. 3871—Continued On Wolcott amendment deleting language enlarging the President's authority to acquire property, including facilities, and to erect plants, factories, etc., and to engage in the marketing, transportation, and storage of such critical materials necessary to national defense; but authorizing installation of additional equipment, facilities, etc., in Government-owned plants and the installation of Government-owned equipment in privately owned plants. On adoption. (Adopted, 233 to 184.)	Yea.
122	...do	On Hardy amendment deleting authority to create new Government corporations by Executive orders. On adoption. (Adopted, 250 to 167.)	Yea.
123	...do	On amendment authorizing a roll-back of 10 percent below the May 10, 1951, prices of agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 234 to 183.)	Nay.
124	...do	On Cole amendment providing a fair and equitable margin for each species of livestock processed to insure a fair profit to all segments of the industry on each species. On adoption. (Defeated, 166 to 249.)	Yea.
125	...do	On Davis (Georgia) amendment providing that for a period of 120 days following enactment of bill prices and wages, salaries, and other compensation shall not be raised above the levels prevailing on July 7, 1951, except that agricultural products may not be prevented from reaching parity. On adoption. (Defeated, 172 to 243.)	Nay.
126	...do	On Poage-Cole amendment to set up a formula, including parity costs, for arriving at ceiling prices for all commodities to insure a reasonable profit. On adoption. (Defeated, 181 to 233.)	Nay.
127	...do	On amendment exempting strategic metals and minerals from ceiling prices when in short supply. On adoption. (Defeated, 200 to 216.)	Yea.
128	...do	On adoption of amendment deleting from the bill language authorizing the licensing of and suspension of licenses of certain businesses covered by the scope of the bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 333 to 82.)	Yea.
129	...do	On amendment deleting from the bill language relating to control of commodity speculation. On adoption. (Adopted, 242 to 172.)	Nay.
130	...do	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 117 to 299.)	Nay.
131	...do	On passage. (Passed, 323 to 92.)	Yea.
132	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
133	...do	H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.): On motion to recommit to committee of conference. On adoption. (Adopted, 188 to 186.)	Yea.
134	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
135	...do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to reduce appropriation for the international information and educational activities of the State Department by $15 million. On adoption. (Defeated, 142 to 245.)	Nay.
136	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
137	...do	H. J. Res. 289, terminating the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany. On adoption. (Adopted, 378 to 0.)	Yea.
138	...do	H. Res. 335, providing for the consideration of H. R. 4484, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Tidelands.) On adoption. (Adopted, 270 to 92.)	Yea.
139	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
140	...do	S. 1717, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 294 to 80.)	Yea.
141	...do	H. R. 4484, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Tidelands.) On passage. (Passed, 265 to 109.)	Yea.
142	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
143	...do	H. R. 3790, making appropriations for Department of Interior for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.) On motion to recommit to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952. (Recommitted, 189 to 170.)	Yea.
144	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
145	Aug. 1	...do	Present.
146	Aug. 2	...do	Present.
147	Aug. 8	...do	Present.
148	...do	...do	Present.
149	Aug. 9	...do	Present.
150	Aug. 9	H. R. 5054. On passage. (Passed, 348 to 2.)	Yea.
151	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
152	Aug. 13	...do	Present.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
153	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
154	...do	H. R. 4914, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations. On passage. (Passed, 353 to 5.)	Yea.
155	...do	H. Con. Res. 140, expressing indignation at the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovakian Government. On adoption. (Adopted, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
156	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices. (Conference report):	
157	...do	On motion to recommit to conference committee with instructions to insist on House provision relating to public housing. On adoption. (Defeated, 169 to 207.)	Yea.
158	...do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 290 to 80.)	Yea.
159	...do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 349, providing housing and community facilities and services in connection with the national defense:	
160	...do	On amendment fixing the termination date of the act of June 30, 1952, instead of June 30, 1953. On adoption. (Defeated, 184 to 188.)	Yea.
161	...do	On amendment striking out provision for acquisition of sites for development in connection with isolated defense installations. On adoption. (Defeated, 175 to 199.)	Yea.
162	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3193, increasing and extending pensions to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities:	
163	Aug. 17	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 318 to 45.)	Nay.
		H. R. 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report):	
164	...do	On motion that House concur in an amendment providing additional $1 million for fighting spruce bark beetle infestation. (Passed, 222 to 138.)	Nay.
165	...do	On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce funds for economic aid by $350 million. On adoption. (Recommitted, 186 to 177.)	Yea.
166	...do	On passage. (Passed, 260 to 101.)	Yea.
167	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
168	...do	...do	Present.
169	Aug. 21	...do	Present.
170	Sept. 13	...do	Present.
171	...do	...do	Present.
172	Sept. 14	...do	Present.
173	...do	...do	Present.
174	...do	H. R. 1005, providing for the free importation of baler twine. On passage. (Passed, 210 to 41.)	Yea.
175	Sept. 18	Quorum call	Present.
176	Sept. 19	...do	Present.
177	Sept. 20	...do	Present.
178	Sept. 24	...do	Present.
179	...do	H. R. 4419, authorizing the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ up to 15 retired members of the armed services as teachers of military science and tactics. On passage. (Passed, 238 to 53.)	Yea.
180	...do	Quorum call	Present.
181	Sept. 25	...do	Present.
182	...do	S. 2006, increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and extending its life 5 years to June 30, 1958. On passage. (Passed, 259 to 69.)	Yea.
183	...do	H. Res. 429, providing for the consideration of H. R. 39, a bill for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 211-112.)	Yea.
		H. R. 39, providing for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities:	
184	Sept. 26	On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Recommitted, 180 to 162.)	Yea.
185	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
186	...do	H. Res. 430, providing for the consideration of H. Res. 82, relating to the unification of Ireland. On adoption. (Defeated, 139 to 206.)	Nay.
187	...do	Quorum call	Present.
188	Oct. 4	H. R. 5118, amending the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees. On suspension of the rules and passage. (Defeated, 197 to 140.)	Nay.
189	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
190	Oct. 5	...do	Present.
191	...do	H. R. 5113, the Mutual Security Act of 1951. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 235 to 98.)	Yea.
192	Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
193	...do	H. Res. 436, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. On adoption. (Adopted, 284 to 15.)	Yea.
		S. 1959, amending the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to validate union-shop elections held prior to time of taking of non-Communist oath by labor-union leaders, and to dispense with the requirement of existing law that an election be held before a labor organization and an employer may make a union-shop agreement:	
194	Oct. 9	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 22 to 304.)	Nay.
195	...do	On passage. (Passed, 307 to 18.)	Yea.
196	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 5650, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year, 1952:	
197	Oct. 11	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to strike out funds for Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri. On adoption. (Defeated, 127 to 183.)	Not voting.
198	...do	On passage. (Passed, 301 to 19.)	Not voting.
		H. R. 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for fiscal 1952. (Conference report):	
199	...do	On motion the House recede and agree to a revision of the language of the House bill relating to United States contributions to international organizations. On adoption. (Adopted, 200 to 126.)	Not voting.
200	...do	H. R. 5684, making appropriations to carry out provisions of Mutual Security Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 222 to 99.)	Not voting.
201	Oct. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
202	...do	H. R. 5411, amending Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Cong. with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas. On passage. (Passed, 257 to 55.)	Not voting.
203	Oct. 16	Quorum call	Present.
204	...do	...do	Present.
		H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951:	
205	...do	On adoption of conference report. (Defeated, 157 to 204.)	Yea.
206	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
207	Oct. 18	H. Res. 463, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 285, authorizing appropriation of $95,000 for commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the U. S. Military Academy. On adoption. (Adopted, 179 to 149.)	Nay.
208	...do	Quorum call	Present.
209	...do	S. Con. Res. 36, authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 75.)	Yea.
210	...do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 355, adjusting the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
211	...do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 339 to 7.)	Yea.
		S. 622, increasing the basic rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government:	
212	...do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 318 to 26.)	Yea.
213	...do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951:	
214	...do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 185 to 160.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3669, amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the monthly benefits paid to retired railroad employees:	
215	...do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 341 to 0.)	Yea.
216	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1864, providing or assisting in providing an automobile or making a cash payment to certain disabled veterans:	
217	...do	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 223 to 53.)	Nay.

The Foreign Aid Program Forgets the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a timely and interesting editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Arc and the Ark":

THE ARC AND THE ARK

The President's foreign aid message to Congress is much more than a money request for the next fiscal year. It opens a new and lengthy—if indeed not interminable—chapter in the history of this country's foreign aid program.

The evidence of the indefinite duration of this program, currently costing the United States nearly $5 billion a year, is abundant. Foreign Operations Administrator Stassen has spoken of 8 years. The President's message by implication goes further. It says the forthcoming transfer of FOA activities to "permanent" departments—State and Defense—emphasizes that foreign aid is "an integral part of our foreign policy." It indicates it may have to be continued until general disarmament becomes possible.

So we are not to see an end to foreign aid, promised so often, next year or any foreseeable year. That is one new thing, long suspected, now made clear. The other is that the bulk of foreign aid from now on is to go to what is called the arc of free Asia—a peculiarly murky, misleading and emotional label.

Few would quarrel with the premise here; as the message puts it, the "threats to world security and stability are now centered in Asia." Ergo, the United States must help to build up strength in some 15 Asian nations so that they can resist communism. Few, again, would dispute the desirability of that goal. What must be asked is whether foreign aid is an effective instrument for that purpose.

First of all, can American foreign aid substantially strengthen the economies of these Asian nations? Consider Indonesia, one of the countries in the socalled free arc. By all authoritative reports, the Government has made an economic shambles of the country and complete collapse has been averted only by the almost indestructible fertility of the land. The Government is considered to have reached a high mark in waste, inefficiency and corruption even for Asia, where such attributes are not uncommon. One may well wonder what American tax dollars will accomplish under such circumstances, and where they will go.

Or take India. One of the things that has perplexed some of our point 4 officials is the prospect that for every gain in agricultural productivity there will likely be a population gain, so that the end result of assistance may be not to diminish poverty but to multiply it. That many sound cruel, but the cruelty is nature's.

In general, the Asian nations are not sufficiently developed to absorb large sums economically. They can be expected to make gradual economic progress over many years, but it is questionable whether any amount we could spend on them could significantly speed that progress.

Secondly, can it be reasonably assumed that American aid will strengthen resistance to communism in this area? Some of the nations—like the Philippines, South Korea, and Formosa—are of course vigorously anti-Communist. But any notion that we can convert nations like India, Burma, and Indonesia to such a positon simply by giving them money does not correspond with political and geographical reality.

India has been accepting American economic aid—not military—for some time, without discernible influence on the "neutralism" of the Nehru Government. Indeed, the Indians are said to feel rather uncomfortable about taking American money, a feeling not likely to be eradicated by more of it. It's a good bet that if India ever becomes strongly anti-Communist, it will not be because of United States aid; it will be because it has decided it has to make a stand against Chinese Communism imperialism or go under. Meantime neutral India and Burma and pro-Communist Indonesia want to try to get along with Peiping.

These nations are also, it should be remembered, obsessed with anticolonialism. They may get over that eventually, but the very suggestion that the United States might want to aid them in order indirectly to affect their politics is not going to win friends for the United States or the anti-Communist cause any time soon.

However, it is sometimes argued that any progress is better than none. If, despite the enormity of the task, the dubious political results, the certain waste, a little can be accomplished, isn't it worth it?

There might be some validity in this argument if the United States could in fact afford a large and quasipermanent foreign aid program. That is, if the Government had balanced the budget at a decent level of taxation, reduced the public debt, and was nonetheless running a persistent surplus. As it is, this kind of program is a luxury this country demonstrably cannot afford.

Certainly there are dangers and threats in the Far East. But Washington will accomplish little if in worrying about the arc of free Asia it neglects the ark of free America.

Answer to Private Utility Proposal on Trinity Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in California, offered to build the powerhouses on the Trinity River project, which has been authorized for construction by the Federal Government under the reclamation law. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s so-called partnership proposal was the subject of extended testimony by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This proposal will not only, if adopted, reverse a half century of Federal Government power policy but will have a serious effect on the operation of the Central Valley project and probably delay for many years the construction of the much needed Trinity River project. Following is a brief summary of the reasons the P. G. & E. proposal should not be adopted:

COMPANY'S PROPOSAL VIOLATES FEDERAL POWER POLICY

First. Acceptance of the company's proposal would be a reversal of half a century of power policy in the Federal Government. The principle of low-cost public power with preference to municipalities and other public agencies has been stated at least 13 times in acts of Congress dating from 1906. In other words, for almost 50 years the Federal Government has consistently followed a policy of selling publicly produced power at the lowest possible rates, giving preference to municipalities and public agencies. If the Federal Government's power policy was to exploit the power potential for profit-making purposes, then it could raise power rates to make a financial showing for the Trinity Project which would completely nullify the company's argument that its proposal would place the Government in a better financial position.

THE AMOUNT OF THE OFFER IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO MEET FEDERAL COSTS

Second. The P. G. & E. Co. has made an offer to the Department of the Interior to purchase falling water from the Trinity project for $3.5 million annually. This happens to be the only firm part of the offer—the offer in all other respects being very vague, as discussed herein under other headings. With respect to the $3.5 million, it is not even sufficient to return to the Federal Government its actual costs at the Government's rate of interest. The amount would have to be about $4,150,000 annually to accomplish this. Therefore, there would be, under the company's proposal, an actual loss to the Federal Government of $650,000 annually, or over $32 million in 50 years. Even if the company paid the Federal Government its full costs of $4,150,000 it would be comparable to the Government loaning the company funds to expand its power facilities at the low Federal interest rate.

COMPANY'S CLAIM THAT ITS PROPOSAL RETURNS $36 MILLION MORE REVENUE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVER PROJECT REPAYMENT PERIOD IS IN ERROR

Third. The company's claim, in its proposal to the Department and in its widely distributed pamphlet on the proposal, that under its proposal an additional $36 million would be returned to the Federal Government over the project repayment period is not supported by testimony given to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Bureau witnesses stated that amortization with interest of the increased cost of enlarging the tunnels under the company's proposal would exceed the $36 million by about $6 million, and that therefore there would actually be less revenue under the company's proposal by about $6 million.

COMPANY'S PROPOSAL WOULD INTERFERE WITH CVP OPERATION AND REDUCE FIRM CAPACITY OF EXISTING FEDERAL POWERPLANTS

Fourth. The firm generating capacity at the existing Shasta powerplant under the company's proposal would be reduced by 60,000 to 100,000 kilowatts, or 16 to 27 percent, and this is a most important and serious aspect of the company's proposal. The Bureau witnesses testified before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that this reduction was estimated at 100,000 kilowatts, or around 27 percent, and that such reduction would decrease the firm energy below that re-

quired to continue service to all existing preference customers. The effort then would be to dedicate a large block of power, about 100,000 kilowatts according to Bureau estimates, from the Central Valley project powerplants to company use. This would be power taken away from existing preference customers now having contracts with the Federal Government, in contravention of the law with respect to preferences.

CLAIMS BY COMPANY REGARDING THE ADDITIONAL POWER-GENERATING CAPACITY UNDER THE COMPANY'S PROPOSAL ARE MISLEADING

Fifth. The P. G. & E. proposal call for installation of 130,000 more kilowatts of generating capacity than the Bureau proposes to install.

In the first place, this figure is misleading because this additional installation results in the firm generating capacity at existing Federal plants being reduced by 60,000—100,000 kilowatts—60,000 kilowatts by the company's estimate and 100,000 kilowatts by the Bureau's estimate. This matter is discussed under the preceding heading.

In the second place, with respect to the increased generating capacity, it must be pointed out that the amount of energy generated is dependent upon the amount of the water which runs through the turbines and not upon the powerplant capacity. An equal amount of water will generate the same energy whether it runs through the Bureau's plants or the company's plants. The company proposes to use the plants for peaking purposes by running the water through in gushes in certain periods and then shutting down the plants completely during other periods. It is like pouring a bucketfull of water through a funnel. Increasing the size of the funnel only results in getting the water through faster.

The effect of the company's proposal to release the water in this manner upon the operation of the Central Valley project and its primary purpose of supplying water for irrigation is not known and requires much additional study as discussed under the next heading.

THE EFFECT OF THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED OPERATING PLAN UPON THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT OPERATION IS UNKNOWN

Sixth. The company in its proposal reaches certain conclusions which are based upon a suitable release schedule. The effect of a suitable release schedule for operating the company's powerplants for peaking purposes upon the Central Valley project's primary purpose of supplying water for irrigation is not known and will require much additional study. It is questionable, and Bureau witnesses so testified before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, whether the reregulation of the Trinity flows which are gushed through the powerplants can be accomplished by the existing Keswick Reservoir without additional storage. If additional costly storage is required, the whole economics of the proposal are affected.

The P. G. & E. proposal is quite vague in other respects. The proposal includes no details as to how and on what terms it will exchange power for pumping energy. Also, the proposal includes nothing as to how the company would support long-term preference customers of the Bureau of Reclamation.

THE COMPANY'S CLAIM THAT ITS PROPOSAL MAKES 5 PERCENT MORE WATER AVAILABLE FOR THE FARMERS IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY IS NOT CORRECT

Seventh. The P. G. & E. Co. states that its proposal would make 5 percent more water available to the farmers of the Central Valley than would be available under the Bureau's plan on the basis that the company would divert 5 percent more water from the Trinity River for operation of its powerplants.

Information given the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee indicates that the releases would be at such time as to make this additional water unusable in the Central Valley. It would simply waste to the ocean through the Sacramento River rather than through the Trinity-Klamath Rivers.

FEDERAL AND STATE TAXES PAID BY P. G. & E. UNDER ITS PROPOSAL ADDS ADDITIONAL COSTS WHICH POWER CONSUMERS MUST PAY

Eighth. The P. G. & E. Co. states that under its proposal $70 million in additional Federal taxes would be paid and $65 million in taxes to State and local governments would be paid—a total of $135 million. This, of course, is simply an additional cost to the company which, along with the company's profits, would necessarily have to be passed on to the power consumers. The Federal Government could likewise pay these additional amounts as in-lieu-of-tax payments by simply raising the Federal power rates in the service area. The energy could be marketed at these higher rates. However, as discussed under item 1 above, the power policy of the Federal Government, as established by law, has been to dispose of electric energy at the lowest rates consistent with sound business principles.

THE ADDITIONAL $50 MILLION CAPITAL OUTLAY INVOLVED IN FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION DOES NOT COST TAXPAYERS ONE PENNY

Ninth. The company's statement that its proposal would save the Federal taxpayers $50 million in capital outlay is misleading. Under Federal construction, this $50 million would be returned to the Federal Government with interest within a period of about 30 years after it had been appropriated and would not cost the Federal taxpayers one penny.

PUMPING POWER FOR SAN LUIS PROJECT IS AN IMPORTANT ASPECT WHICH MUST BE CONSIDERED IN CONNECTION WITH THE COMPANY'S PROPOSAL

Tenth. The only way that the San Luis project can have an assured continuous supply of low-cost energy for pumping purposes is to integrate the Trinity power into the Central Valley project system. The company's proposal includes no details as to how and on what terms it will exchange power for pumping energy.

THE DELAY DUE TO COMPANY'S PROPOSAL

Eleventh. Testimony given to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee indicates that it will probably take 3 years to complete all the studies required in connection with the company's proposal and to iron out all the points of controversy, assuming that they can be ironed out. We cannot afford the resulting delay in construction of the Trinity River division.

Aircraft Contracting in Southern California Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a letter to me from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, dated April 27, 1955, including the text of the statement by Carl P. Miller, president of the chamber of commerce, as mentioned in his letter:

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
April 27, 1955.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Secretary of the Air Force Talbott on February 9 made statements on the subject of Air Force contracts in southern California which called for challenge.

Unfortunately these statements were not released to the press until 2 days ago.

Attached is our answer to the Secretary.

May I emphasize something of which I know you are aware, mainly that the heart of the aircraft industry is not in the buildings and machines, but in the thousands of trained engineers and workers who cannot be found in any new location. This is a national defense effort which must not be destroyed.

Sincerely,

CARL P. MILLER,
President.

STATEMENT BY CARL P. MILLER, PRESIDENT, LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, APRIL 26, 1955

Secretary of the Air Force Talbott has announced that he will stop further aircraft contracting in the Los Angeles area because we have 25 percent of our industrial employment in aircraft now.

Shall we now expect to hear that Mr. Talbott will not authorize the purchase of any more trucks or cars in Detroit because Detroit has 46 percent of its industrial employment in the automotive industry?

Or that he will not approve the purchase of any more steel in Pittsburgh because Pittsburgh has 41 percent of its industrial employment in the steel industry?

Secretary Talbott overlooks several important facts:

1. Only 8 percent of Los Angeles' total employment is in the aircraft industry. Los Angeles has 23 major industrial groups each producing more than $25 million annually. Los Angeles is the best balanced industrial center in America.

2. During World War II Los Angeles had 43 percent of its industrial employment in the aircraft industry. Fortunate for the Nation that we did! We are better balanced by far now than we were then.

3. The aircraft industry is not made up of buildings and machines. It is made up

of the know-how of thousands of engineers, supervisors, foremen, and skilled workers. Their experience goes back to the beginning of the century, because Los Angeles is the center of the aircraft industry. This is the priceless ingredient of our Nation's air defense, the one thing that can't be reproduced no matter where new plants are located. Secretary Talbott proposes to throw it away.

4. A vital complement to the aircraft industry is the electronics industry. With over 400 electronics factories, Los Angeles is a major center for the production of electronic equipment for aircraft. Here again, the know-how is the basic element. It does not exist in brick and mortar of some new plant built at who knows what remote spot.

5. Los Angeles is farther away by air from potential northern European bomb sources than any other large American city. If Secretary Talbot is talking about submarines, then how soon does he expect to put the lid on New York, Philadelphia, and Washington?

In conclusion, may we respectfully suggest that the Secretary might better spend his time in plans for protecting this important national-defense establishment than in plans for its destruction.

Noncompetition Rule Is Felt by All Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph Young:

NONCOMPETITION RULE IS FELT BY ALL AGENCIES

(By Joseph Young)

The administration's new policy of terminating Federal activities which it deems in competition with private industry is affecting virtually all agencies in Government.

The Budget Bureau has directed agencies to terminate and transfer these functions to private industry, regardless of cost.

Thousands of Federal employees have lost their jobs and thousands more face dismissal if the policy continues unabated.

The AFL Government Employees Council, representing more than 600,000 Federal workers, has attacked this policy and has appealed to Congress to bring pressure on the administration to modify it.

"The entire policy is being predicated without regard to increased cost to the taxpayer, national security, and the Government's moral obligation to Federal employees, who have devoted years of their life in the service of the Federal Government," the GEC said.

COSTLY

The GEC declared: "This will have the end result of increasing the cost to the taxpayer for all services and functions performed by private industry, because the Government, upon termination of Government functions, will not have the means to gage the propriety of private industry cost bids.

"In addition, the Government will be forced to accept private industry's standards for the quality of the end product and services received, and the Government would also further be forced to accept private industry standards of improved techniques, engineering, and technological progress. Inasmuch as these will be geared to a great degree to the civilian consumer's acceptance, our national defense and the lives of service personnel could be seriously jeopardized by inadequate or arrested quality, production, development, and research standards.

"The present policy has displayed total disregard for the moral obligation the Government has to provide jobs and economic security to hundreds of thousands of faithful and loyal civil servants who have devoted their lives to Government service. The policy has further disregarded the aderse and social economic impact upon communities and States in which these Government functions are privately located. There is no guaranty that upon termination these Government jobs and functions will develop into similar private industry positions within the same locality or State boundaries. There is also a lack of proper evaluation of the vast sum of taxpayer's monies which have been invested in equipment, facilities, and the training of highly skilled operating personnel."

The GEC also declared that national security is threatened when Defense Department work is performed in private industry plants. It referred to recent congressional reports of subversion and espionage in private industry defense plants. The Council added that: "Federal employees provide a nucleus of loyal and trustworthy civilian servants. * * * They cannot strike, nor do they seek the right to strike against the Government; therefore, there is no danger of production delays caused by differences between employees and management."

The GEC concluded: "The sum and substance of the policy would be to cause the terrific upheaval of the economic status of Federal employees and their families, the dissipation and dislocation of industrial know-how and industries. The policy would further spell the economic death of scores of supporting businesses and services of local communities throughout the Nation."

ACTIVITIES TERMINATED

Here are some of the Federal activities which the GEC declared have been terminated under the administration's policy. The GEC said this is only a partial list and that many other Federal activities have been transferred to private industry.

1. Manufacture of chain and rope.
2. Manufacture of special furniture for naval vessels.
3. Manufacture of special marine paint for the Navy.
4. Manufacture and development of prototype protective clothing for the Armed Forces.
5. Repair and overhaul of typewriters and office equipment.
6. The Reconstruction Finance Corp. has been placed in liquidation.
7. Synthetic rubber plants have been sold.
8. The Army and Navy are divesting themselves of automotive maintenance and repair to private garages.
9. The Air Force is now contracting over one-half of its maintenance and modification work to private industry.
10. The Navy is increasing the farming out to private interests its manufacturing, research, and development and modification functions.
11. Contracts have been let for private delivery of Government supplies from the General Services Administration's stores depots in the Washington and New York areas; and similar arrangements are being made elsewhere through the Nation and in other Government agencies.
12. The cleaning of governmental buildings has been placed under private contract.
13. The Government manufacture of dry ice for the Navy has been terminated.
14. The manufacture of crates and wooden boxes for Government shipments has been contracted.
15. An increasing amount of engineering and drafting services have been contracted to private industry.
16. The Army is divesting itself of increasing amounts of the research and development of prototypes and manufacturing and modification functions.
17. Granting a larger proportion of naval work to private interests than is assigned to Government shipyards, arsenals, etc.
18. Increasing amounts of the Nation's public natural resources are being turned over to private interest, for development for profit.
19. The Government Printing Office has, and apparently will continue to expand their method of farming out printing to outside printing plants.
20. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing has constantly farmed out work, and it is generally understood that shortly they expect to discontinue the printing of cigarette tobacco and alcoholic stamps. This procedure not only eliminates hundreds of jobs but could become a great security risk.
21. Postal finance activities: Postal remittances, money order and other finance activities formerly handled in post offices and in other central accounting offices have been transferred to banking institutions.
22. Highway post offices: The operation and maintenance of trucks used in the conduct of the highway post offices are now being done under contract.
23. Machine rentals: Pitney-Bowes postage meters, IBM machines and others are now being used in postal work with the ownership retained by business firms and used in postal activities on a rental basis.
24. Contract stations: The Post Office Department has contracted much of the postal work to individuals and firms who to all intents and purposes conduct post offices involving money order, registry, COD insurance, stamp sales, and other postal activities.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from Mr. Royal A. Roulston, vice president of the Kalix Mills, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass., which is for the attention of the Members of Congress and the Government departments concerned:

KALIX MILLS, INC.,
Lawrence, Mass., April 25, 1955.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Since 1941 we have been engaged in the processing of textiles and cordage to various Government specifications requiring mildewproofing, waterproofing, coating and flameproofing; and we are still doing so.

No single company in this area which you so ably represent, has processed as many million yards of military webbing as we have done; none has processed the hundreds of thousands of gun slings and bazooka straps that our company has done. All these, and many others we have accomplished without benefit of fanfare, gratuities, or political pressure of any kind—and we do not want any now either. We have been able to achieve these records because we have the

men, the knowledge, and the ability to get things done efficiently, properly, and on schedule. All of the business that we have been fortunate enough to obtain has been possible because we were the low bidders.

Now in the face of rising labor costs, increasing taxes, ascending power and freight rates, it is becoming extremely difficult for a small company to bid low enough to receive a Government contract award. And just how far we can go in lowering our operating costs any more is problematical and the employees know it. Several of them called my attention to the fact that we as a company do everything to save money and lower costs, but that some well-publicized articles that tend to indicate the National Government at Washington and its officeholders are not cooperating to keep us little taxpayers in business. As a matter of fact, it seems that many Federal bureaus are being managed by incompetents who grossly waste public moneys—these same incompetents are unable to calculate, estimate, or analyze the costs of doing a job or the best way and manner to accomplish it. These conditions are being printed from time to time in the press; they are serious and give us small operators great concern, for it is our money and that of our workers that is being thrown around. We believe it is impossible for a private industry to operate that way and be able to pay its taxes and keep out of bankruptcy.

But Government spending is different; a good many of the men who handle the money were never able to successfully run even a small business, so turn to politics for an easy living. We know of no private business that would allow the stockholders or directors to meet and grant themselves a $7,500 increase in salary as was done recently. In this greater Lawrence area the majority of people do not earn $7,500 in a year. On this score, however, we want to thank you and commend you for the way you voted; we feel that by your negative vote to raise your own pay, you were, and are, keeping faith with your electorate. Again, sir, we thank you.

The morning's Eagle Tribune carries on the front page a devastating double column piece about the Navy having enough tin cans of hamburgers on hand to last several years; other departments are also criticized for similar over stocks. The May issue of Reader's Digest contains a very enlightening article entitled "Dollars to Dust," a story of "almost unbelievable governmental extravagance." Congress votes millions of dollars for the use of the Bureau of Reclamation projects—and the record of this Bureau seems rotten, and my esteemed representative, I mean, rotten. Do you know of any company in this country or any other government where individuals have such a record of poor figuring, overspending and general poor management, and where such individuals were not fired? In our own Government circle it appears that such conduct is tolerated. We don't like this waste and wanton business. Can we look into it more, Mr. Lane? And if the charges as preferred in the papers are correct, will you use your good influence to combat such foolish business.

If you will be kind enough to advise me as to whom I might better direct such complaints, I will write to the address directly; but as you are our most competent representative on the scene, we hope you will be able to convince your fellow Congressmen tha people are beginning to watch them. We are not at war now, and we have a terrificially high budget for even this Nation at peace. Under our system, the Congress must vote the appropriations, and Congress should take time to investigate just how wisely these appropriations are being used. On the face of it, it looks as if too many legislators are throwing away too much money on too many needless enterprises.

We do appreciate your efforts on the behalf of this section; we want you to make noise enough to awaken some of your associates to the cases at issue and to influence them to help you to make us a happier group of taxpayers by eliminating such extravagances as the papers are printing.

Our greetings to you, sir, and our best wishes for your continued success in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

ROYAL A. ROULSTON,
Vice President, Kalix Mills, Inc.

California and Los Angeles Proclaim Seventh Anniversary of the State of Israel on April 26, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am pleased to present this letter to me from Dr. Max Nussbaum, chairman, and Dr. Otto Schirn, vice chairman, of the American Zionist Council of Los Angeles, Calif., together with the resolution unanimously adopted at the community-wide celebration in Los Angeles, April 26, 1955, at the Statler Hotel, and a copy of the proclamation issued April 25, 1955, by Hon. Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of the State of California:

AMERICAN ZIONIST
COUNCIL OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 27, 1955.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
Congressman From California,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: We take pleasure in enclosing herewith for your information the text of a resolution adopted unanimously at the communitywide celebration of the seventh anniversary of the State of Israel, which was held last night under our auspices at the Statler Hotel in Los Angeles. May we also attach hereto the text of the proclamation issued by Governor Knight for this occasion.

In this connection, you might be interested to learn that a proclamation declaring April 27 as Israel Independence Day has been issued by the Honorable John S. Gibson, Jr., acting mayor of Los Angeles, and that a resolution marking this observance has been unanimously adopted by the Los Angeles City Council.

Finally, may we inform you, in case you have not seen today's Los Angeles press, that both the Examiner and the Herald-Express carried a full-page pictorial display, as well as editorial comment and feature articles, as a salute to the State of Israel on the occasion of her seventh anniversary.

Very sincerely yours,

Dr. MAX NUSSBAUM,
Chairman.
Dr. OTTO SCHIRN,
Vice Chairman in Charge of Public Relations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY AT THE COMMUNITY-WIDE CELEBRATION HELD AT THE STATLER HOTEL IN LOS ANGELES ON APRIL 26, 1955

We, the more than 1,200 citizens of southern California, gathered in Los Angeles on April 26, 1955, salute the State of Israel on her seventh anniversary. This tiny notch of land, which gave miraculous rebirth to the Jewish people, is not only a spiritual but an unparalleled physical achievement.

We rejoice in the fact that our Government has played an indispensable role in the extraordinary program of human rescue and rehabilitation of the State of Israel. True to the United States bipartisan sponsorship of the Zionist cause and of the establishment of Israel which stemmed from that inspired movement, our country recognized Israel on the day of its independence and has since granted it material aid and moral support in the finest American tradition.

We want to express our deep conviction that it is futile for our Government to attempt, by bait of arms, to bind to our cause nations who have little or no history in the struggle for democracy and who today have no stake in democracy's defense; indeed, whose cause, as the Bandung Conference reveals, is now supported by Communist spokesmen.

We are convinced that there can be no enduring settlement in the troubled Middle East unless it is based upon acceptance of Israel's existence. In these last 7 short years, Israel has made tremendous strides; it stands today on the threshold of a still more fruitful and dynamic participation in the constructive labors of our time.

On its seventh birthday, we salute Israel, its friends, and its millions of well-wishers in the United States and throughout the world.

Gov. Goodwin J. Knight has issued on April 25, the following proclamation:

"April 27, 1955, will mark the seventh anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Israel as a sovereign nation. This occasion is being observed throughout the United States during the week of April 22 to 29. The objectives of these programs will be to offer the American public an opportunity to acquire a broader understanding of the achievements of Israel so that the bonds of friendship which exist between our nations will gain added strength.

"The people of the United States—and especially those of the Far West—have a keen appreciation for the hopes and determinations of pioneer men and women. Out of the hard work and ambitious dreams of a great people, our Nation has pushed back the wilderness and conquered the desert. Much of their inspiration was devised from the chronicle of the pre-Christian Hebrew people which they found in the sacred writ. The efforts of the spiritual heirs of Abraham to reestablish a nation in the ancestral homeland have been watched with great interest by the entire world.

"I hope that my fellow Californians will join in extending congratulations and best wishes to the people of Israel as they celebrate the seventh anniversary of their existence as a modern nation. Through such observances we are able to gain greater appreciation for the problems and purposes of those foreign powers with which we enjoy friendly and peaceful relations.

"GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
"Governor of California."

The Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to pay tribute to the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest

Service, which this year observes its golden anniversary. On April 27, Mr. C. E. Bell, vice president of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., and Mr. Norman Quayle, assistant traffic manager, both of Norfolk, Va., saluted the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service by presenting to the chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Richard E. McArdle, in his office a menu of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad which contained on the back cover a tribute to the splendid work of the Forest Service. I am pleased to include this information, and in so doing, I want to pay tribute to the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, which serves so much of the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, for the interest they take in the forestry improvement of our State and Nation, and I also want to pay tribute to the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service. The Seaboard's tribute follows:

We salute the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, which this year observes its golden anniversary.

Established in 1905, under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, the United States Forest Service had as its first chief, Gifford Pinchot. Making forestry the Nation's business, Roosevelt and Pinchot built up the national forests withdrawn from the public domain to 173 million acres. Through their efforts ground work was laid for the eventual purchase of additional millions of acres on the watersheds of navigable streams. Jointly they made both people and Congress conservation-minded.

Since those early years the United States Forest Service has been the symbol of integrated land use. It will continue to face new problems in making the multiple use concept a reality for the increasing population of our Nation.

The United States Forest Service has been a tremendous factor in the cooperative approach to forestry problems. Their work in fire protection, in production and distribution of nursery stock, in extension-education, and in technical service to small owers have been major factors in strengthening State forestry. The Service has spearheaded research in forest management, range management, watershed management, fire control, forest products, forest insect control and forest disease control.

Today, more than 10,000 men and women employed in this organization are charged with the responsibility of developing the multiple-use concept on 181 million acres of national forests in addition to assisting State forestry organizations on cooperative programs.

In the six Southeastern States served by the Seaboard, more than 110 million acres are classified as timber cropland. There are 15 national forests in these States, with an acreage comprising 5,427,049. These forests furnish timber for the manufacture of lumber, pulp, and paper, and furniture, valued in 1953 at $2,464,000,000. The Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. works closely with industry, State forestry organizations, and the Federal Forest Service toward forestry betterment which contributes to our higher standard of living."

A Reporter in Dreamland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the column which follows appeared in yesterday's New York Times and requires no comment from me:

WASHINGTON—A FEW FANCIES, OR A REPORTER IN DREAMLAND

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—After the President's press conference last Wednesday, this reporter dreamed that Mr. Eisenhower let us go on asking him questions and that he answered every one fully and frankly:

Question. Mr. President, how did the Government happen to say last Saturday that the United States would "insist" on having the Chinese Nationalists in on "any" conversations about the Formosa area, and then announce on Tuesday that we'd negotiate a cease-fire without the Nationalists?

Answer. We goofed.

Question. I beg your pardon?

Answer. We just messed it up. I was up at the farm in Gettysburg Saturday looking over the new decorations in the diningroom when the State Department drafted the first statement.

Question. Who drafted it?

Answer. I think it was that new young Hoover fellow.

Question. Did you approve it?

Answer. Oh, sure, I approved it.

THE BOTTLENECK: HUMAN NATURE

Question. Where was the Secretary of State?

Answer. He was up at Duck Island in Lake Ontario.

Question. Did he approve it?

Answer. No; it was out before he saw it.

Question. Couldn't you get him a telephone up there?

Answer. I've talked to the Signal Corps about that.

Question. But Mr. Dulles got back on Monday.

Answer. Yes; he got back on Monday and thought we should agree to talk to the Communists without the Nationalists.

Question. And what did you think of that?

Answer. I thought that was fine. Great idea. We should never give the world the idea that we are not receptive to talking about peace.

Question. But you didn't think about that Saturday?

Answer. No; as I say, I was busy up the country Saturday.

Question. Mr. President, could I ask you something else?

Answer. Sure ask me anything. (The questioner was really dreaming by this time.)

Question. Didn't you know your switch on negotiations would make Senator KNOWLAND mad?

Answer. Senator KNOWLAND is a ——.

Question. Careful, Mr. President.

Answer. Please keep Senator KNOWLAND out of this.

Question. Don't you like Senator KNOWLAND?

Answer. He's a fine man.

Question. I don't understand.

Answer. He's the only man in the Republican Party who says that if I don't want to run again, nobody should put pressure on me to run. He says he's against having an unwilling candidate in 1956, and so am I.

Question. May I infer from that——

Answer. You may infer from that if nominated I will not run, and if elected I will not serve, unless, of course, I change my mind. Which I may or may not do. Is that clear?

Question. No, sir. How long do you have to serve?

Answer. 20 months, 23 days, 12 hours and, let me see, 45 minutes.

QUEMOY-MATSU: THE FACTS

Question. Mr. President, how did we ever get involved in Quemoy and Matsu?

Answer. I was wondering about that just the other day. We were going along fine, trying to keep our minds on Germany and Japan, and all of a sudden everybody was talking about Quemoy and Matsu.

Question. Can't you defend Formosa without them?

Answer. I can defend anything without them. I never said I'd defend them. We sort of suggested we might have to defend them in the hope that the Chinese Communists would get scared and agree to a cease-fire. But they didn't scare.

Question. If we don't defend them what about the morale of Chiang Kai-shek and his troops?

Answer. And if we do, what about my morale and the morale of my troops? Want me to tell you something?

Question (Eagleriy). Yes, sir.

Answer. I'm sick of Quemoy and Matsu. All I've heard about for weeks is Quemoy and Matsu, and if it isn't Quemoy and Matsu, it's Matsu and Quemoy. I want to get back to Germany and Japan, and all you guys want to talk about is Foster's folly.

Question. May I change the subject?

Answer. You sure may.

ENTER MARSHAL ZHUKOV

Question. On this correspondence you have been having with Marshal Zhukov, isn't it dangerous these days to have a pen-pal in the Soviet Union?

Answer. You mean politically dangerous?

Question. Yes, sir.

Answer. You mean that if I keep on writing to Zhukov, I may get into trouble with the Republican party?

Question. Yes, sir.

Answer. And if I get into trouble with the Republican party for trying to make peace with the Russians, the party might not be so eager to have me run again next year?

Question. I was going to say——.

The President; Oh, Jim; oh, Haggerty, take a letter.

Power Politics in Our Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, high in the Cascade Mountains where the weather and climate of Washington State is cut in two is Cloudy Pass. Trying to count the distant and surrounding snow-clad peaks from this lofty ridge of rock, someone once counted to 10,000—and then gave up. The beauty of this spot is surpassing. Standing here once, a woman, with eyes uplifted said, "Thank you, God."

There was more than the beauty of nature to thank God for, although she did not think of other blessings, because

our greatest resource in the Pacific Northwest is not scenery, priceless as that is—it is water. In the mountains, the moisture of the sky is gathered and harbored on high, and as the snows melt, by rivulet, lake, and stream, the water descends endlessly and irresistibly to the sea. Thus, our great resource of power—the force that gives our region the cheapest and greatest potential waterpower in the Nation.

In the Pacific Northwest, people and politician alike, say, "Thank you, God," for their natural resource of water—not only for its potential for needed cheap hydroelectric power, but also because nearly a million acres of arid soil, rich in minerals, lie here awaiting water by irrigation to transform a dry desert into a paradise of food-producing farms.

This makes for a complementary economy; the cheap power means industrialization and more jobs; the reclamation and agricultural development mean an outlet and prospective purchasers for the products of industrialization; and the workers in the factories mean more consumers for the farmers' produce.

Out in the Pacific Northwest, the people are united when it comes to the immediate and pressing need of further developing their resource of water. Strangely enough, of all the areas of the United States, we are the most power starved; yet we have the greatest potential. It is somewhat analogous to the Nile delta in Egypt where the poorest people in the world live on the richest soil. Our problem is that it takes 5 or 6 years after construction of a project is commenced before we will begin to get needed power. Normal population growth means our power shortage will become increasingly acute by 1960, so we must get a major power project started at once.

Aware of the growing reluctance of the Congress for the Federal Government to assume the huge financial investment of the Pacific Northwest power projects, President Eisenhower proposed a partnership program where local interests would pay for power-generating facilities while the Federal Government would contribute toward flood control, navigation, and other improvements properly coming under its realm of responsibility. I think it is fair to state this plan met with widespread approval. Of course, those who wish to see a Federal power monopoly did not approve. These socialistic and bureaucratic-minded individuals were not left to their own devices and desires. An unholy alliance was immediately effected with the keepaways, those secret obstructionists who would sacrifice the needs of this great region on the altar of their own political advantage. Thus, there does exist a small but vocal bloc who would hope to generate votes in 1956 rather than kilowatts because a failure now to carry out the President's program would allow them to scream that this is a do-nothing administration.

To tie in with the partnership program, the 83d Congress deauthorized the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River to allow local interests to proceed under this plan. Our distinguished and able colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] is entitled to great credit for this legislation to meet the impending power shortage, and I am happy to say there would seem to be reasonable expectation that the Grant County Public Utility Department in Washington State will successfully resolve the financing and problems incident to starting such a project.

However, partnership is not the only answer. We have certain multipurpose dam sites which require Federal financing and construction. Here the vast Federal appropriations involved constitute a serious barrier which has seemed almost unsurmountable because the projects are needed now. Defense is a huge drain on the Federal Treasury and the tax burden has been so heavy that it is difficult to get support for appropriations which would have such an effect on the budget.

Our colleague from Oregon [Mr. COON] has introduced H. R. 5789 calling for construction of the multipurpose John Day Dam on the Columbia River. He has recognized the need—that a new start must be made now. The gentleman from Oregon has also recognized fiscal responsibility and the budget situation. In his measure he provides, therefore, that local groups put up the money for the Federal Government. So while the dam would be owned, built, and operated by the Federal Government, like other multipurpose projects, the money to build the generating facilities would be advanced by local groups, as advance payments for the power they will receive when the construction is completed. Thus the Federal budget is not increased; nor are the taxpayers in other areas putting up money for the Pacific Northwest.

Hearings on H. R. 5789, I understand, will be held soon. There are many details which will have to be spelled out. No doubt there will be some areas for dispute as between private, municipal, and local, publically owned distributors of electric power. But in general the people of the Pacific Northwest will wholeheartedly support this measure which may well contain the solution to their future. It may be the difference between economic salvation or ruin in the area. If this bill passes, the citizen can raise his eyes unto the hills and reverently and prayerfully say, "Thank you, God."

Of course some political sour grapesters will wrathfully oppose this legislation, for surely it precludes the issue in 1956 of do-nothing. The slogan of such obstructionists might well be "Power politics is our politics."

I strongly urge consideration of H. R. 5789.

Israel's Seventh Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by His Excellency Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel to the United States, delivered at the second national dinner of the American-Israel Society in observance of Israel Independence Day on April 26, 1955, at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D. C., the seventh anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel, a democratic nation at the crossroads of the world. The excellent message presents the development of Israel, and its position in the world today. I wish to join in commending Israel upon the seventh anniversary of its creation as a state.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY ABBA EBAN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED STATES, AT THE SECOND NATIONAL DINNER OF THE AMERICA-ISRAEL SOCIETY, IN OBSERVANCE OF ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY, AT THE WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 26, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, once more, at the appointed season, Israel pauses from its daily toil to recollect the splendid annals of its birth.

The fabric of our people's history is rich with enduring memories, both somber and triumphant, stretching out across the broadest tapestries of space and time. Many of Israel's anniversaries have defied the natural forces of oblivion. Generations succeed each other; empires rise and fall; new horizons of opportunity and danger, beyond the imagination of previous ages, arise before the startled vision of mankind. And year by year the descendants of ancient Israel, playing no mean part in all these tumultuous modern changes, continue to preserve the temporal landmarks of their ancient saga. Unfailingly, we celebrate the wanderings and arrivals, the victories and disasters, the revelations and martyrdoms, the harvests and scarcities which formed the experience of those who dwelt in Israel 3 millenia ago.

So deep has been the impact of Israel's experience on the life of other peoples that this intimate national history has entered the spiritual legacy of all mankind.

It is, therefore, a matter of awe and reverence to recall, that we in this decade have added to the list of Israel's festivals a celebration as sublime as any in the record of ages past. For those who assembled to proclaim Israel's new birth of freedom in the Museum Hall on the fifth day of Iyar 7 years ago created a moment of imperishable fame. They restored a nation to its full identity. They reunited a land with the only people whose history, culture, and faith had been cradled in its soil. They consoled the entire house of Israel in its hour of unfathomable grief. They gave shelter of the body and sanctuary of the spirit to the Jewish people, which alone amongst the nations had lacked these essential attributes of a free creative life. The tenacious dream whereby our scattered tribes had preserved their union and identity through the centuries of dispersion had, at long last, completed its cycle of fulfillment.

No wonder that the proclamation of Israel's independence rang out that morning across the ancient valleys in accents of thankfulness and triumph. Nothing since the flight across the Red Sea and Sinai 4,000 years ago can compare in Jewish history with this sudden leap from the blood-soaked agonies of Europe to the pride and exaltation of Israel's sovereignty. The complex symphony of Jewish history had moved to a genuine point of crescendo, with mingled undertones of tragedy and grandeur.

Those who set their hands to our Declaration of Independence were writing history in its highest terms. The world beyond our shores recognized itself as standing in the presence of an unusually majestic event.

Great multitudes in every land owe that which is most precious in their moral lives to the insights and conclusions achieved by the people of Israel in Israel's land through the Hebrew language in the previous epochs of our Nation's history. How could they fail to be exalted by the prospect that the people, land, and language from whose interaction that revelation had emerged would now be restored to their original union? It was true that the Hebrew mind had continued its creative course after the downfall of the Jewish Kingdom. It would be unduly restrictive to measure its achievements exclusively in terms of Israel's life as a nation on its own soil. But the fact remains that it was as an independent nation in the land of Israel that this people rose to peaks of creativeness which it never subsequently attained in conditions of exile and dispersion. Israel's rebirth had created, not indeed the certainty, but at least the opportunity of another memorable stage, in human progress.

Seen in this light the smallness of our State in territory, population and resources became enlarged in the consciousness of men by its broad vistas of historic memory.

But there were other issues closer to the ordinary eye, which went far to explain the special emotion of that hour. So many of the impulses which stir a generous heart were concentrated within the single fact of Israel's nationhood. This was an act of rescue in the truest and most personal sense; it brought a message of redemption for hundreds of thousands of our kinsmen from the abyss of degradation into the dignity of citizenship, labor, and pride of soil. It was also an act of justice. What kind of morality would have marked an international order which inaugurated the freedom of so many nations, while denying the independence of a homeland only to that people which had suffered the most fearful torments under the tyrant's heel? As the nations gathered after the Second World War to write the blueprint of a new world order, they came perilously close to this exclusion. The moral distortion would have been especially grotesque if a small domain of freedom had been begrudged us in the Middle East in which the neighboring Arab people was to inherit sovereign opportunities on an almost imperial scale.

Moreover, this was not merely a benefit conferred upon a people, it was an act of healing to a parched and neglected land, which would now throw off the squalor of centuries and renew its ancient fertility and grace.

The conscience of mankind which had been intimately engaged in the torments of this people and the devastation of this land could not now be indifferent to their reunion. And if anything was needed to enrich the inner drama of the occasion, it was to be found in the slender precarious thread on which the issue hung. Here was a moment distilled out of the hopes and longings of 2,000 years; but no sooner was it achieved than destruction threatened it. Israel came into the world after endless travail, only to feel hostile fingers clutching at its throat. There was a deadly danger that this newborn State so long awaited, would be extinguished with its very first breath of life; and that historians would look back upon that moment as a transient climax to be succeeded by a deep and endless darkness. Few of us will ever forget how at Israel's birth our rejoicing was mingled with a cold stark apprehension, as we saw our embattled, ill-armed forces fighting against invasion from north, and south, and east, with their backs against the sea, which then, as now, was Israel's only salvation from encirclement.

Seven years have passed since then. They have seen sorrows as well as triumphs, frustrations as well as hopes. But as we meet again to pass our fortunes under scrutiny and review, we have no feeling that the brave ambitions of that summer morning have played us false. Seven years ago the prospect of an Israel stable, self-reliant, democratic, progressive, strong was an article of mystic faith. It is now a matter of proven certainty. The permanent advances have enormously outstripped the temporary retreats. In the total balance of these 7 years, the scale is weighted with crushing decisiveness on the side of victory and success. There are breaches in the citadel, dangers to be warded off, imperfections to be repaired, unfinished tasks to be accomplished. But how can any man in his true senses let these anxieties produce a general verdict of doubt or dejection about the ultimate issues of Israel's survival or consolidation.

There is no aspect of Israel's national life which does not reveal an impressive momentum of consolidation. The signatories of our Declaration of Independence represented a Jewish community of 650,000, little more than the bare nucleus of a sovereign community. There are now 1,700,000 citizens of Israel. Month by month they advance toward greater social and cultural unity, establishing a cohesive national personality above the manifold divergencies of their previous abodes. Each year our population rises by 30,000 by natural increase, and the tide of immigration has resumed its flow.

No less expressive than the expansion of population has been the transformation of the land. The cultivated area has been doubled, the irrigated area increased threefold. Four hundred new rural settlements have added their fields and homes to Israel's landscape within the 7 years. It is true that great stretches of our country still lie desolate, a constant challenge to our unexhausted pioneering task. But the swift agrarian progress of these 7 years has already restored to Israel a semblance of its natural abiding grace. The reproach of neglect and erosion will soon be buried beneath broad fields and bountiful forests.

It was only in the third year of our independence that a steady pace of industrial development could be instituted and sustained. Within 4 years the national income has increased by 60 percent. The march towards a solvent economy is most vividly illustrated by the expansion of Israel's export trade which has more than doubled its earnings within the past 2 years. There is little doubt that in the current year our export revenue will cross the $100 million mark, while earnings from invisible exports and tourism will also leap beyond the $29 million earned by these services a year ago. Indeed, this month the unexampled pilgrimage from many lands, in numbers greater than in any previous year, has sustained our country both in its treasury and in its morale—and there are some who see these two points of consolation as in some degree interconnected. Since we met for Israel's anniversary celebration a year ago, markets for Israel exports have been established in 16 new countries. The adverse balance of trade is still acute, but the gap between our requirements and our earnings grows steadily narrower year by year. We enter the eighth year of independence with a merchant fleet of 137,000 tons bearing produce across the oceans under Israel's maritime flag; while 40,000 travelers annually cross the skies on Israel aircraft. We have not begun to see the full perspectives of our economic increase. The past year has seen further progress in the quantity and variety of Israel's mineral resources, which have made the Negev area the most hopeful area of Israel's future potentiality.

There are other evidences of progress which have no physical standards of measurement—intangible but potent symptoms of maturity and strength. Our democratic institutions have stood the test of heavy ordeals.

In a world where the democratic idea faces such comprehensive challenge, the advocates of free government may well draw courage from the manifold and intricate problems which our parliamentary institutions have proved able to sustain. Our people has not lost the genius for sharp disagreement which has distinguished it for thousands of years. But these are always overcome in times of peril, and the unity of our public mind on the main issues of Israel's destiny is all the more impressive because it is voluntarily achieved. Israel's democracy continues to have the special significance which belongs to a solitary example. This summer the peoples of the Middle East, dwelling in the shadow of absolute monarchies, feudal regimes, and the new military dictatorships, may well find serious cause for reflection and emulation in the spectacle of Israel's population asserting their sovereignty through the ballot box. There are few places in our subcontinent where the individual citizen is the undoubted master of his government and the arbiter of his laws.

On this occasion a year ago I suggested that Israel would vindicate the high hopes and vast sacrifices invested in its birth in the measure that it rose to serious levels of performance in the mind and spirit. The past 12 months have seen this aspect of our national life more vigorously emphasized than ever before. New discoveries and acquisitions in archeological research have reminded our people of their roots in the ancient Hebrew past, and strengthened the hallowed associations evoked by the Hebrew language and by the physical associations and environments in which our people live. In many spheres of scientific progress, including those which open the broadest vistas of new abundance and expending power, Israel's scholars and institutions have won a modest but highly cherished international renown. A certain cultural dynamism finds physical expression in the establishment this year of new and more spacious abodes for all our higher institutions of health and learning. The new edifices of the Hebrew University begin to rise on the hills overlooking Jerusalem from the west. The Hadassah University medical center advances towards completion on that very site. The Institute of Technology has burst out of its original walls at Haifa into new buildings housing its five new departments of science, industrial chemistry, architecture, aeronautics and agricultural engineering. The Weizmann Institute at Rehovot has now established its department of nuclear physics, and advanced the high repute which our first president won for Israel in the scientific world.

May I suggest that the experience of the Jewish people in religion and in science are really part of a single harmony. Along the entire journey from Hebrew prophecy to relativity, the central theme has been the belief that the universe and nature are not a wild chaos of unreasoning arbitrary forces, but a pattern of order and progress, guided by an articulate and perceptive system of law. That is the whole difference between Hebraism and superstition. To proclaim this truth has been the mission of Israel's people and Israel's land. We stand with one foot planted on the soil of Hebrew revelation, the other standing firmly in the world of modern technology, overshadowed by the awesome challenge of the atomic age. It is all very well to say that we are a small people. But the great truths are facts of history, not of geography, and it is a fact of history that Israel is the only people whose continuous historic memory comprehends the full cycle from ancient revelation to modern science. Even our geo-

graphic position gives us a vantage point of universality.

Just as we are a bridge between generations so are we a crossroads between continents. Europe, Asia and Africa all lie a few miles from our doorstep. The destiny of each has an impact on our future. Other continents remote in space are brought nearer by links of affinity, sentiment, and mutual aid. America is 6,000 miles from Israel on the map; yet we are united to this hemisphere by intimate relations of friendship with all its countries from north to south; by the kinship which joins us with those who share our Jewish tradition and faith; and not least by the fraternal solidarity which this society has been born to reinforce—I mean the abiding friendship between the United States and Israel as partners in world freedom, and in their aspiration for a peaceful and progressive Middle East.

Israel's international position of which American friendship is a cornerstone is not accurately described by the theory of isolation. Coming to birth against strong hostilities launched against its very sovereignty, Israel has within 7 years achieved ties of mutual recognition with 62 countries, in 48 of which Israel is represented, and 38 of which maintain diplomatic and consular missions in Israel, to promote as well as to symbolize their friendship with us in diplomatic, commercial, economic and cultural relations. Beyond this system of our direct relations stands our membership in the collective world community, in the United Nations and all its specialized agencies dedicated to the vision of a universal community of sovereign States. Against this strongly established integration into modern international life, the fact that there was no such thing as Israel in the jurisprudence of nations a mere 90 months ago seems almost beyond belief. The mark of eccentricity in international life is not to recognize Israel and live in friendship with her. It is the refusal to establish such relations which stands out as the deviation from any normal standards. It is with sadness that I must recall the lack of progress in the disposition of our neighbors to seek peace with us. We have proved our capacity to flourish, if so we must, amidst regional hostility. But this is not our choice. Let us never cease to reassert our will to see our region healed from the plagues of rancor and hostility. The Arab world, in its nine sovereignties extending over a continental expense, can well afford to renounce a useless grudge against a kindred people pursuing its peaceful quest within its lawful domain. How sombre it is to see the Middle East, which by every circumstance of tradition, should lead all humanity in the cause of universal peace, mutilating its own countenance by hatreds, boycotts, blockades and frontier incursions which contribute nothing to the welfare of either people and hang as a weary burden upon the shoulders of a distracted world.

In proclaiming our independence we made no contract with history to solve all our problems in the first 7 years. There is still much to challenge our resourcefulness and faith in the remaining part of this decade. High amongst these objectives stands the cause of Arab-Israel peace. This will come when other nations in our region acknowledge the permanence, the stability and the integrity of Israel, just as we are prepared to hold their permanence, their stability and their integrity in profound and comprehensive respect. We need no mysterious or original formulas for Arab-Israel peace. They and we are signatories of a Charter which obliges us to recognize and respect each other's independence and integrity and harmonize our efforts for the commonweal. The State of Israel precisely as constituted and composed when it entered the United Nations on May 11, 1949, in the precise situation and degree of sovereignty and territorial status wherewith we were accepted, this State of Israel is entitled in the strictest moral and juridical sense, to claim the respect and recognition of the other 59 members of that universal treaty system. The problem is not to find new principles of cooperation for Israel and the Arab States, but rather to assimilate their relationship to the general system of international relations which should prevail everywhere and does prevail in most continents of the world. The independent countries of our continent, most of which only achieved their national freedom in the same decade as we, might well learn and proclaim that men and nations are not at their best when they deny to others the privileges which they loudy claim for themselves. The network of our political and commercial relations now has its outposts in Asia and Africa. The wall dividing us from the destiny of Asia is bound to crumble; and indeed the first promising gaps are already emerging to the view.

As we enter into our eighth year of hopeful struggle, we fix our gaze upon the unique partnership which holds the main promise of Israel's future. The friendship between Israel and American needs vigilant custodians. This friendship is too strong and broadly based to founder upon the rock of any single divergence of interest or judgment.

If our relations were at all times to reflect the various ideals and purposes which we hold in common, there would be no threat to their essential vigor. We hold in common high visions of freedom for individuals and for nations; trust in the inherently affirmative character of human enterprise; devotion to ancient moral precepts which have stood the test of generations; respect for the healing attributes of modern technology and science; faith in democracy as the highest expression of man's social character; a belief that the tolerant harmony of diverse backgrounds, experiences, and creeds may be the avenue to a truly creative culture; warm intimate memories very recent to us, and not too remote for you, of years when pioneer immigrants blazed their trail across many perils toward national identity and strength. In every part of your republic, in its towns and villages, its churches and universities, its State legislatures and public forums, its great media of free opinion and in its departments of central government, I have perceived, and endeavored to transmit, something of the profound sympathy which Israel's cause evokes in the American heart. Similarly in Israel it is to America that myriads of eyes are turned in affection and fraternity, confident that here for the first time in the history of power may be found a union between great strength and deep humility.

The issues on which we are now in counsel are of vital import to the world community. They effect the liberation of our region's natural energies for power and irrigation by just principles of use and distribution; and the urgent need to remove any semblance of preferential treatment in the approach to problems of security and reinforcement. Clearly, if these immediate questions are resolved between us, we shall meet again 12 months from now and celebrate another mighty progress toward a peaceful and stable Middle East.

This society has done much to assert the enduring values which bind us together and determine our destiny of cooperation. I bring my Government's cordial gratitude.

For century after century the mind of the Jewish people, formed and nurtured in Israel, has revolved around the great issues of human destiny and pogress. To the challenge of those issues we now set our gaze as we move with confident stride toward our future. We do so with grateful recollection of the faith, the courage, and the power of decision which we revealed within ourselves 7 years ago this day. To the thousands who fell upon the altar of our freedom we pledge ourselves in an enduring covenant of remembrance. The rich harvest of these 7 years is their monument and our incentive. The fields that we have plowed, the trees that we have planted, the homes that we have established, the fugitives whom we have gathered in, the varied merchandise that we have garnered and created, the ships that we have launched and sailed, the Hebrew life and letters that we have fostered, the enterprise of science and learning that we have promoted, the laws that we have enacted, the friendships that we have exchanged with other peoples, the counsel that we have brought to international causes, the Jewish pride that we have everywhere engendered, the waste places that we have inhabited—all this forms the panorama of our independence celebration. Looking upon this parade of achievement with grateful glance, we move with pride and strength from the contemplation of our greatest yesterday toward the toil and challenge of our everlasting future.

Excerpts From Addresses by Governor Harriman, of New York, on United States Far Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, among the courageous voices which have been publicly heard in recent weeks on the question of our Far Eastern policy is that of the distinguished Governor of my State, Averell Harriman.

All except a few of us here in the Senate were silent in the face of the catastrophic implications of the administration's policy in the Formosa Straits. That policy seems to have been sharply modified in the past fortnight—largely as a consequence of the mobilization of public opinion against that policy. One of the courageous public figures who helped mobilize that public opinion was Gov. Averell Harriman.

Governor Harriman is in Washington this week, attending the Governors conference. I am happy to call the attention of the Senate to speeches on this subject which Governor Harriman made, one as long ago as March 8. I ask unanimous consent that appropriate excerpts from a speech Governor Harriman made on March 8, in New York City, before the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with similar excerpts from a speech he delivered on April 3, at the inaugural dinner of the joint defense appeal, also in New York City.

Governor Harriman's views command public interest and attention because he is not only chief executive of the largest State in the Union, but he is also a man who speaks with consummate authority on foreign affairs. He was, as everyone knows, one of the principal architects

of our foreign policy and one of the principal leaders of that policy for more than a decade. When he comments on our foreign policy, he speaks from a background of knowledge and experience which few individuals in America can match.

New York State is fortunate to have him as governor; and in these difficult times the Nation is fortunate to have the counsel of his authoritative voice on matters of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE DINNER OF THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, MARCH 8, 1955

* * * * * * *

You who are here tonight have an especially deep and personal understanding of the need for the United States to take its proper place of leadership in the world.

No nation can go it alone—not even powerful America.

From a military standpoint, we cannot.

From an economic standpoint, we cannot.

* * * * * * *

Last November, Secretary Dulles and Mr. Stassen were talking about what was called a bold, new economic program for Asia. Although late, this made sense. Under President Truman's point 4 progrgam, we had learned much about these countries and what can be done by America to help people to help themselves—in developing resources and raising living standards and productivity and morale.

In this proposal, the Administration seemed to realize that what is needed to counter the external and internal threat of Communist expansion in Asia is a program bold enough to capture the imagination of the people, and vigorous enough to demonstrate that a decent life can be achieved under freedom. They seemed to understand that the cost to us of such an economic offensive would be a tiny fraction of our expenditures for military defense and military aid. And the effect of our help would be multiplied if cooperative undertakings could be developed among the participating countries as was the case in Europe.

So the talk went on. But the men who appear to have had the last word with the President are those who regard this sort of thing as beyond America's capacity—or not worth bothering about. So the idea was laid aside. Great had been the expectations—and equally great was the letdown throughout free Asia.

In this connection, it is significant that a conference of most of the Asian and African nations has been called to convene in Bandoeng, Indonesia, next month. Red China has been invited to participate—whereas Chiang Kai-shek is excluded. We can be sure that the Communists will try to turn the whole meeting into a "hate America" crusade.

Compounding the effects in Asia of all the lack of understanding has been the incredible story of the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek.

You recall that President Truman, in 1950, ordered the 7th Fleet to neutralize the Formosa Strait—preventing attacks upon Formosa by the Communists and forbidding attacks upon the mainland by Chiang. And you remember how President Eisenhower, in his first message to Congress, reversed all that.

I doubt that anyone would now deny that behind this "unleashing" episode was domestic politics and appeasement of members of his own party.

Yet to the rest of the world it sounded ominous. To the rest of the world, it could only mean that we intended to support Chiang's ambition to return to the mainland; and that, in turn, could only mean world war.

The "unleashing" episode, and the continuing failure to explain or retract it, injured our relations with our European allies—who were quite understandably not ready for such recklessness. And it soured our relations with many countries in Asia.

Last week, Chiang Kai-shek was still asserting that he intended to return to the mainland, with the help of this country. Asked about this, the President finally said "the United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war." In effect, after 25 months, Chiang was to be leashed again.

The President appears to have realized at long last the wisdom of President Truman's policy of neutralizing the Formosa Strait.

Of course, we should and will defend Formosa. There has never been any doubt about that. But it should also be clear that there is no future in any Asian policy which pays more atention to the objectives of Chiang Kai-shek than to the aspirations of the 900 million people of the other free countries of the East—as well as the peoples of Europe.

I am sure of this: The first thing we must do in the Formosa area is to end our desperately dangerous policy of going it alone. Whenever we take positions alone, it offers a temptation to the Comunists to take risks in the hope of furthering their basic objective of splitting us from our North Atlantic allies, and our friends everywhere. We must get our diplomacy back on a basis of collective action. We must internationalize the defense of Formosa, and do this, if possible, through the United Nations.

What we need now is a new spirit in the conduct of foreign affairs—a spirit of humility, of moderation, of partnership, and of peace—a spirit which would ring with a new sound in the ears of the world, but which would gain its strength because it would be a reaffirmation of the finest strains of American realism and idealism—of the values which made our Nation so long the refuge of the suffering people of mankind and the embodiment of the hopes of freedom and justice in the light of God, everywhere in the world.

Only as we return to this spirit can we hope to lead.

Only as we return to this spirit can we hope to survive.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE INAUGURAL DINNER OF THE JOINT DEFENSE APPEAL, WALDORF ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 3, 1955

* * * * * * *

What we are saying applies to world affairs in the same way. In the free world, just as at home, there can be no true strength without unity. And unity in turn depends on a mutual respect and equality of status among peoples of all races and creeds. Prejudice and claims of inherent superiority have no more place in international life than in domestic life.

I submit that we are in danger of losing the whole cold war if we fail to recognize this principle and make it live.

Every time an American rattles the atomic saber in Asia, every time an American talks about Asians fighting Asians, we lose friends among the uncommitted peoples.

Perhaps most tragic of all, for months now our policy in regard to the Formosa Strait has failed to take into account the sensibilities of either our Asian or our European friends and allies. Unhappily, there are those who have put our country in the position of appearing not to care for the judgment of those whom we would have as our friends. This is basically, I am afraid, an expression of that intolerance which we are seeking to stamp out in our domestic life and everywhere.

Surely there is yet time to bring together all of the countries involved—not only in the East but in Europe—in order to internationalize the defense of Formosa, so vital to our own and free world security. The whole world is a party at interest—and it has been not only illogical but deadly dangerous to arrogate to ourselves the sole responsibility for decisions which involve the future of many peoples.

It is a great enterprise in which we are engaged—that of making America and the world more tolerant and happier and stronger. There have been temporary setbacks, and there will be more. But over the years there have been even greater advances, and there will be more. The setbacks serve to make us realize how precious are our liberties, and to stimulate us to work harder for their protection. As long as we are in there doing battle, in good spirits and with confidence, I shall not doubt the outcomes.

For I have infinite faith in the triumph of true brotherhood, not only in this great country of ours, but—with our inspiration and our patient and steadfast leadership—throughout the world.

Secretary Benson's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Secretary Benson's Dilemma," from the Farmers Union Herald, of April 18, published in St. Paul, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BENSON'S DILEMMA

Out of the maze of speeches, testimony, and actions, contributed by Mr. Benson in his short reign as chief agriculturist is a pattern, or theory, of prosperity, unique in American history.

Mr. Benson, as the great engineer of the sliding scale of price supports, has consistently forced farm prices into lower levels. Together with this, he has gone the limit of the law in forcing cutbacks in production. With both lower prices and decreased production, Mr. Benson has sought to cut American farm income under an illusion that what goes down must come up again sometime.

Now, when the come-up is so far in the distance even Mr. Benson has lost sight of it, he assays another goal as part of his theory of prosperity.

Just a few days ago he told Congress that, although farm income is slipping, farm population also is diminishing. Thus, he said, even with less pie, each farmer who's left on the land will have a bigger slice.

Obviously, Mr. Benson thinks farming is like automobile manufacturing. Going broke or fearing they may go broke has driven many from that field. There are only a few left and each is making more profit than ever.

That may be well and good; we will not argue the point. But, when you apply the theory to the entire economy, there are some major defects. Under such a doctrine of monopoly, doctors can and do argue there should be fewer doctors so that the few could make more. Lawyers could want the same. So could druggists, hardware mer-

chants, barbers, office workers, factory hands, and everyone else. Who wants most wants competition least.

Now don't laugh. But the problem Mr. Benson seems to face is too many people and not enough of the good things of life to go round.

Will someone kindly tell Mr. Benson he's not the first to be puzzled about that problem. But please tell him also that eliminating people as the solution is not in the best taste. People just don't like to be eliminated.

The real problem, economists say, is how to parcel out more evenly the good things of life to all the people.

Senator George: Preeminent Senator of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. DUFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON
(By Roscoe Drummond)
PREEMINENT SENATOR OF 1955

Who would you say is the preeminent figure in the United States Congress today?

Would it be Representative SAM RAYBURN, the shrewd, respected Speaker of the House? Or Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the able, malleable leader of the Democratic majority? Or Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, the earnest, lone-wolf Senate Republican leader who sometimes speaks for the administration?

If you name any of these you will at least be going against the majority judgment of the Washington press corps.

Their almost unanimous judgment today is that the single most powerful, most influential person in the whole legislative branch of the Government is Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, the veteran Georgia Democrat, who accepted the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to President Eisenhower's great satisfaction.

Senator GEORGE is today proving himself to be a more positive force than any of the other preeminent Senators of the last quarter century.

He is far more powerful constructively, say, than Senator William Borah, who was largely a negativist, and who in his implacable isolationism stood astride the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when the United States was trying to free itself from a policy of neutrality as Hitler began to topple Europe and strike at the shores of Britain.

He is more influential than Senator Arthur Vandenberg whose great influence centered principally in foreign affairs.

He seems to me to be more influential than even Senator Robert Taft, whose interest and talents were mostly focused upon domestic legislation, and whose influence did not cut as widely across party lines as does Senator GEORGE'S.

This Congress is hardly 4 months old and Senator GEORGE has personally put his imprint on the mood and substance of the largest and most significant congressional actions.

I think it no exaggeration to report that today the quiet, poised, deep-voiced Senator GEORGE is the second most powerful and most influential man in Washington—second only to the President himself.

When this session of Congress began last January, Mr. GEORGE was the ranking Democratic member of both the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He could be chairman of either one. He chose Foreign Relations because his primary interest was foreign policy, and because he knew that the Senate's greatest decisions would almost inevitably be in the field of foreign policy.

He chose the Foreign Relations chairmanship knowing that President Eisenhower had privately expressed the hope that he would do so. He knew that they could and would work together well. He knew that it would be important—important for the country—for him to help create the climate which would give the President the maximum freedom and flexibility of action to take steps which might run counter to short-run public opinion.

He is accomplishing this objective decisively, sometimes against considerable odds.

By his own quiet authority, by his detachment and by his leadership, he has erected a strong barricade around the bipartisan conduct of foreign policy—a barricade against both Democratic attacks and Republican attacks.

Mr. GEORGE helped put through the Senate the President's fight-if-we-must Formosa resolution with only three votes in opposition—two from Democrats; this at a time when many of his Democratic colleagues were looking hungrily at this issue as a means of belaboring the Administration and when, without his restraining influence, many Democrats might have leaped off the reservation.

He deliberately stepped out ahead of the President to break ground in favor of a Big Four conference at the summit at a time when Mr. Eisenhower needed to have public opinion responsive to a Big Four meeting he couldn't avoid if he wanted to.

While the White House was being indecisive, he spoke out instantly in favor of accepting Chou En-lai's offer of direct negotiations over Formosa, and undoubtedly influenced the administration's policy.

In domestic legislation, it is probable that no single Senator was as influential in helping the President defeat the quickie, premature $20-of-everybody tax cut as Mr. GEORGE.

This is some of the evidence that WALTER F. GEORGE is more powerful than any other Democratic or Republican Senator today.

Position of New York State Bar Association on the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the committee on international law, of the New York State Bar Association, has submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee a statement outlining its views on the Bricker amendment, now pending before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The statement was prepared by Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, on behalf of the New York State Bar Association. Mr. Linowitz is also New York State chairman of the American Association for the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent that his excellent statement of the bar association's position on the Bricker amendment be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING BRICKER AMENDMENT
(By Sol M. Linowitz)

I am against the Bricker amendment. I am against it because I have too much respect for the Constitution, too much faith in those who established this form of government, too much confidence in the intelligence and integrity of those who lead this Nation to believe that this kind of tinkering with the Constitution is either necessary or desirable at this critical hour of world history.

This does not mean that I am opposed to all of the things Senator BRICKER and his supporters say they want to accomplish by means of the proposed amendment.

Thus, throughout the discussion there has been constant reiteration of the argument that the Bricker amendment is primarily designed to assure that no treaty or other international agreement which contravenes the Constitution shall have force of effect. The simple fact is, however, that if that were really the major issue, then there would be no great quarrel and the only significant question would be one of procedure rather than substance. For proponents and opponents of the amendment alike entirely agree that the Constitution should be supreme with respect to treaties or any other international agreements. And those of us who oppose a constitutional amendment to that precise effect do so only because we are convinced that this is already the established law under the Supreme Court decisions and that modifying the Constitution so to provide is neither necessary nor appropriate.

What is far more disturbing about the Bricker amendment, however, is that it would, if adopted, go far beyond any such presently professed objective and would in fact seriously hamper the conduct of American foreign policy and impose substantial restraints on all of our international dealings.

As reintroduced in the Senate on January 6, 1955, the Bricker amendment proposes several farreaching constitutional changes, most of them now quite familiar. The one about which most of the discussion again revolves is article 2 which would require an act of Congress in order to make a treaty or executive agreement effective internally. This is the famous so-called "which" clause back again but this time without the word "which."

As has been pointed out, this kind of a provision requiring legislation for any international agreement with internal effect would necessarily mean that a treaty or other international agreement could not become operative internally until five separate acts of approval had occurred: (1) Presidential signature of the agreement; (2) ratification of the agreement by two-thirds of the Senate; (3) passage of a confirming law by a majority of the Senate; (4) passage of a confirming law by a majority of the House of Representatives; and (5) signature of the law by the President. Treaties of friendship, commerce, navigation, international air travel, reciprocal rights of aliens here and American citizens abroad, and countless other types could not go into effect until this five-step mandatory procedure—going far beyond anything required by any other country in the world—had taken place. It is interesting that precisely such a constitutional

provision was proposed by Gouverneur Morris at the Constitutional Convention in 1787 and overwhelmingly defeated because of the practical difficulties which would be involved.

Why then, we may ask, is there 166 years later a need for the very proposal rejected at Philadelphia? Does our experience since then indicate that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention were wrong and that Senator BRICKER and his present adherents are right?

The answer we frequently hear these days is that there is presently an urgent need for this kind of constitutional amendment because of our tragic experience at Yalta and because the United Nations may take action which would impair or suspend our personal and civil rights in this country. I submit that neither of these contentions bears scrutiny. In the first place, the simple and undeniable fact is that the Yalta agreement would not have been affected in the slightest degree even if the Bricker amendment had been part of the Constitution at the time the agreement was made. By its very terms article 2 of the amendment would apply only to treaties or other international agreements which are to become effective as internal law and nothing in the Yalta agreement purported to be of an internally operative nature.

As to the assertion with respect to the effect of United Nations action internally, not only is this prohibited by the U. N. Charter terms, but the danger is admittedly predicated solely on a wholly speculative and subjunctive possibility sometime in the future.

In other words, the Bricker supporters do not establish that United Nations action has in fact ever resulted in the deprivation of our rights; they contend rather that a situation might arise in the future in which the United Nations might take such action and that this action might be approved by the President and two-thirds of the Senate. As Prof. Zechariah Chafee of Harvard Law School has reminded us, never before in our history have we found it necessary to adopt a constitutional amendment predicated solely on a conjectural danger. Every amendment to the Constitution came into being to meet an existing problem or to eliminate an existing evil. Why, then, is there such urgent demand for the Bricker amendment now? Why should we take it for granted that the President and the Senate will in the future do what they never have done in the past—approve a treaty or other agreement to which the Bricker adherents could point as bad enough to justify a constitutional amendment? Why should we now, when American leadership in world affairs is most important, lose confidence in the judgment of our own leaders?

The fact is, of course, that Senator BRICKER and his friends are proceeding on the basis of two fundamental assumptions. One is that the safeguards against unwise treaties set up by the Constitutional Convention and deemed adequate since then will no longer be sufficient to protect us. The other is that the President and the Senate cannot be trusted in the future to refuse to approve any treaty or other international agreement which might in fact invade the rights of any Americans, interfere with due process of law, encroach upon our domestic laws, or change in any respect our form of government. I am unwilling to accept either of those assumptions. I am unwilling to sell short our long-established constitutional procedures and our present and future leaders by showing less faith in them than was shown in us.

Beyond all this, I wonder whether there is not something else of deep but overlooked significance implicit in the Bricker amendment: That the President and two-thirds of the Senate who (according to the Bricker view) cannot in the first instance be trusted to make proper international agreements will for some strange, inexplicable reason be deserving of greater trust and confidence the second time around when precisely the same instrument is presented for approval by a majority of the House and a majority of the same Senate and the signature of the same President. The only logical conclusion from the amendment is that its supporters believe some crucial safeguard will come not from another look by the President and Senate, but because of the additional requirement of approval by a majority of the House of Representatives. If this is so, then it must also follow that what those who support the Bricker amendment really seek is not the realinement or clarification of treaty and international agreement functions as between the President and Congress, but rather the shift of treaty-making authority within the legislative branch of our Government itself. The Bricker amendment would, in effect, give the House of Representatives the right of veto in international agreements over both the President and the Senate. This, I submit, is nothing less than a drastic and revolutionary shake-up of respective responsibilities as between the two Houses of Congress and suggests that the most important effect of the Bricker amendment would be to limit the treaty power and authority of the Senate far more than it would the power and authority of the President. Is that what the Senators who support the amendment really intend?

For 166 years the Constitution has given us a firm basis for a Government with a careful balance of powers. Today, as our responsibilities as a Nation are greater, our confidence in ourselves and our trust in our leaders must be equal to the challenge. It is time we recognized that trying to amend the Constitution out of suspicion, distrust, or fear will not fashion for us a sounder Constitution, a stronger Nation, or a safer tomorrow.

We Live Two Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "We Live Two Lives," which appeared in the April 25, 1955, issue of the Union County Advocate, of Morganfield, Ky. The editorial is as follows:

WE LIVE TWO LIVES

There are 963 weekly newspapers in Canada, with a total circulation of almost 2,500,000. The January issue of a monthly letter issued by the Royal Bank of Canada was devoted entirely to them and their significance. It said: "Singly or taken together these weekly newspapers have a great influence on the thought and action of our people.

"Everyone, in a sense, lives two lives, one in a small and the other in a great circle. He belongs by birth or choice to various intimate groups like his family, his neighborhood, and his cluster of friends. He is also a member of the whole society of Canada, and he is living within an interdependent system of nations. The weekly newspaper belongs to his intimacy."

The same thing is true of the thousands of United States weekly papers and small-city dailies. They are the running record of the community and of the individuals, families, enterprises, and institutions which created, forged, and maintained it.

Love Thy Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, an impressive address was given by the Most Reverend Albert R. Zuroweste, D. D., bishop of Belleville, Ill., at the third International Catholic Rural Life Congress held the week of April 17 at Panama City, Panama.

His Excellency, as chairman of the international congresses committee of the United States National Rural Life Conference, participated in the formal opening on Sunday, April 17, and delivered an address at an assembly of 6,000 persons in the Plaza de la Cathedral, historic site of the proclamation of Panamanian independence.

Because this vital message should be read by everyone in the Congress, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The official opening of our third Catholic Congress on Rural Life took place before the altar of God where we begged God's blessing upon all who will participate in the studies and considerations of the next few days.

In 1951 we inaugurated these congresses on rural problems in the Eternal City with the blessing and encouragement of the Father of Christendom. Our second congress was held in Manizales, Colombia, in 1953, and now it is our privilege to be in Panama for a third congress. This conference has the approval of the ecclestical authorities of 17 countries of the Caribbean area.

Our purpose in holding this congress is to promote the four aims of the International Catholic Rural Life Conference. These aims are listed on your programs. Briefly, we may summarize them by saying that they embrace in a very special manner that second part of God's great commandment of love: "Love thy neighbor as thyself." In this instance our neighbor is the rural dweller and worker, particularly the underprivileged.

We hope to help him spiritually and materially to improve his station in life, to assure him stability and protection of his rights as an individual and give him suggestions for the betterment of his home which is the foundation of all society. We will attempt to offer him opportunity for more leisure time which he might devote to his spiritual welfare and to works of the church. In this program the leadership of sincere, honest, and capable men and women is needed and the spirit of cooperation from the farmer is essential.

We do not come pretending to know all the answers to these problems. We, who are from the United States, hope to learn from you and share with you the results of our experience and experiments. This is to be a cooperative effort based upon Christian principles and the recognition of the fundamental truth that men are made to the image and likeness of God and have an eternal destiny.

The entire program of the Catholic rural life movement has as its objective the teaching and application of Christian ideals in the lives of those who live and work in rural

areas in every country in the world. Naturally it strives to improve social and economic conditions in the home because the home is the foundation of society. In this particular phase of its effort it suggests means of easing the burdens and labors of the wife and mother so that she may have more time to give to the religious training and recreational pursuits of her children. In most countries it has been proved that much of the burdensome daily work of farm life is borne by the woman. It is essential, therefore, in our deliberations, that we formulate plans and methods of improving the status of rural women.

The Catholic Rural Life Conference wishes to emphasize the obligation of non-Communist countries to work together in improving farm methods, animal husbandry, seed and crop development, to foster land and water conservation so that God's good earth will yield a more abundant harvest and thus alleviate the sufferings of mankind. The strong among these non-Communist countries must assist the weak, the weak must cooperate with the strong. The Catholic Rural Life Conference aims at being the beacon light showing the way in proposing plans and programs for increased production, improved social conditions, and elevation of the rural family's status.

Government has an important part in this program and should strive to stimulate in farmers a desire to improve their lot through education, through application of the ability they possess and establish programs of research, education, and assistance which will help them to make better use of their labor and farm resources. Properly organized assistance often would help greatly to develop impoverished people who must do their own work and who find it so difficult to perform tasks which are easily and quickly done by persons better situated. The drudgery of making a living under trying conditions with meager resources and natural inability to complete undertakings easily and well often may be greater than we think. If we do no more than help to lessen this drudgery through early training and to increase the income moderately, we will have done much to help such persons live a comfortable and wholesome life.

In developing the Catholic rural life program it is logical, therefore, for us to seek and welcome the cooperation and assistance of Government. In the United States we urge the Government to use its tremendous productive power to alleviate hunger and distress of people in less fortunate countries. We approve the policy of disposing of surplus farm commodities by selling them to foreign countries at their own currencies.

The technical assistance program finds favor with us because it is indeed the Christian way of contributing to the improvement of living standards of people in other countries. On this point His Holiness Pius XII addressing delegates to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization on December 6, 1953, had this to say: "It is a fact, in spite of recent improvements, that the problem of food remains a crucial one for a large part of mankind." The holy father then summarized the work of the FAO and said:

"The plan, so broad and varied, unquestionably raises uncommon problems. The most delicate, as you have clearly seen, will consist of creating social conditions in which workers to whom you are going to give aid and advice will develop a taste for their work, interest themselves in it and exploit to the maximum the resources procured for them. In fact, it is useless to send out experts to teach new methods and improve mechanical equipment when the human conditions in which a man lives keep him from drawing from his efforts the profit he has a right to expect. Thus to your economic task is added a no less decisive social one."

These words of his holiness are truly applicable to us the sponsors, participants and leaders of the Rural Life Congress. It is not an easy task but it will bear much fruit because it enjoys God's blessing. It demands an intelligent approach, a Christian outlook, a zeal and love for our fellowmen. Each participant must be filled with a holy enthusiasm and be convinced that in this congress he is doing the Master's work. We place our cause in Christ's hands and beseech His virgin mother to be at our side. St. Isidore, our patron and his saintly spouse, Maria de La Cabeza, receive our prayerful petitions in this hour of need.

Seaway, Ships, Trade, Tariff, All Connected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway, Ships, Trade, Tariff Are All Connected," which was published in the Duluth Herald of April 27, 1955. The editorial deals not only with the St. Lawrence seaway, but refers to reciprocal trade agreements. Inasmuch as the reciprocal trade agreements measure, H. R. 1, is the order of business at this time, the editorial is most timely, since it relates to the need for reciprocal trade.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY, SHIPS, TRADE, TARIFF ALL CONNECTED

Three foreign ships, one German, one Dutch, and one Norwegian, docked at Cleveland Sunday. They were the first arrivals from Europe this year. Each is 257 feet 10 inches long, to fit the present locks. All are designed to be lengthened when the seaway is completed, with fewer locks and much longer ones.

Few ordinary commercial events benefit a region more generally than does a new or increased movement of freight into the region and away from it. Imports mean jobs and business. So do exports. We can't expect exports to run far ahead of imports unless we are willing to make up the difference with gifts, under some name or other.

In 21 years, since the beginning of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, our imports have increased remarkably, from $1.707 billion in 1934 to $10.873 billion in 1953. Even after allowing for the shrinkage of a dollar's buying power that remains a huge flood of goods into this country. By old-fashioned protectionist reasoning those goods should have ruined our industries by this time. But the damage has been much more than offset by the increase in exports, from $1.988 billion in 1934 to $15.747 billion in 1953.

The House of Representatives has voted to extend the President's power to make reciprocal trade agreements from 1955 to 1958. The Senate Finance Committee has held hearings which show how much such an extension, without several curtailing amendments, is feared by many industries. Yet the committee has just voted, 13 to 2, to approve the bill without crippling amendments. The committee avoided these through a compromise in which the White House participated—an amendment to empower the President to limit imports of specific products if they become large enough to threaten an industry vital to national security.

Chances for Senate approved in this form are considered good, but we may learn otherwise when debate begins. It has begun to look in recent months as though world trade were about to become a more intense struggle for markets.

Requests for protection are understandable. In a number of cases they seem to be reasonable and could be granted without injuring the whole program. But we can't give all or most industries all the protection their gloomier spokesmen think desirable and still build our export trade as we need to build it. An additional billion or two in exports and imports, a few years from now, might make a big difference in the cities served by the seaway.

Contemporary Life in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three interesting columns by May Craig, Washington correspondent for the Guy Gannett newspapers in Maine on contemporary life in the Soviet Union. The articles appeared last week in the Portland Press Herald.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of April 26, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—FIRST AMERICANS TO SEE PRAVDA PLANT

(By May Craig)

Moscow.—The newspaper Pravda, famous voice of official communism here, carried a story about the American editors' visit, and people everywhere notice us, recognize us, ask our guides if we are not the American journalists. They noticed us before, because we look different, look foreign, but after the story in the paper, they knew who we were.

We had a unique opportunity to go over the Pravda plant, first time Americans have been there. It has an enormous circulation—about 5 million, with an extra half-million on Sunday. This circulation had never been officially revealed up to the evening we were there and the manager of the publishing company, Georgi Romanchicou told us. About 2½ million papers are published in the Moscow plant; the rest in other key cities, with mats sent there from headquarters here, so that there can be no mistake in the official version—no bad copy—either in the numerous magazines or the Pravda and the smaller newspapers also printed at the plant. Some papers are airmailed out.

We saw the floors where they get out the color magazines, as well as the newspapers, and the children's magazine Pioneer; the humorous magazine Crocodile, which is like the London Punch; the Peasant Woman and others.

The editors were enthralled with the trip; they peered at the presses and the rotogravure machinery and asked a thousand questions. Answer came through an inter-

preter who accompanied us. The editors said most of the machinery was not as good as ours. Pravda has machinery from Germany and Britain as well as the Soviet. None from the United States.

After the tour we went up to the manager's office and had a press conference, also hot tea and cakes. The plant covers 6 acres of ground and has many floors below street level. It is a modern building, but the elevators were not what we would call modern. They buy newsprint by the meter (length) and not by weight as we do.

I asked if they had a union of workers and reporters and he said yes, and he belonged to it. Explanations revealed he really runs it, because he has the final say. He was one of the workers himself in stereotype section, and many greeted him familiarly as he conducted us.

It may sound like nothing to you, that we went through this plant, but it was unusual. None of the American correspondents here had ever been through. The Associated Press man was so envious, he offered to carry a brief case for one of us if he could slip in with us. Of course, there is no such thing as "slipping in," in this country. Each one of the editors is a marked person and our permits are very explicit.

It isn't easy—or cheap—to be a correspondent here.

The cost is one reason there are not more correspondents here. One correspondent said living is expensive—he pays a chauffer $500 a month, a cook $250. This is under the ruinous exchange rate—four rubles to a dollar. Apply that to the prices—calculated on the much cheaper ruble value and you find a small triangular silk scarf for a woman, single thickness, $20. The smallest souvenir costs several dollars.

There are long queues at food stores; the International News Service correspondent's wife said she spent a good deal of her time in queues. You get the servants through the government and there are gimmicks in that, too. An American can't get a license to drive a car—that is, not for years and years and under all sorts of conditions. That means he has to have a chauffeur selected by the government, who knows exactly where he goes and probably listens to every word said in the car. Most Americans don't want a license—one accident and you are in the clink for 3 years maybe.

Shopping in the biggest department store is an experience. It is a state store, of course, though there are some small private enterprise stores. It has a huge arcade from street level to the top, four floors up, roofed with glass. Balconies run along the sides in each wing, on every floor, with little departments along the side. People stroll along the balconies, sit on the steps and eat. It is a whole shopping center, but under cover.

When you select something, the salesgirl gives you a slip with the amount, you take that to a cashier in the corridor, with the money, she receipts the slip and you take it back to get your purchase.

People go to the store to look and gossip and see friends, not necessarily to buy. I didn't find the goods fine even when expensive. The Communists do not go in for consumer goods, that is the policy. The money goes into "producing things to produce other things" needed for their national build-up plan.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of April 27, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—SUBWAY STATIONS ARE ART GALLERIES

(By May Craig)

Moscow.—The Moscow subway is beautiful and, so far as I could tell, very efficient. It is one of their showcases and they are justly proud of it. Nobody would think of taking anybody down into a New York subway except to get somewhere. But in Moscow the stations are art galleries. I saw four of them, the best of course. What they may be out at the end of the line, I don't know. But I don't know anything like the four I saw, anywhere else. Fare is 12½ cents as long as you want to ride.

In the first place there is none of that ugly clutter of advertisements that disfigure our roads, our railway stations, our streetcars, and buses. The Union Station in Washington is a disgrace, with advertisements stuck everywhere, so you can hardly see the directions for travelers.

There are no advertisements in the subway trains, which are clean, painted, bright, efficient. Trains run every 105 seconds on the main lines. At the Komsomol Station, the big one, they can handle 100,000 passengers per hour. This is under the Komsomol Square.

The stations are mostly marble. "Easy to clean," the guide told us. They are very large. At each end there is a large piece of bronze statuary—in the Byelorussian stations, there was a memorial to soldiers; at the other end a symbolic statue of a man, woman, and child. Byelorussia is one of the Soviet Republics. This station was designed by a woman. Women here do everything—many of the doctors are women. There are more women than men students in the great Moscow University on Lenin Hill, in the Moscow suburbs.

In the ceiling of this subway station, there are colorful mosaic pictures of life in Byelorussia, pictures of people in native costumes. In the Komsomol Station there are historical pictures on the ceilings. The beauty of the stations, their size and fine proportions must be a daily pleasure to the people. I try to remember that this is all done by the state, that the faults of our system of paying by advertising is the price we pay for free enterprise and choice by the people of what they want. It's like having government radio and TV—you may not like the commercials, but the audience gets a control by what they choose to listen to. It's our choice, not the government's choice, with us.

The Moscow subway has three long lines, criss-crossing the metropolitan area. Then they have a complete circle line, half way from center to the ends of the lines. So you can get from one line to another by the circle. Total mileage is 42 miles.

The subways are immensely deep—240 feet is the deepest. Practically all stations have escalators, and some of them are terrifically long. The stations were used for meetings and as shelters during the war, in bombardment. There is absolutely no clutter, no chewing gum stuck anywhere, no litter of old newspapers and cigarette stubs; there are receptacles for trash and the trash is there.

I felt more friendliness in the subways than almost anywhere else. Men saw that we were strangers and got up and gave seats to even the men in our party. One old lady spoke to me and I answered—I knew she asked me where I was from, but neither understood the other. So I leaned over and asked our feminine guide to translate. Sure enough she wanted to know where we were from. She had two children with her and I asked the guide to tell her I had four grandchildren. The lady smiled and said I looked too young—which flattered me immensely—but the women of this country work so hard that they get old at 40.

People do not seem to care about clothes. They go around in all sorts of nondescript clothes; there is no style. Our hotel has as good food as any place in the city, we were told by resident Americans. This is because it is a cosmopolitan place, many foreigners stay here. It is the Intourist Hotel, the official Russian travel agency. There is a dining room on the street floor for outsiders; upstairs is for the guests of the hotel and their guests.

There are guests of every nation and the talk is a polyglot of all languages. The waiters speak some English, but you never know what you will get when you order. One editor asked for the little thin rolled pancakes, with jelly wrapped inside, which are a breakfast specialty. He got four little square pieces of poundcake.

When people came in with very informal dress—though never the kind of undress you see at American beach resorts—I asked how they could afford the high prices. Answer was that prices are about the same anywhere; that workers get paid pretty well; that prices for them were not what the ruinous rate of exchange made our dollars; that they care less for style of clothes than we do. It is a sidelight on character—important.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of April 28, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN, MOSCOW BALLET, SOMETHING TO WATCH

(By May Craig)

Moscow.—The theater and ballet in Moscow are wonderful. They always were, they say, back in the days of the Tsars. The Communists continue them because they want to show the world that they are a cultured people. The ballet is subsidized by the state, controlled by the state, which is probably why it can be so good. The great Bolshoi Opera House, where we saw the Fountain of Tears, wordless ballet adapted from Pushkin's story, is magnificent. Impressive with its great pillars and the bronze horses jutting out over the pediment; it is beautiful inside, gilt and red velvet, and the tremendous curtain with wheat ears woven into a pattern with CCCP, meaning the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the date of the revolution in 1917 woven into the pattern, so that at first you do not notice the words and figures.

Above the large stage, above the curtain, a medallion of Lenin, and above that in gilt and color, the hammer and sickle, and over all, the star, symbols of the U. S. S. R. The hammer and sickle symbolize the union of labor and agriculture. The scenery was also magnificent, bold in concept, imaginative, colorful and, because of the size of the stage, vast in some scenes. The actors, down to the least extra put a verve and enthusiasm into the ballet that made it a thrilling event. The star ballerina was Ulanova and after the show we went back and were received by her and the other feminine lead and the two male leads. The audience was much more demonstrative than I have ever seen an audience in the States. They stood up for curtain calls and shouted praises, as well as clapping; many trooped down the aisles to the edge of the orchestra pit for the curtain calls. The orchestra leader got the spotlight and applause individually, after each act and when they filed in for the next.

We cannot ignore this bid of the Communists for leadership in culture. President Eisenhower is aware of its importance. In his last budget he asked for a small sum for encouragement for arts, for prizes for artistic achievement. In Washington we have difficulty getting private subscription for a modest national symphony; we have only the Daughters of the American Revolution hall for concerts, we have no theater worth the name, only two small old buildings. Should we subsidize theater by Federal aid—will that lead to Federal control? Other American cities have concert halls and theaters, but not Washington, the Federal City.

The highest hill in Moscow is named Lenin Hill and there is the University of Moscow.

It was built in 4 years, completed in 1953. It has a central tower-like building 32 stories tall, with smaller pinnacles below the summit and the spire. On the wings there are lower towers and pinnacles, giving a sort of modified Gothic aspect. I asked if this type of building which you see elsewhere—the Institute of Culture and Science in Warsaw has it—has a name and the guides said "No, it is just modern Russian." There are wide steps leading up to the impressive entrance, marble and bronze, statues and color.

Here they combine classrooms and living quarters, in long wings. There are separate buildings for such specialties as physics. There are 6,000 rooms for students and 200 flats for professors and instructors. Each student has a separate room, tiny, but complete, with couch-bed, clothes closet, table-desk, and his own toilet, basin, and shower.

This combines what would be our senior high school with the first year of our university, in a 5-year term. Entrance is by competitive examination, and there is a complicated system of scholarships and rewards for good marks so that a student may really get both tuition and living free. They have several thousand correspondence students; 2,500 instructors; books and equipment are free; professors and officials are paid extremely well and have a most respected status. Education is highly regarded here, and an effort made to turn out many scientists and technical men and women. The aim of the Soviet is to develop this country materially and mentally, and the State provides the education. This is for both peace and war and while we haggle in Washington about Federal aid to education, Communists are actually doing it.

The system includes jobs for the graduates, more or less compulsory, I gathered. There is a Committee for Distribution of Young Specialists. The various government departments say what they want; the committee offers the graduate a limited range of positions. When he accepts, he must remain in the job 3 years. He need not accept, but may try to find a job for himself, but from my observation of the system, he wouldn't get much of a job except in what is offered by the committee.

While the building is impressive, with statues, paintings, mosaics of the world's great educators, writers, philosophers, doctors, etc., it is not well-built inside. Wooden floors are already wearing; composition-stone stairs are chipped on the edges. There simply cannot be any comparison in fine workmanship with our Mayflower Hill Colby College. We saw one of the swimming pools, with a woman instructor; a gymnasium, with girls doing calisthenics at one end and boys doing push-ups at the other. Physical culture is obligatory. The sports equipment cannot be compared, for instance, with the gymnasium of the new Skowhegan school where I spoke last fall. They go in for size and massiveness—but will it last? I ask that about the whole Communist system.

More Federal Aid Is Needed for Crippled Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have had brought to my attention by Mr. George J. Hecht, chairman of the American Parents Committee, Inc., a brief but every informative article which appeared in the April issue of Parents' magazine. The article was written by Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, executive director of the American Parents Committee, and is entitled, "More Federal Aid Is Needed for Crippled Children."

As Mrs. Stough points out, while the Social Security Act, as amended, authorizes a Federal appropriation of $15 million annually for crippled children services, the past 2 years have seen an appropriation of only a little more than two-thirds of that amount, and the President's 1956 budget calls for the same figure. As the article indicates, the Federal grants to the States are more than matched by the State and local funds. Certainly the Senate, in its consideration of the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, should consider increasing these funds, so as to have them more closely parallel the authorization.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fine article by Mrs. Stough, of the American Parents Committee; and I commend it to the attention of every Member of this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE FEDERAL AID IS NEEDED FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

(By Ada Barnett Stough, executive director, the American Parents Commitee, Inc.)

The United States program for crippled children has been in operation since 1936 when the Social Security Act became law. Under it Federal, State, and local Governments work together to help crippled children whose parents cannot provide the necessary medical, surgical, or other services needed to help them develop into normal, self-supporting adults. The Federal grants to the States are more than equaled by required State matching, and to this considerable local funds are added.

It is estimated that there are about 2½ million children in this country who are crippled or who have conditions which lead to crippling. Private doctors are caring for those whose parents can meet the cost. About 250,000 are receiving treatment under the crippled-children's program each year, but State and local funds are not adequate to take care of all the crippled children who have no other place to turn for help. Most States give primary attention to their program to children who are orthopedically handicapped. Not much treatment is available under the program for children with epilepsy, rheumatic fever or cardiac conditions. Granting that many are being treated privately, there is evidence that large numbers are receiving no care.

The Social Security Act, as amended in 1950, authorized a Federal appropriation of $15 million a year for crippled children. Yet for each of the past 2 fiscal years only $10,800,000 has been appropriated, or $4,200,000 short of the $15 million authorized.

It is infinitely more economical, quite aside from the humane aspects, to treat and rectify crippling conditions among children than to provide institutional care and support for crippled adults.

Every year Congress votes many millions of dollars for roads and airports and for the control of beetles and the protection of wild ducks. Certainly we cannot refuse to appropriate the necessary funds to help our crippled children.

The American Parents Committee is leading an organized effort to get Congress to increase the appropriation from its present $10,800,000 to the full $15 million authorized by law. Other national organizations are joining in the effort. A 24-page pamphlet called The United States Program for Crippled Children has been published by the APC. A copy may be obtained from the Washington office, 132 Third Street SE., Washington 3, D. C.

In a section addressed to parents and citizens the pamphlet says: "The amount of money available for your local health department to help the crippled children of your community depends on amounts appropriated both by Congress and your State legislature. Congressmen and legislators are always interested in hearing what you, the voters, expect of them."

Security and Censorship Are Sometimes Confused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ann Arbor News of April 30, 1955:

FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW—SECURITY AND CENSORSHIP ARE SOMETIMES CONFUSED

Representatives of the mass communications media, which is just a $2 name for newspapers, radio, television, and magazines, have a difficult time enlisting support in their continuing campaign to keep open legitimate channels of information in Government. The public is apathetic about the matter because it gets only occasional hints of what life could be like without an informed populace.

Americans probably won't suffer because of this apathy because the natural competition among the various news agencies insures continuous pressure on Government officials, local, State and National, to give out the information which will enable citizens to make intelligent decisions. There are two phases to the present debate on the issue in Washington which may confuse rather than enlighten the mildly interested layman.

The statement often is heard that we in the United States know nothing about what goes on behind the Iron Curtain but that we tell our enemies and potential enemies everything by picture and story. That's an exaggeration, but there is enough truth in it to warrant concern.

One should be careful not to confuse the matter of military information leaks with the legitimate flow of news from Government sources. On the one hand we find generals, admirals, high Government officials and paid aides for congressional committees making socalled exclusive disclosures for a price in national magazines, while at the same time some Federal agencies are issuing directives that amount to censorship of news, not of value to a potential enemy but information to which the American taxpayer is entitled.

Such a directive is the one issued recently by Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson. Wilson's order tightening Defense Department rules on giving out military information was well-intended. It was designed

to curb the practices mentioned previously, but the end result is a form of censorship. Whenever an official is given wide latitude in withholding information on a security basis, there is a danger that he will use security as a cover for suppression of news that might be embarrassing to the Department but important for the people to know.

Another phase of the question relates to columnists, not those whose opinions on news of the day are followed avidly by readers, but the columnists who make their living by supposed revelations of the "news behind the news." by paying tipsters in one way or another for exclusives, and by breaking a story a day or so ahead of the time it would have been available anyway through ordinary news channels. Some of them have big followings among persons who don't bother to check back on the accuracy of their predictions or their pontifications. Readers, like newspapermen, glory in knowing something ahead of someone else, although in this case they share the exclusive with a million or so others.

This type of columnist must have a certain number of behind-the-scenes stories to survive, and he can always find a Congressman or Government official willing to leak something in return for the columnist's friendship. There is no bribe involved, though a columnist may sometimes give him a favorable mention in his column.

It is important that Government leaders differentiate among the occasional science-type article which may be ghost-written for a member of the military or some other official, the leaks to columnists grasping for something sensational and the ordinary flow of news that will keep the citizen intelligently informed about his Government. This is not to disparage the story that goes under the surface to uncover what someone is trying to hide from a public that is entitled to know. Indeed, it is this type of information most likely to be suppressed when Government leaders use the term security as a cloak under which to operate the people's business in secret.

The Socialistic Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Derrick, of Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., dated April 29, 1955:

OUR OPINION—THE SOCIALISTIC ROAD

How would you like to see Federal price controls and regulations over all goods and services that Americans sell in the process of earning their livelihood?

Fantastic, dangerous, and undemocratic, you probably will say. Why that would constitute a Government-controlled economy—that's socialism.

You'd be so right with an answer like that. And the fact is, you have every reason for concern. For a situation exists in the United States today which, if it should constitute a pattern, would pave the way for just that sort of a condition.

The situation was brought about by a Supreme Court decision last year which held that the Federal Power Commission under existing law can regulate the operations of independent gas producers by fixing the field price on natural gas sold to interstate pipeline companies.

Heretofore, 2 of the 3 principal segments of the natural gas industry—interstate pipelines and local distributing companies—have been regulated because they constitute enterprises which enjoy the monopoly-like privileges of public utilities. But the third segment — the producer — has functioned without regulation since production activities are carried on under the typically competitive conditions of the American free-enterprise system.

Operating under this sensible and logical pattern, the gas industry has progressed until it now provides a quarter of the Nation's energy requirements and serves 3 times as many consumers as it did in 1938. Meanwhile, demand has increased rapidly and continues to increase.

The record of the gas industry provides ample proof that the pattern of limited regulation under which it has been functioning is in the national interest. But under the Supreme Court decision, this pattern is disrupted by extending regulation to independent producers who sell a commodity for private consumption in a free competitive market.

This regulation of the prices, profits and general operations of private producers is bound in the long run to be extremely costly to consumers. The search for and production of gas is a high risk enterprise. On an average, 8 out of 9 wells drilled prove dry. Only 1 in 44 discovers a substantial field. It is self-evident that only the incentive of a profit commensurate with this long-shot risk is going to keep producers hunting for more gas. Under regulation, this incentive will be sharply reduced. And the result is bound to be decreased supplies which clearly mean higher costs to the consumers.

Far more dangerous, however, than this matter of cost is the new precedent which regulation of the gas producer sets. It is a step toward what could prove to be an all-inclusive control by Government of virtually everything produced and distributed in what we used to regard as a free economy under free enterprise.

It's the road to socialism.

New Orleans-Mexico Air Route—Let's Not Cut Latin Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, George Chaplin, editor of the New Orleans Item, has directed my attention to two editorials which recently appeared in the Item and which I believe should be brought to the attention of this body.

Both editorials pose very serious problems. One is more or less limited in scope to a local condition but most definitely involves a very serious and basic deficiency in the operation and conduct of the Civil Aeronautics Board. There is indeed something very peculiar and most strange in connection with the activities of this particular board. As a matter of fact, there is such great suspicion as to its operation that my distinguished colleague from New Orleans, HALE BOGGS, has before the Rules Committee a resolution to which I heartily subscribe, to investigate, fumigate, and ventilate the whole business.

There is one thing certain about the granting of a permit for direct service between New Orleans and Mexico City and that is that it is most assuredly bipartisan. When President Truman was in the White House he voided an order of the then constituted board, and now President Eisenhower refuses to vacate the order of his predecessor. I have always been of the opinion that what one President can do the other can undo, but apparently neither the desire nor the inclination is here.

The failure to establish a direct airline between New Orleans and Mexico City is one of the most discriminatory acts charged against any board created by the Congress.

There is something present which does not meet the eye, and I frankly do not believe all the cards have been placed face up on the table, and I would not be at all surprise if there were several cards concealed in somebody's sleeve. How to shake them loose is the real problem.

The item in its editorial gives a splendid statement of the case.

In the second editorial which Mr. Chaplin has called to my attention the very provocative question of Latin oil is dealt with.

Here are the two editorials in question:

DIRECT FLIGHT 9 YEARS OVERDUE—NEW ORLEANS-MEXICO AIR ROUTE

The 22d of next month marks the 9th anniversary of a frustrating case in New Orleans' aviation history.

On that day in May 1946, President Truman authorized a direct air route between New Orleans and Mexico City. He was acting under executive power, pursuant to the Civil Aeronautics Act.

What's happened since shouldn't happen to a dogma—much less to a great transportation center like ours. New Orleans today is the only large city on the United States southern border without direct air service to the Mexican capital.

Here, in brief, is the story:

After Mr. Truman O. K.'d the route, the State Department and Eastern Air Lines—which was given the permit to operate the service—ran into snags with the Mexican authorities.

These included a Mexican demand that the United States grant similar rights to a Mexican airline, with the proviso that the agreement would be in force only as long as the Mexican company continued service. The State Department objected that this proviso would set a bad precedent for other bilateral pacts.

This stalemate continued until Mr. Truman on September 8, 1952, withdrew his approval of Eastern's permit and of two other unimplemented certificates concerning service to Mexico City from Laredo, Tex., and Los Angeles.

His view was that this would clear the air and enable a more effective new negotiation.

This was the situation when last November the Civil Aeronautics Board began hearing Eastern's request for a New York-Washington-Mexico City service.

The airline contended that the way in which President Truman had revoked its New Orleans-to-Mexico City permit was unconstitutional. On April 18, CAB bureau counsel made the same argument, that the President had not complied with the pro-

cedures set out in the law of canceling, suspending, or revoking a certificate.

Earlier in the hearing, there had been several different approaches taken on behalf of New Orleans.

Mayor Morrison and a spokesman for Governor Kennon asked the CAB to suspend the hearing of the New York-Washington-Mexico City case until our prior claim is satisfied.

The chamber of commerce took—and presently maintains—a somewhat variant view. It is less concerned with whether the New York-Washington-Mexico case is halted—possibly because it doubts that it will be—than with whether New Orleans-to-Mexico City service can be made a part of that case.

Contends the chamber: No agreement as to any route should be negotiated between our country and Mexico, unless such agreement includes the New Orleans-Mexico service.

That's a sound, practical stand.

New Orleans is entitled to such a direct route.

This is an international city—in location, in ideas, in trade and in communication.

Particularly is all of this true in relation to Latin America. We are a natural north-south gateway, a fact of which the CAB is, of course, fully aware.

We urge the CAB to end this delay and to make direct service between here and Mexico City a requisite of the next bilateral air agreement between the two countries. Let's "rev" up and get off the ground. This flight is 9 years overdue.

NEELY PROPOSAL HARMFUL—LET'S NOT CUT LATIN OIL

An amendment by Senator MATTHEW NEELY, West Virginia Democrat, threatens to cut the heart out of President Eisenhower's foreign-trade program.

NEELY hails from a State whose coal industry unfortunately is having a rought time. But the Senator's plan to drastically curtail oil imports into the United States—especially heavy-fuel oil imports—isn't going to solve whatever is wrong in the coal fields.

Homeowners who heat with oil or natural gas aren't going back to coal furnaces. Ships and factories fueled by oil won't turn the clock back either. And diseled locomotives are going to stay dieselized.

We can understand NEELY's feeling that something must be done to help coal. Certainly, a thriving domestic coal industry is desirable. But his amendment, while failing to provide the remedy he seeks, would work incalculable harm to our foreign relations.

Reciprocal trade is a cornerstone of our foreign policy. To sell abroad, we must buy abroad.

The State Department stressed this among the 10 points it advanced this week why the Neely amendment is contrary to the national interest.

A good example of what the State Department is talking about is one of our neighboring lands to the south, Venezuela, whose economy largely floats on oil. (In the last 9 years, United States companies have invested $800 million in Latin American oil; of this $575 million in Venezuela.)

Our trade with that country has jumped thirteenfold since World War II. She spends almost a billion dollars a year for United States goods and services. And on a per capita basis she buys more from us than any other country in the world except Canada.

The investment climate there for United States capital is healthy—and our venture dollars have helped Venezuela to develop her resources, expand and begin to diversify her economy, and to raise her living standards.

The desirability of such conditions was the dominant theme of the recent Inter-American Investment Conference here. The Latinos sought United States capital. American businessmen wanted assurances of a favorable atmosphere in which to operate. Venezuela, now the world's largest oil exporter, combines both.

We have in recent years cited her as a model of what good trade and friendship with us can achieve. It has been a big talking point in our good-neighbor policy.

But such legislation as that proposed by Senator NEELY would wreck this policy and convince the hemisphere, in particular, that our actions do not square with our words.

• • • • •

Some independent oil men share the coal industry's belief that legislative quotas should be placed on petroleum imports.

Their views, too, must be fairly weighed in terms of both our domestic economy and our foreign relations.

The State Department, in expressing its opposition to NEELY's amendment, noted that the domestic oil industry is operating at or near its all-time peak, that it is prosperous and its outlook is bright.

We use about half of the oil the free world produces. But our known reserves are only about a fifth of the free world's.

The demand for oil products in the United States is expected to double by 1975. And we must not overlook the possibility of having to sharply and quickly step up the rate of domestic oil output in event of war.

Against this backdrop, the State Department's stand makes good sense.

There should be an intelligent balance between oil imported and oil produced domestically, but it is best to achieve that balance by voluntary action of importers.

Unless and until it is demonstrated, after a fair test, that such voluntary restraints will not work, we as a Nation should steer clear of legislative intervention. The Neely amendment should be roundly defeated.

The Richest People in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, this week more than 1,300 representatives of professional pharmacy and the pharmaceutical industry are meeting in convention in Miami Beach, in my home State of Florida. This convention of the American Pharmaceutical Association and its affiliated societies focuses attention on the great good that we all receive from modern medication, something that we sometimes forget.

I have recently seen an editorial entitled "The Richest People in History" which I feel is of high interest to the Members of the House of Representatives, as well as the public at large. It was written by Edward P. Fleming, a pharmacist, and editor of the Prescriptionist. It appeared in that publication, as well as in the March 1955 issue of the Prescriber. Inasmuch as these are both professional magazines, circulated to a limited audience, I hereby request unanimous consent for the reproduction of Mr. Fleming's editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, where it will have wider dissemination to the public:

THE RICHEST PEOPLE IN HISTORY

(By Edward P. Fleming)

To the couple looking down upon that small figure lying so still in the big bed it all must have seemed to have happened very quickly. The small boy coming in from the drenching rain, next day the sore throat, then the horrible cough, the high fever, the succession of nurses and doctors, the never ending vigil by the bedside, the alternating hope and despair and, finally, the irrevocable end. Their son was dead. What mattered their position, their influence, their power, when all of it was unavailing to save their boy. No ordinary couple were Abraham and Mary Lincoln, yet Death had entered the White House as devastatingly as though it had been a hovel. Five dollars worth of antibiotics would have had Willie Lincoln playing out on the lawn within the week but the word "antibiotic" had not yet been coined. Of course, that was 90 years ago.

Not so remote in time was the era of Calvin Coolidge, Jr. He had known automobiles from his earliest memories, he seldom glanced up when an airplane flew overhead, he enjoyed his radio as does every modern boy. Yet a heel was blistered on the tennis court, infection set in to be followed by the dread septicemia and once again Death eluded every barrier to invade the White House and carry away a President's son. Two or three dozen sulfa tablets would have been an effective barrier but the Coolidges knew no more of sulfa than did the Lincolns of antibiotics.

Many other times has the dark specter invaded the White House because the medicines we now dispense so casually had not yet been discovered. To name just two: William McKinley was struck down by an assassin's bullet but it took him 9 days to die; the wound in itself would be considered trifling today but McKinley died because that bullet opened the way for peritonitis. How long has it been since you heard of a fatal case of peritonitis? Warren Harding died of pneumonia, another disease which is rapidly taking its place among the diseases of the past.

And what does this all mean to us today? It means that the humblest person is infinitely better off than were the most powerful people in the land just a few years ago. For half a day's pay the laborer of today can buy these precious things which the Lincolns, the Coolidges, the McKinleys, the Hardings, and untold others could not obtain at any price.

In these days of statistics, we read much about the tremendous sums spent for research, but forget these stories that we know, but have never applied directly to ourselves. Willie Lincoln, and Calvin Coolidge were warm, vital boys, filled with promise and loved by their parents just as are the boys and girls of today. Life to them was no less precious than it is to our children, yet they did not have the sulfa drugs, the antibiotics, the other health protecting drugs that we accept so lightly today.

Truly, we are the richest people in history.

Atoms for Peace—Phases of the Great Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on August 8 there will convene in Geneva the

United Nations Conference on Atoms for Peace.

At that time, the United States will open an historic exhibit, where a research reactor will actually be demonstrated.

The participating nations among the 84 governments who have been invited will be able to see at first-hand how the United States is moving ahead toward harnessing of the atom for peace.

The following month, I am glad to say, here in our own country, and indeed in our own Nation's Capital, will occur an important event when the first Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry will open. This will mark a significant occasion in America's own progress of applying the atom for an ever-higher standard of living for our own and other peoples.

Of course, the making available of the atom for peaceful purposes has not been without its problems.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission, heavily burdened by its massive responsibilities, has been moving ahead, although numerous suggestions have been made to it for intensified efforts in "flashing the green light" so that United States private industry can carry the ball more and more.

Meanwhile, on the international front, the need is increasingly apparent for the United States to accelerate its efforts to bring the peaceful miracles of atomic energy more meaningfully to foreign countries, particularly among underdeveloped peoples.

I have in my hand three important expressions on the various phases which I have mentioned.

The first is a welcome release from the Atomic Industrial Forum announcing the First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry. I know the fair will receive the fullest cooperation from the Washington community.

The second is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 12. It comments frankly on the need for encouraging increasing private participation in atomic work so as to speed what has been called the "atomic revolution."

And, finally, there is an important editorial from the April 27 Milwaukee Journal stating that the atomic power ship of peace, while an outstanding contribution, is by no means more than an introduction to what America can and should do in bringing the atom miracles to the attention of foreign lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these three items—each pointing up an important phase of the problem—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry will be held in Washington, D. C., at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, September 26–30, it was announced today by the Atomic Industrial Forum. The trade fair, which will be held in conjunction with the forum's fall meeting, will have as its theme, "Marketing the Products of Atomic Energy."

According to the forum's executive manager, Charles Robbins, this pioneering trade fair will demonstrate the extent to which peaceful atomic energy and its associated products and services have advanced as an important sector of our industrial economy.

The fair will be seen by an audience of key management and operating officials in organizations engaged or considering participation in atomic-energy development and use, Members of Congress, the staffs of interested Government agencies, and the commercial and scientific attachés of the various embassies and legations in the Nation's capital.

A survey of the exhibit plans of member organizations indicates that there will be displays in such fields as design engineering, package power, medical and research reactors, control systems, reactor materials, instrumentation, construction and fabrication techniques, isotope sources and applications, shielding materials and devices, and reactor components and auxiliaries, in addition to various consultant services.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—ATOMIC INITIATIVE

At a conference on atomic energy in industry held in San Francisco last week, it was evident that many companies are putting far more manpower and money into the field than anyone expected at this early date.

At the same time the Atomic Energy Commission announced it has received four new proposals for the construction of demonstration nuclear electric powerplants to cost an estimated $150 million and produce a total of 455,000 kilowatts. These were in response to the AEC's offer of financial aid in such construction. Significantly, though, the share asked of the Government was only 10 to 20 percent—far lower than had been expected.

These 4 projects, all except 1 of which were suggested by groups of private companies, are in addition to the 250,000-kilowatt, $55-million powerplant New York's Consolidated Edison Co. plans to build without any Government help.

All this—the specific power projects and the general industrial atomic fever reflected at San Francisco—is a direct consequence of the amended atomic energy law enacted last summer. It is a startling tribute to those who got the bill through against the embittered opposition of men willing to stultify progress for the sake of what they thought could be a political issue.

But the progress, impressive though it is, is not an occasion, for complacency. To speed the atomic revolution the amended law will need further liberalizing, and it is none too soon for Congress to be thinking about this.

For the 1954 law did not make atomic industry so much a free enterprise as a mixed Government private enterprise. That is better than leaving it a wholly Government monopoly, but the faster the emphasis can be further shifted to private activity the faster will the benefits of the atom be realized.

Meanwhile there is reason to believe that more could be done even within the framework of the present law. Several witnesses before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy have pointed to continued secrecy as 1 of the major deterrents to more widespread participation in the field.

Partly the complaint is that the AEC could make nonsecret material more readily accessible and explain to industry just how much is already available in the nonsecret category. But there is also a strong feeling that much information presently classified could be made generally available under the 1954 statute without impairing national security.

One recent witness, Francis McCune, vice president and general manager of the Atomic Products Division of the General Electric Co., put the case for more information particularly well. Nothing that bars to the availability of information about atomic energy cannot but operate as obstacles to entry into the industry, he said: "Information should be made available not merely to those who are already interested but, perhaps even more importantly, to those who are not yet interested, for information is required to stimulate interest."

The suggestion here is not that any and every kind of company would promptly plunge into atomic energy if more were known. Rather, it is that a company cannot determine whether or not it should be interested in atomic energy in the absence of sufficient knowledge. "Without adequate information," Mr. McCune said, "industry cannot be expected to show real initiative."

Considering the hobbles on it, industry is showing considerable initiative. It is in the interest of the AEC, Congress and the people that this initiative should not now be frustrated either by too much law or by too little knowledge.

ATOM SHOW SHIP NOT ENOUGH

President Eisenhower's announced plan for an atomic-powered ship of peace is a dramatic proposal. Sent on a world cruise, the merchant vessel would be a floating showcase in which people everywhere might see the promise of atomic science to improve human living—not destroy it.

For us, the vessel would have additional practical value. Its construction and operation would teach us valuable lessons about the cost and efficiency of an atomic surface ship now that we have the submarine *Nautilus* in use and other atomic submarines under construction or planned.

A danger inherent in the President's plan, however, is that the peace ship might become a gimmick that would constitute our do-all in the field of international atomic energy. Instead of a supplement, it might turn into a substitute—a huckster's blurb rather than the production followthrough.

People of the world, we are sure, will be mightily impressed when a sleek ship, driven by atomic power and displaying the good things the atom can bring, sails into their harbors. But unless they are shown a way whereby they can enjoy these atomic benefits, won't they feel like a waif at the candy shop window, permitted to admire the mouth-watering sweets but denied the means of obtaining them?

Like the test reactor that America plans to display at the International Conference of Atomic Scientists in Geneva this year, the peace ship should represent the salesman's sample case of products which America stands willing and ready to help bring to the world.

The peace ship must implement President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan. An atomic powerplant in India, Japan, or Egypt—built with American technical help, manned by native technicians trained in American skills and fueled with some of the fissionable material America has earmarked for world use—will do more to demonstrate American good will than just a showcase ship.

Address by Representative John J. Rhodes, of Arizona, Before the Indiana Young Republicans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on April 22, 1955, Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, addressed the Collegiate Division rally of the Indiana Young Republicans, in Indiana. I ask

unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. RHODES, OF ARIZONA

In deciding the mental makeup of the 1955 model Republican, it might be well to first consider the type of party which the Republican Party has always been. It was born amidst the strife and dissatisfaction preceding the War Between the States. It came of age during the terrible test of physical and moral courage which this country underwent and which we know as the Civil War. It presided over the destinies of this Nation during the boom period of the 19th century, which saw the construction of railroads from coast to coast, the western land migration, and the beginning of the industrial revolution in this country.

This era also produced such industrial giants as the oil and steel trusts, and witnessed the evils of railroad rebates, yellow-dog contracts, and other abuses of "bigness," which were to the detriment of all American people. This party was responsible for the Interstate Commerce Act, the Sherman Anti-trust Act, the Clayton Act, and many other pieces of legislation aimed at maintaining the interests of the average individual as against the industrial giant. It is to the credit of this party that this great purpose was accomplished without materially slowing the rapid development of our natural resources and industrial plants. This party ended the spoils system when it enacted the Civil Service Act.

In the early 20th century, the Republican Party was responsible for the Reclamation Act which has been so instrumental in the development of the West. The Panama Canal was conceived and constructed during a Republican administration. The first attempts to protect the farmer from the speculator at the market place, and to assure the farmer of a fair return on his investment and labor occurred during the Republican administration in the 1920's.

Domestically, the Republican Party has always stood for progress under the mantle of free enterprise. Yet this party has always jealously guarded the rights, political and economic, of our citizens. In other words, this is a party which does not believe in giving advantages to special groups or interests, or allowing such groups or interests to possess advantages which are used to the detriment of the average citizen. Our theory of government places the Federal Government in the middle of a teeter-totter, acting as a balance so that neither side is able to gain advantage to the detriment of the other side.

It is significant to note that although the Republican Party has brought this country its greatest periods of prosperity, it has not, in this century, been in power at the start of any war. Therefore, Republican prosperity is based upon sound economy and does not arise from the stimulus provided by emergency situations. We have not, and I pray that we may never follow the policy of government by crisis.

So what kind of a party are we?

We have never been moss-backed; we have never been reactionary. Whether we are dynamic-conservative or enlightened-liberal, we have never believed in standing still or going backward. We have created a climate favorable to the full development of our resources by private endeavor, with only such help from the Government as is needed to get the job done.

The 1955 Republican should continue to provide a government which balances all interests to benefit the whole Nation. We should neither insert the Government into situations where it is not needed, nor should we shirk governmental action where such action is necessary. As President Eisenhower has said on occasion, "We should walk forthrightly up the middle of the road, because no real progress is made by those who walk in the gutter to the right or the left."

It is hard to be a Republican. During the New Deal era, the pendulum swung to the left. The cry of "soak the rich" rose. This fallacy, sponsored by the Democrats, failed to take into account the facts that: (1) All income of persons who made more than $100,000 a year was very small compared to the Federal budget; and (2) to provide jobs, you must provide a climate favorable to the investment of capital. Roosevelt recognized this, finally, when in 1936 he tried to get Congress to exempt all dividends from taxation. (When we just exempt 5 percent, Democrats say we favor the rich.) But priming the pump did not produce prosperity, nor build it.

But we still have attempts made to prime the pump for the political advantage to be derived from posing as the friend of the little man.

I deny there is a permanent class of people known as little men. There are many of us who are not doing as well as we would like to. We can afford to help those people when they are unemployed, injured on the job, and too old to work. But we can best serve the little man by creating a climate in which he can (1) get a job and hold it, at fair wages; and (2) get as big as he is big enough to get. Do not make him a little man all his life. A job is worth more to a man than is a $20 tax cut.

In order to provide this climate for investments which means jobs, we have had to make some unpopular decisions. In the 83d Congress we had to forego the pleasure of increasing the personal exemption by $100. In this one, we had to vote against a $20 tax cut across the board. We have had to cut spending, curtail contracts, and thereby create local economic crises, and, in general, "kill Santa Claus." This is because a serious Government deficit would cause another round of inflation, and siphon off the capital needed for industrial expansion, which, in turn, means jobs.

After the free-and-easy days of New Deal hand-outs, it is hard to explain to our average citizen that he must forego his candy to have his bread. But we Republicans must continue in the path President Eisenhower has set up for us, and sell Mr. Average American on the wisdom of this course.

I repeat, it is hard to be a Republican.

At home, it must be the job of the 1955 model Republican to keep our country strong, free, and prosperous, by maintaining conditions in which the inherent ambition, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of our citizens may have full sway. But today we live in a world which is becoming, more and more, one community. We of this generation will mould the face of this community. Our actions, or inactions, will determine whether this community will be devoted to individual freedom, or to the 1955 model of slavery known as communism.

I do not believe that Republicanism and communism can exist in the same community, or world. Therefore, we must inevitably conclude that we must pit our way of life against theirs in a struggle for survival.

When we think of such a struggle we inevitably assume that trial by arms will become necessary, as indeed it may. But to assume that this is our only means of triumph is to sell our way of life short. The peoples of the world, if fully informed and free to choose, would certainly choose our free society to the chains of communism. Our task is to so inform them, and to help create a situation in which their composite will may assert itself.

The Bible tells us that at one time all men spoke the same tongue. Then man got too big for his pants, and to chasten him, God caused all men to speak different tongues. The inability of man to communicate with his fellowman has ever since provided us with our greatest inconvenience and our greatest challenge. We have means of sending signals throughout the earth, but still a very few methods of really communicating thoughts. It is still very difficult to determine the composition of the soul of our fellow man.

I hope that some day we will put our brains and treasure to work to learn to communicate thoughts to each other. But maybe something else comes first. Maybe there is still a lesson to be learned from the ancient punishment visited by God on Man. Maybe the sentence was that we must learn to live together before our souls may communicate.

Therefore, with the feeble means at our disposal, let us try it. Let us keep our guns, tanks, planes, and hydrogen bombs, but let us add a new weapon to our arsenal—truth.

Our Government, and most of our people, believe in telling the truth. Most of us can spot a lie—it takes some longer than others. On the other hand, communism, fascism, etc., are nurtured by lies, for they are themselves the greatest fabrications of all time.

Therefore, our best weapon is truth. It is devastating to the enemy; beneficial to us. Imagine the impact it would make on the world if we were to offer Russia free space in our newspapers, free time on radio and TV, to tell whatever they might desire, in exchange for similar free time and space in Russian mediums which would reach an equal number of people, who would be free to listen.

There is no doubt in any of our minds that the Communists would feed our people their choicest selection of tall tales. Let them. We will tell the people of Russia the truth, which the rulers of Russia will brand as lies. But truth can be masked only for a short time, and lies can remain undetected for an even shorter period.

The end result would be a thorough knowledge on the part of the Russian people of our lives, our aspirations, and our souls. Also, they would be able to see that our republican form of government creates a climate for a better life than the one the Russian people have under communism. Once this realization occurs, all the secret police in the world cannot save communism.

An immediate benefit might be a lessening of war tension; 99.44 percent of the peoples of the world want peace. With direct knowledge of our own peaceful intentions, you can imagine the resistance the Russian people would have to aggression and saber-rattling on the part of their leaders. Not even a police state can wage a major war successfully without the support of the people.

I do not offer this idea as a panacea to cure the world's ills, but as a step in the direction of a peaceful world, devoted to the preservation of the freedom of the individual. In this struggle with communism, we must win the minds of men, or the product of those minds may destroy man and our planet. These thoughts consist of my individual ideas on the best weapon to use in winning this war for the minds of men. Only by winning this war can we avoid fighting another and far different kind of war.

This, then, is the challenge which is faced by the 1955 model American of all parties. God give us the strength, wisdom, and courage to face up to this great responsibility.

Air Age Could Be Great Instrument for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached article by Leslie Gould entitled "Air Age Could Be Great Instrument for Peace," which appeared in the New York Journal-American Sun of April 17, 1955:

AIR AGE COULD BE GREAT INSTRUMENT FOR PEACE

A trip half around the world in 10 days—with time for playing "tourista" as we have just done—gives you the full impact of the age of air:

What it means now and in the future to commerce, to travelers and vacationists and most importantly what it can mean for achieving what has been so elusive—peace.

The only way peace will ever be won—and it certainly hasn't been won by two world wars and a couple of smaller ones like Korea—is through a better understanding of people and problems peculiar to them and to their land. This the airplane is helping to accomplish.

Just what the airplane has done, is doing and will do in the future is brought home sharply in a trip such as the one we took introducing TWA's new Super G Constellation—the last word in luxury and close to the fastest thing in commercial aviation. Yet these magnificent planes with Curtiss-Wright turbo-compound engines are already outmoded by what is on the drawing board and will be flying 2 or 3 years hence.

These planes bring Cairo within 18 hours of New York. Distance is no longer the measurement. The planes coming along will cut that time in half.

America has the lead in aviation—both in manufacturing and in design. Our planes dominate all the airways. The British, for example, are taking all our planes they can get, even secondhand ones. What the foreigners haven't got and apparently don't know how to get it—that is the secret of mass production.

When talking of plane travel abroad, most people think of vacation. While that is increasingly important, particularly in broadening the understanding of other lands and their problems, the big impact of this air age is on commerce. It opens every corner of the world to American business.

The air age coupled with the nuclear developments, chiefly in the field of electric power, gives promise of a worldwide prosperity never before dreamed of. They will mean a worldwide rise in living standards—with only the one if—if there is peace.

PEACE WAS BUNGLED

Unfortunately, the peace was bungled at the close of World War II due to stupidity or treachery—more likely a little of both—in the United States State Department. Now incidently, 10 years later, the State Department isn't geared to this air age. This was brought home in Cairo where the embassy made no effort to make direct contact with the newspapermen on this trip. This was not so in Spain where Ambassador John Lodge, his beautiful wife and the staff were on the job—it seemed almost like 24 hours a day.

A shakeup is overdue in the foreign service—there are too many leftover, starry-eyed, New and Fair Dealers. This goes for London as well as most other spots. Also for the FOA.

The real ambassadors are American businessmen who are traveling the airways and who are operating branches and offices around the world, and companies like TWA, which, by the way, operates without a subsidy. TWA makes a point of having almost 100 percent local citizens running its services in the other countries.

In this quick trip, we visited three countries—Ireland, Egypt and Spain—and no three countries of greater contrast could have been selected. Egypt and Spain are bustling. In both, there is a great deal of construction of all kinds—roads, housing, hotels, office buildings and industrial plants. Very little construction is going on in Ireland.

Egypt with its new revolutionary regime—which is a dictatorship and will continue so for some time—the leader frankly admits this—has the most ambitious program. It ranges from a gigantic dam far up the Nile, to school and highway construction—and, of course, a big military expansion. With 23 million people—82 percent of whom are illiterate—and 96.5 percent of the land uninhabited and uncultivated desert. Egypt's main problem is water—irrigation.

Egypt is about the size of Texas and New Mexico, but only a narrow strip of 6 million acres along the Nile is cultivated. The planned Aswan Dam, a 10-year project, will add another 2 million acres to cultivation. This will also supply needed electric power.

The United States is helping out some in Egypt. The technical cooperation program through this year will have spent $19 million, matched by $26 million in Egyptian funds. In addition, the United States has allocated for next year $40 million for development assistance. One of the American projects is to try out 100 different kinds of grass seeds to find one to grow in a farm area that had been worked out by centuries of use.

The Middle East is one of the world's trouble spots and the Egyptians privately look for some time to come to nothing more than an armed truce.

PEACE NEEDED EVERYWHERE

The peace is what the world everywhere needs. It is nonsensical in an area like the Middle East that needs so much—schools, water, roads, housing, modern farm machinery—that money has to be diverted to a military buildup. U. N. was supposed to have the answer to such situations—to bring peace.

American business can and usually does run up against some unusual problems in its foreign expansion. For example, Conorado Petroleum—a joint venture of four American oil companies in its drilling ran into a World War II mine field. There were some casualties, until a special crew with a helicopter was brought in to clear the area under development. This will add considerably to the cost.

So again, it is the age of air that is making the job possible.

Forest Service Budget Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Bakersfield Californian under date of April 23, 1955, relating to the pressing need for additional Forest Service recreational funds:

FOREST SERVICE BUDGET NEEDS

Each year, the use of the national forests for recreation, for use of natural resources and exploration of mineral possibilities takes a tremendous upward trend, and the income from the sale of forest products and permits and other items rises, yet the money that is allocated for the upkeep of these forests, their protection, the development of recreation areas, and the maintenance of those already in existence is pitifully small compared with the needs.

At present, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Forest Service budget is holding hearings, and one of the principal matters of interest is the provision that will increase money allotted to the Service for recreational development work and timber sales management.

These amounts are infinitesimal when compared with amounts distributed around the world on global projects, yet they concern deeply the average American citizen to whom national forest vacations offer the most economical opportunity for healthful sojourns and to whom timber resources mean a great deal in terms of comfort and income.

According to Representative HARLAN HAGEN, of this district, the bill now before the Senate calls for an increase of $200,000 for recreation and an additional $800,000 for timber sales management. California's stake in the matter is, according to Mr. HAGEN, approximately $40,000 or nearly 20 percent, of the new recreation money which would be used in forests here, and this State would get about $100,000 of the timber sales money.

Mr. HAGEN points out that the California national forests are the most heavily used in the Nation, with thousands of visitors coming from the San Joaquin Valley. For many years, he reminds us, the use of our forests for recreation has far outstripped the money made available by Congress for the upkeep of present recreational facilities and the development of new ones, with the result that the public has been denied full enjoyment of their opportunities here.

In the field of timber management, the need for more money to assist the Forest Service in this field is imperative because there is much timber that should be cut now in its prime for proper use, and other areas must be developed as better timber-producing spots, all of which will return dividends of many kinds on the money invested. Timber sales revenue has been increasing steadily and in order to keep this resource profitable, funds for management and access roads, fire protection, and other operations must be increased. The money comes back in many forms, including cash for the Treasury in the form of timber-sales receipts.

Together with the watershed protection necessity, and other factors involving the national forests whose proper management contributes vitally to the California economy, the San Joaquin Valley people have a huge stake in the improvements that will be possible with an increase in appropriations for the Forest Service, and they believe that this purpose for the money is more important than some that call for the expenditure of far greater sums and will accomplish far less good here and on a national basis.

Mr. HAGEN, aware of the implications of this matter here, has been strong and steadfast in his support of additional help for the national forest organization to be effective now, and he has also been instrumental in advocating a plan whereby more help in a financial way will be extended to the Forest Service in the years to come.

Through the efforts of the 14th District Representative, and his associates in the

House of Representatives has approved the desired increases and favored the plan for future assistance in this field, and it would be a good idea for Californians to let their Senators know that they are in complete support of the project, so that favorable action will be forthcoming in the upper Chamber of Congress and the benefits hastened for the people.

Minimum Wage and Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, those interested in maintaining at least minimum standard of living for all Americans have long been convinced that just as workers need a minimum wage the farmers need price supports. The farmers minimum wage law was the law guaranteeing him 90 percent of parity on basic crops.

But it took opponents of 90 percent parity and firm price supports to dramatically emphasize the relationship between labor's minimum wage and the farm bill.

Following are examples of telegrams I have recently received from people in my district who want me to vote against H. R. 12 and $1.25 minimum wage. As the author of H. R. 3452 providing for 100 percent of parity on basics on H. R. 3124 providing for $1.25 minimum wage, I will not be able to comply with these requests from my district—requests that do not reflect the opinion of the majority of the people I represent:

HELENA, MONT., *April 30, 1955.*
LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Hope you will oppose H. R. 12 and also minimum-wage law.
A. L. NEILSON,
Wolf Creek, Mont.

HELENA, MONT., *April 27, 1955.*
Hon. LEE METCALF,
Washington, D. C.:
Farmers other than wheat growers are caught in a squeeze between labor and the things we have to buy and on the other hand what we receive for our livestock and irrigated crops. Why give wheat man a subsidy of better than $2 per bushel when they can make money at $1 per bushel with new methods and modern machinery. We hope you will oppose bill H. R. 12 continuous rigid support, also $1.25 minimum-wage bill.
TOM HERRIN,
Chairman of Lewis and Clark County Farm Bureau Legislative Committee.

HAMILTON, MONT., *April 30, 1955.*
LEE METCALF,
United States Montana Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
I am opposed to high rigid price support for agriculture and also a minimum-wage hour of $1.25. Request you oppose H. R. 12.
EARL BJORK,
Stevensville, Mont.

HAMILTON, MONT., *April 30, 1955.*
LEE METCALF,
United States Montana Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Minimum wage of $1.25 and high price supports are not beneficial to agriculture. Mrs. McPherson and I request you oppose this legislation.
JAMES L. MCPHERSON,
Stevensville, Mont.

HAMILTON, MONT., *April 30, 1955.*
LEE METCALF,
United States Montana Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you to oppose H. R. 12 on floor of House. High rigid price supports have failed to meet the farmers problem of surpluses. Minimum wage of $1.25 is very inflationary so urge you to oppose this bill.
GEORGE ANDERSON,
Vice President of Ravalli County Farm Bureau.

HAMILTON, MONT., *April 30, 1955.*
LEE METCALF,
United States Montana Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Ravalli County Farm Bureau of representing farmers and ranchers in Ravalli urge you to oppose H. R. 12 on floor of House. High price supports put too much control in hands of Government and inflationary inflates and creates surpluses and cuts net income to farmers. I also oppose $1.25 minimum wage.
ANDREW M. POLSON,
Corvallis Secretary Ravalli County Farm Bureau.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pride and gratification to me that the Governor of my home State of Georgia has proclaimed May 1 as Loyalty Day. I am proud also that many of the mayors of cities and towns in my congressional district at home likewise proclaimed May 1 as Loyalty Day, and that pursuant to these proclamations Loyalty Day was observed by parades, rallies, and patriotic activities. Participating in these ceremonies were many of our officials, numerous patriotic groups and veterans organizations, as well as individual men and women, boys and girls who love our country and appreciate the priceless blessings which we enjoy as free American citizens.

It is fitting that May 1 has replaced the spot on the calendar that for many years was a rally day for Communist organizations and the other units of radicalism which oppose every concept of patriotism, every right of free men, embodied in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Loyalty to flag and country is the keystone in the arch of good citizenship. Designation of May 1 as Loyalty Day takes the battle to the hordes of subversion on the date such forces had preempted over many years as their day of demonstration.

Today I received a letter from Charles A. Moran, chairman of the loyalty day committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Atlanta, Ga., who has enlisted the aid of radio stations, newspapers, and speakers in publicizing Loyalty Day by repetition of patriotic slogans.

I would like to place 1 or 2 of those slogans in the RECORD. One reads:

On Loyalty Day let us recite the new pledge to the flag: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Another reads:

Loyalty means liberty. Observe Loyalty Day May 1 in your own way. Reaffirm loyalty to God, our country, and our flag.

To these sentiments, Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans in saying a fervent "Amen."

Should Have Been an Open Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from the Bakersfield Californian, a fine newspaper which is published in the congressional district which I am privileged to represent. It relates to the controversy over the release of the Yalta documents and appeared on April 22, 1955:

SHOULD HAVE BEEN AN OPEN SESSION

Currently there is an altercation between two United States Senators over the testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles concerning how certain newspapers obtained advance release of the Yalta Conference papers to the disadvantage of the remainder of the press and press agencies.

This testimony was given at a hearing that was closed to the press by Senators, an ironic note, indeed, and one that hardly coincides with the ideas of freedom of information we hear so much about, even freedom to know why discrimination was practiced in the release of documents that according to the campaign platform of the party now in power should be repudiated.

Information reaching the press after this hearing concluded yesterday put Mr. Dulles in a peculiar position considering all that has been said in certain quarters concerning Yalta. This information indicates that Mr. Dulles, now Secretary of State and for decades considered an authority on international affairs, does not agree with those who have excoriated the Yalta agreements and does not follow the campaign platform line demanding their repudiation.

According to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who was present at the closed session and gave newsmen a detailed account of the proceedings afterward, the Secretary

of State admitted to the hearing that the Yalta decisions have actually been advantageous to American foreign policy instead of the treasonable acts they have been termed by some.

Mr. HUMPHREY declared that Mr. Dulles asserted to the group of Senators that he still disavows the Republican platform pledge of 1952 calling for repudiation of the Yalta agreements. This is a significant point, since the Secretary of State and the President are the chief architects of American foreign policy and neither has made any move to implement the execution of this pledge.

The views of Mr. Dulles, as expressed to the committee, indicate that in his informed belief, most of the criticisms of the Yalta agreements are groundless or politically inspired and not consistent with good policy.

Senator KNOWLAND, of California, who has been, strangely enough, one of the principal leaders of the majority party yet the most consistent and vocal critic of its foreign policy, is apparently incensed over the action of HUMPHREY in allowing reporters, and the people at large, to learn what went on at the meeting, calling HUMPHREY's action "a violation of the rules and precedents of the committee."

Nowhere, however, has Mr. KNOWLAND been found to express direct contradiction of Mr. HUMPHREY's account of the Secretary of State's testimony nor of the assertion by Mr. HUMPHREY that during the hearing he would not agree to withhold information concerning questions put to Mr. Dulles and the answers of the Secretary.

On the other hand, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, who attended the meeting, has issued a statement generally corroborating the report of Senator HUMPHREY, so that it would seem that the furore about violating the rules and the precedents of the committee is less of an expression of concern over the integrity of the rules and precedents than it is an expression of profound and anguished consternation at the Secretary of State's fatal thrust at one of the great shibboleths of a certain wing of his own party.

This Mr. Dulles accomplished with remarkable skill, if Mr. HUMPHREY's account of his testimony stands. The Secretary has, with prime authority, registered defense of the Yalta agreements and rendered the competent opinion that they served the foreign policy of the United States well, disposed of the partisan criticism of the agreements and disclosed obliquely that the administration and presumably the Republican Party will make no move to carry out the repudiation terms in the 1952 campaign platform.

This is a major development, and it would have been more appropriate and far safer to have allowed the press to cover this important session and reported its proceedings in the proper manner than to have barred the doors and caused the present rumpus.

Resolution Adopted by the County Commissioners Association of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Georgia, a board of commissioners constitutes the governing body of the individual county governments. These county commissioners have formed an association which is known as the Association County Commissioners of Georgia. Each year this association holds an annual convention at which convention discussion is had and action is taken upon current problems and subjects of importance to these county government officials.

These county officials are elected by a vote of the people in their respective counties. They are persons of recogized ability and standing. I would say that their collective judgment is an accurate reflection of the sentiment and collective judgment of the people of Georgia.

This County Commissioners Association held its annual meeting last week in Augusta, Ga., and one of the subjects which came under discussion at the meeting was the United States Supreme Court school decision of May 17, 1954.

This attempt of the Supreme Court to usurp legislative functions which the Court does not possess has been the subject of discussion at a number of meetings and gatherings which are representative of Georgia citizens and which reflect their feelings. Such a meeting was the State convention of the Democratic Party held at Macon, Ga., in the autumn of last year. A strong resolution was adopted at that convention condemning the outrageous action of the Supreme Court in attempting to amend the laws and change the Constitution illegally.

There have been other meetings, some statewide, some local, at which similar resolutions have been adopted expressing the resentment which people of Georgia feel and expressing their condemnation of this high-handed action on the part of the Supreme Court.

At the County Commissioners Association convention above mentioned, on April 26, 1955, that group of representative Georgians adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the people of this sovereign State of Georgia have been and are devout and law-abiding people, and throughout the history of our country have opposed tyranny in any form; and

Whereas on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court chose to abandon all principle and to strike down legal precedent established by able, representative, and distinguished jurists, and by such untoward decision it threatened to attempt to destroy the peaceful relationships existing between the white and black races in the South and Nation; and

Whereas this untoward and unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court was encouraged by the President of the United States through the office of his appointed Attorney General; and

Whereas such a decision is an affront and challenge to the traditions of our people, to the peace and goodwill of our black and white citizens and to our way of life; and

Whereas this decision will breed chaos where there is now harmony and mutual progress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association County Commissioners as follows:

(1) That this association and the members thereof both jointly and severally pledge to the Governor and all public officials of the State, full support in each and every way or means required or necessary, or advisable to protect and maintain the segregation of the races in our schools;

(2) That regardless of what the Federal Government or any division thereof says or does, that there will not be a mixing of the races in our schools and we positively and unequivocally so pledge ourselves;

(3) That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, to the Governor of Georgia and to the governors of each of our sister Southern States, and to each member of the Georgia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out on the floor of this Congress as long ago as 1949 that the Supreme Court was planning to usurp legislative functions, and to assume authority which the Court in fact does not possess,, by handing down a so-called decision, the effect of which would be to amend the Constitution and to change the law of the land.

The Court has endeavored to do exactly that. When this so-called decision was published, the then Governor of Georgia characterized this outrageous and highhanded action of the Supreme Court as an unwarranted assumption of authority, and as the chief executive of a sovereign State, declared that Georgia would not submit to any such assault upon her rights as a State and upon the constitutional rights of her citizens. The present Governor of Georgia has likewise declared himself and stands firmly upon that same position.

This resolution of the County Commissioners Association is another declaration by the people of Georgia that they know their rights, and that they will not suffer those rights to be wrongfully taken from them by a group of would-be reformers who happen for the moment to be sitting in high place in one branch of our Government.

New Cotton Support Plan Is Favored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make available for the edification of my colleagues the following worthwhile editorial which appeared April 22, 1955, in the Bakersfield (Calif.) Californian:

NEW COTTON SUPPORT PLAN IS FAVORED

A new support plan for cotton is reported to be winning the favor of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, who seeks to avoid insofar as possible any fixed high supports and rigid controls on the cotton crop for the coming year.

The new plan would lower the price support level but permit larger planting allotments. Although little has been heard generally about the new plan, it is known that the new arrangement has been devised to permit the cotton farmers to get out from the present rigid controls that have cut the acreage down to the minimum, due to the tremendous carryover and somewhat dim market outlook, as reported by Department officials.

Washington reports point out that the crop, while being cut to the minimum, is being supported at the highest point permitted by law, 90 percent of parity. At a news conference this week, Secretary Benson declared that a program such as that suggested would permit farmers to sell more cotton at home and abroad, and would subsequently permit larger planting allotments.

Mr. Benson said he is finding widespread backing for the plan on the farm level and growers of wheat and rice, also having difficulty with prices and allotments, are seeking a similar program to cover their crops.

The reaction of Western cotton growers to the new arrangement has not been heard, but it is believed that a plan that awards a premium for efficient production of quality cotton and relieves the industry of restrictive practices will find favor here.

Any development that assists the cotton industry to meet market conditions and increase economic returns will be approved by the growers, who are not in favor of restrictions of any kind. Western growers are also anxious to receive equal consideration with others and want no discrimination in any arrangement.

Insofar as high support trends are concerned, here is one view from the New York Times that is interesting:

"High support prices tend to keep farm prices in this country at higher levels than they would be under the operation of natural market forces. We cannot sell farm products at prices above the world market price; the result is pressure to subsidize such export sales. But export subsidies are a form of economic warfare directed in the main against our friends and allies of the free world. They bring animosity and recriminations which weaken free world unity. Moreover, as the growers of cotton have learned to their sorrow, high United States prices stimulate the growth of competitive plantings in other countries.

"All of us are consumers and taxpayers. We pay for high support prices twice, at the grocery store and in our tax bills. Farmers, who are also consumers, also pay a higher price, because high supports require that farmers accept a high degree of governmental regulation for their chief crops. Surely it is time that we made an approach to sanity in our farm policy by adhering to the flexible support program."

H. R. 5928

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I introduced H. R. 5928, a bill which extends tax-amortization benefits to those who construct new plant facilities in areas of labor surplus as designated by the Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

In remarks made on the floor at that time, I referred to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania memorializing the Congress to enact legislation of this type. As a part of my remarks, I include the text of the resolution to which I referred:

Whereas under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code it is permissible to amortize more rapidly certain expenditures made for emergency facilities; and

Whereas the President of the United States if he so finds may declare any area in the United States an acute distress area because of unemployment surplus of labor or other economic cause: Therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation amendments to the Internal Revenue Code so that capital expenditures in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment surplus of labor or other economic cause may receive the same treatment with regard to depreciation allowances as emergency facilities receive under section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

The United States Shipbuilding Industry and Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, many people in the United States are alarmed about the present status of the American merchant marine and the American shipbuilding industry. A strong and modern merchant marine is vital to our Nation's commerce and defense. In the April, 1955, issue of the American Federationist there is an excellent article entitled "Why Should America Stand Last?" written by Mr. James A. Brownlow, president, American Federation of Labor metal trade department. He discusses our merchant marine and our shipbuilding industry. I commend the article to the attention of every Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brownlow's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHOULD AMERICA STAND LAST?

(By James A. Brownlow, president, A. F. of L. metal trades department)

America's shipbuilding industry and merchant marine are vital links in our national defense. On the strength and readiness of the shipbuilding industry and the merchant marine the safety and economic well-being of all Americans depend to a considerable degree. We should have learned this lesson well—the hard way—from our experiences in World War I, World War II and, more recently, the Korean conflict.

Each time our shipbuilding industry and our merchant marine were completely unprepared to meet the emergency. Each time our shipbuilding industry had to perform its tasks in a great rush and at great cost. Each time the industry had been allowed to stagnate until the next emergency hit us.

It is high time that all Americans—regardless of where we live or what we do for a living—awake to this national problem. We must see to it that our elected spokesmen in Congress are aware of our concern and of our insistence on legislation to meet this critical situation effectively.

What has happened to our once vast shipbuilding industry and our merchant marine is a sad saga hidden in statistics. Seldom does the story make the headlines. The reports and the releases of the Maritime Administration and the various shipbuilding and merchant marine associations tell a tale all Americans should know and do something about.

Lloyd's latest report indicates that the United States has dropped to last place among the major shipbuilding nations of the free world. During the last quarter of 1954 our country fell from sixth to twelth place. On January 1 the gross tonnage on the ways in our private United States yards was less than half of that on October 1 of last year.

Lloyd's report is based on all vessels under construction having a gross tonnage of 100 gross tons or more. The Shipbuilders' Council of America collects figures on merchant vessels of 1,000 gross tons or over and which are under construction or on order. The Council's report for January 1 reveals the same shocking story.

On that day the shipyards of the free world had under construction or on order 1,347 vessels of 11,249,398 gross tons. Of this total only 14 vessels of 193,660 gross tons were in American yards. The United States had dropped to tenth among the major shipbuilding nations. On January 1, we had only 1.7 percent of the total tonnage building or on order.

What were other countries doing? Here is the picture:

Country:	*Percentage*
Britain	35.1
Germany	12.6
Sweden	12.3
Holland	9.8
Japan	7.0
France	5.3
Norway	4.8
Italy	3.9
Denmark	2.7

While the United States has been slipping rapidly in ship construction, other countries have been experiencing remarkable gains. During the last quarter of 1954 the yards of the United Kingdom, Japan, Germany, Holland and Italy all rolled up substantial increases in new-tonnage construction. Japan nearly doubled her tonnage during the last quarter of 1954. She claims that during the last three quarters of 1954 she had more ships on order than in 80 years of shipbuilding. Japan now claims to be third in the world in shipbuilding capacity. The yards of Western Germany turned out 920,000 gross tons in 1954—the largest tonnage since World War II. And British yards have a backlog of 4,250,000 gross tons, the president of that country's Shipbuilding Conference has announced.

Meanwhile, our own American shipbuilding industry is in a distressed condition, and it is indeed a sad commentary that this condition has been aggravated—and to a large measure caused—by American firms and their affiliates. They have aggravated the condition by placing ship construction orders in foreign shipyards.

While American yards and their skilled work forces are suffering from lack of work, United States companies and their affiliates have seen fit to build large numbers of ocean-going vessels in the busy shipyards of foreign countries which have been rolling up substantial tonnage.

As of last June 30, United States companies and their affiliates were building or had on order in foreign yards and for foreign registry 57 vessels totaling 888,687 gross tons—roughly 4 times the entire merchant ship tonnage which all our United States private yards had building or on order as of that date.

The orders for 57 vessels to be built in foreign yards included 41 tankers of 678,252 gross tons, 10 ore carriers of 187,150 gross

tons, and 6 dry-cargo vessels of 23,285 gross tons.

These orders of American companies and their affiliates placed in foreign shipyards amount to almost five times the total tonnage under construction or on order in our American yards on February 1. As of that date, our yards had on the ways or on order only 13 sea-going or inland merchant vessels of 1,000 gross tons or more. These 13 vessels, 7 for Government account and 6 for private United States flag account, total only 188,960 gross tons.

These foreign shipbuilding orders of American companies and their affiliates would have assured employment for 1 year for more than the 36,000 skilled worker nucleus which the Maritime Administration figures we need to maintain our private yards in a position to meet the needs of rapid expansion in the event of full mobilization.

If we include our coastal, Great Lakes, and inland waterways and the repair facilities, 130,000 workers are needed in the shipyards of the Nation. These workers and yards should be distributed in the proper ratio on the three coastal fronts and also inland and Great Lakes waterways.

A few weeks ago another large American oil company (Tide Water Associated Oil) announced that it had ordered four 50,000-ton supertankers, the largest such ships ever built, to be constructed in France and delivered in late 1956 and early 1957.

The Maritime Administration has estimated that the construction of a considerably smaller supertanker of 35,500 deadweight tons provides approximately 750 man-years of shipyard work. On this basis, it would appear that these 4 supertankers alone would have supplied our shipyards with at least 4,000 man-years of shipyard work.

Each of these vessels ordered abroad is a direct loss to our shipbuilding industry. As all of them are to be operated under a foreign flag, they will also constitute a loss to our American merchant marine. It is through such practices that these companies fail to sustain our American standard of living and the purchasing power of American workers, which is principally responsible for the broad American markets for their products.

These companies are American companies. They have a moral obligation to support American industry and our standard of living. It is unfair of them to ignore the plight of American workers. The patronage of American workers has made their success possible.

Trade unionists are well acquainted with the tactics of the runaway shop and farming-out of work. What is this practice of American companies in placing their ship construction work in foreign yards and then operating the vessels under foreign flags but another form of this same old problem?

It is true that construction costs in foreign yards are substantially less than in our own. The American standard of living is higher. Direct and indirect costs are greater. Therefore, even though our shipyards are more efficiently operated than those in foreign lands, the end-product costs more.

The construction of a large ocean-going vessel is not nearly so susceptible to the techniques and economies of mass production which have enabled so many American industries to meet foreign competition and constantly improve American living standards. It is still essentially a construction operation requiring specialized skills and large amounts of hand labor.

The fact that a merchant vessel is an instrument of foreign commerce makes it particularly vulnerable to cost advantages of foreign construction. Foreign construction is further stimulated and encouraged by the savings which accrue through foreign-flag operation. Foreign-flag construction and operation under a foreign flag constitute a runaway from the decent living standards established over many years of struggle by American ship-building workers and merchant seamen through their respective trade-union organizations. The saving on construction averages at least 30 percent, and thereafter foreign flag operating costs are only about one-fourth of the costs of operation under the American flag.

Ten short years ago the United States led the entire world in ship production. Between 1941 and 1945 our yards produced 5,280 ocean-going ships totaling 54 million dead-weight tons. For every 100 workers employed in our private yards during the wartime peak, less than 5 are employed today. Today the United States is fighting for its life as a shipbuilding nation. We stand in last place—not first—among the major shipbuilding countries of the free world.

America's shipbuilding facilities are a vital part of our national defense. The success of any wartime overseas operation depends directly on the availability of speedy modern vessels to transport men, equipment, and supplies. Prompt and adequate action by Congress on a program, including subsidies, to offset advantages of foreign-yard construction and foreign-flag operation is essential if we are going to maintain the necessary hard core of our shipbuilding industry and our merchant marine.

The merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry go hand in hand. The merchant-marine picture is dark. For the first time since 1939 we have lost our world leadership in the volume of privately owned ocean-going tanker tonnage. As of the close of last year, according to the American Merchant Marine Institute, our privately owned ocean-going tanker tonnage had decreased by 38 vessels and 320,000 deadweight tons. This left us at the start of 1955 with 6,624,658 deadweight tons, as compared with the United Kingdom's 7,054,000 deadweight tons.

United States petroleum imports in 1954 were a little above 1953 and five times those of 1938. However, our American-flag tankers hauled only 33 percent of this oil in the first 9 months of 1954, while in 1938 American tankers hauled 53 percent of our incoming oil and in 1946 they hauled 76 percent.

Our tanker-fleet tonnage is at its lowest level in 6 years. The standing of the leading tanker nations on January 1 was as follows:

Country:	*Deadweight tonnage*
United Kingdom	7,054,000
United States	6,624,658
Norway	5,693,000
Panama	3,578,000
Liberia	2,609,000
Italy	1,642,000
France	1,442,000
Sweden	1,166,000

The American people are the largest users of petroleum in the world. A vast portion of this petroleum comes from overseas. Recent testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee indicated that six companies import 70 percent of the foreign oil used in the United States. Five of these are American companies. These five are purported to have 89 percent of their proved oil reserves and 64 percent of their present oil production outside of the United States.

Increasingly these American companies are resorting to foreign-ship construction and foreign-flag operation (frequently through their foreign-controlled affiliates). Foreign construction gives them an initial cost advantage. Often this is supplemented by a healthy-sized construction subsidy, accelerated cost-writeoff allowances and, in at least one country (which has now passed us in construction tonnage), a complete exemption from income tax of all revenue derived from new ships for the first 3 years of their operation.

Tonnage itself does not tell the whole story. The American Merchant Marine Institute estimates that about 75 percent of our American tanker fleet was built during World War II and only 12 percent since the war. By contrast, only 25 percent of the foreign-flag tankers were built during the war and more than 50 percent of foreign tankers are relatively new, having been launched since the war.

About 85 percent of our tankers will face the problem of obsolescence within the next 10 years. Replacement of our tankers as they reach the 20-year age limit will require careful planning of industry and Government and the availability of large sums of money if our privately owned and operated tanker fleet is to be maintained.

During the last 12 months increasing numbers of American merchant seamen have been beached. These Americans are jobless because of generally slow conditions in our shipping industry, the transfer of more than 130 ships to foreign flags and the construction of new vessels for foreign-flag operation.

On January 1, according to the Maritime Administration, our merchant fleet offered 58,800 berths. This was 7,550 fewer than a year earlier. Unemployment rolls and union waiting lists "reflect the sad state of the Nation's seagoing force," says the New York Times. According to this newspaper, the A. F. of L. Masters, Mates, and Pilots report only one-third of 12,000 members at sea. This union supplies deck officers for virtually all of the Nation's deep-sea shipping. The other unions of seagoing workers report longer-than-usual waits for jobs.

America's shipbuilding industry and America's merchant marine operate directly in the national interest. They are part and parcel of our national defense. Last year Congress enacted various measures designed to bolster the shipbuilding industry and the merchant marine. These included:

The so-called 50–50 cargo bill, requiring that at least one-half of all cargoes financed by the United States Government—whether inbound or outbound—must move in American flag ships. A ship mortgage insurance law. A law providing for the private construction of 15 tankers for long-term Navy charter and the building of 4 by the Navy. The Liberty ship conversion program, providing for the experimental conversion of four of these vessels. The tanker "trade in and build" program. The passenger-cargo ship replacement program providing for the replacement of four passenger-cargo vessels for South American and Caribbean trade. The Navy (MSTS) special ship program, involving seven special-type ships. The emergency repair program providing $12 million for repair of vessels from the laid-up fleet.

These programs are helpful. They mitigate—but do not solve—the national crisis in shipbuilding and the merchant marine. The long-term merchant ship construction program, which the 83d Congress failed to act on, is sorely needed. This proposal called for the construction in American shipyards of 60 cargo and cargo-passenger ships per year.

Adoption of this program would be a long step toward meeting the "block obsolescence" which faces our merchant fleet and would assure a nucleus of about 36,000 skilled workers employment in our merchant shipyards for our ocean-going ships. According to the Maritime Administration, this is the minimum peacetime employment which must be maintained in our merchant ship construction program as a "mobilization nucleus" if our private yards are to be in a position to meet the needs of rapid expansion in the event of full mobilization. The 84th Congress, which is now in session, should take prompt and favorable action on similar legislation.

The present growing trend toward foreign construction and foreign flag operation is sapping the strength of our shipbuilding industry and our merchant marine. Our national safety, which demands the maintenance of our shipbuilding at least at the "mobilization nucleus" level and a speedy modern merchant marine fleet with the skilled men to man it, is endangered.

Our merchant marine is our lifeline in wartime overseas operations. It must be ready and available to transport men, equipment and mountains of supplies, should the need arise.

We must keep our American corporation-controlled ship construction work in our American yards. We must see to it that American-owned vessels operate under the American flag. Effective action to solve these problems must be taken promptly by the 84th Congress.

National Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I present below an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Post, Washington, D. C. I feel this editorial presents a clear picture of the proposed national Reserve program which will soon be before the House of Representatives for consideration. The editorial, entitled "A Compulsory Reserve" is as follows:

A COMPULSORY RESERVE

The House Armed Services Committee has produced what probably is as good an Armed Forces Reserve bill as can be obtained in present circumstances. The bill in no sense provides universal military training, which has become a sort of emotional bugaboo on Capitol Hill. Because there is a possibility, with lowered draft quotas, that some young men will escape both active duty and Reserve obligations, there will be charges that the bill is unfair. Nevertheless, the measure retains the one most essential feature of all: authority for the armed services to compel participation of trained men in Reserve programs, with failure to participate penalized by call to active duty and possible court-martial. Obviously this authority should be used sparingly and sympathetically, but the authority itself is necessary.

Legislators as well as military officials are aware that the present Reserve program, at least in the Army, is very largely a joke. It is virtually impossible to tell how many effective, trained reservists actually could be counted on in an emergency. Some of the trouble arises from the slipshod manner in which, until recently, the Army managed reserve training; but some also arises from the tenuous nature of the present law which makes participation in the Reserves difficult to enforce once men have been released from duty.

The new bill recognizes a reserve obligation of up to 7½ years, depending on the length of time served on full-time duty, for young men who are drafted for regular service or who volunteer for the proposed 6-month UMT-type training program. The committee declined, however, to give the Armed Forces authority to draft men for the 6-month basic program if volunteers should not fill the quotas. Thus the Armed Forces will draft men for active duty only, as at present. The appeal of the 6-month program will lie in the chance it offers young men to volunteer and get their full-time duty over with rather than to wait out the possibility of 2 years of draft service.

Although the requirements of the atomic age may change the patterns of manpower use, there is no reason to think that there will be any less need for trained men than in the days of more conventional defense. A genuine universal training program would still be the most equitable way to build a strong Reserve. If the UMT concept is politically infeasible, then what the House committee has devised is the next best thing. We hope that the full House, as well as the Senate, will recognize that mandatory training is the only key to a reliabe Reserve.

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a pertinent editorial from the Carlisle, (Pa.) Sentinel of April 26, 1955:

GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP

In a recent interview, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, chairman of Armed Services Committee and former Secretary of the Air Force, declared that long-range, guided missiles are, currently, the gravest threat to the United States; this Government is far behind in development of these missiles; that Russia has made much greater progress along this line, and—going back in history—if the Normandy invasion had been delayed 2 months it could not have been made because Hitler's rockets would have been sufficient to stop such an invasion.

This information came as a complete surprise to the public, but the Senator is in a position to know what he is talking about. The only reason the public has not known is because information has been suppressed by the Defense Department on orders of Secretary Wilson. Secretary Wilson, of course, is acting on orders from his boss.

It is within the right of the President to order the withholding of information which could be detrimental to the program of defense, but it is tragic that the Defense Department is permitted to withhold information which the public should have, by marking it "classified"—not only because the public has a right to know but because pertinent information such as the status of the missile situation should, and will bring an increase in public interest and will help the Civilian Defense and Ground Observer Corps programs.

The long-range, guided-missiles situation is, however, only one of many subjects of which the people of the Nation should have knowledge. Others are (1) cutbacks in the military—the elimination of men and women who volunteered for service, have been taught, and have experience, while at the same time men who do not want to serve and are green are being drafted daily to take the places of those discharged; (2) the Air Force which, instead of having 143 wings as planned, has only 58; (3) the overall lack of strength to fight a war in the Far East and lack of United States foot soldiers to hold territory gained; (4) the cool relationship between the United States and her allies; (5) bombs, and methods of protection against bombs.

For some imperceptible reason the administration thinks information on vulnerability to attack, military strength, weapons, and all else, would be bad for the public. That kind of thinking is false. Americans want to know the best and the worst. They proved in 1776 and ever since that they can face good and bad news calmly. They should be given the news. Supersecrets they want kept supersecret.

But if the administration has any notion that much of that same "classified" information and secrets are not known by enemies, the administration is incredulously naive.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Emergency Controls Over Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congressman FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and I have today filed identical resolutions directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to exercise, for a limited period of time, certain emergency controls with respect to the distribution and use of the Salk vaccine.

It is with some reluctance that we arrived at this decision to provide some elements of compulsion to the great problem of price, priorities, and distribution affecting Dr. Salk's great achievement in the field of infantile paralysis.

However, events of the past several days clearly indicate that voluntary cooperation in this matter on the part of the drug industry, the medical profession, distributors, and local communities is deteriorating into a state that requires compulsion.

Already rumors have given way to fact that a black-market, profiteering, sales to adults rather than provision for children are being established. There is considerable evidence that the vaccine will be in short supply. This situation necessitates compulsion.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that in section 8 of the resolution we ask that its effect end on May 31, 1956, except that if, prior to that time, the Secretary finds and makes a public announcement that the emergency which necessitated this resolution no longer exists. Then the resolution shall cease to be in effect at the close of the day upon which such public announcement is made.

The following editorials and news account bring sharply into focus the need for the kind of resolution presented to this House today:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 2, 1955]

WASHINGTON MUST ACT

The Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis is a national blessing which has created a national emergency. Experts have confirmed the vaccine's general efficacy. The demand is far greater than the supply. Every child in America has a right to its protection.

The serum can only be, and must be, controlled nationally.

Prior to the publication of the Francis report on the success of Dr. Salk's discovery, no agency, public or private, had thought through all the problems involved in the production and distribution of this great boon.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which deserves great credit for initiative, efficiency, and determination, had made contracts for the purchase of vaccine for free administration to children. It is delivering the serum to communities, but has no authority over private distribution of quantities produced in excess of its own contracts, nor can it effectively control community action after the vaccine is in the hands of local health authorities.

States and localities have improvised their own distribution systems. For the most part, these are based on voluntary allocations and priorities, and are concerned more with the acquisition of and payment for the vaccine than with seeing to it that priorities are absolutely observed. Only on Friday, after it was clear that the voluntary system was breaking down, did New York City place penalties on the unauthorized sale or possession of the Salk serum. This was a purely local move; the penalties, moreover, are light in view of the great temptation offered by the short supply of the vaccine: $500 fine, a year in jail, or both.

The Federal Government, the only authority capable of exercising national controls, made no serious effort, before the release of the report, to anticipate its responsibilities. The Public Health Service licenses and supervises the manufacture of the Salk vaccine under the National Biologics Control Act. Powers under this act have been exercised in withdrawing the product of the Cutter Laboratories from distribution.

But the law applies only to the source, only to quality. It gives the Federal Government no authority over allocation, over price, over violators of agreements. The administration has relied on voluntary cooperation and on advisory committees.

The fear of polio has haunted parents for generations. It is too much to expect of human nature that when the promise of release from that fear appears, voluntary arrangements will hold against a mother's insistence on the protection of her children or the greed of those who want to make money out of that emotion. New Yorkers remember the near-riots that were produced by the distribution of gamma globulin, far less effective than the Salk vaccine. They are aware that already supplies of the new serum have disappeared into unauthorized channels and been diverted to adults when the moral right of children to priority is unchallenged.

To bring order out of this explosive situation, a national law is essential. There are five requirements for such a law:

1. It must be simple and sweeping, giving the Federal Government the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producing laboratory to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions and absolute priorities according to need.

2. It must provide for the prompt dissemination of fully evaluated information on all medical aspects of the program. Doubts have arisen across the Nation over such matters as provocation and the timing of shots in relation to the incidence of polio. Parents are entitled to know what disinterested experts think of these questions as they arise. Their children's lives are at stake.

3. It must be clearly limited in time and subject, so that there will be no doubt that this is an emergency answer to an emergency situation, not a step toward socialized medicine. A year, or at most two, will probably bring supply and demand into balance.

4. It must have teeth. Penalties for violators—both users and sellers—should be harsh, several years in jail, some thousands of dollars in fines, so that there will be no prospect of profit in flouting the law.

5. Finally, and of the utmost importance, the act must be passed immediately and administered vigorously. The emergency is now—not tomorrow or next month. Congress can pass a law through both Houses in a single day, if the need is great enough. It should pass this legislation forthwith. The Government should be prepared to put its execution in the hands of the country's top administrators, experienced in allocations and priorities.

Given such leadership, working in harmony with all interested parties, red tape could be cut, the machinery set in motion, and speedy enforcement assured.

The parents and children of the Nation demand it. The whole world is waiting to see whether the United States will use this great new weapon against polio swiftly, efficiently and—above all—equitably.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of May 2, 1955]

FAIR PLAY FOR ALL

It is estimated that it will take roughly 2 years to get the Salk polio vaccine inoculations on a standard national level; to the point where supply and demand become compatible and the whole matter is more or less routine.

Two years is a long way off, when you start measuring time in terms of human life. Between now and then, there will be millions of Americans who will want, and need the polio preventive, and what has happened during the past 2 weeks demonstrated how poorly prepared we were, as a Nation, to utilize fully this tremendous medical boon to all mankind.

Very naturally, all parents want their children to be among the first to be protected. This is manifestly impossible and already there are ugly rumors that predators in the guise of human beings are moving in to take advantage of a difficult situation by organizing and running a black market in the Salk vaccine.

The penalties for any such outrageous offense should be swift and drastic. These vultures are trading in human lives, and the quicker they are exposed and removed from this society the better it will be for everyone. Because of the magnitude of this entire enterprise, the United States Government should be the agency to shoulder the responsibility and see to it that every child gets his fair share of this golden opportunity to rid the human race of one of its most dread diseases.

The announcement that the inoculations would still go forward, despite the unfortunate circumstances surrounding the Cutter vaccine, should provide heartening news. Eventually, research will disclose whether the California-produced vaccine was faulty, or whether its makers just had the bad luck to be participants in a series of coincidences they had no way of predicting.

All of this is part of the current uncertainty that is rapidly reaching critical proportions. Because the human element is so vital, it behooves all agencies connected with

the dissemination of the vaccine to employ the utmost caution in their dealings with those who are to handle it, and to make sure that it gets into only the most trustworthy hands.

This is easy to say and hard to do, yet it certainly must be done. That there should even be rumors of a black market in the vaccine is enough to turn the stomach, and one way to wipe out that menace would be to have every vial and all its contents officially accounted for right up to the point where it reaches the person to be inoculated.

Such a system of controls won't come into being overnight, but the sooner someone in authority starts on it, then the sooner the whole country can begin getting the greatest good from this modern-day miracle.

We are given to understand that the Salk vaccine will not be 100 percent effective. This was predicated in the Ann Arbor findings. There will be those who will still be victims of polio, but the majority will be protected. This is more than we have ever been able to say before and the measure of hope is wonderfully comforting.

There are going to be adults who will try to get themselves in line for the shots ahead of little children, and for them we have nothing but the utmost contempt. They, too, should face some sort of penalty, and be forced to recognize their responsibilities if they haven't the moral stamina to understand them of their own accord.

All of these elements should be part of any comprehensive program to protect the vaccine from racketeers and to insure its getting to the correct destination as safely and as quickly as possible. The same rules should apply everywhere, and every child should get a square deal. It is unthinkable that any other procedure can be allowed.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of May 3, 1955]

VACCINE

NEW YORK.—The World-Telegram and the Sun reported that Salk polio vaccine was pouring steadily into offices of many New York physicians but not a single drop had been made available for the city's 281,000 school children.

The Scripps-Howard newspaper said this unpleasant picture on vaccine distribution via commercial channels had been made available to it by a top pharmaceutical source:

1. At least two manufacturers of the Salk vaccine are mailing, or delivering directly, three to nine cubic centimeters of the vaccine to hundreds of New York doctors—in exchange for orders on other pharmaceutical items.

2. One manufacturer has sent free samples of the vaccine to all stockholders who hold 20 or more shares in the company.

3. Some 4,500 vials of the vaccine, in three and nine cc packages, have been earmarked for 3,000 New York physicians by the Parke-Davis Laboratory in Teterboro, N. J., according to William R. Peer, executive secretary to Mayor Robert F. Wagner.

[From the New York Post of May 3, 1955]

VACCINE MAKERS EXPECTED TO REAP $20 MILLION PROFIT DURING 1955

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The Salk polio vaccine, which yields no royalties to Dr. Jonas Salk who discovered it, is expected to bring $20 million in profits this year to its manufacturers, the Post learned today.

Pre-tax profits for the 6 drug houses licensed to produce the vaccine will be more than 33 percent, well-informed Wall Street sources estimated. This figure includes deductions for manufacturing and distributing costs.

Stock market speculators also stand to realize handsome profits.

Mrs. Jean Cummings Collingwood, Washington's "Mother of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it gives me not a little pleasure to include in the noteworthy events to which the attention of the Members of the House is from time to time called, the selection of Mrs. G. Harris (Jean Cummings) Collingwood as Washington's "Mother of the Year."

Mrs. Harris came to Washington with her husband, G. Harris Collingwood, from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, which it has been my honor and privilege to represent for some years. She was born in Centreville, Mich., 7 miles from the city of Three Rivers, and a few miles from the village of Constantine, my boyhood home.

One of her six children, her daughter Jean, was also born in Centreville, and now resides in St. Joseph, Berrien County, Mich., also in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, as the wife of my good friend, John H. Spelman, presently prosecuting attorney of Berrien County.

An interesting article about Mrs. Cummings, written by Mrs. Esther Van Wagoner Tufty and published in the Three Rivers (Mich.) Commercial, follows:

MICHIGAN IN WASHINGTON

(By Esther Van Wagoner Tufty)

WASHINGTON.—Washington's mother-of-the-year, Mrs. Jean Cummings Collingwood, still calls Michigan "home" although she's lived in the Capital since 1923.

She's one of the first Michigan-in-Washington people I met. Handsomely tall and attractively-alert, she was helping her friend, the late Mrs. Arthur Vandenberg serve tea and those tiny Vandenberg-doughnuts to a hundred or more visiting Michigan Daughters of the American Revolution in the Capital, for their spring congress. (Mrs. Collingwood retains her membership in the Abiel Fellows Chapter of DAR in Three Rivers.)

Born in Centreville, 7 miles from Three Rivers, which is still her voting residence, she is the daughter of the late Frank Cummings, who manufactured these well known Denton sleeping garments for children. His daughter laughingly recalls, "My sister Margie and I wore the first models."

Two of the six Collingwood children were born in Michigan: Charles, in Three Rivers (he's named for Circuit Court Judge Charles B. Collingwood who served for 25 years in Ingham County); and Jean in Centreville (she attended Michigan State College and is married to Prosecuting Attorney John H. Spellman and lives in Berrien County). Another daughter, Rebecca, graduated from Western Michigan College of Education at Kalamazoo and presented her mother with twin grandchildren. Married to James P. McHale, Rebecca now lives in Hopkinton, Mass.

The local American Mothers Committee chose wisely as this Michigan-born woman gives special meaning to the word "homemaker." Her husband, G. Harris Collingwood didn't chose a profession (forestry and conservation) that produced lavish luxuries for their six children.

But the six * * * all of whom had to write "supporting letters" * * * are really exceptional. One son is an artist. Another is a well-known radio-TV news star. The youngest is a preacher. The three daughters are "well married."

Now mother Jean, at 60, has 9 grandchildren. But she continues her civic interests, although she's dropped out of the PTA and church youth work. Still active in Westermoreland Congregational church and volunteer YWCA activities, Mrs. Collingwood inherited a desire to participate in things political, social, and cultural. She was singing at a political meeting (Republican) attended by the Cummings and Collingwood families when she met her husband.

Mrs. Collingwood will compete for the national title at a luncheon in New York later this month.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege today to pay tribute to a national holiday which cannot be observed in the homeland of the people we are honoring. This is Polish Constitution Day, commemorating May 3, 1791, when the people of Poland wrote a document which won wide acclaim as an achievement in creative statesmanship. Although Poland was shortly thereafter overrun, when its people again won their freedom they returned to that fine constitution and observed its tenets until the armies of two dictators—Hitler and Stalin—enforced the brutal partition of Poland in 1939. Today, the terrible force of international communism is maintaining that despot rule.

What do the Poles think of their Communist overlords? Any of you who know the Poles and their descendants who are in America today realize that communism is alien to the very nature of a Pole. Despite a fanatic band of traitors who do the bidding of the Russians, the Communist Polish Government has great difficulty finding persons it can trust to leave the country.

Look at a few of the Poles who have defected to the West during the past year:

Andrzei Panufnik, Poland's leading composer in Switzerland in July 1954.

Antoni Klimowicz, a stowaway in London in August 1954.

Krystyna Bujnowska, of the famous Mazowsze dance ensemble in Paris in November 1954.

Twenty-two Polish sailors from the ships *Praca* and *Gottwald* on Formosa.

And so many others. They all tell the same story: That Poland will not be destroyed; that the overwhelming majority of Poles are bitterly anti-Communist, and that they need reassurance from the free world that we have not forgotten them.

Can we ever forget the nation which was first to resist Hitler's aggression and was an original signatory of the Declaration of the United Nations on January 2,

1942? Can we forget that the Polish Constitution—which was adopted only 2 years after our own—was inspired by the same faith in freedom?

Our own freedom was won, and has always been maintained, at great cost and through constant endeavor. Wherever freedom is suppressed, it is a threat to our liberties. We must dedicate this day to the great people of Poland and observe for them this constitution day which sometime in the future they will be able to celebrate again as free people.

The John Day Multipurpose Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 the Dalles Chronicle, published at The Dalles, Oreg., carried an editorial entitled "Let's Be Specific." This editorial deals with an explanation of H. R. 5789 and is such an outstanding example of what the public press can do in the way of educating the American public on current legislation which affects them that, under unanimous consent, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

LET'S BE SPECIFIC

For the first time the proposal for Federal-partnership construction of the John Day multipurpose dam can be debated on the detailed provisions of the measure.

The new bill sponsored by Representative SAM COON, of eastern Oregon, is so detailed in its requirements that the debate on the question can be argued on specific provisions. Up to now, debate has been largely confined to political philosophies with insufficient reference to the facts.

Now the people of The Dalles area, at least, have had the opportunity of acquaint themselves with the provisions of the new bill that would provide the means for early construction of the vitally needed project only 30 miles upstream from here.

Representative COON has explained the provisions at length in news stories and this past week the Chronicle ran a four-part series reviewing the bill, section by section. The Eastern Oregon Congressman's vigorous advocacy of his project has served to throw light on a subject that has been more denounced than explained.

Examination of the bill indicates that every effort has been made to include provisions that will meet reasonable objections. There is no reason to believe the bill cannot be amended to meet other objections.

There has been the outcry that the Government would receive the short end of the partnership proposal. One way to test the accuracy of the accusation is to check what the Government gets out of the bill. First, the Government puts up $37 million and the partners $273 million for a $310 million dam that the Government would own lock, stock, and barrel. The Government would sell the power to the partners and this revenue would be used to operate the dam and retire the cost of 88 percent of the project. When the power facilities were paid off in 50 years or less the Government then would sell the power to anyone.

The next step in checking the accuracy of the charge that the Government would suffer a loss is to reverse the positions of the Government and the partners. Can you imagine the outcry that would go up if the Government were to invest $273 million in a dam that would be owned by groups that would put up only $37 million?

Most of the furor over the partnership principle comes from Democratic Party leaders who apparently are unfamiliar with the record set by Presidents Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, southwest Oregon Congressman, notes that the Government has engaged in partnership contracts for more than 30 years and under Democratic and Republican administrations. To quote Representative ELLSWORTH:

"Under the Truman administration in July 1950, the Federal Government began replacement of a navigation lock and dam at St. Anthony Falls, Minn., which cost the Federal Government $9,743,000. The partnership was entered into with the private utility, Northern States Power Co., which remodeled and installed power facilities at a cost of $1,535,000."

The latest in date of four partnership projects during the Roosevelt administration listed in the statement is given by the Congressman as follows:

"The Roosevelt administration in 1941 approved a partnership at the Harry L. Englebright Reservoir project in California where the Federal cost was $4,003,000 and the cost to the partners for installation of the power facilities was $1,500,000. The partners were private hydraulic mining interests and private utilities, the Sacramento Valley Utility Co. and Pacific Gas and Electric Co."

What is more, Democratic Party's 1952 presidential candidate, Adlai Stevenson, made a statement in Portland that has been interpreted to mean that he favored the partnership principle when local interests were able and willing to finance a project.

Until both Houses of Congress show a willingness to finance all-Federal construction of the John Day dam, the Federal-partnership bill should be considered on its merits.

If opponents kill the John Day Federal-partnership bill they will be obligated to produce an alternative that will accomplish the same purpose—early construction of a vitally needed multipurpose project.

The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio conducts an essay contest, and the winners are given a trip to Washington. Out of the thousands of essays submitted, three winners are selected from each grade from 9 to 12. This year the subject was The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today. This noon members of the Ohio delegation in the House and Senate entertained the prize winners at lunch. Each of them made brief speeches. It was a great experience for all of us. I congratulate the American Legion of Ohio for their carrying on this contest and on the timely and important subject selected for this year. I congratulate the winners. Two of them were from my congressional district. I want the House to see their essays, and I have therefore obtained leave to place them in the RECORD at this point:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Charlotte A. Jenkins, 1517 Elaine Road, Columbus, Ohio)

Spirit guidance has played a great part in the world of yesterday; today, its importance must still be deeply stressed, for it can cause our lives to be bountifully rich or miserably poor.

Our Nation today shows the effects of the spiritual guidance of our colonial forefathers. Those men fought and died with hope and guidance from one divinely strong. All was not glory, for there were times when the black thundercloud of despair prevailed. Take, for instance, the year 1787, the year of the Constitutional Convention. The delegates continually gossiped among themselves, argued, and were faced with resentment and rivalry. A general air of dissension prevailed until an elderly gentleman of 81, namely, Benjamin Franklin, stood up and instilled in those men's hearts the importance of spiritual guidance and prayer. After adjournment, heads bowed asking for guidance from God. God answered these humble pleas and under His guidance that great document of liberty, the Constitution, was penned. We today feel the effects of this spiritual document. Just think. You or I can rise from the realms of nothing to a position of highest respect. We are free to worship, free to think and act, free to work and play, free to look toward new heights. These are the effects of spirtual guidance of the past.

The world's greatest people of today and yesterday have asked for and received spiritual guidance. George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Edison, Florence Nightingale, Pope Pius XII, President Eisenhower, and countless others under God's guidance have played star roles in our lives. They have affected the world by preserving liberty, by inventing marvelous wonders, by shining as an example to the millions of people. The agony of one of our most tragic diseases of today, polio, has been greatly alleviated because of one woman who had the courage to defy sneers and jests, and who prayed for guidance. This woman was Sister Kenney, and her work shall always hold a place of the highest respect.

In today's modern world, we need more spiritual guidance. Delinquency of both juveniles and adults, the high rate of divorce, the growing tentacles of communism, and the threatening menace of war testify to the lack of this guidance. The delinquency of our adolescents is a crucial matter. A few mischievous pranks is a symbol of youth, but crimes of brutality and savagery committed by young people call for action on the part of everyone, young and old, rich and poor. In a home under spiritual guidance, a youngster can grow where all physical and spiritual needs are supplied. This youngster will become a better citizen, equipped to protect his heritage of freedom. Great men have asked for guidance on this problem of delinquency; in answer, organizations, such as the Big Brothers and Father Flannagan's Boys' Town, have been established. These organizations have made their mark in the world, for most of their boys have become good citizens, prepared to live useful lives.

We have something which can change the life of the whole world and is, in my opinion the greatest product of spiritual guidance: the Bible. Missionaries, carrying this message into the densest forest and jungle regions have brought new hope and faith to peoples once hidden in darkness. In some parts of the world, the complete lack of belief

in the Bible and spiritual guidance has caused morale to sink to a low ebb, and brutality and barbarianism to prevail. In countries of Christian belief, the people have faith and a higher moral code.

When we consider the men who play the most vital part in our spiritual guidance, we must, without doubt, mean our ministers. These men, in sorrow and joy, administer guidance in a way that satisfies each individual group.

Yes, through spiritual guidance today, we can hope to enjoy a better world tomorrow. Because of our American heritage, we are destined to be a beacon of light and spiritual guidance to the world.

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Paul Redmond, 1466 Oakwood Avenue, Columbus, Ohio)

There is in the world today what I believe to be the beginning of a great spiritual awakening. Already its effects are being felt in all phases of life. A constantly increasing number of people are becoming concerned about the lack of Godliness in the world and are trying to do something about it. I am going to give a few examples of the effects of this growing interest in spiritual matters by telling what some people and organizations have already accomplished.

The great American evangelist, Billy Graham recently toured Europe. He preached in England, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Germany, and France, proclaiming Christ as the only salvation for the world today. He preached every night for 3 months in Great Britain; from there he went to the continental cities, staying only 2 or 3 days in each city. Everywhere he spoke there was an overflow of people who had to be turned away because of the great throngs of people who had come to hear him proclaim his message. At one place where he spoke there was a crowd of over 120,000 people. Under his spiritual guidance hundreds of thousands of people have accepted Christ and His way of life. When interviewed, Billy Graham said, "Britain is at the beginning of what could be the greatest spiritual awakening of all times."

This last summer there was a meeting at Evanston, Ill., of the World Council of Churches. This meeting was composed of representatives from 161 denominations, 48 countries, and every continent on the globe. The object of this meeting was to bring those who believe in Christ together in one big effort to put Christ back in the world today.

During the last 2 years there has been a great spiritual awakening in our own United States. President Eisenhower has helped in this greatly. He realizes his personal need for God's guidance, attends church regularly, and sees that each of his cabinet meetings is begun by prayer. Our President has become a good influence on the spiritual life in America today. Recently a new Prayer Room in the Senate chambers has been opened so that the Senators might have a place to go to beseech divine guidance.

Several months ago the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was changed by act of Congres. It has been changed from "One Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all" to "One Nation under God indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." This was another stepping stone toward bringing God back into His rightful place.

In the field of literature, religious books in America last year outsold all other books put together by 3 times. Along this same line, there has been a great increase in church attendance.

I hope, and I believe, that the world is gradually turning more and more to God for spiritual guidance. If the people continue to do this, it will not be too long before this world will be a better place to live in. It is the prayer of all nations that there shall be peace in our times.

The Polish Spirit of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, when Americans study the history of their revolution, they cannot fail to be impressed by the participation therein of certain foreigners, who were attracted to these shores to fight for liberty. Among these illustrious men none was more valiant, and none was more valuable to the cause of freedom, than two officers from far away Poland, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, and Gen. Casimir Pulaski. The former was to a considerable extent responsible for the defenses of West Point, the latter was our first commander of cavalry, and gave his life for our yet unborn country in 1779.

In serving the cause of freedom, Generals Kosciusko and Pulaski were given expression to the characteristic Polish love of liberty. Indeed, Poland had a long tradition of democracy, a tradition which found its expression in the Polish Constitution of 1791, whose anniversary we celebrate today. That constitution, proclaimed only 2 years after our own beginnings as a nation, was a classic statement of the philosophy which holds that the source of government's power is found in the people. It provided for a bicameral legislature, limited the rights of the king, guaranteed freedom of religion, granted political rights to the common people, and improved the status of the peasants by bringing them under the protection of the law.

Soon thereafter, however, tragedy struck. Poland was partitioned for the second time by the rapacious powers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. From 1795 until the end of the First World War, Poland was under hated foreign rule. During all that time, however, she never passively accepted tyranny, but revolted repeatedly. During all that time also, she had the ardent sympathies of the United States, a sympathy repeatedly expressed by many groups in our society.

The new Polish state which arose in the wake of the First World War was confronted with the twin problems of security against external aggression and the provision of an adequate standard of living for her people. She struggled manfully to meet these problems in a world of increasing tension, both economic and political.

Finally, in 1939, Poland was to make the world's first stand for liberty against the onslaughts of the Nazi hordes. But her strength could not avail against the blitzkreig, supplemented as it was by the Soviet stab in the back. In short, Poland suffered a new partition, and one far worse than the old. No people endured more, or resisted more defiantly than the Poles. When the circumstances of war made the Russians our allies, hope rose again in Polish hearts that Poland might yet be free.

To our profound regret, this was not to be. With utter hyprocrisy the Soviet Government failed to carry out its pledge to permit free elections in Poland. Instead it clamped ever tighter the vise in which Poland is held today.

Today all Americans join our brethren of Polish descent in affirming that we cannot believe that this is the final destiny of Poland. We know that in God's good time the hirelings of Moscow who rule today in Warsaw will be deposed. When that time comes, the spirit that will move the Polish people will be the spirit and the tradition of the constitution of 1791.

The Effects of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay which won a prize in the essay contest conducted by the American Legion of Ohio:

THE EFFECTS OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Raymond J. Zeman, Jr., Geneva, Ohio)

It is encouraging to note that religious influence is at work in the world today. In many countries the children are guided along religious beliefs as soon as they are old enough to read and write, and are taught the difference between right and wrong. In this way the young people grow up properly guided which is beneficial not only to their locality but to their country as well.

Today, more than ever, spiritual guidance is needed in this world. Inspired men like Bishop Fulton Sheen and Dr. Norman Vincent Peale have dedicated their whole lives to God and the Church. They broadcast on television and radio with people half-way around the world listening to, and benefiting from their programs. Both of these great orators have recorded several long-playing records of their inspirational talks, and have written many books, begin to realize that we are all here for one purpose, which is to love and serve God. If more people would understand this, our world would be a much better one in which to live. Fortunately, the effects of such inspirational help are beginning to take root, as the sale of religious writings have reached an all-time high.

A country, like Russia, that doesn't have religious freedom experiences many difficulties. Since everything belongs to the state, the people don't have anything to live for. The productivity of their farms is declining, since most of their hard-earned products are taken from them, leaving scarcely enough food for the poor peasants' own sustenance. Personally, I think that if the Russian people were allowed to worship as they pleased, their agricultural standards would improve rapidly, and this in turn, would result in an improved philosophy toward life.

In a democracy, such as the United States, spiritual guidance is well demonstrated by binding the country together. Without religion the people of this country would not work or live together in peace for 5 minutes. Spiritual guidance helps the people to work with their neighbors, which results not only

in self-improvement, but it benefits the country as well.

All of our presidents, from George Washington to Dwight D. Eisenhower, have demonstrated their faith when taking the inaugural oath. This divine guidance has made it possible for our leaders to solve the many problems which have confronted them in the past years, and it is apparent that in the future all major problems will definitely be solved by this spiritual influence. Woodrow Wilson, during the depressing years of World War I, said, and I quote, "I fairly believe in divine providence. Without God I think I would go crazy, without God, the world would be a maze without a clue."

The effects of spiritual guidance have been manifold. Never before have there been so many charitable organizations whose purpose is to relieve man's suffering. By ship and plane, food and clothing are being sent to the hungry and destitute people of the world. State and national contests, such as this one inspire our youths to think constructively about things that are worthwhile. The YW and YMCA are instilling Christian principles in our young people. By posters, television, and radio, people are urged to attend church; the Bible heads the list of best sellers, theological universities have increased enrollments, far in excess of past years. National days of prayer have become customary; the trend toward God is definitely encouraging, so much so in fact, that the day will surely come when His children can say: "God's in His heaven; all's right with the world."

Economic Growth of South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting, instructive, and well-prepared reports on the economic growth of the South, with special emphasis upon trends as shown by the gulf coast area and Louisiana, has been prepared for the Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc., of Lafayette, by Dr. William H. Baughn, Ph. D., professor of business administration, Louisiana State University.

I am advised that this publication entitled "Economic Expansion, Louisiana, the Gulf Coastal States, the South" will receive widespread distribution by the Central Louisiana Electric Co., the Louisiana State Department of Commerce and Industry, and other State offices. It will certainly add considerable impetus to the ever-growing interest in the South's rapid progress and unlimited opportunities.

Subjects covered include area and population; income and purchasing power; resources of the region, including climate, water, raw materials and energy sources; agricultural industry; total business activity; mining industries; construction activity; transportation and public utilities; trade and services; foreign trade activities; financial activities; regional market; regional advantages for manufacturing industry; and list of manufacturing industries. The latter embraces paper and pulp industry; petroleum industry; chemical industry; primary metals production; fabricated metals; machinery production; transportation equipment; lumber industry; furniture industry; food processing industries; tobacco industry; textile industry; apparel industry; stone, clay, and glass; printing and publishing.

Further evidence of the wide scope of this study is offered in its introduction, which follows:

The central characteristic of the South today is growth—absolute growth of proportions not fully realized and appreciated by man, and relative growth that is enabling this region to catch up with the Nation in its economic position. The South has been and is getting more than its share of the tremendous economic expansion that the Nation has enjoyed since the 1930 decade. This region, which was labeled in a report to the President of the United States in 1933 as the Nation's No. 1 Economic Problem, is now being described as the Nation's No. 1 Economic Frontier. Actually, it is not a frontier in the usual sense of the word, for much of the development is already in place. Its frontier characteristics stem from the fact that its many inherent economic advantages offer expanding opportunity for those business enterprises that are willing to become a part of its future.

The southern region has many assets—many raw materials, a climate conducive to year-round operation, more than its share of the energy resources of the Nation, the most adequate water resources found in the country, and people. Of these, its people are by far its greatest asset, with the highest natural rate of increase of any region in the country, and with large numbers of rural people who will be leaving the farm as a result of farm mechanization. This area can supply, in almost unlimited numbers, personnel for industrial plants. It can furnish people who are capable of receiving training at a rapid rate and who, when trained, provide as dependable and productive labor supply as any available in the Nation. People also provide markets. Expanding incomes, as a result of more productive agriculture and of growth in nonagricultural employment, make the South an increasingly attractive market.

The South, which was once almost entirely agricultural in its way of life, has been attracting industry at such a rapid rate that it can boast an economy based on neither agriculture nor industry, but upon both. Industries which have been coming South in recent years to seek the many advantages the region has to offer are industries with a strong technological base. These industries have a high productivity per worker and pay good wages and salaries. With this industrial expansion has come even more rapid growth in dependent economic activity. The record shows that, for each new job created by a new industry, several additional ones were created by this related economic activity. Consequently, markets in the South have been expanding at a rate several times the rate of industrialization.

Within this southern region, there is a smaller region which stands out above the rest in its economic promise. The gulf coastal region of the South, centered around the mouth of the great Mississippi River and blessed by nature with raw materials in quantity, quality, and type so necessary for certain major industrial processes, is this special region.

This study seeks to analyze the major economic characteristics of the South with special emphasis upon what is occurring in the gulf coast area and in Louisiana in particular. Economic trends have meaning only if they are judged within a frame of reference. It is believed that the most accurate conclusions with regard to the economic trends can be arrived at by comparing what is occurring in our region with what is going on in the Nation as a whole. Absolute progress is important, but relative progress is even more significant. Throughout this entire study, the economic trends in the Gulf Coastal States and in Louisiana will be compared with national averages.

No effort has been made in the study to analyze economic trends from an historical point of view. To understand the extent of this economic expansion of the South and of this area in particular, one needs only to analyze the growth patterns since 1939. Since a substantial proportion of this expansion had its roots ineconomic activity coming as a result of World War II, it is meaningful to review the trends for a period which would include those wartime years. At the same time, the dynamic aspects of the South's economic growth should also be related to what has occurred in the region since World War II. For this reason, wherever possible, quantitative economic data have been analyzed in such a way as to focus attention on trends and growth patterns for the entire period since 1939, and also for the period since 1946.

May 3: A Date To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is the 164th anniversary of the establishment of constitutional government in Poland on May 3, 1791. In that constitution the Polish people discarded many class discriminations and made many privileges available to the people. Absolute religious toleration was established on that memorable day, and provision for further reforms from time to time was made.

This is the anniversary of a constitution which marked a notable step forward for liberalism in Europe. We pay tribute to the love of freedom which inspired the writing of that great document, which was designed to safeguard Polish liberty and independence.

Unfortunately, the freedoms gained by the Poles in the 1791 constitution were to disappear during the next few years. Seizures of parts of Poland by her neighbors resulted in the subjection of the Poles to the Russians, Prussians, and Austrians. In many instances Polish culture and even the Polish language were erased and replaced by those of Poland's alien rulers. But no matter how heavy the burdens of oppression, the Poles in the decades that followed continued to look forward and to work for freedom and independence. Throughout the 19th century many Polish intellectuals—writers, artists, and patriots—lived abroad. In Western Europe, and especially North America, these patriots saw a different way of life, free from oppression, and free also from discriminations which were present in their native land.

A new Poland was born again in the peace treaty following World War I. President Woodrow Wilson, who was a friend of the Polish patriot Ignace Paderewski, was instrumental in securing

the re-creation of this country which for so many years had not enjoyed the right of self-government. In a speech to Congress on January 8, 1918, Woodrow Wilson announced as one of his famous 14 points:

An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

From 1918 to 1939, Poland as an independent country made considerable progress in advancing the happiness and welfare of its people. It was, however, difficult at first—because the Poles had to undo 123 years of division and foreign domination; the country was in ruin; almost every segment of its new independent life had to be reconstructed—from the unification of the laws to the building of elementary schools for thousands of illiterate peasants.

Between the wars the Poles made noteworthy progress in developing their national economy. Poland ranked third in Europe in coal reserves. Hydraulic power was greater than in Switzerland or Yugoslavia. Mineral assets of potassium, rock salt, zinc, lead, iron ore, and oil were developed. From 1920 to 1937 the population increase was nearly 30 percent. Between 1919 and 1938 nearly 1,400,000 acres of fallow land were brought under cultivation. In 1920 agriculture provided approximately two-thirds of the Nation's income—the other one-third was from industrial production. In 1938 industrial production equaled that of agricultural production. The lumber, food processing, chemical and mining industries all progressed by leaps and bounds. The tiny fishing village of Gydnia in 1919 became the fifth largest port in Europe by 1938.

In the educational field 70 percent of the peasants under Russian domination were illiterate in 1918. But within the next 20 years education made great strides. By 1938, 28,722 elementary schools were attended by 4,851,000 children. The 722 secondary schools had an enrollment of 221,200. Nurseries and kindergartens numbered 1,651. By 1939 there were 6 universities, 21 colleges—2 of these engineering, 314 learned societies, 141 museums, and 10,146 amateur theatrical companies.

However, Poland's progress was abruptly ended in 1939 when she again became a victim of aggression. On September 1 of that year the Nazi hordes poured across the border into Poland. The Poles, jealous of their freedom and willing to die for their rights, chose to defend their beloved homeland in the face of hopeless odds. By virtue of their mutual defense agreements with Poland, Britain and France responded to the Nazi onslaught by declaring war against Germany. Less than 3 weeks later the Soviet Union, united with Germany under the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, stabbed Poland in the back with an invasion from the East. Poland was soon crushed by the blitzkrieg tactics of the Nazi war machine.

But the Poles did not willingly submit to the Nazi occupation. They founded what was practically a complete underground state, consisting of a government, parliament, judiciary, and an army.

After Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941, and Soviet Russia joined the Western Powers as an ally, the Poles entered into an understanding with the Russians. By the Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30, 1941, Poland was to receive territory which had been taken away by the German-Soviet treaties in 1939, and the liberation of Polish citizens held as prisoners of war or otherwise by the Soviet Government was to be effected. At first the understanding with the Communists looked hopeful, but as time went on and since no list of Polish deportees was submitted by the Soviet authorities, serious doubts of Soviet good faith began to arise. Subsequently these doubts were verified as Polish citizens of Jewish faith and of Byelorussian and Ukrainian origin were jailed. Others were conscripted into the Soviet Army. When the Red Army crossed the prewar Polish-Soviet frontier in January 1944, the Polish underground was betrayed by the Soviet hordes. Many of the Poles were liquidated by the invaders. In Lublin alone more than 50,000 persons were arrested between July 1944 and January 1945.

The duplicity of the Soviet Union and their treachery toward their Polish "allies" was shown in a remarkable manner in the case of the Warsaw uprising—lasting 63 days—from August 1, 1944, to October 2, 1944. This uprising was one of the most daring and patriotic feats performed by the Polish people. The Soviets had urged the people of Warsaw to rise up against the Germans and they promised they would assist their fight for liberation. This the Poles did. But the Red Army deliberately did not assist and the Nazi war machine rolled over the people of Warsaw. Two hundred and fifty thousand perished, including 40,000 of the underground. Today the Soviet commander, Marshal Rokossovsky, who carried out this diabolical order from the Kremlin is now "marshal" of Poland, commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, and keyman in the Communist Polish government in Warsaw.

The Yalta Conference of 1945 provided for a coalition government in Poland. But the majority of the cabinet posts were filled with Communists or Communist followers. From 1945 through 1947 they imposed their will on the Polish people. After the January 19, 1947, election, which the Communists manipulated for the success of their own candidates, immediate mass liquidation of democratic elements took place. After 1948 no longer did open opposition exist in Poland. In the elections of 1952 only one ballot existed—a voter went to the polls, took a ballot, put it into a prepared envelope and dropped it into a box. No one was permitted to cross out any candidate's name, add new names, or abstain from voting. It is obvious from such conditions as these that for the present at least the Communists have Poland tightly in their grip.

Yet, as we find this gallant country overrun by the godless, alien philosophy of communism, and trampled under the tyrant's heel, those Poles who are in a position to do so are celebrating the anniversary of one of their first steps toward a democracy, the adoption of the constitution of May 3, 1791. There is no doubt that Poland will some day rise again and recover its freedom and independence. It is my earnest hope its resurrection will be hastened by the United States and the American people in every practicable way that they can. In this way we can have the satisfaction of honoring a gallant, unconquerable people, who possess the spirit of truth and freedom and the utmost spiritual integrity.

May 3: The Constitution Day of the Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Poland's contribution to the civilization of the West is considerable and varied. In the realm of the arts and literature, and also in science, the sons and daughters of Poland have been among the most distinguished. Particularly in music, Poland's place among the nations is very high. Polish warriors, statesmen, and martyrs for the cause of freedom have registered inspiring achievements that are known throughout the world. In all of these distinct domains the accomplishments of the Poles are recognized and admired by all of us. But their contribution to the science of government, especially as pioneers in that field in Eastern Europe, more than a century and a half ago is probably not as well known as it should be. For most of the time during the last several centuries the Poles have been governed either by monarchs or have been subjected to unwanted alien governments. But, at the same time, they have had a deep desire for liberty and have striven to introduce truly democratic features into their Government. One of the most significant and remarkable of these attempts was made in 1791. In that year a constitution was drafted and adopted by the Polish Government which, judged by the standard of those days, seemed quite revolutionary. This document, as drafted by men of penetrating intellect and fervent patriotism, represented a decisive advance over anything of the kind yet attempted in that part of Europe. By this constitution Poland became a limited monarchy. The intricate and incongruous features of the old system were abolished and ministerial responsibility in government was introduced. The towns were allowed to have a certain amount of parliamentary representation and were given administrative autonomy. Personal privileges enjoyed solely by the gentry were made available to the townsmen. Absolute religious toleration was established and religious freedom was guaranteed.

Compared with the long lists of human and political rights which are written into present-day constitutions, some people might not consider the Polish Constitution of 1791 one hundred percent democratic and liberal, but according to the standards of those days it was a genuinely progressive instrument and has been widely acclaimed as such.

Today in celebrating the 104th anniversary of the constitution we pay our respect to the memory of its patroitic and humanitarian drafters and hope that the liberal spirit of that document will soon prevail in a free and independent Poland.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, the Polish Constitution was adopted, and that day is now celebrated as Poland's Constitution Day. It has been said that the Poles have sometime had a large country, sometime a small one, and sometime none at all, but nevertheless, the Polish people always stanchly maintained a strong national loyalty and patriotism.

For this we honor them. We are also grateful to the thousands of Poles and the millions of Polish-Americans who have contributed so much to the growth and strength of these United States.

Count Casimir Pulaski was one of those Polish volunteers who gave his life for American independence. Killed during the siege of Savannah, he had distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine, had endured Valley Forge, and had organized an independent cavalry corps known as Pulaski's Legion. He died to make us free.

Then there was Thaddeus Kosciusko. He left Poland in 1776 to serve in Washington's revolutionary army. Appointed chief engineer in charge of the construction of West Point, he later became adjutant to General Washington. His work in fortifying the battlefield at Saratoga contributed greatly to the American victory in this battle, the turning point of the Revolutionary War. Today, Kosciusko is memorialized in Lafayette Park, oposite the White House, as a hero of American freedom.

It is through men like Pulaski and Kosciusko and thousands of their compatriots, both here and abroad, that the common bonds of liberty, decency, and loyalty bind our country to the Polish people and nation.

Enslavement, oppression, destruction are no strangers to the Poles. But neither are hope, struggle, and victory.

On this day in which Poland again finds itself in subjection, this time under the heel of atheistic communism, we reaffirm our devotion to our common bonds.

This common enemy of America and Free Poland is no simple power-drunk dictator. He is not a military genius merely exploiting his talents. We fight against a vicious ideology which twists and warps the human mind and degenerates human beings.

We oppose the enemy because he is morally wrong; because he denies God, and destroys the dignity and worth of the human soul.

On this Polish Constitution Day, we invite all Poles and all peoples everywhere to make common cause with us against this mortal enemy. The struggle is deep-seated, difficult, and dangerous. But the Poles are accustomed to such. They felt the force of Soviet Russia in 1919, and the power of Aloph Hitler in 1939. But they also experienced the assistance of their democratic brethren in those dark days.

Today we share with them the knowledge that wrong cannot always be on the throne, and that our cause shall prosper because it is fair, just, and right.

Israel's Seventh Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, April 27 marked the seventh birthday of the State of Israel. I offer my congratulations and warm regards to the citizens of that bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Israel's display of friendship and hope for peace sets a bright example for all freedom-loving nations on earth. She is to be commended for instilling in her society full political, cultural, and religious freedom. Israel has constantly sought to enhance relations with the Arab nations. This declaration of peaceful intentions is a thorn in the side of the Communist tyrants who would feed on dissension in this oil-rich land.

The courageous, industrious citizenry of Israel knows well the horrors of oppression, toil, slavery, and mass murder. For 20 centuries, they and their forefathers have been herded through the lands of Asia and Europe. The end of these privations and a forced nomadic existence become doubly significant on this anniversary of the building of a homeland which shines as a symbol of freedom in the shadows of the Middle East—a homeland raised from the sinews and the strength of these determined people.

As the youngest nation in the world, Israel has made gigantic strides in the development of her country. Since her birth a short 7 years ago, her population has more than doubled, as well as her cultivated and irrigated farmland. She has taken her place with honor as the 57th member of the United Nations.

As years pass, greater things can be expected from the State of Israel. She can look forward to progressive and inspiring leadership as that given by such great men as David Ben-Gurion, President Ben-Zvi, and Moshe Sharett.

From all America and those who have cherished the cause of Zionism, congratulations and best wishes to Israel on her seventh birthday.

Sick Leave for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, in justice to the many hard-working postal employees, I think there should be some reply in the RECORD to the recent newspaper articles based on a statement from the General Accounting Office which spoke of widespread abuses of sick leave by the postal workers. This article also stated that "Federal employees are entitled to 28 days sick leave a year." This, of course, implied that all postal workers get 28 days sick leave when, as a matter of fact, postal employees get 13 days sick leave. For the RECORD, I am inserting the following letter from a postal worker in my district:

CUMBERLAND, MD., *April 24, 1955.*
Hon. DEWITT S. HYDE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HYDE: Certainly hope you will steer the press release from Washington, D. C., correctly. Is it right for my wife and two children to be faced with false statements of the press? This article appeared on the front page of the local evening Times. It refers to all postal workers but in percentages it uses substitute employees. Clarifying these employees it must be understood that these employees work 7 days a week; are on call 24 hours a day. They may work 6 a. m. to 3 p. m. and be called out 10 p. m. the same day. They are worked exhausting hours which sacrifices health. These employees comprise one-sixth or 16⅔ percent of all postal employees.

The article further states postal employees get 28 days a year sick leave. All postal employees get 13 days not 28 days.

It further states employees use sick leave before retiring. Two cases locally, one man had cancer and through willpower and determination he struggled to work until he could not move. As a result he started taking sick leave as a source of income with hopes of returning to duty. The same is true of another employee who had two heart attacks. He is using sick leave in hopes of recovering to return to duty. His doctor advised him to retire but 40 years in a post office it is hard to change to a new way of life after such loyalty.

In Russia false statements go unchallenged. In America we must protect the truth.

I'm sure if you speak against this false press release we'll be happy for you though you didn't vote for our recent pay raise. Money isn't everything; morale, spirit, and truth of facts are more important to me.

I've worked in four different private enterprises. I know much more is expected of a postal clerk than a factory worker.

Sincerely hope you will preserve the truth for 500,000 employees.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. SEITER,
Secretary, P. O. C.

The Polish Constitution of 1791: A Landmark of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today is Poland's Constitution Day and Free Poland's national holiday, but the occasion is being commemorated with the gallant Polish Nation in chains.

As a nation the Poles are proud of their great deeds and accomplishments, and they are fully justified in their pride. Not only are they well known as diligent and skillful workers, but they are equally well known as accomplished masters in the arts and the sciences. They are no less famous as brave and courageous warriors for great human causes. The names of all the Poles who have staked their lives for freedom and liberty are too numerous to mention here. Of the many Poles who have taken an active part in struggles for liberty, two that are best known to the people of our country because of their roles in our revolutionary war are Kosciusko and Pulaski.

The Poles have, as individuals as well as a nation, struggled hard for independence and freedom. This was particularly true during the latter decades of the 18th century when they were grievously threatened by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. At that time they remodeled their governmental machinery hoping thereby to increase their power of resistance against the aggressors. It was at that time that the Constitution of 1791 was framed and adopted. This was an important fundamental document in which many of the old abuses of monarchial government were eliminated and a type of limited monarchy was introduced. Parliamentary representation was expanded and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. Freedom of conscience as well as religious toleration were established.

Even though the Polish Constitution of 1791 may not be regarded as a perfectly democratic instrument according to the criteria of our day, yet it was at that time far in the vanguard of constitutional development in Eastern Europe. In that respect it was a pioneering document, a landmark in the history of Poland as well as in that of European governmental reform.

Because of international complications and the eventual partition of Poland—in 1795—there was little chance to carry out the provisions of this constitution. Even so, all Poles as well as the friends of Poland regard it as an epoch-making document. I am glad to join in the 164th anniversary of that memorable constitution and express my hope that the spirit and memory of that constitution will afford solace and encouragement to the people of present-day Poland as they pass through the darkness of suffering and tyranny that has fallen upon them. They may be sure that the people of the United States will take every practicable measure to hasten the day when the light of freedom will return again in its full brilliance to their country.

Congressional Night at the Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the National Press Club, the largest of its kind in the world, has a very enjoyable annual custom of holding congressional night. It is a pleasant moment of relaxation and fun for Members of Congress. And it is a gracious gesture by Washington newsmen, correspondents, columnists, and commentators—a gesture which we are certain all Members of Congress who have attended appreciate very much.

Last Wednesday night, through the courtesy of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, we heard a prediction of things to come, not by a columnist, but by one of America's top songwriting teams, Lyricist Howard Dietz and Composer Arthur Schwartz. They collaborated on such Broadway hits as the Band Wagon, Inside U. S. A., At Home Abroad, and Revenge With Music. And they wrote such songs as Dancing in the Dark, I Love Louisa, Louisiana Hayride, and You and the Night and the Music.

It is indeed a pleasure and privilege to join with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, not only an outstanding Member of Congress but also a former illustrious concert singer of great talent, in inserting into the RECORD the latest composition of the famous American popular composers, Mr. Arthur Schwartz and Mr. Howard Dietz.

This composition was especially composed for congressional night at the National Press Club, which was held in the banquet hall of that great association. The composition entitled "You've Got To Be an Actor Today," was personally performed by Mr. Schwartz and was received by the audience with most enthusiastic acclaim. As readers will observe, it is a colorful, satirical treatment of a public career in these advanced days of television and electronics.

The gathering was attended by a large number of Members of Congress led by our distinguished and beloved Speaker, whom we all hail as one of the greatest living Americans, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM RAYBURN. From the executive department of the Government, and the United States Senate, we were all greatly honored by the presence and participation of a former Member of the House, whom we all highly esteem as a dear friend and great American and a sterling public servant, the distinguished Vice President of the United States and Presiding Officer of the Senate, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON, who demonstrated to the assemblage that, in addition to his other brilliant attainments, he is a gifted and talented piano player. His piece de resistance was, curiously enough, not the Londonderry Air, but a Democratic air heretofore closely associated with our former great President from the State of Missouri, our friend, colleague, and beloved Harry S. Truman. The Vice President demonstrated his great skill and ability as a piano virtuoso to the enjoyment and delight of everyone present.

Our beloved Speaker, not to be outdone by a member of the opposite political faith, not only willingly assumed direction of the Congressional Choraleers, which regaled the gathering with nostalgic melodies, but also, in accordance with his long-established rule, preserved decorum and order during the singing program.

On the whole, it was a great occasion to which we were all deeply indebted to the Press Club and the friends who so kindly invited us to be their guests for this exhilarating event.

To Mr. Arthur Schwartz, great composer and fine gentleman that he is, we are most grateful for the splendid performance he gave us of his world-famed melodies, and for his kind and gracious presence which contributed so greatly to making the evening so enjoyable and unforgettable.

The topical song of the evening, effectively rendered by Mr. Schwartz, follows:

YOU'VE GOT TO BE AN ACTOR TODAY
(By Howard Dietz and Arthur Schwartz)

Politicians nowadays
Have adopted thespian ways
For they have to be performers on TV
Their oratory mingles
With all the commercial jingles
On channels CBS and NBC
In Washington the Republicans
Have appointed Bob Montgomery
To organize the bureau of mummery
The Democrats are working on a plan
To have their candidates directed by Kazan

CHORUS

You've got to be an actor today
Your manner must be affable
Your features photographable
You've got to be good in an audio-video way
Max Factor is a factor today
Powder and paint can make you look like you ain't.
Years ago any candidate could be the people's choice
Even tho he never had a sexy voice
Like Marlon Brando
Vocal education will pay
And down in sunny Florida they say
That the mayor of Tallahassee
Was coached by Raymond Massey
You've got to be an actor today

SECOND CHORUS

You've got to be an actor today
The people who examine you
Appreciate the ham in you
Yot gotta rate high in a Hooper and Nielson way
Your chances of election are fine
If you're the mystery guest on What's My Line
Have you heard that the Ways and Means Committee formed a band
When they played they were panned and they were canned
By Arthur Godfrey
Senators who are anxious to stay
Obey their campaign managers who say:
Don't be noble
Don't be global
Just be like Georgie Gobel
You've got to be an actor today

Systematic Terrorism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the representatives of the United States are presently meeting with the other three great powers to consider the Austrian State Treaty. We must make sure that the lives of anti-Communists who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain into Austria are protected. In my opinion, if we ratify this treaty with article 16, as now proposed, contained in it, we will be a party to a small-scale forced repatriation program. We must not repeat what happened under the forced repatriation program from 1945 to 1947.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter to the New York Herald Tribune by the General Committee of the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

SYSTEMATIC TERRORISM

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Concerning the state treaty with Austria, there is one aspect of that problem which appears to us of major importance not only for the maintenance of the spirit of resistance against communism behind the Iron Curtain but also for the political and moral position of the Western Powers.

It is a most regrettable fact that 10 years following the war's end in Europe there still remain in Austria some 30,000 refugees from behind the Iron Curtain whose status and fate have not yet been solved. Should the text of the state treaty with Austria agreed upon at the Berlin conference be signed, these 30,000 refugees and all future escapees throughout Austria would, on the basis of article 16 of that treaty, be deprived of all aid and subjected to procedures tantamount to forcible repatriation.

Denial of the right of asylum and insistence on the return of all refugees to the Communist-dominated homelands is and has been all the time a tenet of Soviet policy. In June, 1946, at the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, Molotov refused even to consider the first draft of the Austrian Treaty unless "the forcible repatriation of displaced persons in Austria" was accepted by the West.

During 8 years of negotiations concerning the Austrian Treaty the Soviets have never given up this demand. As late as March 30, 1955, at a meeting of the ECOSOC in Geneva, the Soviet delegate repeated his demand for "repatriation, if necessary, by force of all refugees from Central and Eastern Europe," and also complained that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is granting "illegal" protection to refugees who really are guilty of "crimes" against their fatherland.

After withdrawal of the troops of occupation, the Austrian Government will have to negotiate the completion of the repatriation of all refugees on a bilateral basis with the Soviets. Having all the trump cards in their hands, the horrors of the early postwar years may be expected to be renewed in Austria after ratification of the treaty.

Fundamentally, Soviet policy is based on systematic terrorism. To make that system effective it must be demonstrated that there is no escape from the Communist stranglehold. Thus, by discouraging desertions from their armed forces and by plunging their dissatisfied populations into hopelessness, the Soviets maintain discipline and build up power for the perpetration of further acts of aggression against the free world.

Fully aware of the dangers resulting from the state treaty with Austria, we ask for a speedy resettlement of all the displaced persons still in Austria. The three Western Powers are also entitled to demand from the Soviets additional guaranties against abduction, forcible repatriation, brainwashing, and other abuses against fundamental human rights generally practiced by the Communists against their nationals who refuse to return to their homeland.

The fighting in Korea was prolonged by 14 months at the cost of 130,000 additional casualties to the United Nations and South Koreans only because of the demand for forcible repatriation. We cannot believe that even if camouflaged by hypocritical verbiage this principle should now be accepted by the West.

The General Committee of the Assembly of Captive European Nations: Hasan Dosti, Albania; Dr. George M. Dimitrov, Bulgaria; Dr. Stefan Osusky, Czechoslovakia; Leonhard Vahter, Estonia; Dr. Tibor Eckhardt, Hungary; Dr. Vilis Masens, Latvia; Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Lithuania; Karol Popiel, Stefan Korbonski, Poland; Constantin Visoianu, Romania.

NEW YORK, *April 26, 1955.*

Dr. John F. Enders, of Brookline, Contributor to the Research Which Lead to the Salk Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the large contribution made by Dr. John F. Enders, of Brookline, Mass., to the research which culminated in the Salk polio vaccine.

Dr. Enders discovered 6 years ago a method of growing polio virus in test tubes. Previously, scientists had to depend upon experimentation on live animals, principally monkeys, in order to observe the effects of the polio virus. Faced with the problem that the live polio virus, only 1 millionth of an inch in diameter, cannot be seen with the most powerful microscope, Dr. Enders found that its presence, growth, or arrest could be observed by the deterioration or lack of it on non-nervous tissues of monkeys. Thus the great work of John Enders, in effect, put antipolio research on a mass-production basis.

For providing this formidable weapon in the great battle against a dreadful disease, Dr. Enders and 2 of his associates at Harvard Medical School received the 1954 Nobel prize for medicine.

A doctor of philosophy and a doctor of science, a native of West Hartford, and a graduate of Yale College, John Franklin Enders is an individual of whom New England and the world can be justly proud.

A Tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, peace, security, and progress are fundamental objectives which most people of the world seek; but, goals such as these are seldom achieved in their entirety. Certainly among the peoples of the world who have not long enjoyed the fruits of peace and security are the Poles; for since the first partition of Poland in 1772, with the exception of the period between World War I and II, the history of Poland has been one marked by oppression and strife.

The constitution of 1791 which all free Poland commemorates today held out to the Poles a great promise for the future. This memorable constitutional document contained elements which would undoubtedly have brought Poland to the threshold of renewed national greatness. But, Russia, then as in so many instances since, intervened and through treacherous means destroyed the Polish hopes for the future.

Much has been said about the tragedy of Poland. And indeed, the modern history of this nation is tragic; for it reveals a long catalog of grievances and oppression. Once a great nation, Poland was reduced by the Russians to a condition of subservience. After the third partition in 1795 the Polish state no longer existed. Only the people remained to carry on the great traditions of Poland. Russia and Poland's two neighbors to the west, Austria and Prussia, shared the spoils of this formerly great state. And for over a century Poland no longer existed as an independent state. Only in the minds and hearts of this oppressed people did the idea of Poland remain strong and virile. World War I brought freedom to Poland; but again at the beginning of the last great war, Poland was despoiled by her powerful neighbors, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Then, at the close of this conflict when all the free world believed that peace, security, and progress would again be the preoccupation of mankind, Poland along with her sister states along the eastern borderlands of Europe were brought forcibly into the Communist empire.

As one views the world scene since 1945 it becomes clear that one principal factor which frustrated the advance of the world toward peace, security, and progress is the activity of the Soviet Union. In every way Soviet Russia wantonly and recklessly dissipated any hope for a world at peace and relieved of international tensions. Throughout Eastern Europe the Soviets imposed a new and awesome tyranny, and in international affairs they have acted in such a way as to inspire distrust and fear. And today they have advanced a new propaganda theme designed to conceal

their real treacherous intentions, a theme entitled "peaceful coexistence." Try as they will the Soviet shift in policy will not divert the attention of America from its attachment to relief for the oppressed; for no tactic of the Communists could ever obliterate the humane impulses of America to see those oppressed peoples freed from the bondage of Soviet tyranny.

This anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 provides a proper occasion for us to rededicate ourselves to the cause of oppressed Poland. To a great extent this cause of Poland is our cause, because it has its roots in a desire for freedom. And, so long as Poland and the other oppressed nations of the world do not enjoy the blessings of liberty, the world itself will never know peace, security, and progress.

Chicago Representative Urges Congress To Protect Consumers' Interests in Natural Gas Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Joseph F. Grossman, special assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, and head of the public utility division of the office of the corporation counsel, appeared before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission in opposition to the removal of jurisdiction from the Federal Power Commission over the sale of natural gas for resale by producers and gatherers. Mr. Grossman is one of the leading authorities on this subject, and I feel that his statement should be made available to our colleagues in the House. I therefore wish to include the following statement made by Mr. Grossman and a resolution adopted by the city of Chicago as part of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH F. GROSSMAN TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

I am special assistant corporation counsel, head of the public utility division of the office of the corporation counsel of the city of Chicago. On January 26, 1955, the city council of the city of Chicago passed a resolution directing the corporation counsel to oppose any action of Congress to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce by independent producers is subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission and to make such representations to the Congress of the United States to prevent the enactment of such legislation. Certified copies of that resolution are filed herewith, together with a letter of authority from the corporation counsel designating me as the official representative of the city of Chicago to testify in opposition to such legislation.

This committee is engaged in an investigation and consideration of legislation materially affecting the cost of national defense, the cost of living of every inhabitant, and the burden of every individual taxpayer of the United States. The subject of pending natural gas legislation affects the public interest so extensively and so vitally. The White House directive to the Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy respecting the committee's assignment and the report of that committee amply testify to the general public interest which I have described in the proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

To begin with, the effect of the proposed amendments upon the supplies, discovery, and development of reserves "in the interests of national defense, and expanding domestic economy, and reasonable prices to consumers," stated to be the concern of the White House Committee, with which no one can find fault, must be clearly understood and reasonably appraised in the light of the present Natural Gas Act as construed by the United States Supreme Court.

The Phillips case did not expand the Natural Gas Act to control or regulate the production or gathering of natural gas. It did not subject the operations of independent producers of gas to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission which would in any way interfere with free competition in the exploration for gas, or with the development of energy supplies and resources fuels in the interest of national defense and for public consumption.

The present Natural Gas Act does not impose upon independent producers the obligations or status of a public utility. It does not require them to dedicate their resources or supply of natural gas to public use or for sale in interstate commerce. No one claims that the Federal Government should control the production, gathering, processing, or sale or natural gas by independent producers, unless such gas is sold for transportation in interstate commerce for resale for ultimate public consumption. Independent producers have a free choice, to their best advantage, in the use or sale of their gas for local purposes or local distribution, without FPC regulation, or for sale in interstate commerce, subject to regulation by FPC.

On the other hand, in the most important area of the use of energy supplies by the largest number of consumers, there is no free choice. In the city of Chicago and many other metropolitan areas throughout this country, the residents are dependent upon gas for cooking. Coal and petroleum are not adaptable for such use in modern day city living. Consumers who have a substantial investment in gas waterheaters and space-heating equipment have created a captive market for natural gas and are now at the mercy of the producers of such gas for their supply at ever-increasing cost, under contracts subject to unilateral termination, escalator or so-called favored nations provisions, without regulation under the Natural Gas Act.

Within the last 4 years the cost of natural gas to the distributing company in Chicago was doubled principally because of competition in the sale of gas in the producing fields. The following table[1] of the average cost of all natural gas purchased by Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. of this city, including low-cost gas purchased at interruptible rates, indicates the effect on the wholesale rates for gas to the Chicago area of the kind of competition which now exists in the gas fields:

	Cents per thousand cubic feet
July 30, 1950	12.07
July 30, 1951	12.45
July 30, 1952	14.32
Mar. 2, 1955	24.01

The Chicago gateway rates are based on the present cost of gas produced and purchased in several fields ranging from 6.03 cents to 15 cents per thousand cubic feet. But there are now pending before the Federal Power Commission proceedings for authority to one of the natural-gas companies supplying the Chicago area to construct pipelines to a new field involving an investment of $32 million based on contracts negotiated with independent producers which will bring the price of gas from that field at its present pipeline terminal in Texas to more than 35 cents per thousand cubic feet.

The increased wholesale rates for gas now effective have already resulted in successive increased rates to consumers in Chicago up to 30 percent.

It has been said that regulation of the price of natural gas at or near the field of production is an impossible task for the Federal Power Commission to undertake. In the month of January 1955, the Federal Power Commission conducted an investigation respecting the principles and methods to be applied in fixing rates to be charged by independent producers for natural gas sold in interstate commerce for resale. The producers, their bankers, the pipeline companies, the retail distributors of gas and the consumers' interests were heard.

The producers and their bankers advocated acceptance of the prices and conditions of sales governed by competition in the field of operation without and investigation of the propriety thereof, including the right to increase their price of gas, pursuant to escalator and so-called favored nations provisions in their contracts or by renegotiation of old contracts to the current prices prevailing in the field offered by pipelines who seek a source of supply to satisfy the potential demand of their customers.

The representatives of integrated natural gas systems engaged in the production, transportation, and distribution of natural gas to consumers in municipalities pleaded for the current field price of gas for the production department of their operations, to increase the return on their investment in mineral rights, wells, and gathering lines reflecting the market value of gas purchased from independent producers.

The city of Chicago representing consumers of gas insisted that the Commission should resort to the rate base approach in determining a fair and reasonable return for the production, gathering, transmission, and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce, without preference or discrimination in applicable principles of rate regulation, between independent producers and pipeline operators who produce the gas from their own reserves.

The difference in principles and methods to be applied in fixing rates proposed by each class of parties affected thereby cannot be resolved without the power of regulation by the Federal Power Commission in the interest of ultimate consumers as well as in the interest of investors in the production of natural gas, in interstate transmission lines, and in the local gas distribution facilities.

The Federal Power Commission, with the assistance of its expert staff, can and should be relied upon to work out the criteria for the determination of just and reasonable rates for all natural gas companies subject to its jurisdiction under the present Natural Gas Act. Indeed, the President's Advisory Committee has recommended that FPC retain a measure of regulatory supervision of the price of natural gas in the field, to provide some protection for the consumer, when considering the certification of new transmission lines and applications for increased rates based on new or renegotiated purchase contracts.

The difference between the regulation recommended by the President's Advisory Committee and the regulation authorized by the present Natural Gas Act is that under the Natural Gas Act regulation is a continuing function which is subject to a changing na-

[1] Computed from exhibits in proceedings before FPC and Ill. C. C.

tional economy, whereas in the White House report the measure proposed is unalterable, once "the contract prices of the natural gas which the applicant has contracted to buy are competitively arrived at and represent the reasonable market field price." Regulation of the price of gas at the source of supply by competition is nonexistent. The competition is not between producers who seek customers for the gas, but between pipelines who seek an adequate supply of gas for their customers.

It has been argued, pretentiously, that natural gas when produced is a commodity, similar to wheat and other produce and to timber, coal, ore, and oil, which are sold in the open market free from price regulation; that natural gas in the field should likewise be free from price regulation. The forests and produce of the land must be differentiated from the mineral resources which cannot be replenished or restored when consumed. These mineral reserves constitute the primary wealth of the Nation and the public has such vital interest in their products that they are inherently subject to Government regulation for conservation and necessary use. The necessity for regulation of traffic in such products depends upon the degree of freedom of the channels through which they can be brought to the market for ultimate consumption, as well as upon the balance of supply and demand.

Under our pattern of dual government jurisdiction, and in accordance with long-established tradition, the States have assumed control of production of natural gas to prevent waste and rapid depletion of the resources within their respective boundaries and the local distribution of gas for consumption. Congress has undertaken to regulate the transmission and sale for transmission of natural gas in interstate commerce to protect the ultimate consumer from economic pressure incident to virtual monopoly of the interstate channels for distribution of the gas.

The producers of gas are primarily engaged in the production of oil. They explore the country for oil and may discover gas which, but for the demand of distant consumers developed by investors in interstate transmission facilities, would be flared off or carried away by the winds. They are not interested in the security, comfort, or convenience of posterity or, for that matter, in the welfare of the present generation. They are bent upon immediate exploitation of domestic resources for all the oil and gas which they can sell in the present advantageous market with preferential taxwise consideration of 27½ percent of their gross receipts for depletion. Since oil and gas are competitive fuels, the producers can control the price of both if the gas can be sold without price regulation.

The domestic producers of oil and gas have organized an unprecedented lobby for legislation to fortify their market on all sides against competition while declaiming their right to a free competitive market price for natural gas in the field of production. Not only are they here seeking exemption from regulation of the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce, but in the Senate they are fighting, as they did in the House, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act to make importation of petroleum prohibitive or at least to impose quotas on imports of fuel oils. These are the measures they advocate under the banner of the American way for free competitive market prices. What chauvinism can we endure?

Such are the measures which are claimed to stimulate exploration for natural gas to supply the present unsatisfied demand of consumers and conversely encourage conservation of fuel resources in the national interest. How inconsistent can we be?

Contrary to their insatiable quest for profits the producers of natural gas have suggested or threatened to withhold their supply from interstate markets or suspend their operations entirely. This is patently a squeeze play and we urge Congress to call their bluff and await their action under the present Natural Gas Act. In this way the future public policy in regulating the price of natural gas sold by producers for transmission in interstate commerce will nowise be impaired.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH F. GROSSMAN,
Special Assistant Corporation Counsel.

RESOLUTIONS ON EXEMPTION OF INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS FROM REGULATION BY FEDERAL POWER COMISSION

Whereas more than 1 million homes in Chicago are dependent upon a supply of natural gas from the Peoples Gas System for cooking, and many of them for other domestic uses, such as water heating, refrigeration, and space heating; and

Whereas the Peoples Gas System is an integrated system of interstate natural-gas companies and the Peoples Gas & Light Coke Co., the sole distributor of gas in the city of Chicago and said system is dependent in great measure upon a supply of gas purchased from so-called independent natural-gas producers who have heretofore been free to sell their gas at prices affected by competition between natural gas pipeline companies seeking a supply of natural gas to satisfy their respective customer demands; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently determined in the case of *Phillips Petroleum Company* v. *Wisconsin*, that independent producers are natural-gas companies within the purview of the Natural Gas Act and are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission to prevent unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory prices for natural gas produced and sold in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the oil and gas interests in the United States have initiated a nationwide campaign through the press and other media for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission so that they may exact from those who supply gas for ultimate consumption in the homes of Chicago and elsewhere the highest price obtainable by the incidence of competition among the pipelines for their sources of supply; and

Whereas such competition and competitive prices will rapidly increase the cost of gas for domestic uses in Chicago and elsewhere and will inevitably increase such cost as to restrict the normal use of gas necessary for the health and comfort of residents of Chicago: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States be fully informed of the consequences of such legislation and that the corporation counsel be and he is hereby directed to use all proper means, and to make such representations to the Congress of the United States, to prevent the enactment of legislation exempting producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

National Reserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have received a considerable amount of mail on the subject of H. R. 5297—the national Reserve plan. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring to the attention of my esteemed colleagues the following letter from Mary Locher, chairman, conference of Christian citizenship of the board of education of the Methodist Church. This letter expresses the sentiments of the majority of those persons and organizations which have written me on this subject:

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 27, 1955.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: We thought that you would be interested in the resolution adopted April 24 by the senior Methodist youth fellowship house of councils.

"We, the elected legislative body representing the 350 Methodist Churches and 10,000 youth of the high school Methodist youth fellowship of the southern California-Arizona conference of the Methodist Church, feel that the national Reserve plan in the new bill H. R. 5297, which embodies the idea that each person who volunteers or is drafted into the Armed Forces or their reserve components must serve a total of 8 years is in opposition to our freedom of choice of armed service duty prompted by a love of country, and that this bill makes the military way of thinking a guiding part of American living, and in this respect is contrary to our concept of Christian love and brotherhood."

Sincerely,

MARY LOCHER,
Conference Christian Citizenship Chairman.

What Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great appreciation the fine articles by Miss Mudgett from Illinois, and Miss Swanson from Arizona, on What Democracy Means to Me, as printed in the Appendix of the RECORD last week, and under unanimous consent, I would like to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to insert a similar essay written by Miss Bonnie Cotter, a 17-year-old student at Benton High School in St. Joseph, Mo. This essay recently won the George Washington Honor Medal in a contest sponsored by Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge. Before entering Benton High School, Miss Cotter attended a rural grade school in Missouri where she was active in 4–H Club work, and I think her essay is a timely tribute to those institutions:

AS THE CORN GROWETH

I was reared on a farm. There every year I saw seeds put into the earth where they grew. First just the bare fields, then small flora just above the ground, later small stubs with leaves, much later tall, slim, sturdy green poles which were "corn sticks" growing into ears of corn, which mean life to the earth.

Like each grain of corn growing and multiplying, our Nation has grown strong with its freedoms and the many privileges resulting. "There was a dream—that men could one day speak the thoughts of their own choosing; there was a hope—that men could stroll through streets at evening, unafraid; there was a prayer—that each could speak to his own God, in his own church. That dream, that hope, that prayer became America."

As I dreamed over the ear of corn I imagined its some 12 hundred grains to be our privilege, surely as many in number. Here is the grain of freedom, in fact there is a whole row of these grains, freedom to work, to laugh, to get an education, to worship, to travel, to speak our thoughts, to read whatever we wish.

Next I see a row of our privileges, the fruits of American labor and skill. Each family can have its telephone, its car, radio, television. My mother can have her electric washer, dryer, mixer, iron, and deep freeze. I may have my orlon sweaters, my own wrist watch, a job after school.

Then there are the grains which in my fancy symoblize the vision which a democracy allows to its people. Down through the years we have been able to dream, to explore, to invent. And out of dreams have come realities. We are able to have faith in the future, to dream of a new family home, a better job, life insurance to protect our home, a better job, life insurance to protect our loved ones, with some assurance that by work, energy, and saving we may bring the dream to fulfillment. These grains may come to fruition because a democracy allows its children to make the most of their opportunities.

I woke with a start from my day dreaming over the ear of corn to find twilight fading and the friendly lights coming on in the farm houses. I saw the father relaxing in a big lazy chair, calmly reading the evening paper, perhaps reading the finals in an election where that day he had placed his own free vote. Bob, the 18-year-old son, having an individual choice of what he may be in later life, is reading some engineering pamphlets. Connie, 16, is listening to her favorite radio program while sketching a party dress. She hopes someday to be a dress designer. Mother sitting on the other side of the room is mending socks that Bob and father walk out of as fast as she mends them.

Love and security in the warmth of their home, cast out fears that a knock on the door will mean a raid on the house or that one of the family will be taken away for speaking his mind.

Yes; we have as many privileges today as there are grains on an ear of corn. Yet like the corn needing care and close attention, in order to mature into fertile, wholesome grains, we must constantly protect and guard our democracy so that no Communist or Fascist ideas may succeed in coming into our country of freedoms.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is wise to be aware of tendencies in other countries which could leave a similar result in our own country should prices our farmers receive continue below what they must pay to produce their commodities. Under leave for extension of remarks, I include the article, The Kremlin's Big Problem: The Peasant, taken from the New York Times magazine section of April 24, 1955:

THE KREMLIN'S BIG PROBLEM: THE PEASANT—RUSSIA'S FOOD SUPPLY IS NOT KEEPING PACE WITH HER POPULATION GROWTH—A MAJOR REASON FOR THE CRISIS IS THE FARMER WHO DEEPLY HATES COLLECTIVE FARMING

(By Thomas P. Whitney)

Farm problems are still very much at the front of the Soviet stage. They refuse to retreat to the rear. When, on February 8, Georgi Malenkov "resigned" as Premier of the U. S. S. R. he blamed himself for the failure on the agricultural front. This self-implication was reminiscent of the confession allegedly extracted from former Soviet Police Chief Lavrenti Beria in 1953 that he had sabotaged the party's farm program. Neither Malenkov nor Beria, of course, was more guilty in this field than their colleagues. The truth is that the failure of the Communist Party leadership to produce enough food was so self-evident that there had to be scapegoats. The most guilty of the criminals in this field—Joseph Stalin—could not be exposed for political reasons. So Beria and Malenkov took the rap for his mistakes.

This year, as last, Soviet newspapers are talking of little else but agriculture. There was a radical shakeup recently in the Government's agricultural leadership. The boss of the Communist Party, Nikita Khrushchev, is spending substantially all his time on implementation of the programs for increasing food production which he himself proposed.

The reasons for this interest are simple. Russia is being haunted by the ghost of a moral and philosophically inclined English clergyman who died more than a century ago—Thomas Robert Malthus. Malthus developed the theory that the growth of population outruns the food supply. His concept became an organic element in the foundation of British classical economics and also of Darwin's theory of evolution. Through both these channels it entered into the theoretical foundations of Marxism.

Nevertheless, in the Soviet Union, Malthusianism has come in only for castigation. The modern disciples of Malthus in the West are labeled "cannibals" and in effect charged with desiring to exterminate human beings. The Kremlin claims that the law of Malthus holds only for capitalism and not for socialism. Thus, it is ironic that it should turn out to be in the Socialist paradise of the world that the food supply is not keeping pace with population growth. In the United States food piles up in surpluses difficult to manage—even to the extent that certain farm groups have been proposing a big food gift for the Russians.

Here is the heart of Russia's food problem: according to official Soviet statistics, from 1940 through 1952 over-all agricultural production rose by only 10 percent. In the meantime, the population rose by slightly more than the same margin. Thus, if in 1940 Russians were poorly fed, though not starving, in 1952 they were slightly worse off.

From 1928 to 1954, the population of the Soviet Union rose by roughly one-thrid. Meanwhile, the livestock population (cattle, pigs, sheep, poultry, and other animals) declined sharply. In other words, the average consumption of milk, butter, meat, eggs, and all other animal and poultry products fell rapidly. From the modest beginnings of a protein diet which they had in 1928, Russians have since been forced more and more to live on potatoes and cabbage and bread.

Furthermore, the population of Soviet cities has been increasing by about 3,400,000 each year, while the population of the countryside has been declining very slightly. This means that in order to maintain the standard of food consumption in cities, the government has to force a higher and higher percentage of production out of Soviet farmers.

In any case, from a standpoint of farming and climate, Russia is by no means a dream country. Moscow lies in about the same latitude as Glasgow in Scotland, Hopedale in Labrador, or Hudson's Bay or southern Alaska. None of these areas is exactly noted for farming opportunities. There is little Soviet farm land south of the 45th parallel—which runs roughly through mid-Maine, Minneapolis and Portland, Ore., or, in other words, through the northernmost United States.

Soviet farming gets squeezed between mid-Asian desert climates in the south and Arctic short growing seasons in the north. This creates a narrow zone. Fortunately for the Russians, the best climatic conditions more or less coincide with a large wedge of fertile black earth which begins in western Russia and thins out toward mid-Siberia. It is on this soil that the most profitable farming takes place. But even here drought is frequent.

In the best of circumstances, the Russian farmer would have no easy time feeding the present Soviet population on North American standards. But in addition to his other difficulties, the Soviet agriculturist has had forced on him a system of organization of agricultural production which deprives him of the land and thus leaves him with inadequate incentive to be efficient. In a sense, this summarizes the agricultural history of Russia: it can be written in terms of a frustrated struggle of the Russian peasantry for the land.

Just 100 years ago the overwhelming bulk of the Russian population consisted of serfs. The great-grandparents of most of today's citizenry began their lives as slaves who could be bought and sold. The serfs resented their own lack of freedom, but more than anything else they resented their lack of property rights over their land. They considered that they owned the land and that their owners had taken it away from them. "We are yours, but the land is ours" was their favorite proverb.

When, in the 1860's, the Czar liberated the serfs, he did not give them all the land, and, in effect, made them pay their former owners for what they did receive. When the Revolution came in 1917, the peasants were acutely discontented and prepared to take over by main force that portion of the land they did not own. The Bolsheviks encouraged them and thus won their support. The peasants got it—for a time. During this period, Russia recovered from the destruction of war and revolution, and by 1927 and 1928 began to enjoy the greatest farm prosperity it had ever known.

But this did not suit the Communists. They had established themselves firmly and they decided to carry out,at gun point, collectivization of all peasant farms. They took the land from the peasants and merged small farms into big farms with several scores of families on each.

All peasants who had a little more than other peasants were labeled "kulaks" and sent away to dig canals in northern Russia or to cut wood in Siberia. Centralized control of all farming was established. The farmers no longer had any right to decide what they would sow. The whole collective farm system meant that the Government, instead of extracting from the farmer perhaps half of his produce in taxes, could take up to three-quarters or even nine-tenths of it.

The peasants resisted collectivization. They killed their livestock and Soviet livestock culture has never recovered from the blow. They went on a sitdown strike. The Stalin government answered with mass terror and intentional famine in which millions died. Stalin broke open peasant resistance.

But terror and famine proved to be poor means of producing more food. Stalin was never willing to face the problem he had created. He simply bequeathed it to his heirs.

And thus his successors have got the bear by the tail and can't let go. Collectivized agriculture has become one of the foundations of the Soviet system. It cannot be undone without undoing the system as a whole. The problem of Nikita Khrushchev, the man who has become the farm czar of Russia, is to produce more food without abolishing collective farms. That is no easy task. By now the peasants hate collective farms so deeply that they are not likely to change their attitude toward them even if a lot of changes are made. Yet more food must be found.

What is the Russian peasant like? This is worth knowing, for the Russian peasant is still the most important man in the Soviet Union. There are still more Russian peasants than there are city folk.

Zakhar Kuzmich Ilichyov is a farmer on the "Dawn of Communism" Collective Farm in the Oryol region. He is a composite, representing several dozen collective farmers I have met.

The "Dawn of Communism" farm is what is known in Soviet terminology as a "backward" collective farm. This means that it is far behind some others known as "progressive" collective farms which have better production and technology. But the fact of the matter is that the backward collective farms of Russia are many and the progressive farms are few. It is the backward farms which are typical of the country as a whole.

Zakhar is 60 years old. He has a thin, wispy beard. He has worked hard all his life and he is still healthy. He had 6 children, 4 of them daughters. Both of his sons were killed during the war. The daughters have all moved away to the city. Two of them have husbands who are alive and the two others are war widows. Zakhar lives with his wife, who is his own age and who grew up in the same village as he.

Zakhar works on the collective farm fields about two-thirds of the time. Recently, because of new laws, he has had to raise the proportion of time he puts in on "government work," as he calls it.

The reason he calls it government work is that he sees very little result from it. He gets a few kilograms of grain each year and a sort of mythical sum of rubles, which disappear somewhere into taxes and loan subscriptions. He feels about government work roughly the same way his grandfather felt about the work he did for an estate owner under serfdom. The main difference is that he has to put in about 4 to 5 days a week for the Soviet Government, while his grandfather put in 3 days a week for the serf owner. Zakhar isn't conscious of this precise difference, but he knows that he is getting very little back for what he does for the collective farm—for the government.

He has never seen more than 100 rubles as income from the collective farm paid to any of its members. He once heard someone read an article from Pravda about a peasant who got some thousands of rubles a year for his work for the collective farm. Zakhar laughed quietly to himself. He knew it was all a fairy story. Nobody can fool him.

Zakhar has seen a lot of money at one time and another. But he got it by working very hard on his own little private plot during the war. He raised a lot of potatoes then and he still does. He eats them and he sells them. That's where he gets his living.

But he has pretty much given up any hopes for anything better in his life. He is glad his daughters are in the city. He doesn't see any future in the country for anyone. At the same time, he makes up food parcels for all of them ever so often and sends them off from the nearest post office, some 10 miles away.

Of one thing he is certain: The work he does for the Government is nothing to him. He will do just as much of it as he is compelled to and no more. He knows that it is the Government that gets all the profit, anyway.

It is perfectly obvious, of course, that such people as Zakhar are not going to increase their productivity; are not going to think up means of raising crops which the Government will get in the end; are not going to pay much attention to anything that Moscow wants done.

There are, to be sure, collective farmers in the Soviet Union who get much larger incomes in cash and food for the work they do on the collective-farm fields, as distinct from their own private plots, than Zakhar Kuzmich. Some of them even have a fairly favorable attitude toward the collective-farm system. But there is hardly a farmer in all the Soviet Union who would not prefer to have his own private farm to belonging to a collective farm—if he had the choice.

Zakhar Kuzmich once had his own small farm. It was very small, but it was his own. He has given up all hope of getting it back. But he knows what he thinks of the Government in Moscow. For the fact of the matter is that the nine top men in the Kremlin have one thing in common. None of them was ever a peasant. None of them ever tilled the soil for a living. Not one of them ever looked out at the world from behind a plow.

One is bound to wonder whether this lack of experience is not one of the reasons for some of the mistakes of the Soviet leaders in farm matters. Any peasant could have told them that some of the things they did were just plain silly.

While it was Stalin who made the most egregious blunders, his heirs have also continued his tradition of adopting drastic approaches in agriculture. The leaders keep turning up with a cure-all which, they hope, will revolutionize Russian food production overnight. It was such a drastic approach that led to the big mistake of collectivization in the first place. It was such an approach that led Stalin, in 1950, to proclaim his plan for afforestation of the steppes of southern Russia, a program now junked. A similar cure-all was the perennial grass-crop rotation system, which has now been plowed under.

And so it happened, time after time. Something new, a new crop, a new rotation scheme, a new idea, was turned up and publicized by the Kremlin as the answer. And all were found wanting.

It would be a serious mistake, however, to classify the present drive on the farm front as merely a continuation of the Stalin line. Unlike Stalin, his successors need more than faked crop figures. It is in these circumstances that the Kremlin has decided to pour investments into agriculture at a rapidly increasing rate. The overall picture of the agricultural campaign as it has developed since Stalin's death includes far more than just a highly publicized fad for corn. It is a large operation:

1. In 1953, the Government more than doubled prices paid to farmers as a stimulus to greater production. At the same time the hated agricultural tax was cut in half in order to ease the pressure against private, small-scale agriculture.

2. In late 1953, the Government decided to send tens of thousands of technicians and party people into the countryside in order to bolster collective farms and their staffs.

3. In 1954 the Government adopted the new-lands program which now envisions the ultimate cultivation of 75 million acres of unused and virgin land, most of it in the eastern reaches of the Soviet Union. The plan was to get as much as 30 million metric tons of wheat out of all this.

4. Now, in 1955, the Kremlin has adopted a plan to plant 75 million acres to corn for fodder.

5. With this there has emerged the concept of more decentralized controls and planning.

6. For 1960 the overall production plan is stated now as 164 million metric tons of grain and doubled supplies of all livestock products as compared with 1954.

7. Now a new campaign has developed to send experienced Communist Party leaders from the cities down to the collective farms to take over all the positions of leadership. Khrushchev has announced that the heads of tens of thousands of farms are to be replaced with his new appointees.

The results for 1954, the first post-Stalin year, are now in. They are not brilliant. The grain harvest, it is claimed, increased slightly. Livestock herds increased by modest margins, less than planned. The big success of the year was allegedly in the "new lands" program where grain production was said to have reached 4.5 million tons. It is claimed that by 1956, 75 million acres will be under cultivation and yielding crops under the program.

This whole plan for putting under crops vast areas of previously unused and virgin lands in the heart of Asia is a fascinating and dramatic demonstration of the economic might of the Soviet Government.

In general, the entire new post-Stalin farm program of the U. S. S. R. is deadly serious and a tremendous undertaking. It cannot be laughed off as a paper fantasy.

However, nothing so far has been decided. It is by no means clear, for instance, whether permanent agriculture is, in fact, possible on the new lands. It is not clear whether the corn program of Nikita Khrushchev is really practical.

But the really crucial question is quite different. Has the attitude of the Russian peasant toward the Government and toward the collective farm system changed or not? New land schemes and corn-hog plans are important enough. But the only ultimate factor is what the peasants think about the post-Stalin farm regime.

The Soviet leaders have spoken many tens of thousands of words on the new farm policies of the U. S. S. R. But the only decisive words in Russia on these programs have not yet been heard. What is the Soviet peasant saying about them?

FARMERS AND BUSINESS PEOPLE SHOULD BAND TOGETHER

Mr. Speaker, ideas from Main Street are very essential to a full knowledge of what people want and need. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these editorial observations from the Middle River Record, of Middle River, Minn., of April 21, 1955, in my district, the Ninth District of Minnesota:

An oft-discussed subject on Main Street is the trend toward fewer and fewer farmers. Small towns in rural areas have prospered in proportion to the number of farm families living in the trade area; yet most people feel so helpless about doing anything about the trend. The sooner business people band together with farmers to reverse the trend, the sooner bad situation is going to become better.

Nationally, all trends point toward bigger farms and less farmers. Farm programs and policies seem designated to aid that trend.

Here's the way one commentator discussed the situation: "Answer to the farm problem." That's the claim made in the headlines on a special report appearing in the current issue of Business Week. And, under the comforting headlines, we get a story with a rosy glow, telling us how neatly the problems of agriculture are being solved in two short, simple ways, (1) more farmers are finding more part-time jobs off the farm and supplementing their farm income and (2) more farmers are getting off the land and going to the cities for employment.

Charts are provided to show how neatly all this is working out. Total income for farmers is on a downward trend in the first. But the second shows farm population dropping rapidly.

So farmers, per capita, are not doing badly, says the magazine in describing the third chart.

In brief the farm-income pie has been getting smaller, but so many farmers have been pushed from the dinner table, that actually there is a tiny bit more of the pie available to those who remain. And that is what provides the happy situation, which Business Week magazine sees in agriculture. The magazine describes it as, "This cheerful outlook—directly contrary to what most experts have been predicting.

"The idea is to cut the number of people now living on about a million subsistence farms—farms that just eke out a bare living for their occupants. That's what the Department of Agriculture is said to be working on. The approach is said to be one of latching on to trends already in motion and giving them a boost with legislation.

"Secretary of Agriculture Benson said much the same about trends when he was before the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations last month. He said sure, farm income has fallen from 1947 to 1954 by some 25 percent, but, look, things aren't so bad, because our farm population has fallen by a good 20 percent in the same time. That's the way his testimony added up.

"And the chairman of the subcommittee, WHITTEN, of Mississippi, replied, 'The committee cannot subscribe to such reason. It didn't believe that the fact that farmers are being forced off the land is any cheering sign that we've got the farm problem licked.' "

Victims of false thinking is an editorial of remarkable logic and intensity. This nutshell summary is a remarkable statement of the trend under "quicksand parity." Under leave to extend my remarks I include this article from the Northland Times of Bemidji, Minn., of April 22, 1955:

VICTIMS OF FALSE THINKING

(Adapted from the Grand Rapids Herald Review)

Reports from Washington indicate that the leadership of both major political parties are beginning to worry about the farm vote. It is about time. Because of this, the politicians may do something for those who have been the victims of both political cupidity and thoughtlessness.

There are two great misconceptions which have been used to justify the administration's farm program.

First, that high parity prices have produced surpluses. The apparent logic is that there have been parity prices and there have been surpluses. Therefore the price is the cause of the surplus. Unfortunately, there have been surpluses before, caused by good weather, good crops, ability on the part of the public to buy farm products, and stimulated production to meet the demands of war.

Second, a theory that low prices will reduce production. This is just as wrong as it is cruel. For most farmers, the set expenses remain the same. So much for the mortgage; so much for machinery purchase, upkeep, and repair; so much for clothing, etc. When parity supports are removed, the farmer can only do one thing. In order to maintain his gross income to meet these set expenses, he must produce more. If he does not, he is out of business.

We must face the fact that establishment of even 100 percent of parity would not have a noticeable effect on the price of the finished product you buy in the store. Yet this would give us the best possible insurance for a stable economy that this country could have.

It is time to stop the present experimenting and start giving the farmers some support in making a living. Unless we have actions in Washington, we will have auctions here, and will see a way of life disappear from the American stage.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial from the Henning Advocate of Henning, Minn., of April 21, 1955, in my district. It contains fears raised by many of my constituents about the tragic consequences to both community and farmers if we fail to solve problems confronting our farm families:

LARGE FARMS—GHOST TOWNS?

An interesting letter appeared in a daily paper recently, written by a Miles Otto—he hits the nail on the head with this contribution:

"It has often been said that if we could sell our experience for what it cost us we could retire. That certainly would be the case if we were to follow some lines of thinking."

"Our surpluses did not come from the small farmer, they are the result of a farm program which favored the larger farmer. Ninety percent of the grain in Government storage was produced by 10 percent of the farmers, perhaps much less than 10 percent.

"Efficiency? Yes, along with mass production. But these are not the things which made America great. We became great through our constitutional right to own property and participate in free enterprise. Are we to force the small farmer off his farm—not because he is inefficient but because he is in someone else's way? Are we to consolidate our small farms into such big units that in a matter of 1 or 2 more generations no one but a millionaire will be able to own land?

"Many farms have already been bought by larger operators, the buildings removed or destroyed or in sad need of repair. Many villages where this condition prevails will soon be ghost towns. Schools and progress which depend on property owners will be at a standstill."

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 9, 1955]

POLISH FARM COLLECTIVES FALL SHORT OF GOAL

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

Of the 3,000 new farm collectives which the Polish Communists ordered to be set up during the past year, only 2,000 have been organized.

Apart from the general failure to reach the target, the majority of the new farm collectives were not set up in the designated districts of eastern and central Poland but in the western parts, formerly German territory, where there are many new holdings resulting from divided estates or abandoned farms.

No provision was made for supplying the new settlers with any kind of equipment or aid.

Review of the work and achievements of the longer established collectives and the annual elections to the administration of the individual units has brought to light disturbing facts. For one thing, faulty management of the collective is prejudicing the peasants against the socialist idea of reconstruction of rural life. The private plots, to which collective members are entitled, are immeasurably larger than they should be by rights, and horses and livestock are kept on them that should be added to the collective. There is no fixed daily work norm, and altogether the management of collectives where horses are used is deficient, a report declared.

It is apparent that the regime has been far from successful in its collectivization policy. The state farms have been a particular cause for worry. They have fallen far short of production goals, their management has been severely criticized, and the laborers have been loud in complaints of inadequate housing, harsh treatment, and delayed pay. To better the situation, the authorities called for volunteer workers—so-called pioneers—and hoped that by the end of February 10,000 new workers would have been enrolled and on the farms.

Experts in rural development and experienced farm workers, particularly for the neglected and ill-managed state farms in the West, are urgently sought. Recruiting for these pioneers is going on chiefly in Krakow, Katowice, and Rzeszow districts, where agriculture has reached its highest development and where most experts in that field are to be found.

But the state farms do not attract trained men. There is too much bureaucracy, too much politics, always the danger of being denounced as a saboteur or an enemy of the people.

Associated with this problem of the collectives and state farms is that of the independent peasant farmer, called by the regime a kulak, or rich peasant, who is the object of continual denunciation by the press and radio. The authorities are bent upon breaking him morally and financially and forcing him to enter a collective.

By the authorities' own admissions they have not progressed much yet, but time works for them. One new decree after another is meant to hasten the process, the latest empowering the new local councils (soviets) to compel delivery of farm quotas. Failure to make the demanded milk and meat quotas is noted especially now, and this, like all other rural shortcomings, is blamed on the kulaks, "who hold back deliveries."

The fact, as observers remark, that the peasants have had to make compulsory deliveries of grain and fodder in the fall and therefore are short of feed in the winter, with the resulting poorer milk and meat production is never mentioned.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 164th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. In connection with this anniversary, Gov. G. Mennen Williams has issued a proclamation designating May 3 as Polish Constitution Day. I wish to take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD the governor's proclamation, which is as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing.

PROCLAMATION

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

In a day when the democratic ideals of men are undergoing their severest test, it is important that we remember one of the greatest examples of men's will for freedom and liberty. On May 3, 1791, the people of Poland instituted their constitution.

This constitution expressed the Polish people's belief in individual liberty. It contained this statement: "All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people."

Despite the fact that within a few years Poland was completely overrun by foreign troops, this will for independence has been one of the hallmarks of the Polish nation.

Today even though Poland has been subjugated to godless communism, people throughout the world look on the Polish constitution as a symbol of the day when Poland will again be free.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 3, 1955, as Polish Constitution Day in Michigan, and urge all citizens to join with their brethren of Polish descent in remembering the great aspirations expressed in the Polish constitution of 1791, and in paying tribute to the gallant struggle for freedom which Poland has constantly waged.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 14th day of April, in the year of our Lord, 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. Mennen Williams,
Governor.

By the Governor:

James M. Hare,
Secretary of State.

The Alaska Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been given in Alaska, and elsewhere, to a statement credited to the former general manager of the Alaska Railroad noting a profit for that government-owned line for the year ending June 30, 1954, on the order of three-quarters of a million dollars. With this publicity there was the clear implication that the Alaska Railroad had gone into the black for the first time, at least in a long while. The Homer (Alaska) News disproves this in an editorial statement which I present here:

Alaska Railroad Finances Seem To Have Been Misreported

Several months ago the general manager of the Alaska Railroad, Frank Kalbaugh, told an Anchorage audience that the Alaska Railroad made a profit of $750,000 for the year ending June 30, 1954, compared to $750,000 lost by the organization in the preceding 12-month period. At the time we felt that there might be something wrong with the statement, especially after we learned that Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, used it in stateside talks with obvious political motives.

In January we wrote to Delegate Bartlett and questioned the profit statements. In turn, the Delegate wrote to William Strand, Director, Office of Territories, and requested information that would answer our question.

All of the information is in and we were right in questioning Manager Kalbaugh's original statement.

In the first place the Department of the Interior figures show that the Alaska Railroad net income was only $719,624.65 for 1954. This figure is $30,475.35 less than the $750,000 quoted by Kalbaugh. Perhaps to the general manager of the Alaska Railroad this is a trivial amount, but wouldn't it have been just as easy for him to have said that the railroad made approximately $720,000 in 1954?

Secondly, Kalbaugh stated that the Alaska Railroad had lost $750,000 in 1953. According to the Department of the Interior report that we have, the Alaska Railroad lost only $42,045.95 in 1953. In this case the Alaska Railroad manager exaggerated $707,954.05. Why? We think it was pure political propaganda and it was exploited to the utmost by Kalbaugh here in Alaska and by the Secretary of the Interior in public speeches in the States.

Our readers might be interested to know that in a summary income statement of the Alaska Railroad covering the years 1940–54, the railroad showed losses for only 4 years, 1946, 1949, 1952, and 1953. The remaining 10 years of the statement indicate that profits as high as $5,242,824.45 (less depreciation which is running at approximately $1,500,000 per year at the present time) in 1944 have been made. In 1948 the Alaska Railroad had a net profit of $2,326,855.85.

It might also interest our readers to know that Congress has not made an appropriation for Alaska Railroad since 1939, according to a Strand report.

So the Kalbaugh-McKay myth that the Republicans are the only ones who can make the Alaska Railroad pay is dissolved.

We have no argument in regard to the operation of the Alaska Railroad by Kalbaugh. His laying off of several hundred employees was probably a sound move made by an experienced administrator. We hope that the money he saved in salaries is put back into the railroad in the form of better equipment, roadbed, etc. But in the future, we hope that the manager will get his facts straight before making a public statement.

Recovery Without Inflation or Farewell to Colin Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record a column by Edward H. Collins from the New York Times of Monday, May 1, 1955:

Economics and Finance

(By Edward H. Collins)

Recovery Without Inflation

Just about a year and a half ago, with production sliding off from the high record reached in the second quarter of 1953 and with employment just beginning to feel the effects of the post-Korean readjustment, the administration's antirecession policies were under heavy attack. This attack came both from the political opposition and from those economists whose unvarying prescription for any and every disorder of the body economic is a generous injection of the wonder drug of inflation.

In some cases this offensive, which was conducted on an international scale, bordered on the hysterical. It reached its peak of recklessness, perhaps, in Britain, in November 1953, when the Manchester Guardian weekly (while prudently dissociating itself editorially from their contents) ran two spectacularly lugubrious pieces by the Australian economist, Colin Clark, under the title "Danger Signs of an American Slump." Wrote Clark:

"If events take the course predicted, and only a $5 billion tax reduction is made in January, then by next June (1954) business activity will have fallen and unemployment risen to about the 1949 level. By that date public and congressional opinion may have had time to become alarmed and be prepared for drastic measures. At any rate, if it has not become so by then, it will be no use later; it will be the last chance. An additional tax reduction of about $20 billion per annum, commencing on July 1, next, would suffice to turn the corner."

The President, however, had chosen as his economic advisers key administration officials on the economic and financial fronts men (1) who shared his own deep convictions as to the primary importance of the individual and private initiative in the American way of life; (2) who were not shackled to the past in their thinking, and (3) who were socially minded in the most genuine sense of the term. In fact, in the annual economic reports to Congress, where the ideas of these men have been synthesized, we have witnessed the unfolding of a philosophy regarding the Government's role in the national economy that is as refreshing for its reinvigoration of these traditional values that have carried this country to its present position of world leadership as for its repudiation of the spirit of doctrinarianism either of the right or left.

THEIR JUDGMENT ACCEPTED

Having selected his advisers with great care, the President never wavered in acting on their judgment.

A year ago it was possible to applaud the economic logic of the administration's antirecession program and to feel strongly that its authors were on the right track; but at that time the process of inventory reduction was still in full swing; and while the decline in industrial production had flattened out, unemployment, which had not begun to reflect the impact of the business readjustment until 5 months after the downturn in production, had just passed what was to prove its crest. Six months ago it was clear that administration policy had succeeded in achieving its first, and most important objective. The retreat, which some had feared might turn into a rout, had been halted. The only question that remained to be answered 6 months ago was whether, with the defending forces now dug in and refusing to give further ground, the next stage would be a stalemate, and possibly one of considerable duration, or a swift counter-attack.

By January of this year, when the figures of the Department of Commerce revealed that the gross national product, after hovering around $356 billions for the first three quarters of 1954, had rebounded to $362 billions, we had had a tentative answer to that question. But if any doubts remained these would seem to have been dissipated with the publication of the basic economic statistics for the first quarter of 1955.

The gross national product, which had recovered from $355.5 billions to $362 billions in the final quarter of 1954 had risen by another $7 billions in the opening 3 months of 1955, to $369 billions. At the same time, the statistical evidence seemed clearly to indicate that the two elements that had been mainly responsible for the contraction of economic activity since mid-1953 had either completely or largely spent their force.

These were (1) the downward readjustment of business inventories, and (2) the decline in Federal expenditures. Inventories were expanding during the first three quarters of 1953 at an average rate of more than $3 billion annually, this phenomenon reaching its high point in the second quarter of that year, at $5.4 billion. In the fourth quarter business began reducing inventories at an annual rate that was to average $4.4 billion from that quarter through the third quarter of 1954.

FIRST BREAK IN TREND

The first break in the trend came in the fourth quarter of 1954, when the rate of such cutbacks fell to $1.6 billion. In the first quarter of 1955 inventories were reported as

unchanged. An even bigger influence making for contraction of economic activity has been the steady reduction in Federal spending (chiefly as a result of the leveling off of the rearmament program and the end of hostilities in Korea). From an annual rate of $62.2 billion in the second quarter of 1953, Federal spending on the whole had receded by the first quarter of 1955, to $45.5, a decline of $16.7 billion.

Of this overall decline the decline of spending in connection with national security has accounted for $14.6 billion. Now it is plain that had nothing been done to cushion the impact of these two forces we might have expected a contraction, in the GNP $14.4 billion, but of $10.4 billion plus $16.7 billion, or $27.1 billion. We might have expected a decline in the GNP, not from $369.9 billion to $356 billion, but from $369.9 billion to around $342.8 billion. That we didn't is explained by the fact that, as the economic report has put it:

"The Federal Government has contributed significantly to the process of recovery. It influenced the economy in two principal ways, first, through the automatic workings of the fiscal system, second, by deliberately pursuing monetary, tax, and expenditure policies that inspired widespread confidence on the part of the people and thus helped them to act in ways that were economically constructive."

If anyone wishes statistical evidence on this point, let him turn to the figures of personal consumption over this period of contraction and incipient recovery. Only in one quarter—the fourth quarter of 1953—did the rate of personal savings recede. At that point it stood at $229.7 billion. As early as the second quarter of 1954 when it reached $233.1 billion, personal consumption had set a new high; and it has continued to set new highs in every quarter since then. In short, it can now be said with every reason for assurance that we have just witnessed the early snuffing out of a business recession by a Government program at a time of declining Government spending, without any instability of prices, and to the accompaniment of a tax reduction of historic dimensions.

Poland: Freedom's Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we Americans who have been free for over a century and three-quarters cannot—indeed we must not—overlook the plight of a nation whose freedom antedates by centuries our own, and who today, although left in the hands of a harsh taskmaster by her erstwhile friends, remains the symbol of man's eternal fight for individual liberty.

The shame of America is that our leaders, without the consent or approval of the American people, sold the valiant Polish Nation into slavery and then at the request of the Soviet slavedriver turned over a score of her most brilliant statesmen who had stood valiantly by our side while we were fighting the Nazis.

Today we hear much of peaceful coexistence as the pious hope of those who seek an easy "out" to a policy which we underwrote at Yalta and Potsdam. We, in our mature judgment, must realize that you cannot exist peacefully with liars and murderers, and the Poles know from centuries of sad experience that you cannot live in peace on the same continent with men in whom there is no honor. Poland, by every right that has been spelled out in Christian ethics, deserves her freedom and will continue to look to total liberation as her goal. Indeed, we insult a valiant ally when we expect her to settle for less.

Toward Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News for April 30, 1955:

TOWARD STATEHOOD

Perhaps the most curious aspect of the long controversy over statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is the almost complete lack of opposition from the American people. The last Gallup poll in February showed 82 percent favorable to Alaska and 78 percent to Hawaii.

It now appears that the House will vote soon on a bill to admit both Territories this year.

While combining the two proposals largely was the work of men who expect them to inherit each other's opponents, it makes sense politically. The Republican Party is much stronger in Hawaii than in Alaska, and a member of the GOP would have to be unpardonably naive to expect a Democratic Congress to give his party such an apparent advantage as Hawaii's admission alone would mean.

This newspaper has advocated statehood for these two Territories ever since their qualifications became evident.

While we have suggested the Federal Government turn over to Alaska all its land there, the President and his military advisers consider it necessary to permit a large part of the uninhabited areas to be taken over by the Armed Forces. This bill will do that, and at the same time give the new State an amount of public land greater than the area of any State in the Union except Texas, and more than it could survey in a lifetime.

Hawaii's political and economic maturity and the stanch Americanism of its people have been demonstrated in peace and war.

Alaska, though smaller in population today, has an infinitely greater future. It already is the fastest growing area under the American flag, and has attracted from all parts of the country the kind of adventurous, confident young people who built our great West. Its natural resources are almost legendary.

But only under statehood, with self-government, liberal land laws and full citizenship for its people, can Alaska achieve the destiny for which nature favored it.

We hope this Congress will have the vision to approve statehood for these Territories, and we have no doubt President Eisenhower will complete their emancipation with the pride and the sense of historic decision that the occasion will deserve.

High Water on Lake Ontario

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently called the attention of this body to the problems caused by high water on Lake Ontario. I shall shortly have more to say on that subject.

The lowest and smallest of our great inland seas, Lake Ontario is subject to wider fluctuations than any of the other Great Lakes, and it is also subject to storms of severe intensity, which sometimes convert it into a churning cauldron of wind and waves.

In a state of nature, the high-velocity winds accompanying the storms tend to occur when the lake level is low. Thus their damage to the shores is minimized. If and when the levels are artifically raised and sustained at high levels, wind and water combine to wreak havoc on the shores.

One of the ablest analyses of the relation between wind velocities, water levels, and shore damage has been made by Miss Melissa E. Bingeman, of Rochester, N. Y., in studies published by the Rochester Academy of Science, of which she is a fellow.

Miss Bingeman is also a poet of note, however, and it is to a poem written by her concerning the effect of high water on the lake shores that I wish to call attention at this time. The poem was originally published in the Gleam, the annual anthology of the Rochester Poetry Society, of which Miss Bingeman is a member.

It is entitled "High Water on Lake Ontario":

HIGH WATER ON LAKE ONTARIO

THE ROCK

The rock, now liberated by a raging surf,
Fallen and submerged,
Had, since the ice age, fortified this hill.
The turmoil of the breakers on the beach
Is magnified as they behold
The new-made cavern, now within their reach.

THE HILL

Time rolls its centuries, while the wooded hill
Shrinks, tree by tree, and rock by fallen rock,
As waters rise or ebb, and wild geese northward flock.

THE WOODS

It matters not to heron or to hawk
That shorelines change, or forest patriarchs fall.
Another tree provides as high a roost,
Another cove provides as safe retreat,
Only to man are changing shores, defeat.

THE SHORE

The shambles on the shore is eloquent
Of tempests gone berserk.
Nor is there testimony anywhere
Of gardens buried deep beneath the rubble,
Of iris, fern, of violets or mint.
Uprooted stumps, oil drums, a boatswain's chair,
Dead fish, a rubber boot, fragments of wall,
Bleached bones of forest monarchs—these are there.
This monstrous cairn, built by an angry sea
Entombs the hopes that once were part of me.

THE SHOAL

That shoal, due north, long centuries ago—
Was that a promontory,
Where eagle-feathered warriors scanned the lake
For sign of friend or foe?
When nomads ranged this countryside
Was that their lookout, then?
Did tepees rise, and smoke from campfires curl
Where now the waters turn
From indigo, to green, to dun.
Here fishing boats repair at setting sun,
While fishermen troll endlessly, nor know
Their shoal was shoreline in the long ago.

—*Melissa E. Bingeman.*

Raise Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article prepared especially for the Pilot, Boston, Mass., by Dr. Laurence J. Phalan, former professor of economics at Boston College.

I have sponsored legislation providing for an increase in our minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, since the economy generally will benefit, I feel from the increased purchasing power which a realistic minimum would put in the hands of families who need it most and will put their increased income right back into economy.

The article follows:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Pilot of April 23, 1955]

HOW LOW CAN YOU GET?—RAISE IN NATURAL MINIMUM WAGE RATES WOULD BENEFIT NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIES

(By Dr. Laurence J. Phalan)

Once again the question of a new minimum wage is under consideration by Congress. President Eisenhower has proposed raising the minimum under the Fair Labor Standard Act from 75 cents to 90 cents an hour and other advocates of increase have suggested that the minimum be raised to $1.25.

These amounts are a far cry from those set forth in the original Fair Labor Standards Act. Not so long ago, in 1928, when the act first became effective, it was set forth that during the first year of the law the minimum should be not less than 25 cents an hour, and during the next 6 years, not less than 30 cents an hour and after the expiration of 7 years not less than 40 cents an hour.

In January 1950, the act was amended raising the minimum to the present 75 cents an hour. This Federal minimum applies to workers who are engaged in interstate commerce or in production of goods for interstate commerce including those in any closely related processes or occupations directly essential to such production. These workers are contrasted with local retail clerks and others who are not subject to the provisions of the law. It is estimated that about 24 million workers are covered by the act.

Minimum wage legislation is designed to protect employees from employers, to defend the latter from other employers and possibly to protect regions of the country from other regions and to increase consumer purchasing power.

NOT LIVING WAGE

Since the basic minimum wage established has generally borne little relationship to a living wage—certainly 75 cents or 90 cents an hour does not represent an adequate living wage in this country today—the legislation is directly concerned with the economically weak workers, and with preventing them from exploitation. However, it does affect other workers because of the tendency of all wages to increase with increases in those received by the lowest paid workers.

While often there are objections raised by employers to legal minimum wages, there is generally much support to such wages by employers paying in excess of them in order to defend themselves from unfair competition by those who pay inordinately low wages.

Employers in one region who wish to protect themselves from low wages in another region are also supporters of minimum-wage legislation. This has been particularly so in industries like the textiles where New England employees have been continuously faced with the lower wages paid by southern manufacturers.

While industrial diversification and economic growth has eliminated a considerable amount of the wage inequities between the North and South, the impact of the proposed higher minimum wages will still be greater on the South. A recent study by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that 4.6 percent of the production workers in manufacturing industries in New England had received less than 90 cents an hour whereas 20.2 percent of those in the South were so paid. While 9.2 percent of production workers in manufacturing in the New England States were paid less than $1 an hour, 28.2 percent of such workers in the South received less than that amount.

TO AID NEW ENGLAND

All of these figures show that it is generally to the advantage of the New England employers to have a new minimum which would to some extent eliminate the wage advantage of the South. Of course, it may be held by some that the wage differences do not mean actual differences in labor costs because the productivity of the southern laborers is less. However, facts would not seem to support such a conclusion and there would seem to be ample evidence that the wage differences are based upon historical practices and lack of unionization in the South rather than related to productivity differences. And, therefore, as long as the southern producers are permitted to pay low wages they enjoy a competitive advantage over New England.

Some advocates of a new, higher minimum wage are chiefly interested in a higher wage because of the support which it is claimed it will give to the Nation's economy through placing greater purchasing power in the hand of those who would use the extra money rather than save it. This reasoning runs into many arguments which get very technical and elusive.

PURCHASING POWER

There are two general approaches to the question of stimulation of the economy through wage adjustments. Under one, wages are kept down, thus reducing costs, increasing profits and thereby stimulating the employer to expansion of activities. The other method is to increase wages thus giving more purchasing power to consumers who buy the goods produced.

While higher wages may increase purchasing power, some marginal producers may be so adversely affected by increased costs brought by wage increases as to be forced to contract operations, thus making for increase in unemployment. Particularly is this possibility present in a period of falling prices. So much weight was given to this line of reasoning that, before the New Deal in this country, the chief way out of depression was thought to be through cutting costs including wages. With the New Deal and wide acceptance of what is known as Keynesian economics, came greater stress on the role of consumer purchasing power as a support to the economy. Instead of approaching the problem primarily through labor costs reductions, chief concerns was given to support to consumer purchasing power. Thus, we had such depression agencies as the WPA, which was really more concerned with getting money into the hands of consumers than with actual work done.

Of course, conditions today bear little resemblance to those of the depression, WPA days. Nevertheless, possibilities of recession and depression are always present in the thinking of economists and Government officials. So much so is this presence felt that a committee headed by Leon Keyserling, former economics advisor to the Truman administration, has recently proposed that the minimum wage under Federal laws be raised to $1.25 an hour rather than the 90 cents advocated by President Eisenhower. The claim is that unless steps are taken to bolster purchasing power, we will have 5 million unemployed in this country by the end of this year. Unemployment in January was estimated at 3,347,000 up from 3,087,000 in January 1954.

While January 1955 unemployment exceeded the comparable month in 1954, there is generally greater optimism because in 1954 employment was falling sharply and gave indication of an impending recession while employment this year is generally turning upward.

Keyserling and others believe that there are indications that consumer purchasing power will not be sufficient to maintain an upward swing in employment and have advocated the higher minimum wage, decreased taxes for lower-income families, and a strong public-works program.

JUSTIFICATION

A detailed discussion of those areas is too great for an article of this length. It would not seem too difficult, however, to see the justification of a higher minimum wage when we know that the 75 cents minimum bears so little relationship to a living wage. Moreover, the proposed 90-cent minimum is related rather to ability of industry to pay than to a living wage. Certainly $36, for a 40-hour week, is not sufficient to adequately support a family at today's prices.

A yearly wage, at $36 a week, of $1,872 compares very unsatisfactorily with various budget estimates of the amount required to support a family today. For example, in October 1951 the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that $4,217 a year was required to sustain a family of four in Boston at a modest but adequate level of living. Since October 1951, the cost of living has increased about one and one-half percent.

On the basis of these figures, it would seem that a very strong case can be made for a new and higher minimum on moral and ethical grounds. Certainly anything which can be done to aid the economically weak to obtain a wage more in keeping with human dignity finds support in the teachings of the church.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report

of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 82d Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in 1 place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record:

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 82d Cong., 2d sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 8	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 15	Quorum call	Present.
3	...do	H. R. 5715, providing for an across-the-board increase of 10 percent in pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces. On passage (Passed, 270 to 89).	Yea.
4	Jan. 30	Quorum call	Present.
	Feb. 4	H. R. 401, providing that any person not a citizen and regardless of age who serves with the Armed Forces between June 25, 1950, and June 30, 1955, may be naturalized after compliance with the naturalization laws (Passed, voice vote).	Yea.
5	Feb. 5	H. Res. 517, citing Sidney Buchman for contempt of Congress by his refusal to comply with a subpena issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 314 to 0.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 19	H. R. 5893, as amended, authorizing not to exceed $125,000,000 additional for revolving fund for the purpose of making direct loans under Servicemen's Readjustment Act for housing at 4 percent interest rates where such loans are not available from private sources. (Passed, 342 to 0.)	Yea.
7	Feb. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		House Resolution 514, directing Secretary of State to transmit to House information relating to any agreements made by the President of United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain during their recent conversations:	
8	...do	On motion to table resolution. (Defeated, 184 to 150)	Nay.
9	...do	On adoption. (Adopted, 189 to 143)	Yea.
10	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 28	...do	Present.
12	Feb. 29	...do	Present.
13	Mar. 3	...do	Present.
14	...do	H. R. 6854, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: On amendment reducing the operating expenses of the Coast Guard by $1,600,000. (Adopted, 191 to 128).	Yea.
15	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5904, Universal Military Training and Service:	
16	...do	On adoption of substitute providing that training shall be provided as part of high school curriculum. (Defeated, 155 to 235.)	Nay.
17	...do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 236 to 162.)	Yea.
18	Mar. 10	S. 2667, establishing daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia for 1952. On amendment exempting all Government offices and departments from the daylight-saving time provisions and keeping them on standard time. (Defeated, 48 to 240.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 539, providing authorization by the Special Committee To Investigate the Massacre of Polish Soldiers in the Katyn Forest during World War II to hold hearings in Europe:	
19	Mar. 11	On previous question. (Defeated, 164 to 156.)	Yea.
20	...do	On adoption. (Adopted, 206 to 115)	Yea.
21	...do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2077, transferring from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission the task of investigating loyalty of personnel prior to their being employed by the Government in certain agencies:	
22	...do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 86 to 233.)	Yea.
23	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 13	...do	Present.
25	Mar. 18	...do	Present.
		H. R. 6444, omnibus claims bill for the relief of sundry claimants:	
26	...do	On amendment striking out title II. (Defeated, 147 to 184.)	Yea.
27	...do	On amendment deleting claim of John Fleckstein for compensation due to physical injury received in 1912 while employed in the service of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Panama Canal. (Adopted, 186 to 141.)	Yea.
28	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
29	...do	H. Res. 578, providing for consideration of H. R. 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for the year ending June 30, 1953. (Adopted, 228 to 133.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
31	...do	H. Res. 556, providing $65,000 to send a committee to Europe to investigate the massacre of Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest in Russia during World War II. (Adopted, 235 to 114.)	Yea.
32	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices and agencies for the year ending June 30, 1953:	
33	...do	On Fisher amendment limiting to 5,000 the number of public housing units to be started in fiscal year 1953. (Adopted, 192 to 168.)	Yea.
34	...do	On Coudert amendment reducing by $14 million the funds allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority. (Adopted, 199 to 159.)	Yea.
35	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 26	...do	Present.
37	Mar. 27	...do	Present.
	...do	H. R. 7176, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the year ending June 30, 1953:	
38	...do	On amendment reducing from $18,816,800 to $18,000,000 for the Bureau of Mines. (Adopted, 192 to 164)	Yea.
39	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
	...do	H. R. 7216, making appropriations for government of the District of Columbia for the year ending June 30, 1953:	
40	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce by $2,400,000 the Federal Government's appropriation to the District's general fund. (Adopted, 162 to 143.)	Yea.
41	Mar. 31	S. 1415, providing for payment for compulsory labor by, and inhuman treatment of, prisoners of war as well as the relief of certain organizations in the Philippines which aided Americans during World War II. (Passed, 325 to 0.)	Yea.
42	...do	H. R. 6661, on motion to suspend the rules and pass bill amending the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926 authorizing the Department of State to expand its building program overseas through the utilization of $90,000,000 of foreign credits owed the United States. (Passed, 240 to 82.)	Yea.
43	...do	Quorum call	Present.
44	Apr. 1	...do	Present.
45	Apr. 2	...do	Present.
46	...do	H. Res. 591, providing for consideration of S. 1203, providing for appointment of 23 permanent and 4 temporary circuit and district judges. (Adopted, 192 to 182.)	Nay.
47	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
48	...do	H. Res. 561, creating a special committee to conduct an investigation and study of tax-exempt foundations and other comparable organizations. (Adopted, 194 to 158.)	Nay.
		H. R. 7280, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary for the year ending June 30, 1956.	
49	...do	On amendment reducing from $43,400,000 to $40,399,000 the amount allowed for salaries and expenses of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Adopted, 193 to 136.)	Yea.
50	...do	On amendment limiting, with certain exceptions, the filling of only 25 percent of the vacancies which occur in the offices and bureaus, etc. covered by this bill in 1953. (Adopted, 208 to 114.)	Yea.
51	...do	On passage. (Passed, 200 to 55)	Not voting.[1]
52	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
53	...do	...do	Present.
54	Apr. 8	...do	Present.
55	Apr. 9	H. Res. 602, citing Henry W. Grunewald for contempt of Congress. (Adopted, 334 to 0)	Yea.
56	...do	H. R. 7391, making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the year ending June 30, 1953. On amendment limiting to $46 billion the amount to be expended by the military in 1953. (Adopted, 220 to 131.)	Nay.
57	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
58	...do	...do	Present.
59	Apr. 23	...do	Present.
60	...do	S. 1203, providing for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges. On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 165 to 150)	Yea.
61	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
62	...do	H. Res. 532, directing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board. (Adopted, 255 to 88.)	Yea.

[1] Absent. Would have voted "Yes" if present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 82d Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
63	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
64	Apr. 30	H. R. 6839, modifying and extending the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes. On amendment requiring that all lease-purchase agreements be submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works. (Adopted, 178 to 165.)	Yea.
65	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 5	do	Present.
67	do	do	Present.
68	May 8	do	Present.
69	May 13	do	Present.
70	May 15	do	Present.
71	do	S. J. Res. 20, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 247 to 89.)	Yea.
72	do	H. R. 5715, the armed services pay raise bill. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 333 to 0.)	Yea.
	do	H. R. 4323, amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, authorizing Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements:	
73	do	On recommittal to committee with instructions it be reported back with amendment providing for submission of all lease-purchase agreements involving more than $50,000 to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House and Senate 30 days prior to their execution. (Recommitted, 260 to 75.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, 210 to 114.)	Yea.
75	do	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 16	do	Present.
77	do	S. 677, fixing the personnel strength of the U. S. Marine Corps at not less than 3 full-strength combat divisions and 3 full-strength air wings, and to add the Commandant of the Marine Corps as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. (Passed, 253 to 30.)	Yea.
78	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
79	do	H. R. 7800, increasing old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, preserving insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits. On suspension of rules and passage. (Defeated, 150 to 140, two-thirds majority required.)	Nay.
80	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
81	May 22	do	Present.
82	May 22	do	Present.
83	May 23	do	Present.
84	do	H. R. 7005, Mutual Security Act. On amendment reducing economic aid funds to $615,300,000. (Adopted, 221 to 137.)	Yea.
85	do	On amendment cutting funds for Asia $111 million and separating the military funds from the point 4 funds. (Adopted, 192 to 165.)	Nay.
86	do	On passage. (Passed, 246 to 109.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6811, increasing District of Columbia gas tax:	
87	May 26	On passage	Nay.
88	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
89	do	do	Present.
90	June 2	do	Present.
91	June 5	do	Present.
92	do	H. R. 7656, authorizing educational and training allowances and other benefits comparable to those granted veterans of World War II for veterans of Korean war. On passage. (Passed, 361 to 1.)	Yea.
93	do	Quorum call	Present.
94	do	H. R. 7005, Mutual Security Act. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 230 to 115.)	Yea.
95	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
96	do	S. 97, authorizing the appropriation of $18,200,000 for the construction, operation and maintenance of facilities for generating hydro electric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River, Tenn. On passage. (Passed, 132 to 121.)	Nay.
97	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
98	do	do	Present.
99	do	do	Present.
100	June 11	do	Present.
101	do	do	Present.
102	do	H. J. Res. 477, extending certain emergency powers until June 30, 1953. (Adopted, 285 to 69.)	Yea.
103	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
104	do	H. R. 8120, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations in the amount of $2,758,318,000. On passage. (Passed, 332 to 7.)	Yea.
105	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
106	June 17	H. R. 7800, increasing old-age and survivors insurance benefits, preserving insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits. (Passed, 361 to 22.)	Yea.
107	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
108	June 19	do	Present.
109	June 20	do	Present.
110	June 25	do	Present.
111	June 26	do	Present.
		H. R. 8210, Defense Production Act of 1950 extending beyond June 30, 1952, program for materials allocation, and price, credit and rent controls:	
112	do	On amendment providing for decontrolling materials by suspending ceiling prices when such materials are selling below ceiling prices, when such materials are in surplus or adequate supply and are not rationed. (Adopted, 210 to 182.)	Yea.
113	do	On amendment guaranteeing the customary percentage mark-ups of individual wholesalers and retailers. (Adopted, 231 to 164.)	Nay.
114	do	On amendment abolishing the Wage Stabilization Board and creating new Board with limited jurisdiction. (Adopted, 256 to 138.)	Yea.
115	do	On amendment requesting the President to invoke the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act in the current labor dispute in the steel industry. (Adopted, 228 to 164.)	Yea.
116	do	On amendment terminating all wage and price controls on July 31, 1952. (Defeated, 151 to 244.)	Nay.
117	do	On amendment terminating all rent control on Sept. 30, 1952, except in critical defense areas or where local governing authorities request its continuance. (Adopted, 225 to 170.)	Yea.
118	do	On passage. (Passed, 211 to 185.)	Nay.
119	do	H. R. 5678, revising and codifying laws relating to immigration, naturalization and nationality. On overriding the President's veto. (Overridden, 278 to 113.)	Yea.
120	do	H. R. 7072, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices and agencies for year ending June 30, 1953. (Conference report.) On recommittal to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House limitation of 5,000 public housing units to be started in 1953 instead of the compromise figure of 35,000. (Recommitted, 195 to 181.)	Yea.
121	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8370, making supplemental appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1953:	
122	do	On amendment reducing from $3,273,824,750 to $3,128,224,750 the mutual security funds for military assistants. (Adopted, 173 to 167.)	Nay.
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Nay.
123	do	S. 2594, extending the Defense Production Act. (Conference report.) (Adopted, 194 to 142.)	Nay.
124	June 30	H. Res. 717 citing Arthur McPhaul for contempt of Congress. (Adopted, 348 to 0.)	Yea.
125	do	H. Res. 718, citing Saul Grossman for contempt of Congress. (Adopted, 349 to 0.)	Yea.
126	do	Quorum call	Present.
127	do	H. R. 8122, continuing the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities. (Passed, 207 to 121.)	Nay.
128	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
129	do	H. Res. 638, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Select Committee To Investigate Foundations and other comparable organizations exempt from Federal taxation. (Adopted, 247 to 99.)	Nay.
130	do	Quorum call	Present.
131	do	H. R. 7072, appropriating funds for independent offices for fiscal 1953. On recommittal to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House limitation relative to the number of public housing units to be commenced in 1953. (Rejected, 160 to 194.)	Yea.
132	July 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7176, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1953:	
133	do	On recommittal of conference report to committee of conference with instructions to reinsert provisions relative to western Minnesota power transmission lines. (Rejected, 49 to 299.)	Nay.
134	do	On amendment appropriating $5,493,750 for administrative expenses of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the trusteeship agreement. (Approved, 345 to 2.)	Yea.
135	do	Quorum call	Present.
136	do	do	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan; 82d Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
137	July 3	H. R. 7289, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for fiscal year 1953. On recommittal of conference report to committee of conference with instructions to agree to Senate amendment barring use of appropriations for expenses in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference. (Recommitted, 184 to 157.)	Yea.
138	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
139	...do....	...do	Present.
140	...do....	Motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 138 to 189.)	Yea.
141	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
142	...do....	H. Res. 695, providing for consideration of H. R. 7888, to create a Joint Congressional Committee of the Budget. (Rejected, 155 to 173.)	Nay.
143	July 4	Quorum call	Present.
144	...do....	S. 3066, amending the defense housing laws. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 295 to 22.)	Yea.
145	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
146	...do....	H. R. 7656, authorizing educational and training allowances and other benefits comparable to those granted veterans of World War II for veterans of Korean war. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 322 to 1.)	Yea.
147	...do....	H. R. 7289, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for fiscal year 1953: On motion to recede and concur with Senate amendment deleting language barring use of funds for preparation or prosecution of any suit or proceeding in any court by or on behalf of the United States against a State of the Union. (Rejected, 119 to 181.)	Nay.

Cleveland Press for Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the House an article which appeared last Saturday in the Cleveland Press. The article makes a strong plea for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. It follows:

For years, the hopes of the citizens of Alaska and Hawaii for statehood have been shamefully enmeshed in partisan politics.

Hawaii is a mature and prosperous country, a keystone of our Pacific defense ring, a land of spectacular beauty and friendly people.

Alaska is a large booming Territory, populated by sturdy, pioneering folks who insure its bright future.

Both are fully prepared to assume the reponsibilities of statehood, to stand on their own political feet. Both deserve voting representation in the Congress which governs them.

But both are the victims of political jealousy, of political conniving and maneuvering.

Democrats don't want Hawaii in, because they suppose it would send Republicans to Congress. With Alaska it's vice versa. So, the whole question has bogged down in political stalemate.

Some—including President Eisenhower—also raise objections to statehood (especially for Alaska) because of the fancied fear it might water down the authority of military commanders.

This is a difficult argument to swallow, since the military forces have successfully maintained huge bases on the mainland—in States—for scores of years.

The statehood issue is before Congress again this year. There's no excuse, good or bad, for further delay. Alaska and Hawaii deserve to be States. Now.

ALASKA

Almost 70 years ago the United States bought Alaska from Russia for a whopping $7,200,000 in a transaction hootingly referred to as "Seward's Folly." When it developed 30 years later there was gold in them thar Klondikes, the price looked mighty good.

The population figure of Follywood, 170,000 at last count, is streaking upward in a vast area twice the size of Texas. The big towns aren't very big. Anchorage tops them all with 11,000 and Juneau, the capital, boasts 5,000 plus.

There are resources aplenty. Walt Disney's fabled Pribilof Islands in the middle of the Bering Sea are home base for millions of fur seals that the Federal Government takes proper care of. Interest in oil leases is high with 1,800 fields going at present. In 1954 the first major pulp mill opened in Ketchikan—a modern $52 million plant. And there are plenty of fish in the brooks, $70 million worth last year.

The crying need is for farmers and the means to get crops to market. Most of the fertile land is concentrated in the Matanuska Valley north of Anchorage. There are only 470 miles of rail, this from Seward to Fairbanks.

Alaska got territorial status in 1912 and gets a governor every 4 years appointed by the President of the United States. Two years ago Eisenhower named B. Frank Heintzelman, a Yale Forestry School grad who had served previously as a regional forester. The Alaskans send 1 delegate (nonvoting) to our Congress.

HAWAII

Smack in the middle of the Pacific lies a cluster of eight islands. Gentle blue waves lap the shores, palm trees sigh at tropic breezes and half a million people bustle about the business of daily living. That's the Hawaiian Islands.

Lump them all together any they're just half as big as Rhode Island. Hawaii is the biggest of the islands but by far the most important is Oahu which boasts the capital, Honolulu—a city the size of Akron.

It surprised no one when Sanford Ballard Dole, the pineapple king, became the first American-appointed governor in 1900, a post now held by Samuel Wilder King. Popular Delegate to the United States Congress is Mrs. JOSEPH FARRINGTON, who was elected to the same office her husband held until his death last year.

The rich, reddish-brown soil of the islands is just right for growing sugarcane and pineapples, the kingpins of Hawaiian economy. The pineapple business amounted to $150 million last year and the sugar was almost as sweet—$100 million.

Hawaii's progress is especially apparent on the bigger islands with their fine network of roads—over 2,000 miles of them paved.

The islands are now a greater melting pot than the United States itself. Two hundred years ago there were 300,000 natives who much resembled the Polynesians. Now there are less than 21,000—mainly because of intermarriage. Largest single groups are the Japanese and whites ranked second.

Ten Turbulent Years Since Meeting at the Elbe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Ten Turbulent Years Since Meeting at the Elbe" which appeared in the April 24, 1955, issue of the Messenger and Inquirer, of Owensboro, Ky. The editorial is as follows:

TEN TURBULENT YEARS SINCE MEETING AT THE ELBE

Ten years ago tomorrow United States and Soviet troops met on a partly demolished bridge over the Elbe River at Torgau. At this time Russian troops had already entered the outskirts of Berlin and victory for the United States and allies in Europe—a victory that has brought no peace—was almost complete.

In those days the United States, Great Britain and Russia were closely allied fighting nazism, as if they were scientists joined to fight a plague against mankind. A drastic switch since the opening of World War II had brought Russia into the allied fold, and a common effort had wiped the slate clean. Russia, which had decided with Germany on the partitioning of Poland, found it to her interest to change sides.

As the soldiers of the United States and Russia met on that bridge in Germany, marking the cutting in two of the Reich, there was a common bond which enabled them to greet each other with open arms. Despite a language barrier dividing them, it was an occasion which will probably never be forgotten by the parties who met on that day.

Approximately 40 of the 91 Americans in the patrol, which met the Russians on the Elbe, are planning to meet in Washington tomorrow to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the event. And, in a rare postwar gesture of amity, the newspaper Pravda announced on April 16 that nine Soviet soldiers, who were in the Russian patrol, have accepted invitations to attend the Washington celebration. It will be interesting to follow this meeting. It is difficult to believe that those who were actually fighting for a common goal could now be so far apart. The Russians fought to drive the Germans from their land and to seek revenge for Nazi ruthlessness. We fought to keep our freedom and the pre-

vention of what happened to Russia from happening to others, including ourselves.

On the April date Allied troops in the field were heady with the wine of victory—as well as with assorted spirits "liberated" from the Germans. The German surrender in Europe was only a few weeks away—May 7—with VE-day and the formal ratification of the surrender following in Berlin on May 8.

Hindsight is always better than foresight. When the story of the linkup came out, a day of jubilation for the handful of soldiers who met at the Elbe and a significant day for the free world, an entirely different story was in the making. A dictator was busily at work preparing to consolidate the gains he had made, and one of the most important was his advantage in the taking of Berlin and the area around that once great center of Nazism. Stalin was determined that his will would reign over all that his troops conquered, and he apparently had ideas beyond that. His soldiers were of no concern to him, other than that they forwarded his aims. This was especially so of the troops who met with the United States patrol on the Elbe.

Churchill knew what Stalin was doing and what he had in the back of his mind. At least the plans he forwarded indicated he realized the situation. His country had been battered for 6 years. His people knew what they were fighting for as well as the Russian people. There was only one difference between the two, one was led by a democracy, the other by a dictator.

Churchill lost his fight when he tried to get the United States to move into the underbelly of Europe. He was going to play Stalin's own game. That which was taken by world forces could be negotiated much better than that which was taken and occupied by the Russians. He lost his second fight when he put a premium on the capture of Berlin.

But compromise had to come in. Eisenhower and the general staff knew that an attack in southeastern Europe would be costly in lives, and would mean a long, drawn out war. A beachhead on Normandy would be much more expeditious. Too it would better relieve the pressure on the Russian front, which was needed, and Russia was demanding that plan.

To complete the compromise, the British had taken a licking on the Continent and on their island. Britain's resources were limited and her best were at war. Churchill was determined to husband his forces, many of whom would have to accept future responsibilities of the Empire.

He lost his second battle of wits when he was turned down on his Berlin proposal—beat the Russians to the German capital. Even Eisenhower at one time saw the sense in this. By this time the Russian poker hand showed badly. It was a hand with very little secrecy of the hole card.

Undoubtedly the primary factor which ruled against this decision was the closeness to the conclusion of the war, and the great effort which would be needed to beat the Reds to the Nazi capital. It is doubtful if the attempt would have been accepted as necessary at home. Families wanted their husbands and children back home, and crumbled Berlin was no longer an important military objective.

What has happened since, we all know. How it happened we have a fairly clear idea. The question of the future depends upon the morale and faith of the free world.

The pity of it all is that the men who fought hard for sincere causes, such as those who met on the Elbe, could not have had the determining voices at the conclusion of the war. Had that been the case, we are sure that the world would be a quieter place today.

But, again, things have changed in 10 years. Whether the nine Russian infantrymen who are coming for the Monday anniversary celebration will be able to express themselves freely is doubtful, for the fear of influence of the few at the Kremlin reaches to the ends of the world. But certainly the meeting cannot hurt, and it may kindle a spark which will start a comforting warmth in the future. After 10 years of turmoil between the victors in World War II, there is ample reason to wish for an honorable settlement soon of their differences, in the hope that the next 10 years may bring the world into paths of peace and happiness.

What Makes Congressman Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include at this time a most interesting article describing how my distinguished colleague the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, from the 23d District of California, decided to run for Congress. The article was written by Bernard Kahn, sports editor of the Daytona Beach Evening News, and published in the April 6, 1955, edition:

As "Admiral" Judge's *Seaborn* plowed through the river and passed Moore's siding near New Smyrna Beach, an elderly, small, white-haired lady stood on the dock with an old man standing beside her and his arm around her shoulder. She waved a miniature American flag, no bigger than 6 inches, at the passing Congressmen.

I noticed one Congressman wave back at the old woman and I took a chair next to him. The result was no great shakes of an interview or story, either. But this man struck me as a kind fellow with a warm face. At the time I knew nothing about him, whether he was a Democrat or a Republican; nothing whatever about his personal affairs or his political career.

It was something I felt about him as he answered the casual and unimportant questions that I asked him.

His name was CLYDE DOYLE, Democrat, United States Congressman from the 23d District in California, outside Los Angeles. He is a member of the House Armed Forces Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

DOYLE practiced on the baseball diamond Monday, "and my feet are still sore," he said sadly. "Guess I'm not as young as I used to be. The ball looked funny when I tried to bat. Must be these bifocals," he added, carefully cleaning his specs.

He's 65, and looks 55. He was a pitcher for the University of Southern California 47 years ago.

"Not a very good one," DOYLE apologized.

Mrs. Doyle accompanied the Congressman here. She's been at his side ever since 1908, when he run for the student body presidency of Long Beach Poly High School and she managed his campaign.

"We won, too, DOYLE declared. "We're a team, Mrs. Doyle and I."

The insignificant incident of the little old lady waving her little flag was significant to DOYLE.

"You get away from it all here, yet you really can't get away from the people," DOYLE explained. "I thought that elderly lady was very inspiring."

I asked DOYLE how he came to run for Congress.

"I had a successful law practice," replied the Irishman. "We were thrifty and sober. And we saved a little money.

"My boy was going to USC and he was a good athlete. Then my boy and 11 other fraternity brothers volunteered for the Air Force in World War II. Nine never came back.

"My wife and I talked about these boys risking their lives to protect us folks at home. As a successful lawyer, I thought why shouldn't I do something, too. So I ran for the United States Congress and won in 1945.

"Just 2 months after I was elected my boy was killed in action. He was our only son."

DOYLE reminisced. He told me what his son, Clyde Doyle, Jr., had told him; that he could never hate the enemy, but that he learned to shoot to kill to protect the people at home who were too old to fight.

"He was a fine young man and a fine athlete," the Congressman continued. "He was doing well at USC. I wanted him to enjoy life and the things that I didn't have. I remember when I went to USC I didn't have enough money to join a fraternity and I was too proud to allow others to pay it for me. There's a very reputable judge in Los Angeles, Walter Gates, who was at USC when I was there. Judge Gates and I were the only students who wore celluloid collars. We couldn't afford linen ones."

DOYLE recalled his first meeting with General Eisenhower before he was President, when he was our war leader.

"When I was introduced to Eisenhower, the general put a hand on my shoulder and said, 'Congressman, I'd give my right arm not to ever send men into battle again.' Now Eisenhower is our President."

He dug into his wallet and extracted a picture of a handsome, tall young man.

"That's my son," said CLYDE DOYLE.

He hauled a handkerchief out of his pocket and dabbed at his moist eyes.

"Sea spray is clouding my glasses," said the United States Congressman, as he wiped away the tears.

Oppose Hoover Commission Recommendations on REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Pepin County Farmers Union in opposition to proposed recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to the REA.

Following is the resolution explaning this organization's views on the subject:

Whereas the Hoover Commission is attempting to do away with our present REA setup by opposing Government lending; and

Whereas it would be necessary in the future to rely on private capital at higher rate of interest, thereby forcing service rates to go higher and also curtailing much needed future expansion: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the delegates attending the Pepin County Farmers Union quarterly convention, held on April 18, 1955, go on record this day as opposing such action; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators and Congressmen, urging them to oppose any reduc-

tion in Federal lending for REA, in the event such a bill should come before Congress in this or any future session.

This resolution was voted upon at the county convention and passed with a unanimous vote.

PEPIN COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
HERMAN ORNE, *President.*

A St. Patrick's Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following message from the Prime Minister of Ireland, Mr. John A. Costello, addressed to the people of the United States and Canada for St. Patrick's Day 1955. It seems to me that the warmth and sincerity of this message brings home to us very well the close and intimate ties of affection and friendship between this country and Ireland. It illustrates too the community of interest existing between the two countries and, for my part, I think that it should lead all right-thinking and freedom-loving Americans to look with favor and sympathy upon the aspirations of the Irish people:

Once again I am happy to be able, through the medium of the International News Service, to send a message of greeting and good wishes, on behalf of the Irish Government and on my own behalf, to our kith and kin and our numerous friends in the United States and in Canada.

To us in Ireland the feast of St. Patrick is our great national festival, but our pride in our faith and in our race is enhanced by the fact that this great festival is so significantly and distinctively honored and observed in so many countries throughout the world.

The United States has always had a special place in the hearts of Irishmen. There is no country with which we have stronger ties or more friendly relations.

BARRY STATUE

The erection of the statue to Comdr. John Barry, the Wexfordman founder of the American Navy, which we hope will take place during the coming year and the gift of the statue from the American Government to the Irish nation will emphasize and bring home to both our peoples the close association which still and must forever exist between them.

Frequently, but hardly adequately, I have endeavored to express gratitude for the assistance given over the years by the United States to our people toward the realization of their national aspirations and appreciation of the material help given in recent times by the generous people of the United States to the economic development of our country.

We watch with pride and thankfulness that great nation assuming tremendous and ever-increasing responsibilities in world affairs and using its wealth and power in the cause of that worldwide peace which small nations such as ours particularly and passionately desire.

That pride and thankfulness are all the greater because of our realization that citizens of the United States who are of Irish origin, while abundantly discharging their duties as citizens of the great nation to which they are proud to owe allegiance, never forget their Irish mother country.

It is not merely gratifying to our national pride to recall that so many men and women of our Irish race have contributed toward the building of the Nation which has become the greatest in the community of free nations, but it is satisfying to realize that thereby we have in some small measure helped to discharge our debts of gratitude.

Irishmen, too, played a part in Canada's march to nationhood, and to the Canadian nation and people we are also indebted for unfailing sympathy and support which we received at all times in our need.

And therefore to Canada, a young nation which has achieved greatness and which is directing its growing influence and prestige in world affairs to the cause of peace in our time, we send our greeting, our gratitude, and our desire for even closer association and friendship.

As a small nation and one that has fought so tenaciously and for so long to achieve its freedom, Ireland desires peace and liberty for all nations to live their lives in peace. This desire for peace is all the more intense because of the horrors that must follow the use in war of modern instruments of destruction.

Peace-loving peoples, and more particularly small nations, appalled at the frightful possibilities of such instruments of destruction, can only clutch at the hope of the deterrent effect of mutual frightfulness and look to the great nations faithfully to discharge their duties as trustees for humanity and civilization.

UNIFICATION

A united Ireland might give a significant contribution to the cause of world peace. A partitioned people can only feel frustrated at being deprived of the opportunity of giving such a contribution.

If the forces which are inexorably, if slowly, at work to break the unnatural barrier which spreads across the face of our motherland could be accelerated, Irishmen of all creeds and classes at home and abroad could unite in a common effort to aid and save our civilization.

Resolution of Spokane Public Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to copy below a resolution of the Spokane Public Forum, Spokane, Wash., dated April 23, 1955, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Honorable EUGENE SILER, of of Kentucky, has introduced H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas the Spokane Public Forum previously went on record for the Bryson bill to take the nauseating beer and cigarette commercial off the TV and radio, reaching into the home for youthful converts to the deadly poison they misrepresent;

Resolved, That the Spokane Public Forum go on record highly commending the Honorable EUGENE SILER for his courageous stand to protect the public, especially the younger generation, from said vicious and false advertisements about the light temperance beverage beer.

JOSEPH E. NESBITT, *President.*
MARY J. WELSH, *Secretary.*

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth time since I have been a Member of Congress, I recently mailed questionnaires to the 86,000 boxholders in Nebraska's Fourth Congressional District. The following tabulation shows the results of this poll in (a) the rural areas and (b) the cities:

1. What type farm program do you favor?

	Flexible	*90% parity*	*100% parity*
(a)	50.7%	26.9%	13.4%
(b)	73.0%	19.0%	8.0%

2. Would you favor a bushel quota on wheat?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	66.7%	33.3%
(b)	57.7%	42.3%

3. Would you favor a two-price system on marketing wheat?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	48.4%	51.6%
(b)	45.3%	54.7%

4. Should 18-year-olds vote?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	38.4%	61.6%
(b)	40.9%	59.1%

5. Do you favor present Social Security for farmers?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	58.7%	41.3%
(b)	63.1%	36.9%

6. Your choice for President in the next election—

	Eisenhower	*Stevenson*	*Others*
(a)	73.1%	7.2%	19.7%
(b)	76.3%	7.6%	16.1%

7. Should tariffs be—

	Lowered?	*Raised?*	*Kept as they are?*
(a)	24.8%	20.8%	54.4%
(b)	28.7%	18.3%	53.0%

8. Do you favor the present foreign policy?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	43.5%	56.5%
(b)	48.0%	52.0%

9. Should we grant more or less foreign aid?

	More	*Less*
(a)	9.0%	91.0%
(b)	8.0%	92.0%

10. Should there be Federal aid to education?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	41.8%	58.2%
(b)	44.6%	55.4%

11. Should there be Federal aid for school construction?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	50.2%	49.8%
(b)	55.5%	44.5%

12. Do you favor universal military training?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	49.3%	50.7%
(b)	58.2%	41.8%

13. Do you prefer the present Selective Service System?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	64.6%	35.4%
(b)	67.3%	32.7%

14. Do you favor raising postal rates to meet the cost of service?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	59.1%	40.9%
(b)	65.6%	34.4%

15. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	6.5%	93.5%
(b)	7.3%	92.7%

16. Should Alaska be made a new State?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	77.1%	22.9%
(b)	79.2%	20.8%

17. Should Hawaii be made a new State?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	74.4%	25.6%
(b)	79.9%	20.1%

18. Do you favor a State sales tax?

	Yes	*No*
(a)	43.4%	56.6%
(b)	46.9%	53.1%

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address which I had the privilege of delivering at the annual businessmen's day to the students of the school of business administration at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Tex., on April 26, 1955, as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS THE SOMETHING-FOR-NOTHING PHILOSOPHY

Mr. Chairman, students of the SMU School of Business Administration, faculty, and alumni, it is a real pleasure to be present with you today. Since your kind invitation was extended me, I have realized how much I have in common with those who are going out into business on their own.

First, I think of my college days when, like yourselves, I was greatly concerned over my future and what career or business endeavor to embark upon. In my case the answer came one night at dinner in a friend's New York apartment, when for the first time I saw a picture show broadcast over the air—television. From the moment of this strange introduction, I knew this was to be my field of business. So it was that after graduation, I plunged into the merchandising and distribution end of this fascinating new industry which, in 1940, was in its marketing infancy.

Another comparison is my situation today when, as you know, I am in an entirely new field of endeavor. I have just plunged into this tremendous task much as will many of our young business people starting out on their own. In the case of a Congressman and the young businessman, both must shift for themselves. The Congressman learns on arriving in Washington and thereafter that while his colleagues are sympathetic, they would never volunteer help but only answer questions, because they know, as I even now know, that part of the job of being a Congressman is learning to make the adjustments and being left alone to make the adjustments, since each Congressman is an individual coming from a particular district and the strength of our system is built upon the differences which each Congressman represents. Through the adjustment and the struggle, there comes of course a corresponding satisfaction when challenging and new tasks are met and overcome. I appreciate the system in Washington as I have come to learn it.

In much the same way a newcomer to business enters his new endeavor, somewhat alone, where his character and ability are developed through the challenges which are presented. He is a free agent. This is possible because we have free enterprise. We believe in this country in this growth of human personality and character within the framework of a master plan which only the Almighty knows.

My own personal convictions have been tested, as have those of others here present, through those first business endeavors which I was privileged to participate in before the Great War. Then in the war these convictions were further tested, and others came to light that had been lying dormant and were what I now recognize as innate spiritual and religious beliefs. Now, in Congress, my convictions are still tested almost daily, as at this moment in speaking to you, because I am in a position, as a Congressman, where the fundamental ethical, moral and spiritual beliefs, as a yardstick, must continually be applied in making decisions concerning the big issues that face us today.

Through all of the trials and struggles, I have found no reason to change my basic belief in the principles which I was taught going through school. I believe in human freedom, and that means economic freedom. I have come to understand why our forefathers and my forebears believed as they did in free enterprise, competition, the open market place, to establish demand-supply and price, as contrasted with the foreign planned economies and isms they left behind when they left the old country.

So it was that when thinking of talking to you today, the titles that sprang to mind were: "Free Enterprise, the American Way," "Government and Free Enterprise," "Let's Put Business Principles Into Government, and Take Government Out of Business," "The Government in Your Business Future"—but no matter what the title they all started and ended with free enterprise, because within the framework of the definition of free enterprise, as we Americans have traditionally defined it, is found the individual worth and dignity of the man or woman, our spiritual beliefs, the best system for economic growth, the "merit system," individual incentive and intiative. In short, the sum total of American beliefs. To me free enterprise and Americanism are one.

My title finally became "Free Enterprise versus the Something-for-nothing Philosophy." The something-for-nothing philosophy is based on the erroneous belief that government can do for us what we cannot do for ourselves. Forgotten is the fact that ours is a Government of, by and for the people. Through the declared emergencies of a depression and two wars has arisen a Federal bureaucracy of such scope that few, if any, know all the present services offered by Government—many unnecessary to the people. This philosophy spawned on regulations and controls of our economy, through planned deficit financing which resulted in spiraling inflation and cost of living. States rights have been usurped by Federal domination, until the State-Federal proportion of operation and tax income has changed from 75–25 percent to 25–75 percent.

In this something-for-nothing philosophy is found the belief the Federal Government can manufacture, finance, merchandise, market, and compete in every way with private industry, that it can do so without paying tax on its operation which is passed on to private businessmen to pay, who must also pay their own taxes. Simultaneously, the Government often blames free enterprise business which staggers under the Government-imposed regulation and heavy tax, saying that free enterprise is faulty. It is of interest to note that at this moment the Government is still the Nation's biggest electric power producer, the biggest power consumer, the biggest banker, the biggest employer, the biggest insurance company, biggest landlord, biggest tenant, and biggest publisher. In fact, Uncle Sam owns more wheat than the wheat farmers, more grass land than the cattle men, and more trucks than General Motors. Our national debt is $278 billion and we have a hidden debt of $250 billion, an overall tax rate of 30 cents on the dollar.

In the something-for-nothing philosophy, there is the belief that wealth can be redistributed to the point of confiscation by a heavy progressive income tax. This money can be placed in the hands of the low-bracket purchaser who then can stimulate business by buying. This is called the percolate up theory by some. It overlooks the fact that production is necessary or there'll be no goods to buy—and production needs money for plant and equipment to produce, to expand, and to create more jobs.

The advocates of the something-for-nothing philosophy are intentionally or unintentionally disloyal Americans. Some are avowed socialists. These are the most dangerous because as Americans considering themselves patriotic devoted citizens they are undermining the country's economic strength as a friend—not an avowed enemy such as the Communist we have come to recognize as antithetical to all we believe—and who is dedicated to the overthrow of our country. We recognize communism as an enemy, yet communism is economically a socialistic form of government, and there is the great danger. Too many of our well-meaning socialistic friends of the last 2 decades are playing right into communistic hands. The godless materialism of this philosophy must not be for this great country of ours. As idealists we Americans acquiesce to the goals that social measures propose. It is easy to succumb to the belief first, that government can do it, and second, that we can pay the cost, not only for our own people, but the world. Too often lost in the shuffle is the free-enterprise system that must pay the cost of our grandiose schemes.

The present administration is struggling valiantly to satisfy the increased citizens' demands of its government and at the same time build our economic strength by freeing our business to operate with minimum government intervention or control—of this I approve—but I would counsel this or any administration to always remember an earlier American adage "that government is best that governs least." Our forefathers believed this and they built the free-enterprise system into the world's greatest productive system.

This system was based on freedom—to think, act, and do as an individual—in business as well as government. They recognized that our freedoms were so interrelated that the loss of one meant the loss of all. Therefore economic freedom was fostered in the free-enterprise system. Everyone had a stake in it. They knew and we should remember that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Further, there was no caste system. Unlike many foreign countries, an American was not forced to stay in the same level that he was born into. A man was recognized for whatever he made of himself. The great accomplishments in the production of American industry is testimonial to the many free men and women who dedicated their efforts to business within the free-enterprise system. These are our traditions—our heritage. We must carry them on.

In the United States there is still no limit to your goal. Each of us can become what we are capable of achieving. Surely, we have proven too that what a mind is capable of thinking, a man can do; witness the new duct-fan helicopter, the modern flying carpet. Since 1900 the world has produced airplanes, radio, television, and countless other scientific discoveries. We all know we have just scratched the surface in new inventions and ideas, that untold worlds may open up ahead of us. New ideas and opportunities need only to be thought of and recognized.

The United States has a magnificent future. The Southwest area of the United States may very well have an even more brilliant future than the national average. Its population and industries are growing.

And you have freedom of choice. You can look around and decide—stay put or move along as new horizons open, and let me assure you from my personal experience that there will be countless vistas unrolling before you, challenging you to new effort—if you stay alert.

In your business ventures you are not likely to forget the part that government plays in our lives, and I hope you will not neglect your duties as a citizen. Using myself as an example in the establishment of my corporation and two small individually owned companies in real estate, I often worked 7 days and some nights. My par-

ticipation in government suffered. Actually, I deprived myself of the right of participating—a right and privilege all Americans should treasure and enjoy. One day I realized with a shock that many of the bureaucratic policies of our Federal Government and our loss of many States rights were contrary to my beliefs. So here I am.

Many other business people are guilty of leaving the charting of their country's course to others. They are so enmeshed in their personal worries they will not take time to vote, much less in political work. Because of this the very men who could inform our people most of the value of our free-enterprise system do not speak out and the result has been the lack of emphasis on the greatness of traditional American enterprise. It is my hope, therefore, that you will always keep an active interest and participation in your government at the local level. Otherwise, you are leaving the decisions to others whose views may not embody your own.

The weakness of our system, as Plato pointed out centuries ago, is the lack of an informed electorate, or apathy on the part of the people. Businessmen in our country by their neglect of citizen participation in governmental affairs have failed to protect free enterprise by influencing legislation.

Businessmen realize through hard-earned experience that private enterprise and Government cannot compete in business. Businessmen operating on a profit system know that deficit financing is an impossibility, and any system based on it is unsound and should be corrected. Businessmen, having learned these lessons, permit their Government in many instances to make mistakes which their experience and judgment could have prevented if they had been taking a part in the direction of their Government.

My final thought then would be some conclusions I reach in forecasting the trend our Government would take if more business people participated in it. I believe the program would be accelerated in getting the Government out of business. I believe that businessmen in our Government would throw their weight behind balancing the budget, reducing the national debt, reducing taxes, thereby stimulating incentive, further investment, and creating more jobs. They would reduce the gigantic intended redistribution of wealth the Socialists and Communists are so pleased to see us engage in. There would be further incentive for those talented individuals whose property in the form of earnings is almost entirely confiscated in the upper bracket, and whose responsible positions create more jobs by this stimulated effort. The so-called little man who bears taxation's heaviest burden numerically would be given greater relief in his taxes, made possible by reducing the cost of Government. This reduction would be made possible through decentralization and return to the States of many of the Federal activities. The businessman might insist, I believe, that the Government operate within its income. In fact, the businessman might insist upon a constitutional amendment controlling the Government's ability to tax, borrow, and spend, thereby assuring a sound economy by whoever the elected officials were. Businessmen in Government would continue to remove the Federal Government from areas of operation which do not pertain to government.

It is my heartfelt belief that the future greateness of our country is interwoven with the perpetuation, strengthening, and success of our free-enterprise system. It must be kept free. I believe that people with business experience must join together to continue to remind the American people of the advantages that we enjoy, the high level of production and prosperity, the great economic, moral, and spiritual strength resulting from our beliefs. These are the things, I believe, which business people should remember and practice. I hope that all of you will take your part in the good faith to preserve the free-enterprise system.

I have enjoyed this opportunity of being with you and sharing a few thoughts. I wish you all the very best of everything in whatever you undertake. May you be successful and happy, and in return for the blessing of living and working in this great Nation take an active part in its guidance. Thank you.

Appeal by the American Bicycle Industry for Relief From Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under the "escape clause" provision of Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the American bicycle industry appealed to the Tariff Commission on June 1954 for relief from "injury" caused by excessive importations. During September 1954, the Tariff Commission began hearings on the subject and interested parties were able to present their cases to the Commission. At that time I asked the Commission for relief from excessive imports, since the bicycle manufacturers in my district were notifying me that their businesses were suffering because imports were supplanting their products in local markets and that a rising unemployment rate was inevitable. From advices which I have received later from manufacturers and from labor unions, it seems as if the situation is getting progressively worse.

The Tariff Commission has now completed its findings on the case. In studying the facts the Commission had two avenues of action open to it; one, in the event that no injury to the industry was proved, the Commission could make those findings available to the general public immediately; on the other hand, if the possibility of injury is proved, the Commission could present its findings and recommendations concerning relief from excessive imports to the President for his own disposition of the matter.

Under the tariff law the President has 60 days in which to decide whether he would follow the recommendations or not. On this coming May 14 the waiting period of 60 days expires. At that time the President can notify the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee that he does not intend to follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission as regards action on the appeal or he may refer the case back to the Commission for further information. When this latter situation arises—as has occurred to many appeals in the past—the appeal generally dies on the vine, as it were.

On the other hand, the President may follow the recommendations tendered to him by the Tariff Commission and on May 14 he will announce his action and his reasons for such action. This may be either in the form of announcing that tariffs will be increased to a level that will tend to offset the competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign manufacturers or some type of quota may be worked out. The eventuality of a quota being instituted, either a flexible or a straight percentage quota, is unlikely, since up to the present that type of tariff procedure has been avoided in the case of manufacturers and also because it is a cumbersome procedure.

Should the Senate version of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with its national security clause be passed, then the President will be able to set quotas on imports.

Mr. Speaker, since I am vitally concerned with the plight of the unemployed in my district as well as the plight of the small-business man who cannot meet the low prices of foreign bicycles, I wrote a personal letter to the President on Friday, April 29, asking that tariffs be raised on imported bicycles. I insert a copy of this letter as sent to the White House at this time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been advised by the United States Tariff Commission that they have submitted to you their findings and recommendations on an appeal for relief filed by the bicycle industry under the escape clause proceedings of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Since the employment situation in my district is vitally affected by the excessive importation of foreign bicycles, I wish to add my voice to those of others in the industry asking that you give action to positive relief proposals for this segment of our economy.

In 1930 imported bicycles averaged 1.3 percent of the American market. In the immediate postwar years the total gradually rose till by 1953 the percentage was 22.8; by 1954 it had risen to 37; and now during the first 3 months of 1955 the percentage has climbed to well above 50. In 1953 alone more bicycles were imported than the accumulated total of the 20-year period 1931–51.

Foreign bicycle manufacturers thrive because they have an unbeatable price advantage due to low cost of labor and materials, and subsidies, as well as protective legislation in their own countries. In addition our tariffs are so low that foreign exporters derive great benefits by shipping their bicycles to our shores.

Mr. President, I have always felt that the administration of the Trade Agreements Program could be accomplished without causing undue injury to the workers employed in American industry and agriculture. However, it is only a matter of time before the entire domestic bicycle market is lost to foreign imports. Affirmative action by you, Mr. President, is imperative if the bicycle industry is to survive.

In January 1955, in your state of the Union message, you said: "Nothing in our trade program will operate to injure or damage American industry."

Again, on February 17, in your special communication to us in Congress asking that the Trade Agreements Act be continued, you stated: "No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure."

Mr. President, in 1930 the tariff rate was 30 percent ad valorem. The present rate is as

low as 7½ percent, and now the request is for even further cuts in this very low tariff.

The Tariff Commission has voluminous statistics to show that our freer trade policy does "injury or damage" to many small plants with thousands of workers. Certainly the American bicycle industry is suffering injury because of the substantial portion of the domestic market being taken over by bicycles imported under our low tariffs.

I am especially concerned because of the acute unemployment in my district caused by the influx of foreign-made bicycles. Because of this interest, I requested our Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, to conduct a special unemployment survey of the Torrington area, Connecticut. This survey was conducted and on April 4, 1955, Secretary Mitchell advised me: "The survey showed that a substantial labor surplus does exist in this area. Accordingly, we are officially classifying the Torrington area in Group IV–A—area of substantial labor surplus." From advices received from manufacturers and labor unions in my district it is evident that this labor surplus has been caused largely because so many workers in the bicycle industry were laid off.

I am vitally concerned because of the realistic approach we must exercise as regards unemployment. Our country is embarking on a freer trade policy and we seem to adopt a strictly doctrinaire position, namely: free trade is sound in theoretical economics, and therefore, free trade should be pursued. What freer traders fail to realize is the fact that if limitless imports produce unemployment in our country, the uneconomic effects would eventually result in restrictive tariff on the high side.

Mr. President, the very fact that the Tariff Commission has not made public its findings supports the assumption that positive "injury" to the American bicycle industry has been caused by excessive imports and that recommendations have been made for the alleviation of this "injury." What the Tariff Commission's recommendations are, I do not presume to know, but my personal recommendation would be that tariffs on bicycles should revert to the status of July 1, 1945. In the event that you feel this cannot be done, then I would recommend a flexible quota based on a certain percentage of domestic sales over a 5-year period.

I am submitting this request to you, Mr. President, having regard to your concern for the welfare of our economic structure as a whole and with due expectation that you will give relief to this hard-pressed sector of our economy.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from bicycle and bicycle parts manufacturers from many sections of the United States. The problem of foreign bicycle imports is touching a $200 million industry to such an extent that in the first few months of 1955 fully 50 percent of our domestic market was being taken over by these importations.

It had been suggested in the Randall Commission report that many industries should retrain their workers for similar type of manufactures in cases where their domestic industries are being injured by excessive imports of the type of commodity which they produce.

Anyone knows how difficult that type of program will be. I well remember the case during the war of the gold-mining industry. The War Production Board had advised that no machinery or parts would be available to the gold-mining industry. Workers in that industry should be shifted to similar types of mining or retrained for similar types of employment. Some of you may not know this, but the relocation and the retraining program was an abysmal failure. The men refused to be relocated in other areas, and special efforts were made by the companies to keep the men at their current locations in case the mines opened at sometime in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress the fact that the American domestic bicycle industry is not of such minute proportion that its dislocation can be ignored. In our small factory towns the men have lived and brought up their families, bought their homes, and have grown roots, as it were. It is hard to remove men from these small towns. Yet, when their means of livelihood are being undercut they have to do something else to provide food for their families. This they will do, no matter what hardship they undergo. Yet, when the time comes for this type of mechanic to go back into the bicycle industry it will be hard for them to rechange their employment status. Once men leave an industry it is not easy to build up such an industry again.

Mr. Speaker, all this points up the reason to which I am coming now. I am in favor of a reorientation of our foreign-trade program. I believe in the interchange of goods between nations. But the whole trade-agreements program seems to be encumbered at present with such a vast amount of administrative procedures as to make it practically impossible for an industry to get amelioration of its difficulties should excessive imports hurt such an industry. There is the matter of appeals, the holding of hearings, the searching and investigating of reports of injury, the dislocation of labor; the research of possible retraining efforts, a recommendation to the President, a waiting period of 60 days, a possible denial of such appeal or a type of action which might not give relief to the affected domestic industry.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that although the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 has been stigmatized as the highest in United States history, that tariff has now been cut down to such an extent by successful percentage cuts under the renewal of every Trade Agreements Act extension as well as by concessions granted at Geneva, Torquay, Annecy, and now at Geneva again, that to find the exact rate in operation is a difficult matter indeed.

I think the time has come, and I would urgently stress the sooner the better, that we in this Congress initiate a new study for the revision of our basic tariff act. Not only is such a revision overdue but, it is of prime importance to us in Congress that we do not relinquish too much of our authority to any one executive agency. I mean by this that in Congress our ultimate responsibility is to our constituents and yet here, because of a multiplicity of procedures concerning tariff cuts or the reimposition of tariffs, we are unable to give relief to our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, quite a few of us in this Congress have been importuned time and again by our constituents for intervention on their behalf against excessive importations. My feeling is that we should revise our tariff law that our constituents may know that their interests are being protected. I wish to state that I think the time is ripe and a beginning should be made in the restudy and rewriting of our basic tariff law.

A Citation for Father Kelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to have printed an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, April 30, 1955. The article announced the award of the Eastern Labor Press Conference's annual citation for individual achievement in the field of labor relations. The award this year was appropriately presented to the Reverend William J. Kelley, of Catholic University, who has devoted 25 years to the important work of promoting stable labor-management relations. His Christian devotion to this field of human relations is a worthy exercise of his holy office.

The article follows:

LABOR PRESS HONORS FATHER KELLEY, OF C. U.

The Reverend William J. Kelley, of Catholic University, was honored by the Eastern Labor Press Conference yesterday for 25 years of "promoting rational cooperation between industry and labor rather than class conflict."

The citation was presented to Father Kelley by Frank B. Powers, president of the organization which is made up of editors of labor papers in the East which have a combined circulation of 5 million.

The citation read in part:

"Through the years, his able service and wise counsel have been available to all those in need without regard to religion or wealth. Father Kelley has provided an inspiring example of a man courageously dedicated to serving the brotherhood of all men."

A member of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate who celebrates the 25th anniversary of his ordination next month, Father Kelley served as head of the New York State Labor Relations Board before coming to Catholic University.

He has served as a mediator in scores of labor-management disputes, and recently engineered the historic agreement between the International Association of Machinists and the United Brotherhood of Carpenters which ended a 40-year jurisdictional feud between the two unions.

This year he took an active part in fighting a proposed right-to-work law which was considered and turned down by the Maryland Legislature.

During the Willard Hotel meeting yesterday the 50 labor editors took part in workshop sessions devoted to improving the readability and content of their papers.

The Democratic Party and the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 26, Gen. Telford Taylor, a leading citizen of my State, a distinguished author and political observer, and an able public servant, made a speech before the New York Young Democratic Club.

He said some things which are worthy of general note, and I ask unanimous consent that a press release summarizing General Taylor's remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"A general reshaping of national policies to meet the changing structure of domestic and international affairs" was called for tonight by Telford Taylor, New York attorney and former Federal Government official. Addressing the New York Young Democratic Club on the subject The Democratic Party and the General Welfare, Taylor ridiculed the contention that the Democratic Party has no major issues to advance in the current Congress and next year's elections:

"Issues are one thing we have plenty of," Taylor declared, "and what are most needed now are the initiative, eloquence and follow-through to burn these issue into the public consciousness. It is the opportunity and responsibility of the Democratic Party to manifest these qualities and to furnish the leadership in grappling with the issues."

"Among the major problems confronting the Nation which the administration and the Republican Party are abjectly failing to recognize and cope with," Taylor listed:

"1. The disastrous decline in America's capacity for leadership in the international community and in the development of a stable and peaceful world order under the rule of law—a leadership which is just as vital to our security and far more important to America's enduring glory than leadership in the evolution of nuclear weapons.

"2. The trend toward an inflexible military establishment designed only for the total world war which may and should never be fought, and inadequate for the localized wars that are almost certain to continue and recur for some years to come.

"3. The nationwide crisis in education, resulting from the rapid growth of population without comparable expansion of educational facilities, which, unless resolved, will soon present a far more dangerous threat to the national well-being than the Red Air Force.

"4. The progressive paralysis of the executive branch and deterioration of the civil and military services of the Federal Government, as a result of benighted personnel policies and security hysteria.

"5. The new wave of banking and industrial mergers, resulting in a dangerous trend toward economic concentration which must be checked by an antitrust policy designed not to penalize bigness, but to enable the big and the little to coexist."

Taylor contrasted these issues with those that had faced the Nation in the early years of the Roosevelt administration:

"The very phrase 'New Deal'—implying that a few people held all the high cards—indicated that the main purpose then was to iron out the worst inequities in the distribution of wealth and power between labor and capital, farm and market, investor and financier. Of course, many flagrant injustices of distribution persist today, and we will never strike a perfect or permanent balance. So, too, the present administration has revived old abuses of governmental favoritism toward special interest groups, and the administration's squalid surrender of national resources, which can fitly be described only as public corruption on a vast scale, is a glaring reminder that constant vigilance is the price of administrative integrity.

"Nevertheless, the most serious problems of the present day do not lie in the conflicting interests of classes or regions. Rather, they are matters of common concern to the national community as a whole. A poorly educated generation, or an inefficent Federal service, is as bad for the farmer or workman as for the corporation executive.

"The Democratic Party must remain the party of the common man, but the time is past when the common man means only the underprivileged. As David Riesman has pointed out, the very success of the New Deal has brought about its own demise. It is a proud tradition, but no longer a living political slogan. The common American man is not longer an underpriviliged man in the New Deal sense.

"Today the common man is every man. The Constitution was adopted to promote the general welfare, and the general welfare of the national community must now be the core of the Democratic Party program and of national policy."

Not the Right Occasion for a Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Providence Journal, Providence, R. I., of April 23, 1955. The editorial entitled "Not the Right Occasion for a Veto" argues that a Presidential veto of the postal pay bill would be politically unwise and economically unsound. I heartily concur in the sentiment expressed and I urge all my colleagues to read the article at the earliest opportunity.

The editorial follows:

NOT THE RIGHT OCCASION FOR A VETO

Mr. Eisenhower will have to dig very deep if he is to come up with a convincing reason for vetoing a postal pay increase bill because the House voted six-tenths of 1 percent more than he has indicated he would approve.

A year ago he denied the postal workers a raise for the legitimate reason that Congress provided no funds to pay it. But this year the responsibility rests with him to make sure that these faithful public servants get their proper share of the pay boosts that economic circumstances have persuaded him to recommend for other civilian employees. These circumstances have already compelled the Government to provide increases for its military personnel and, more conspicuously, for the Members of Congress themselves.

Where the conference committee will finally fix the percentage point remains to be revealed. It must stand somewhere between the House's 8.2 percent pay increase and the Senate's 10 percent. But obviously there is no reason to expect that either branch will drop back to Mr. Eisenhower's 7.6 maximum.

And considering that the administration in the next fiscal year plans to spend upward of $60 billion, with at least 3.5 percent of total expenditures allotted to alien peoples, it can hardly afford to haggle over perhaps a dozen million extra dollars that Congress may decide to give the postal workers beyond the amount the President prefers to ratify.

In the circumstances, if the conference committee sticks to the House's 8.2 percent, Mr. Eisenhower should not compel the legislators to attempt to override a veto. Such Presidential action would be politically unwise and economically dubious.

National Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport Times of Shreveport, La., of April 29, 1955. The editorial is on a subject of vital importance which will be before the House within the near future and I commend it to all Members for reading. The editorial, entitled "Keep It Voluntary," is as follows:

KEEP IT VOLUNTARY

Defense Secretary Wilson said, after testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, that he had given up hope of having a provision in the new military reserve bill for drafting 17- and 18-year-olds for 6 months of training.

Secretary Wilson pointed out that Chairman VINSON, Georgia Democrat, was opposed to such a draft and probably a majority of the Committee feels the same way. VINSON later confirmed this.

Wilson should not feel too bad about not getting the draft proposal which was included in the original version of the Eisenhower administration Reserve bill, as drawn in the Pentagon. The provision for training of youngsters for 6 months at the ages of 17 and 18 remains in the bill, but this program will be on a volunteer basis instead of a draft basis. It was worked out that way in the Armed Forces Subcommittee which handled the bill and which was under chairmanship of Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Shreveport.

In all probability this change, and other changes which may be made in the original version of the bill, will meet with full approval of President Eisenhower himself and of his administration. The sentiment against setting up a new draft of 17- and 18-year-olds is not partisan in any way. In fact, opposition to such a program is somewhat inherent in the American character, which always has wanted to avoid military draft at any age in peacetime but has recognized in recent years that there is no such thing as real peacetime.

But the age of 17 simply is too low for military draft—as a matter of fact, the Times always has held that 18 was too low, even in wartime unless there was absolutely no other way to get the manpower needed.

This new program of 6 months' training for teenagers should go over without difficulty under a voluntary basis. It is being

made especially attractive to the 17- and 18-year-olds because it keeps them out of the present regular military draft so long as they carry out the provisions of reserve service which include a certain number of drills each year and a certain period in summer camp training.

The greatest advantage in it is that the boy getting out of high school and not going to college can settle down pretty quickly into whatever he has chosen for his life's work without having to give up 2 or 3 years to military training. If the volunteer system does not work, then it may be necessary to work out some form of compulsion if the training of youngsters at the ages of 17 and 18 still is considered essential to national security.

American Legion Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio has, for a number of years been putting on an annual essay contest among the young boys and girls of each of the congressional districts of Ohio. The prize offered has been a free trip to Washington and other eastern points with all expenses paid, and under the guidance of high American Legion State officials and high officials of the ladies auxiliary of the American Legion of Ohio.

One of the leaders of the American Legion who has been prominent in putting on these contests has been Mr. Peter DeWeese. His success has been so consistent that he is assigned this task annually.

The Members of the House of Representatives and the Senators from Ohio have, from the beginning of these contests, been giving a luncheon in honor of the essay winners here in Washington in the Capitol Building, and this luncheon for 1955 was given today. The State commander of the American Legion and the State legion auxiliary representatives were present, and most of the Members of Congress and Senators from Ohio were present. Each of the winners was introduced and given a chance to speak. Each of them in his or her speech showed his or her appreciation of what the Legion and the Members of Congress have done for them. And every Senator and Congressman spoke feelingly about the program of the American Legion, and of the ability and fine purpose shown by the winners, all of whom were present.

One of the prize winners was Miss Anna Belle Lanning, of Murray City, Ohio, which is a fine historical town located in the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, which is one of the finest congressional districts in the country, and which is the congressional district which I have had the honor to represent for 30 years.

The American Legion is to be congratulated upon the fine subject which was selected to be the subject about which the essays should be written. The subject was The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today. No more fitting subject could have been selected in these trying times. The young lady from my congressional district surely discussed this timely and important subject most effectively; her essay is logical and shows that she has a brilliant mind, and has a proper spirit. I am glad to have her fine essay printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that it will be read by the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also hope that this brilliant young lady may be able to continue her education, and thereby be able to take her place in the world as a brilliant woman and as a woman of spiritual guidance and influence. Her prize-winning essay is as follows:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

Our free way of life was developed by men and women of deep religious faith. America has always been conscious of the need for religion. The founders of our Republic were sincere and profound men, men who looked to God for guidance. Today our religion and democracy are so strong that they can never be conquered by direct and open attack. They can succumb only to indifference and neglect.

Fortunately for America and for the world, there seems to be developing a spiritual awakening that has been growing in the hearts of men.

Every citizen of every political and religious faith must feel a sense of security in realizing that our distinguished President understands the importance of prayer and faith in God. Mr. Eisenhower recently made the statement, "Only a people strong in Godliness is a people strong enough to overcome tyranny and make themselves free and others free."

There is nothing strange about the word "spiritual" today. It's on every tongue, in every newspaper column, and in the title contents of some book on almost every bookshelf. There isn't a phase of life where it doesn't apply.

Effectualness is a noun too little used. What evidence we have so far of the effectualness of spiritual guidance in the world today are sufficient to make the free people of the world very thankful for the spiritual guidance they have received down through the years from men and women who were devout Christians.

Increasing interest in religion becomes more evident as time goes by. For example, at the top of the nonfiction best seller list for most of the year of 1953 was a religious book, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's the Power of Positive Thinking. The revised standard version Bible, published in 1952, had sold more than 2,500,000 copies by the end of its second year. Even the old half-forgotten custom of grace before meals was undergoing a revival. The American Legion and the undenominational Laymen's National Committee conducted campaigns to get Americans to say grace. They sent prayer cards with three graces—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—to thousands of restaurants and eating places where they were displayed on menus or tables. In Los Angeles paper napkins were printed on which were written some old-fashioned prayers for parents to give their children to learn.

While commenting on the progress of religion and spiritual guidance in the world today, we must always be alert to the one most dangerous threat to our spiritual freedom—communism. The best way to keep godless communism out of the world is to have a strong, active Christianity everywhere. Christian citizenship is a rock of Gibraltar that will withstand all outside and inside attacks by communism.

The first and the best place for spiritual guidance to begin is in the home. The Scriptures tell us, and I quote, "Bring up a child in the way it should go, and when it is old it shall not depart from this way." It is the duty of every parent to give their children spiritual guidance from the time they are able to understand the meaning of Christianity in order to protect them from the ungodliness in the world today.

Award for Distinguished Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following remarks of Mr. Harry Seeve, director of the Greater New York Committee for State of Israel Bonds, at the Israel bond organization dinner honoring the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, which was held on April 25, 1955, at the Waldorf-Astoria.

Mr. De Sapio's response to these fine words has already been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1955, by Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN:

REMARKS BY HARRY SEEVE AT PRESENTATION OF AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED LEADERSHIP TO HON. CARMINE G. DESAPIO, APRIL 25, 1955, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL GRAND BALLROOM

Mr. Guest of Honor, Mrs. DeSapio, Your Honor the Mayor, Mr. Harman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is my honor and privilege, in behalf of the officers of the Greater New York Committee for State of Israel Bonds, to present the unique award for which our guest of honor, the Honorable Carmine DeSapio, has been selected.

As the director of the State of Israel bond organization in Greater New York for the past years, I am in a better position than anyone else to know the people who have really helped to make our campaign in these years successful. More than anyone else I can give the most telling evidence of the tremendous role which our guest of honor has played in the bond campaign and the warrant for his receiving the award tonight.

But perhaps even more significant than the choice itself is the name of the award, which is being made tonight for the first time—the award for distinguished leadership. That term carries with it the most important connotations of which I hope the committee will take note and will make an annual custom.

Leadership is a term that is much overused and greatly abused. It is often and loosely applied to many whose claims to it are not valid.

Our guest of honor has in the past year been the recipient of many and varied appellations—enigmatic, stoic, sphinx-like, mystery man. Words of adulation, honor, and respect have been heaped upon him. On the other hand, there are those who have applied names which we would not care to repeat this evening. But he is one of the few men I know to whom the term "leadership" is applied with unchallenged unanimity by friend and foe alike. It is an overriding quality for which his closest friends love him; others admire him; and for which his enemies respect him.

Leadership is the most difficult and heartbreaking career of all human endeavors. It imposes responsibility for the welfare of many; it requires a capacity to make farsighted decisions on a long term course of action. It demands determined and immutable adherence to that course, regardless of the constant difficulties which arise all the time; it requires an ability to maintain a self-confident persistence despite the defections and importunings of even the closest and dearest of friends. Many times it requires an imperturable facade and the strongest stomach to withstand obloquy, ridicule, scepticism, and the most vicious opposition.

And all the time, no one must know about the personal problems, the deep anxieties, the heartaches, the questions, the doubts. To friends and enemy alike, there must be presented a face of assurance and self-confidence.

Leadership is the most difficult role which life and human affairs have to offer to any man. And when a man appears who has the qualities of strength, wisdom, and tenacity to carry them off—the public, the people, the Nation, and the world is that much the richer for it.

That is why all of us, friend and foe alike—all Americans should welcome the emergence of this powerful, young leader upon the national scene of American political affairs.

We pray that he may be given the health and good fortune to continue his enormous contributions to the American society.

For Israel and for the bond organization, I want to say that we are humbly grateful that on top of all the rest of his problems and "tzores" he has been generous in lending the influence of his leadership to us. It has meant much—not only in the concrete results which have been achieved, but also in the encouragement and hope he has given to all of us. I hope he will not mind that I also add a personal word of thanks for myself and my entire staff for all that he has done, both in connection with this affair and the many times he has interested himself in our campaign in the past.

As a very slight token of gratitude and appreciation our committee has asked me to present this first award for distinguished leadership to him. With this award goes our profoundest gratitude and our sincerest good wishes for the future.

(Mr. Harry Seeve then presented the Honorable Carmine G. Desapio with the plaque of award for distinguished leadership.)

Department of Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced in the House a bill to abolish the present Federal Civil Defense Administration and to create within the Defense Department a Department of Civil Defense, under the direction of a Secretary appointed by the President.

With an initial allocation of $25 million the new Department would be authorized to prepare on a nationwide scale a comprehensive and effective program of civil defense, to make known to the public to the fullest possible extent, consistent with national security, the facts about the destructive power of the instruments of modern warfare, and to supply itself with an adequate number of personnel, either through the normal voluntary procedure, or, if necessary, by means of the Selective Service System. The bill also gives the President the power to transfer personnel into the Department of Civil Defense in case of a national emergency, as and when proclaimed by the President or the Congress.

There is an immediate, pressing need for such legislation. The civil defense program in the United States at present is utterly inadequate to cope with the danger of enemy attack. The problems of civil defense cannot be effectively separated from the problems of military defense.

The fiscal resources of the individual States and local communities are inadequate to guarantee equal minimum protection to all peoples in the United States, and although the patriotic efforts of part-time volunteer citizens is commendable, the complex requirements of an effective civil defense system call for full time, thoroughly trained personnel recruited on a national scale as in our present military departments.

Observations in Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles entitled "Collective Farms Have Not Worked" and "A Look Around the Kremlin," written by May Craig, Washington columnist for the Guy Gannett newspapers in Maine, and published last week in the Portland Press Herald. The articles are based on observations during her recent trip to Russia.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of April 29, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—COLLECTIVE FARMS HAVE NOT WORKED

(By May Craig)

Moscow.—Agriculture is the basis of life because it is the source of food. That makes it a fatal failure that communistic collective farming has not worked. It has not worked because it violated the fundamental human desire for reward for effort; because it means interminable rigid bureaucracy.

Russian communism has a monolithic principle, the state supreme, all for the state. It must control agriculture to succeed, as it must control labor and the basic production of all kinds. It is now trying variants of the original collective farm which has failed to produce food for people of Communist countries.

The collective farm is an entity, workers, acres, animals, poultry, professional men such as agronomist and veterinarian, technicians, and farm machinery and equipment. There are social services for the people. There is a complicated method of payment. Sop to human nature is the private garden allowed each family, with a few animals. Trouble is, they spend too much time on their private plots to the detriment of the collective. Krokodile, the Russian humorous magazine, is always making jokes about the collective farmers who are so busy shuffling papers they cannot dig potatoes.

Marketing is 3-way: compulsory deliveries to the government, additional voluntary sales to the government, and free sales in the open market. There have been many changes and adjustments in these methods of sale. There is complicated payment for work by a working day unit, which is measured by output, not by time. State farms are a little different in method of approach and are complicated too; they are generally engaged in one specialized type of production, maybe a special kind of milk cow. A state farm does not share its produce. It is more like an agricultural experiment station in the United States. Workers on state farms get cash wages. There are always goals and plans for these collectives, no matter what brand; always a plan that must be "fulfilled," with bonuses for overfulfillment.

The new regime here, of which N. S. Khrushchev seems to be the bossman, is turning to a different effort to meet agricultural production. This is to open up new land. He knows that agriculture is the Achilles heel of communism. One reason given for the demotion of Malenkov is that he was responsible for the poor agricultural showing.

The Soviet won't accept foreign capital with all that implies. It had none of its own. The only place to get it is from the peasant. That means so little return to the farmer, after the state share is taken for capital, that it requires force to make the farmer farm. Some little incentive has been given, such as the private plots. This has not produced the quantity needed, if Russia is to be industrialized and her millions of industrial workers fed from the farms. Agriculture is not keeping up with the increase in population, and that is bad omen for the future.

So, the plan is to open up the steppe areas of Kazakhastan, Siberia and in the Volga River area. This is thin crust of good earth, but it is flat, rain is scanty, and the winds are strong. Russia might take warning from what we did when we ripped the grass from our prairies. We got a dust bowl. It has happened in other countries, which eventually got deserts.

Khrushchev is said to want a "grain base economy" in the new lands and leave the old land to vegetables and other crops. Already some pioneers have been sent out to the new land and say they exceeded their goal of acres plowed and grain reaped. State farm system is being used. One advantage of the new land plan is that the settlers will be young people, veterans, many who have not farmed before. The land will be new to them, they will not have the passionate attachment to the bit of land that old people have to land they have held for years, perhaps their family for generations. The Communists have found the attachment of farmers to their land one of the most unmalleable traits of human beings. It is one of the factors in the failure of the original collective farm system—this clinging to the land.

The hope is to create an agricultural proletariat, like the industrial proletariat, controllable by the state more easily than the old-time peasant, clinging to every grain of his land obstinately, and wanting to keep what he wrings from the land.

It is estimated that 14 eastern regions of the Russian Federation and 8 regions of Kazakhastan, alone, have 100 million acres of virgin and long-fallow lands, with more beyond. Railway lines and roads are being constructed, machinery shipped out. Soviet youth is being called to come "because we are young and brave and love our country."

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of April 30, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—A LOOK AROUND THE KREMLIN

(By Mae Craig)

Moscow.—Moscow is the heart of Russia and the Kremlin is the heart of Moscow. Behind its age-old brick wall, on an eminence, are the golden cupolas of the churches, the well-kept office buildings and palaces and museums dominate the city. Nobody but the rulers know what goes on inside, but it is there that the 220 million Russians are governed and the satellites and provinces that add up to six or seven hundred million more.

On a bright blue day, but sharply cold, we visited the Kremlin, with a guide and the several woman guides who had taken us around the city and Lennim, the pleasant, keen young man who had been with us constantly from our arrival.

He made a point of telling us that the restoration of the churches and cathedrals and the icons had been done by the Communists. The restoration of the icons—paintings of sacred persons, rather than statues—was an artistic triumph, because in some cases there had been 3 or 4 paintings superimposed. X-rays were used to discover how many layers there were, and in some cases they had exposed only a portion of each to show how many there were.

In the Annunciation Cathedral, floored with jasper, which was the chapel of Ivan I, grandfather of Ivan the Terrible, there were exquisite frescoes, one arched doorway of carved stone fine as lace, with the background of the raised carving painted blue. The icons and other objects go back to the 12th century. We saw the Archangel Cathedral, begun in the 16th century, where all the czars and princes are buried, up to Peter the Great, who is buried in Leningrad. There is the great belfry of enormous bells—and outside it the biggest bell ever cast, silver and copper, cast for Michael, the first Romanoff. And the biggest cannon ever cast—three balls piled in front, each weighing 2 tons; gun weighs 40 tons. Never fired—nor the bell ever rung.

In Assumption Cathedral, the oldest, all czars were crowned. Patriarchs were elected there, and buried there in tents of fine metal grill work. There is the throne of Ivan the Terrible. These buildings are warm and comfortable; not for the people, but for the paintings which must have right temperature and moisture content.

There is the great palace of the Tsars which is now used for meetings of the Presidium, the supreme government body; for congresses of the Communist Party; for the New Year children's parties, for all official occasions.

We saw the museum, the churches and the bell-towers—but we never saw the inside of any office building, nor did we come near the buildings where modern official work is carried on. We could take pictures of the Kremlin churches and museums, even inside some of them—but never did we come near anything that was not ancient. Our tour was strictly managed.

The museum, which was founded in 1720, is really excellent in arrangement and scope. The exhibit of ivory and gold and jeweled thrones is extensive and extremely valuable. There were glass cases of dresses, the silver wedding and coronation gowns of Catherine the Great. There were dresses of Elizabeth, daughter of Peter the Great, who left 15,000 dresses.

There were exhibits of armors and armor; of horses with jeweled harness, even gold horseshoes. Exhibits of the presents from foreign ambassadors to the Tsars and Tsarinas. There was the exhibit of crowns—including many old ones with fur around the bottom where they touched the head. There was the exhibit of carriages—sometimes several hundred horses were hitched to a royal carriage. There were gold carriages, carriages with cupids painted on the sides, gift of the French, heated by coal braziers, lined with satin.

The value of the jewels in this place must be colossal. There was one cape with 120,000 pearls. A church robe with two emeralds big as walnuts, weighing 100 carats each—so many that one stopped appreciating them. There were household utensils of all sorts, drinking cups, jeweled, round on the bottom, so you had to empty it, you could not set it down. Clocks, big and little, one decorated with eagles which dropped pearls every 3 seconds into mouths of hungry eaglets in the nest below. (It was not working.)

We asked where were presents from American Ambassadors and the guide said they stopped making presents before we became a Nation. Everything about the Kremlin is in perfect condition—except where in process of reconstruction. Must cost immense amount of money. Planting is well-planned, cannon polished, buildings heated. Communists preserve the past as evidence of culture—no church is in use as such in the Kremlin enclosure. No one gets in without permit. The enclosure works under orders and the rulers are never seen except when they want to be.

Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill to authorize the President to control, regulate, and allocate the use and distribution of medicinal substances used for the prevention or treatment of disease, if the prevalence and seriousness of the disease creates an emergent national-health problem.

The President would be authorized to issue a proclamation setting forth such finding and declaring that it is necessary to exercise the powers that would be granted to him, to allocate such medicinal substances, and regulate the use and distribution thereof, to such extent as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the protection and preservation of the health of the American people. The President would also have authority to fix price ceilings on such substances.

The President would be able to delegate any power or authority granted to him, to the head of any department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government.

The President or the Congress would have the power to declare the emergency at an end.

Representative MULTER's bill contains a penalty provision. Anyone who willfully does any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, under any order or regulation issued by the President, or the head of the department or establishment to whom the power or authority is delegated by the President, would upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. Representative MULTER's bill provides that the act would be effective immediately.

Introduction of the bill was prompted by the current situation involving the use of Dr. Salk's serum for the prevention of infantile paralysis.

Newspaper accounts and editorials, as well as telecasts and broadcasts by persons familiar with the matter, clearly demonstrate the need for the bill. It is not intended as a reflection on the medical profession or upon any health department.

In every walk of life there are persons, who will do what is required of them only under compulsion of law. It is because of those few and in order to guarantee equal and fair distribution to those who should be taken care of first that this legislation is required.

I hope the House Banking and Currency Committee will conduct hearings on this bill in the very near future and present it to the House for consideration.

The March of Bigotry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, Mr. Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, has written a series of six articles entitled "Hate, Inc." The articles deal with the march of bigotry in the United States, and are appearing daily in the Washington Daily News. The first article appeared yesterday.

Concerning them, there appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Daily News an editorial entitled "Hating for Pay." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 2, 1955]

HATING FOR PAY

One of the most diligent reporters we know is our Jack Steele.

For more than 2 months, Mr. Steele searched official records, hunted down elusive facts, interviewed people and dug up background for a report on the professional peddlers of prejudice.

One of the least reported stories in the country today is the story of organized bigotry.

The results, carefully set down and documented, are reported in a distinctive series of articles titled, "Hate, Inc.," which begins today.

It is solid reading for all Americans. To many of our readers, we suspect, Mr. Steele's articles will come as a shock. In recent years, hatemongers have not been as noisy as they were. But there's a revival on.

To all readers we commend Mr. Steele's series. The articles will describe those who seek to foster hate, usually in the name of the finer citizen attributes—religious belief or patriotism.

Arrayed against these salesmen of bigotry are hundreds of church, civic, fraternal and

veterans' organizations, who make it their business to promote better understanding among all groups, and who quietly and persistently combat the insidious operations of these enemies of tolerance, reason and decency.

Yet the bigots rave on, preying on the gullible and the biased, exalting themselves, sometimes with considerable guilt—many of them for pay.

It is not a pretty report Mr. Steele has to make, but it is one we all ought to know about.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the articles are most interesting and illuminating, and deserve the consideration of every thoughtful American. In the course of their publication, I shall request that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. At this time, I ask unanimous consent that the first two of the articles be printed.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 2, 1955]

HATE, INC.—BIGOTS ARE ON THE MARCH AGAIN IN UNITED STATES

(By Jack Steele)

Organized bigotry is on the upswing in the United States.

Professional hatemongers, ranging from cynical racketeers to hysterical zealots, again are doing a thriving business.

Scurrilous venom sheets and pamphlets are flooding the mails and turning up, often unsolicited, on breakfast tables and businessmen's desks throughout the country.

Hawkers of hate are capitalizing on cold-war tensions between communism and western democracy, just as their predecessors did on depression-born frustrations and war fears during the 1930's.

Bigotry had its heyday in the late thirties. It went into eclipse in the brief era of peace, prosperity, and good will following World War II. Some of its peddlers, on their uppers then, even had to hunt for jobs.

But now a revival is on. It's been coming up over the past year or two.

The House Un-American Activities Committee recently reported a resurgence of neo-Fascist and hate activities.

The Post Office Department has noted an increase in complaints about hate literature, some of them resulting from the discovery by bigots that they could use the now abandoned junk-mail service.

VITRIOL

A 2-month study of current vitriol sheets and their sponsors by this reporter has produced these major conclusions:

Hatemongering today is not as obvious or dangerous a menace as it was in the late thirties, when it fed on deep economic unrest and was supported by Nazi and Fascist funds. There are perhaps 100 groups active in the country today, compared to 400 to 500 then. None has an organized membership such as those of the defunct Christian Front or German-American Bund.

But today's bigots are growing bolder and are reaching an ever-expanding audience. Unless checked by exposure and education, they again may grow strong enough to subject the Nation to a bath of hate.

New leaders—armed with new techniques and gimmicks to trap the unwary—have emerged from the underground era.

Copying the fifth-column tactics of the Communists, hate specialists have had some success in infiltrating legitimate rightwing and anti-Communist groups.

The resurgence of venom spreading is largely an unwelcome dividend of the Nation's awakening to the greater menace of the Communist conspiracy.

Many of its current hucksters use anti-communism as the cloak for their bigotry. They have learned that anticommunism is an effective sugar coating to make the bitter pill of hate palatable to some Americans.

HATE FACTORY

Thus Conde McGinley's semimonthly Common Sense—denounced by the Un-American Activities Committee as a hate factory—masquerades under the title of "The Nation's Anti-Communist Newspaper."

It was in warning against such covers for bigotry that the committee said last year in its annual report: It is not sufficient to be simply anti-Communist if one is anti-American at the same time.

Haters also use anticommunism to screen themselves from attacks. Anyone who turns the spotlight on their practices can expect to be branded by them as a Red.

Hate sheets from coast to coast let loose furious tirades at the Un-American Activities Committee after its brief report on hate groups was issued in December.

A California zealot wrote that the committee had been infiltrated by Communists and become a tool of subversion.

A Vermont hate sheet called The Green Mountain Rifleman had this heading: VELDE Plays Swan Song on a Jew's Harp. Representative HAROLD VELDE, Republican, of Illinois, was committee chairman when the report was issued.

Chicago's Elizabeth Dilling called the report a plot to silence all honest Christian patriots.

Today's hate brochures have many targets—chiefly Negroes, Catholics, Jews, and members of other minority groups.

Some of their most vicious barbs are aimed at President Eisenhower to whom the more blatent sometimes refer at "Iky" or "Ike the Kike."

The ever-recurring theme in these attacks is that the President is a front for Bernard Baruch and that his administration is the captive of a Jewish invisible government.

Incredible as such attacks seem to most Americans, some hate crusades are even more fantastically ludicrous.

Some recently have exposed fluoridation of drinking water—to retard tooth decay—as a Red-inspired plot to poison all true patriots. And others see equally sinister motives in the labeling of kosher foods.

COURT CALLED SUBVERSIVE

The United Nations is depicted as the instrument of a "Jew-Communist" plot to rule the world. The Supreme Court is called subversive because of its antisegregation decision.

Most fanatic groups hitched free rides last year on Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY's bandwagon, all without any apparent encouragement, or discouragement, from him.

But some embraced McCarthyism warily. They could not reconcile his Catholicism and his use of Jewish investigator Roy Cohn with their own bigotry.

NEW TACTICS

Rabble rousers have adopted some new tactics since the late thirties.

Then they blared out their admiration of Hitler and their hatred of minorities on street corners and in hired halls.

Then synthetic storm troopers patrolled bund meetings and native bigots tried to organize semimilitary forces such as the Silver Shirt Legion and the Knights of the White Camellia.

Today few of them try to stage public rallies in competition with TV. Vanished, too, are elite-guard forces copied after those of Hitler and Mussolini.

Largely ignored by the press and radio, many have turned to pamphleteering, copying the style of slick magazines and advertising brochures.

Some use newsletters and intelligence services to give their bigotry added appeal and an air of authenticity.

DIRECT MAIL

These haters have discovered the value of direct mailing lists to get their "literature" into the hands of people who would never subscribe to or pay for it. Funds are solicited from wealthy "angels" to pay for the mailings.

It is impossible to tell how much money some hatemongers are now raking in or how many people they reach with their messages of discord.

Gerald L. K. Smith is one of the few who makes a public financial report. Since his Christian Nationalist Crusade operates as a political party, he has to report to Congress on its finances.

His reported receipts for the last 3 years averaged over $185,000 a year. This compares with the $113,000 he reported in 1950.

Common Sense claims to have distributed nearly 500,000 copies of The Coming Red Dictatorship—an anti-Semitic broadside.

A west coast purveyor claims to have put out more than 2 million pieces of his "literature."

HOPE

Despite all this fanaticism, there are some hopeful signs:

The hatemongers—unlike the Communists—lack central direction and organization. They copy each other's ideas, plug and sell each other's publications, and sometimes even trade mailing lists. But whenever they try to get together they end up fighting like alley cats.

Outside of the Deep South, hate appears to be waning as a political force. Elsewhere, no politician dares openly to embrace bigotry today. And most recent excursions into politics by hatemongers themselves have been dismal flops.

Some disavow their bigotry. They issue vigorous denials of anti-Semitism, for instance, even though their publications openly attack Jews. Others resort to euphemisms (like Zionist for Jew) in hope of escaping the stigma most Americans place upon prejudice peddlers.

Some have even gone far afield for interest catchers to help sell their hate sheets. Their gimmicks include spiritualism, quack cures, and recently even flying saucers.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1955]

HATE, INC.—A GALLERY OF PROS IN THE HATE RACKET

(By Jack Steele)

Early in World War II the Federal Government indicted 29 assorted bigots and Bundists for conspiracy to commit sedition.

Their mass trial in Washington was an 8-months farce. The defendants used disruptive tactics which were copied by the Communists a decade later in the first Smith Act trial before Judge Harold Medina.

In the sedition case, the presiding judge died, a mistrial was declared and the indictments were eventually dismissed.

The trial demonstrated the difficulty of prosecuting hatemongers.

But it did turn the spotlight on the pre-war hate ring. It hampered—temporarily—the operations of its leaders, including some who were not named in the indictments.

Today, a surprising number—older, seedier but unreformed—are back spreading hate. Others have faded into oblivion.

Here is what has happened to some of the old-timers who were not indicted in the sedition mistrial:

GERALD L. K. SMITH

He's the No. 1 "Old Pro" of the haters. He has poked a finger into many efforts to stir up prejudice and disunity in the last 20 years. Some of his one-time lieutenants

run little hate shops of their own. He taught them not only how to hate, but how to make hate pay.

Although he was not indicted in the sedition case, Mr. Smith rushed to Washington to raise a "$1 million defense fund" for the trial.

He started out as a preacher. William Dudley Pelley claims to have initiated him into the bigotry business. A hot-shot rabble rouser, Mr. Smith's raucous voice graced many prewar rallies.

He helped push Huey Long's share-the-wealth plan. After Long's assassination, he preached the funeral oration. Later he moved to Detroit, where Father Coughlin's social-justice program was in full swing.

In 1947 Mr. Smith shifted again to St. Louis where he founded the Christian Nationalist Crusade as a vehicle for his own political ambitions. That, too, failed to catch on.

Now he operates from Los Angeles. He recently reported that 45 of 104 contributions of over $100 he received came from California.

Mr. Smith currently confines most of his rabble rousing to the west coast. But he also roams the country as a self-anointed go-between of the hate fraternity—living in the best hotels and sometimes traveling incognito.

Here are a few of his recent ventures:

He helped engineer the abortive plot to block confirmation of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg as Assistant Defense Secretary in 1950.

He led the hate attack on President Eisenhower in 1952 and, at the GOP convention, tried to stage a stampede for Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He ran General MacArthur as the Christian Nationalist candidate for President—without the general's permission—but got only about 15,000 votes for him.

In 1953 he organized a new San Francisco conference to abolish the United Nations. Last year he tried to muscle in on the McCarthy movement.

Smith tries to make his monthly magazine, The Cross and the Flag, a sort of bible of bigotry, doling out praise and criticism of his colleagues. But some refuse to accept him as the arbiter of the hate brigade.

FATHER CHARLES E. COUGHLIN

The so-called radio priest also was not a defendant in the sedition trial. He was silenced on political issues by the Catholic Church in 1939.

Since then, Father Coughlin has stuck to running the spiritual affairs of the Shrine of the Little Flower near Detroit. His magazine, Social Justice, is defunt. The Christian Front, which he inspired, is inactive.

He emerged briefly 2 years ago to make a public speech endorsing the guaranteed annual wage.

GEORGE VAN HORN MOSELEY

General Moseley, onetime Army Deputy Chief of Staff, likewise was not indicted in the sedition case, but he was a hero to many of the defendants.

Now living in semiretirement in Atlanta, Moseley was until recently chief adviser to Judge George W. Armstrong, oil millionaire of Fort Worth and Natchez, Miss., who devoted his wealth and declining years to fomenting anti-Semitism and white supremacy.

Judge Armstrong in 1950 offered oil lands worth $50 million to Jefferson Military College if it would teach white, Aryan supremacy. The little Mississippi college turned down the offer.

He died last fall, but willed the bulk of his estate to two fronts for his bigotry. They may continue to put out his scurrilous pamphlets, including one devoted to the Korean war entitled, "Third Zionist War."

LYEL VAN HYNING

Unlike her frequent collaborator, Elizabeth Dilling, Mrs. Van Hyning was not indicted in the sedition case. But these Chicago sirens of hate are equally strident.

Mrs. Van Hyning founded "We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America" and still issues her hate-sheet, "Women's Voice."

A recent issue carried an article headlined "Impeach Eisenhower." It attacked the President as the tool of Communists and Jews.

In a signed editorial in response to the Un-American Activities Committee's report on hate groups, she wrote: "I welcome any investigation which will expose the real enemies of my country, the Jews."

Viereck was a prewar paid Germany propagandist. Although not a sedition trial defendant, he served a jail term for violating the foreign agents' registration act.

He is now living quietly in a New York hotel and claims to have gone back to his first love—writing poetry.

Among his friends, however, are some of the ringleaders in the National Renaissance Party, branded as "neo-Fascist" by the Un-American Activities Committee.

Viereck celebrated his 70th birthday recently at a cocktail party arranged by H. Keith Thompson, a former registered agent for the neo-Nazi Socialist Reich Party. He was given a bound volume of "tributes" from such persons as Hjalmar Schacht, Franz Von Papen and the Rev. Gerald B. Winrod.

Here is what has happened to some of the sedition mistrial defendants:

WILLIAM DUDLEY PELLEY

Pelley has managed to blend hate and mysticism. An aristocratic mien and trim goatee have been his trademarks. In the 1920's he promoted California real estate and a book purporting to describe his personal voyage to heaven. It was a round trip.

An early admirer of Hitler, he organized the Silver Shirt Legion the day after the Fuehrer came to power. For years he flooded the mails with such anti-Jewish, anti-Negro hate sheets as Roll Call, Liberation, and The Galilean.

Pelley drew a 15-year jail sentence after a separate trial for sedition in 1942. He was paroled in 1950, but the Supreme Court recently refused to restore his civil rights.

Now he lives in California, but issues a curious publication called Valor from his old headquarters at Noblesville, Ind. Its subtitles are The Golden Times Weekly and A Journal of Applied Spirituality.

His big pitches are spiritualism and flying saucers. He has fathered a cult he calls Soulcraft—a name worthy of the advertising agencies where he might have flourished but for his obsession with bigotry.

Pelley has another new gimmick. Hour-long recordings of his mystical preachings and fund appeals are played at meetings of his followers.

GEORGE DEATHERAGE

Another dean of the venom dispensers, Mr. Deatherage is remembered for his Knights of the White Camelia. The Un-American Activities Committee accused him in a 1940 report of trying to create a united Fascist movement with his American Nationalist Confederation. Its emblem was a swastika.

After the sedition mistrial, Deatherage ran a contracting business in Baltimore. Last year he turned up in Florida as a research specialist for Upton Close and Don Bell, two former radio commentators who now put out nationalist newsletters.

ELIZABETH DILLING

She plunged into bigotry in the 1930's with a book entitled "The Red Network" and an organization she called the Patriotic Research Bureau. She was one of the noisiest of the sedition trial defendants.

Hysterically anti-Semitic, Mrs. Dilling still puts out irregular bulletins and writes for Common Sense and other tip sheets of prejudice. She recently sent a diatribe to the Un-American Activities Committee demanding that she be heard or indicted.

EDWARD JAMES SMYTHE

His chief claim to fame was an abortive attempt to unite the Ku Klux Klan and the German-American Bund. He also organized dozens of Protestant front groups as fund raising ventures.

Smythe still sends out hate literature from Washington under the imprint of his latest front—the Protestant Press Association. He recently moved out of an office here and claims he was dispossessed by Jews.

He pleaded no defense to a mail fraud indictment in Newark, N. J., in 1950 and was given a 3-year suspended sentence.

Smythe has been violently anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic. He wrote several years ago that, if forced to choose between catholicism and communism, "we would gladly accept communism as the lesser of two evils." He recently told this reporter: "We're not Fascists or Nazis, but we are anti-Jewish."

JOE M'WILLIAMS

In the late thirties he incited street-corner crowds in New York's Yorkville section with pro-Hitler, anti-Semitic tirades. After the sedition mistrial, he moved to Chicago and then to the Northwest. He has not been heard from for several years.

LAWRENCE DENNIS

Once called the brains of American fascism, he now puts out a newsletter entitled "Appeal to Reason" from Becket, Mass. A recent issue referred to World War II as the war against anti-Semitism.

OTHERS

Another aging sedition case defendant, Col. Eugene N. Sanctuary, still finds an outlet for his hate in the pages of Common Sense. Robert E. Edmondson in 1953 Published a book, I Testify, which was advertised as American invisible Government unmasked. James B. True, who once patented a club he called a "Kike Killer," died soon after the mistrial.

Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement which I had the privilege of making before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 4560 and related bills to amend the Natural Gas Act which would remove Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over independent producers and gatherers of natural gas, as follows:

My name is BRUCE ALGER. I represent the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, Dallas County. I was elected last year, running on a platform advocating free competition in the marketplace and less Federal control of our economy—a platform quite similar to that of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This action of the electorate made me the first Republican elected to Congress from Texas in a regular election in many years. It also indicated to me that the people of my district likewise realize the vital importance of a return to the free-enterprise principles that made our country great.

My interest in the legislative efforts to correct the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case is more than a desire to correct an injustice to one of the large industries of my State. It is a determination to overcome a new and dangerous philosophy announced in the Supreme Court's decision.

Why should natural gas, the product of an intensely competitive and high-risk industry, be singled out as the only commodity so produced to be brought under Federal price-fixing while in the hands of the producer?

If a bureau in Washington can fix the price of gas, can it not just as easily fix the price of other products?

If natural gas is singled out for Federal price-fixing today, might it not be oil or cattle or cotton or dairy products—or all of them—tomorrow?

If there is any doubt that natural gas is a commodity produced by a highly competitive industry—far removed from the utility status—let us take a look at some of the facts about the demand-supply-price picture. They will show not only that the industry is competitive, but also that the consumer of natural gas inevitably receives his greatest protection from competitive activity.

First, there is a great and growing demand. Natural-gas customers have tripled and natural gas delivered to residential consumers has quadrupled since 1938. Consumption of natural gas has just about tripled since World War II. Today almost 25 million gas customers are residential users. The American Gas Association estimates that an additional 1.2 million users will be added each year in 1955 and 1956 if supplies are available. Countless other potential customers are anxious to see their communities served by natural gas.

Obviously, the efficiency and cleanliness of this fuel contributed to its popularity. Obviously, also, its reasonable prices have been considered among its advantages to the constantly growing gas consuming public.

Competition between producers of gas—as well as between them and other fuels—has been evidenced by the refusal of prices of natural gas to react to inflationary conditions as sharply as have the prices of other fuels. Natural gas is one of the few items in the family budget for which price has remained comparatively stable.

Based on 1935–39 averages for 50 representative cities compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, natural gas in 1953 had an index of 99.6, or just under average prices for the 1935–39 period. Contrast this with 233.4 for anthracite coal, 212.9 for bituminous coal, and 205.5 for No. 2 fuel oil. Contrast this also with the 191.3 overall cost-of-living index for 1953.

If the tremendous demand is not matched by a similar rise in supply, the price of natural gas naturally will tend to rise. But this increase will be even larger if the producers' prices are regulated. Supply is the great consideration, and price-fixing regulations will have a tendency to reduce, rather than increase, the search for new supplies. They also will tend to divert more of the supply from the interstate market into the intrastate, which even now represents half of the total marketed production. Intrastate sales were not made subject to Federal control by the Phillips decision.

With the tremendous expansion of the market made possible by the many large interstate lines built since World War II, the ratio of new supply to net production has diminished rapidly. In the first 5 years after the war new gas supply was proved up at an average of almost 3 trillion cubic feet for each trillion produced. Then the ratio dropped to 2 million for each trillion produced. During the past year, new supply barely exceeded actual production.

Which represents the greater need—to fix prices with a hope of keeping costs to consumers down, as long as the present supply lasts; or to rely on time-tested free competition to encourage wider search for greater reserves to supply the present consuming public and the millions who hope to join today's fortunate consumers?

Developments of recent years clearly show that all reserves possible are essential to meet future needs. Roughly speaking, we have 21 years of supply at the current rate of withdrawal, but that rate of withdrawal may continue to grow.

Certainly an adequate price is essential to prevent waste of casinghead gas, which is produced with oil. Prices for natural gas must be at least enough to pay for the expense of conservation measures. Adequate price also is essential to promote production from wells whose primary product is gas. Leading geologists are convinced that we have not reached the limit in our discoveries of oil and gas. However, the incentive provided will determine to what extent we are able to make additional discoveries.

Because of joint costs and the infinite number of variables, it is impossible to determine a regulated price based on a cost formula, such as would be necessary if gas producing is considered a utility. Gas must be allowed to seek its true price level through free competition with competitive fuels, or it will be found necessary to regulate the prices of these fuels, also, and thus establish a Federal bureau control over all of our energy resources.

If reserves are to keep pace with demand, every producer—not just a few big companies—must have price incentive to search for and produce more gas. The minor or independent producer is the typical wildcatter. He finds the big majority of new fields, and we cannot meet our needs without him. He needs incentive.

There are thousands of these independents in action today. All told, about 8,100 producers of natural gas operate in the country, counting only those who report to the various State agencies. The picture some would paint of a monopoly industry controlled by a few large companies is far from true. Of all the extractive industries, bituminous coal is the only one in which leading companies produce as small a portion of the total as in the natural gas industry. Compared with manufacturers of all kinds, natural gas is less concentrated in the hands of a few companies than 382 out of the total of 452 studied.

The picture of gas production is: First 4 companies, 17 percent; first 8, 28; first 20, 46; first 50, 66; and first 100, 78. There also is a gradual gradation from one size to the next in order, a condition ideal for competitive behavior. Seekers of monopoly can look elsewhere.

The ease of entry into production of natural gas is a sure sign of the absence of monopoly. Natural gas companies even seek additional competitors, frequently looking for partners because of limitation of funds when they spend so much on exploration, title clearance, and leasing.

Competition definitely is present when the producer or gatherer meets the interstate pipeline or transmission company at the bargaining table. The pipeline companies are not so numerous as the producers, but between them they have an interconnecting network of lines covering the large producing areas of the Southwest. With one exception, the various large lines all are connected either directly or indirectly with most of the producing areas of the Southwest. Thus they have widely scattered supply sources to which they can turn if one source prices itself out of the market. Neither the seller nor the buyer has the other "over the barrel."

These active competitive conditions which prevail are pointed up by the price behavior of natural gas. Prices have shown great flexibility and continually have lagged behind the rising cost of living.

Indicating their responsiveness to competitive conditions, prices paid under contracts executed in 1952–53 ranged from 21 to 29 cents per thousand cubic feet in the Appalachian region; from 7 to 18 cents in Panhandle-Hugoton; from 4 to 13 cents in East Texas-North Louisiana; and from 3 to 16 cents in Louisiana-Texas Gulf Coast.

The increased rates paid by consumers today are not due primarily to higher field prices, but to generally higher prices of everything that enters into the distribution, transmission, and production of gas. These include sharp rises in the cost of steel, labor, taxes and many other expenses. Only about a tenth of the total cost to the residential consumer is represented by the price received by the producer for natural gas at the wellhead.

Under free competition, the natural gas producing industry has met every test of service to the consumer. What sound reason is there for fixing the wellhead price that a producer may get for his gas?

Regulating only the "larger producers" is no answer to the problem. Who is the "larger producer"? What if royalty owners, owners of divided interests, small producers feeding into a single gatherer or natural gasoline plant, and others demand payment in kind and insist on separate sales?

Price-fixing is not in the long range interest of the consumer. Putting gas production on a utility status would bring staggering problems and costs, with no benefits and very probably some definite losses.

Consider the staff necessary and the expenses involved if the Federal Power Commision must review 30,000 separate sales transactions, with thousands more each year. Consider the insurmountable difficulties in trying to determine prices on a cost basis. What about loss of incentive to producers? Futility compounded.

No five men can solve all of the problems that have been solved by millions of individual decisions from day to day. The vast machinery for regulating prices would be only one of many costs, both tangible and intangible. The consumer will pay the price, both in taxes and in increased charges for the gas itself.

Regulation in the form of price-fixing is not the answer. The consumer's greatest protection is competitive activity. His true interest lies with a continuing supply. He deserves the benefits of competition.

The Natural-Gas Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to present for the attention of the Members an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Journal, of Shreveport, La., on April 27, 1955, entitled "How To Undermine an Industry." I feel this editorial deserves careful reading:

HOW TO UNDERMINE AN INDUSTRY

Concerning Federal regulation of prices of natural gas at the wellhead, against which we have editorialized on several occasions, the Industrial News Review has come to our aid with the following well-documented argument:

"As a result of a Supreme Court decision, the Federal Power Commission now regulates the field prices of natural gas at the wellhead. And authority after authority, both within and without the natural-gas and oil industries, has urged in the strongest terms that Congress act to free producers from this control.

"Lieutenant General Thompson, of the Railroad Commission of Texas, one of the country's foremost conservation authorities, said that Federal control 'will shrink the actual and potential supply' of this vitally needed fuel by inhibiting future exploration and discovery, and will result in higher prices for consumers.

"An official of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana told a North Dakota audience that the State's oil progress depends largely on whether Congress will free natural-gas producers from Federal regulation. He said: 'How can you regulate the gas without regulating oil that comes out of the same hole? If you can justify the regulation of one commodity that goes into interstate comerce, you can justify the regulation of all of them. You can control coal—and you can control wheat and corn and cattle and every other commodity.' He pointed out that the Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, realizing this, have passed resolutions asking for an end to Federal controls over independent gas producers.

"Chairman Kuykendall, of the Federal Power Commission, appeared before a House committee and urged that the controls be abolished. A majority of the Commission agreed.

"No one is trying to end State regulation of sales of natural gas to the consumer by utility companies, or Federal regulation of the interstate pipelines. The sole purpose is to free the producers from controls in the interest of the industry's progress and very existence. These producers are independent businessmen, and theirs is a highly competitive and risky enterprise. Most holes turn out dry and worthless. And when gas is found, it must be marketed in competition with all the other producers in the area.

"Most authorities also feel that it was never the intention of Congress to authorize regulation of gas at the wellhead. A number of leading Senators and Representatives have said as much. The solution is passage of a bill making Congress' position clear and final."

Union Shop Is as American as Apple Pie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article from the May 1955 issue of the American Federationist, by Kenneth J. Kelley, secretary-treasurer and legislative agent, Massachusetts Federation of Labor. Mr. Kelley has established an enviable record in the field of labor legislation, and due to his exceptional experience in this subject matter, he has become one of the outstanding leaders and advisers.

The article follows:

VICTORY IN MASSACHUSETTS

(By Kenneth J. Kelley, secretary-treasurer and legislative agent, Massachusetts Federation of Labor)

The labor movement of the old Bay State has had many distinctions. Its most recent claim to fame is the defeat in a most decisive manner of a so-called "right to work" bill at the 1955 session of the legislature.

House bill 860 was introduced by Representative Charles S. Marston III, Republican, a nonunion shoe manufacturer from Haverhill. The measure was loaded with legal doubletalk. Its purpose was to outlaw all forms of union security.

The legislature convened on January 5. Shortly thereafter it was discovered that House bill 860 had been filed without any fanfare. Immediately the officers of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor went into action. At the helm was the president of the federation, Henry J. Brides, a seasoned and respected leader.

Letters were dispatched to all 750 affiliates of the State Federation of Labor. The evils of the proposed legislation were set forth. It was pointed out that the bill, if enacted, would give the scab and the free rider legal sanction and protection. We also called attention to the fact that some business interests in Massachusetts were secretly backing the "right to wreck" movement. These employers, we pointed out, hope to be able to slash wages and thereby meet cutthroat competition "by dragging our workers down to the level of certain backward States."

Subsequently the officers and members of all local unions in the State were kept informed by legislative bulletins from the State Federation of Labor. The demand for printed copies of the bill at the document room of the statehouse was enormous. The supply was exhausted in a short time. The State Federation of Labor had 10,000 reprints made of the bill. These were distributed, together with an exposé of the bill, to all local unions, unaffiliated as well as affiliated, to business and civic leaders, to daily and weekly newspapers, and to the general public.

A. F. of L. President George Meany was promptly advised of the introduction of the bill and received periodic reports of the developments in the campaign. In addition to rendering every assistance to the officers of the State Federation of Labor, President Meany made available 5,000 copies of the valuable Right to Wreck pamphlet as soon as it was printed. These were sent to members of the legislature, the press, local unions, and other organizations. Subsequently, copies of the International Association of Machinists' pamphlet about the moral aspects of "right to work" laws were sent to the members of the legislature. Two of the three authors of the machinists' articles happen to be from Massachusetts. The Reverend William J. Kelley, O. M. I., is a Bostonian by birth and a frequent visitor to Quincy. The Reverend Dr. Walter G. Muelder is dean and professor of social ethics at Boston University's School of Theology.

The present writer, as secretary and legislative agent of the Massachusetts Federation of Labor, communicated with every international union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The internationals were told about house bill 860. They were asked to write their local unions in Massachusetts.

About 200 locals are not affiliated with the State Federation of Labor. That was one of our reasons for approaching the international unions. Our second reason was that locals sometimes respond more readily to a request from their international than to similar requests from other organizations. About half of the international unions replied and signified their intention of urging their locals in Massachusetts to assist the State Federation of Labor in defeating the "wreck" bill.

Once the hearing date was set, a new slogan appeared on all correspondence sent out from the federation's office. The slogan was: "Labor has a date—February 28." For weeks there were feverish preparations for D-day. From Cape Cod to the Berkshires locals were arranging to charter buses to transport their representatives to Boston, the State capital. The crowd that actually showed up at the State House on February 28 exceeded our fondest expectations. An hour before the hearing opened every one of the 1,200 seats in Gardner Auditorium was filled. By the time the 15 members of the joint committee on labor and industries arrived, the aisles, the stairways, and the corridors were jammed with an additional 1,000 trade unionists, including many women. Hundreds of others, unable to get into the building, clustered around the windows outside where they were able to see the proceedings, although unable to hear what was being said. Some longshoremen declared a holiday and showed up in their working clothes to give color to the demonstration. Attachés who have been observing legislative hearings for many years said it was the largest crowd that had ever attended any hearing at the State House.

Presiding over the hearing were the cochairmen, Senator C. Henry Glovsky and Representative Michael J. Carroll. They managed to keep things orderly and pretty well under control during the day-long hearing that lasted until 6 p. m.

As the sponsor of House bill No. 860, Representative Charles S. Marston III read a prepared statement in which he attempted to justify the legislation with specious arguments about "compulsory unionism," interspersed with frequent patriotic references to "individual freedom" and the "inalienable right to work of all Americans." Representative Marston had some difficulty in putting his points across in a hall bursting with grimly determined union members. Significantly, no other person appeared to support Marston's bill until some 5 hours later, when Joseph Lee, a member of the Boston school committee, spoke in favor of the bill, delivering a speech that was a masterpiece of tortured reasoning.

Opposition to the bill was overwhelming as well as bipartisan. Gov. Christian A. Herter, a Republican, in a strongly worded statement delivered by Commissioner of Labor and Industries Ernest A. Johnson, opposed the bill, calling it ill-advised and warning that it "would create industrial strife and jeopardize relations between employer and employe organizations." Following this, 138 members of the legislature—Republicans and Democrats—publicly recorded themselves as opposed. Both parties recognized the political implications of the bill and the impact that its introduction had upon union members throughout the State.

After the views of Governor Herter and the legislators had been recorded, the first labor spokesman recognized was the present writer. I introduced the Reverend Francis J. McDonnell, chaplain of the Catholic Labor Guild of Boston. Father McDonnell presented the Catholic social teachings and principles on "right to work" laws in a dispassionate and yet persuasive manner.

The trade union opposition to the bill was then presented by this writer. "Right to work" was described as what is really is—"a cleverly designed huckster's slogan that attempts to hide the real intent of this vicious legislation which is to reduce unions to mere social organizations and thereby break down wages and working conditions they have established." In defense of union security I said:

"The union shop is as American as apple pie. It is predicated upon the democratic principle of majority rule. Those participating in the fruits of industrial government share in the costs of maintaining the union responsible for them. This vicious bill would glorify the free rider, the industrial tax dodger who refuses to accept or discharge his social responsibilities."

Urging the legislature to defeat House bill 860, I said:

"It is union-busting legislation that is bad for business. It would breed bitterness and industrial strife and adversely affect the economy of Massachusetts."

Albert G. Clifton, legislative agent for the State CIO, summarized that organization's opposition and introduced J. William Belanger, president of the Massachusetts State Industrial Council, CIO. Then President Brides, of the State Federation of Labor, spoke. He described the Marston bill as "a fraudulent hoax upon the public and the jobless workers of the Sate and Nation." He urged the legislature to defeat it speedily.

Five A. F. of L. leaders expressed the opposition of their particular trade groups. For the building trades the speaker was Samuel Donnelly, president of the Worcester Building Trades Council; for the printing trades, Anthony J. DeAndrade, international vice-president of the Printing Pressmen's Union; for the transportation unions, Nicholas P. Morrissey, New England organizer of the Teamsters' Union. Mr. Morrissey introduced Francis J. Thompson, general counsel of an employers' group of motor freight carriers, who delivered a strong condemnation of the bill fom management's viewpoint.

Spokesmen for many other unions expressed strong opposition. John J. Kearney, executive secretary of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders, Local 34, emphasized that not a single worker or employer had appeared in support of House Bill 860. This demonstrated that there was no need for such legislation, he said. Using an enlarged map, Mr. Kearney showed the blackout of progress that has taken place in the States which have adopted "wreck" laws. Vice-President Philip Salem of the United Textile Workers attacked the bill. He said that the problem of North-South textile competition was not going to be solved by trying to get down to the economic level of "right to wreck" southern States.

As the afternoon progressed, officers and members of other unions vigorously condemned the bill. These speakers included Francis E. Lavigne, director of education for the Massachusetts A. F. of L.; James P. Meehan, secretary of the State Building Trades Council, and officials of the railroad brotherhoods. Civic and political leaders registered their opposition. More than 3,000 signature cards and signed petitions opposing the bill were submitted to the committee by the State Federation of Labor. Many of the signers remained in the auditorium throughout the long hearing in order to record their views publicly.

One of the highlights of labor's case against the bill was a satirical poem entitled "House Bill No. 860 (Opus III)" composed by Peter A. Reilly, poet laureate of the Massachusetts labor movement and secretary of the Carpenters' District Council of Boston.

Shortly after the impressive demonstration of labor's strength at the hearing the committee on labor and industries voted to reject house bill 860. The report rejecting the bill was then filed in the house of representatives. On March 7, a rollcall vote was taken on the question of rejecting the bill. By a lopsided vote of 190 to 2, the bill was killed for this year.

One of the two votes for the bill was cast by its author, Representative Marston. The other vote came from Representative Isaac A. Hodgen, a stationer from the farming community of Belchertown.

While the trade unionists of Massachusetts are pleased, we are not operating under any illusions that the size of the vote is an accurate barometer of labor's strength with the current legislature. A number of the representatives who voted against house bill 860 did so in order to acquire a "good" vote on the official labor record prepared every 2 years by the Massachusetts Federation of Labor.

Massachusetts labor is far from complacent about its impressive victory. Similar attempts to weaken unions have been seen before. In 1948 a "right to wreck" measure similar to house bill 860 appeared as referendum No. 5 on the State ballot. Also appearing were two other antilabor referenda, No. 6 and No. 7.

In 1948, we recognized the danger and we organized ourselves to overcome it. The 1948 version of "right to wreck" was defeated, 1,077,642 to 443,368.

Thus, twice within a decade the trade-union movement of Massachusetts has responded magnificently to attempts to shackle it, bearing out the adage that freedom must be a fresh conquest with each generation.

Birth of a Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks many of the Members have been privileged to see a color movie film setting forth in detail the contemplated improvements to be established on the Colorado River watershed by the upper Colorado River Basin project legislation now pending in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The film, titled "Birth of a Basin," is one of superior workmanship and outstanding photography made by a film in my district in Colorado. Forney Films, Inc., of Fort Collins, Col., is a local industry that enjoys the finest reputation in the field of photography and the film Birth of a Basin is an example of the excellent work turned out under difficult conditions by this fine organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article reprinted from the April issue of American Cinematographer written by C. M. Howe, president of Forney Films, in which he tells how his company made Birth of a Basin:

A PLEA TO CONGRESS VIA FILM

(By C. M. Howe, president, Forney Films, Inc.)

One of the more unique applications of motion pictures, perhaps, is the factual presentation before Congress of a vital project proposal up for its consideration. This was the purpose behind Birth of a Basin, which our company, Forney Films, produced for the Upper Colorado River Basin Commission. In addition to the showing in Washington, D. C., the film is scheduled to be screened throughout the Nation and is also to be televised.

The upper Colorado River Basin covers roughly 110,000 square miles and encompasses parts of the States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona. The proposed basin project includes plans for 6 major dams and involves 15 subsidiary or participating projects. It is a billion-and-a-half dollar undertaking that will make TVA and the Hoover and Bonneville Dams look small by comparison. The commission is composed of representatives from the upper Colorado River Basin States appointed by their respective State governors; they are devoted to the task of getting the project passed by the 84th session of Congress. At stake is the development of the West—rich in undeveloped resources, and badly in need of water and power.

When our company's representative brought us the production contract on November 1, 1954, the foregoing facts plus 20,000 pages of 6-point type consisting of the transcript of the House and Senate hearings of the 83d Congress were all we had to start with. When we asked about the date set for delivery of the finished film, our man said simply, "The 14th of January."

"1956?" our production man asked. When he was told "January 14, 1955," tops were blown all over the place and everybody went to man their stations. The 8-hour working day was discarded; wives of staff members were informed there would be a late Christmas, and away we went.

Six days and nights later a script was ready for presentation to the sponsoring commission. Meantime, our camera crews already were scouting location sites and shooting footage that could be used in the production. The author and sound man Jerry Tunnell set out in the company's Chevy station wagon with the following production equipment: a motor-driven Auricon 16-mm. sound camera; a Cine Special plus extra magazines; a Bolex H-16 for use in hard-to-get-at location sites; and a Magnafilm portable synchronous 16-mm. tape recorder plus necessary accessories.

Camera accessories included 1-, 2-, and 6-inch Wollensak lenses, a 1-inch and a wide-angle Ektar, and a Pan Cinor zoom lens; 3 tripods; a camera dolly; 1 reflector; and a Norwood and a GE exposure meter.

First day out, we photographed the Seedskadee Dam site, also core drilling operations, grazing sheep, and the land itself. We were shooting scenes for a picture of dams and water that existed only in the minds of a few men who were dedicated to the development of the West. We had as a guide only a brief outline of script that had not yet been approved. We were gathering footage for a film that didn't even have a tentative title.

Testimonials of native westerners could have a terrific impact in a picture of this kind, so using the sound camera and tape recorder, we secured lip-sync shots of farmers and men in western industry as they stated their views on the need for development of the basin project.

Leaving Wyoming, we moved into Utah. To understand some of the problems that were encountered, consider that the proposed dam sites in the basin project are all practically inaccessible at the present time except by boat. Steep canyon walls, rising in some places to 3,000 feet above the river, make it almost impossible to find a place where long stretches of the river can be viewed from above. This meant that shots of these sites had to be done by aerial photography.

Harold Doll took to the air in Forney Films' Beech "Bonanza" plane. Arriving at the location he shot the required footage from the air, using a Bell & Howell 16 mm. camera. Doll's aerial camera coverage included all the dams in the lower Colorado basin, from Hoover Dam on down to the Gulf of California. Included also was a pictorial record of the canal and aqueduct system which brings water to Los Angeles and San Diego, and a comprehensive pictorial account of the agricultural development that has resulted from utilization of Colorado River water in the lower basin area. In all, Cameraman Doll covered 27,000 miles by air, while we covered a mere 2,700 miles in our station wagon.

While Forney cameramen were at work in the field, another important phase of the production was receiving attention at our studio in Fort Collins. Here Production Manager Ed Hawkins was doing by animation process, what was impractical or impossible to do in conventional cinematography. Artists' conceptions of the various dams were

obtained from the regional Bureau of Reclamation in Salt Lake City. These were photographed on our title board with the Cine Special camera. Color slides which had been made of various areas in the basin were likewise reproduced on 16 mm. film in order to show the appearance of the areas in the summertime. This, briefly, is the story of the footage shot by Forney Films for the basin film.

In addition to our own material, we utilized films and stock shots obtained from a number of sources and integrated them with our footage in the editing of the picture. An almost unlimited source for such shots was Glenn Turner, a Utah ciné amateur of note—an amateur, incidentally, only because he likes to make movies for fun instead of money.

Meantime, tempus was fugiting, as the saying goes, and we had no sound track for the picture—usually an essential item when preparing a workprint. The answer? A blind sound track; we would then edit to the track.

Using seven different narrators, and intercutting the lip-sync tracks we had secured on location, a track was recorded and an optical made as a work track. This enabled our editors to get right to work in cutting the master print. In the meantime, background music and sound effects were recorded in sync with the voice track, and we had our sound track completed even before picture editing was finished.

Working far into the night, night after night, our editors put in 2 full 70-hour weeks on the production. A problem was keeping track of the borrowed footage, which had to be accounted for and returned to its owners upon completion of the editing phase of the production.

As editing progressed, the editors decided that superimposed overlays and underlays were needed in spots. So cameramen got into action promptly and filmed rushing water, and scenes of power installations, etc., for the purpose.

Finally animation and titles were shot. The opening title description called for a live action background of a world globe suspended in midair and rotating slowly, with title text superimposed on it. This was accomplished by suspending a 12-inch globe on a string and placing before it a panel of glass with the title text lettered upon it. Shooting through the glass, the text and globe were effectively photographed. An added feature was the effect of clouds drifting over the earth—obtained with the aid of dry-ice vapors.

In time the master was ready and the first answer print was delivered to us from the processing laboratory on the 14th day of January—right on deadline. But the story of this film production did not end here. The premier of the picture was scheduled to be held in Gallup, N. Mex., in conjunction with a tribal council meeting of the Navaho Indians and members of the upper Colorado River Commission. A feature of this meet was to be an enactment of the Navaho going on the warpath—the first time the colorful ritual had been performed in 100 years. Forney Films was called upon to record this event on both 16-millimeter and 35-millimeter film—the latter for the newsreels. On the site we had an Auricon-Pro, a Cine Special, two Bolex H-16's, and a 35-millimeter Eyemo.

An interesting fact about this production, incidentally, was revealed by our accounting department when it set about figuring the billing for pickup footage. Birth of a Basin is 972 feet in length. Of this, only 218 feet was pickup or purchased footage; the other 754 feet had been shot either by our location crews or on our sound stage in Fort Collins, Colo.

Oil for the Fires of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Reciprocal Trade bill which this House passed sometime ago, there was considerable debate on the subject of the limitation of oil imports and from time to time speeches have been made by my colleagues from the coal-mining districts in support of their position that oil imports should be limited. I have always opposed the limitation, and shall continue to do so in the future. Our New England industries have been hard hit from time to time by a variety of causes, the greatest of which is the pirating of our industry by southern States.

We, of Connecticut, contribute heavily to Federal taxation and thereby contribute to the continuation of particular projects of the South, mainly Tennessee Valley Authority. Consequently, we are paying for the support of these activities and at the same time are having our industries taken from us.

The statement which I herewith attach states quite clearly why New England objects to the limitation of importation, and I subscribe wholeheartedly to the claims made and the reasons for such action:

OIL FOR THE FIRES OF NEW ENGLAND

In the debate now under way on America's reciprocal trade policy, one of the questions at issue is the proposal made by a number of Senators to limit imports of Venezuelan oil into the United States.

Any such legislation would have direct economic effects upon New England and all other sections of the Nation.

It would affect New England consumers, who depend upon imported oil for a large share of their fuel supplies. It would affect New England businessmen, who sell an important volume of goods and services to Venezuela annually.

The largest producer of oil in Venezuela, the Creole Petroleum Corporation, believes that oil import quotas would be damaging to the security and prosperity of the United States. Adoption of such quotas would lead to repercussions throughout Latin America, and would jeopardize the employment of thousands of American workers engaged in producing goods sold in Latin American markets.

New England would be particularly damaged by oil import quotas, as the Governors of the six New England States have recognized in a resolution adopted March 15, 1955. The resolution called for united action by New England residents to protect New England commerce and industry from this threatened injury.

To bring the dangers involved in this legislative proposal to the attention of New England people, it is important to keep in mind the following facts:

1. New England produces no significant amount of fuel. All oil and coal it obtains from beyond its borders. New England needs the most ample supplies of all fuels at the lowest fair prices and it is to the advantage of New England to have the greatest possible competition among domestic and foreign fuels and fuel sources.

2. Some of the lighter grades of fuel oil, and over 58 percent of the approximately 65 million barrels of heavy industrial fuel oil (sometimes called bunker C or residual oil) used annually in New England is of foreign origin. These supplies are important in meeting New England's total fuel requirements.

3. Bunker C heavy fuel oil is extensively used by New England industry and public utilities and for heating large apartment and office buildings. Oil is convenient to use and has proved to be economical. New England, for its own advantage, must have continued access to adequate supplies of this type of oil.

4. If New England were to be deprived (by quota restrictions) of any substantial part of the over 58 percent of its yearly supplies of heavy oil which is of overseas origin, serious shortages would be almost certain to develop. Present prices of heavy oil are not high enough to lead domestic producers to provide adequate supplies of this heavy oil without price increases. Domestic production of fuel oil is very directly tied to the production of more valuable components. (See appendix 1, below.)

5. New England has reason to fear oil shortages. In 1947 prices of bunker C oil went up rapidly (over $1 a barrel, or about 50 percent, in less than 12 months) in a period when only a moderate shortage existed. If quotas on foreign oil imports are imposed and if a serious shortage ensues, for each 1 cent per barrel of rise in price, New England's annual heavy oil fuel bills would increase by at least $650,000. Credible estimates are that the increase in price of bunker C oil, delivered in Boston, would be about $1 per barrel, an aggregate increase in New England's yearly oil costs of not less than $65 million.

6. Quota restrictions (followed by substantial shortages and oil price increases) could force New England users of heavy fuel oil to reconvert (at great expense) their oil burning heaters and plants to less convenient coal-burning equipment. This, of course, is precisely what some proponents of quotas are trying to accomplish.

7. Price increases for bunker C oil inevitably will be borne by the general public in New England and by New England industry. Such price increases would constitute a further obstacle to successful competition by New England industry with industry in other parts of the Nation.

8. New England, directly and indirectly, exports large quantities of goods to Venezuela amounted to over $525 million. Venegreat bulk of its foreign produced heavy oil. In 1953, United States exports to Venezuela amounted to over $25 million. Venezuela obtains the dollars to pay for these exports principally from th sale of its fuel oil in the United States. To curtail these oil sales will reduce the dollars which Venezuela has to spend in the United States and the exports which it can absorb, for 90 percent of Venezuela's foreign exchange is obtained from sales of Venezuelan oil.

9. Proper long-range policies of conservation of national natural resources make the use of overseas oil desirable to conserve irreplaceable domestic sources of supply. The United States needs a domestic oil industry, but in peacetime it should take full advantage of access to foreign sources of supply, which may be less readily available in times of emergency.

APPENDIX 1

WHAT IS HEAVY FUEL OIL? ITS PRICE

1. Heavy fuel oil is the heavy, nonvolatile, relatively low-priced remainder left after the extraction from crude oil of the more valuable components, such as gasoline, kerosene, light fuel oils, diesel oil, and other higher priced items. For domestic crude oil there

remains only about 20 percent of heavy oil after the removal of these high-priced products by refineries which are constantly and successfully trying to minimize that heavy oil yield. (The heavy Venezuelan crude oil, on the other hand, at the Antilles refineries produces only about 35 percent of the more costly items, leaving a 65-percent yield of heavy fuel oil.)

2. The production of domestic fuel oil is naturally greatly influenced by the extent of demand for the more valuable components. The low price of such oil gives no incentive to domestic refiners to produce it when a good market exists for the 80 percent of more valuable elements of the crude oil. On March 24, 1955, the refinery prices (f. o. b. gulf coast) per barrel of the principal refined products were (low for the day):

	Per gallon
Gasoline (87 octane)	$0.105
Kerosene	.095
No. 2 fuel oil	.0875
Heavy fuel oil (bunker C)	.0464

($1.95 per barrel.)

Domestic producers will probably be unwilling to treat as heavy fuel oil crude oil (from which high-priced components can easily be extracted), unless there is an increase of at least $1 per barrel in the price paid for domestic heavy oil. The tank-car price in Boston (March 30, 1955) for such oil is $2.42. A dollar increase would raise it to $3.42, about a 40-percent increase.

H. R. 4560

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Leo P. Carlin, mayor of the city of Newark, has submitted an excellent statement to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H. R. 4560, the Harris bill, which I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues. Mayor Carlin ably sets forth the reasons for his opposition to the bill, and I think the entire Membership of the Congress will be interested in reading his complete statement, which follows:

STATEMENT ON THE HARRIS BILL BY LEO P. CARLIN, MAYOR, CITY OF NEWARK, N. J., BEFORE THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

My name is Leo P. Carlin. I am mayor of the city of Newark, N. J. The principal offices of the city of Newark, N. J., including the office of the mayor, are in city hall, 920 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. The term of office of the present administration of the city of Newark is from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1958, the form of government having been changed from the commission form to the mayor and municipal council form by popular vote. I was mayor for the year preceding July 1, 1954, under the former commission form of government and also served as commissioner and director, department of public works, for the preceding 4-year term.

According to the 1950 census figures the population of the city of Newark was 438,776. I am informed that there are 122,170 gas customers in the city of Newark and that approximately 8,000 use gas for heating purposes. Many of the Newark industries depend upon gas in their industrial processes. Gas for cooking and heating within the city of Newark is supplied only by Public Service Electric & Gas Co. We are informed that approximately 80 percent of the thermal send-out of that company is derived from natural gas purchased from various natural gas pipeline companies.

The families of the city of Newark who use gas for the various purposes have no benefit of competing suppliers but must take gas from the one and only supplier at its price. These families, furthermore, do not actually have the benefit of the choice of competing fuels, such as coal, oil, or electricity. The gas ranges for cooking and burners for heating cannot be transformed to the use of other fuels and the cost of new equipment would be an additional burden on our citizens, especially when a heating unit is involved. It has been recognized and has become a national policy that consumers in such circumstances must be protected by laws and regulations.

It is my understanding that the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that the prime aim of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 is to protect consumers against exploitation at the hands of the natural gas companies. The act presently provides for regulation of prices charged by the producer to the transmission pipeline companies and the prices charged by those companies to the distribution company whose rates to the ultimate consumer are also regulated by the Public Utility Commission of our State. In regulating these prices the act presently provides for just and reasonable rates.

I am informed that Public Service Electric & Gas Co. agreed to pay 25 cents per thousand cubic feet when the company signed its first contract for delivery of natural gas some time in 1947, and that before the first cubic foot of gas was received under this contract in 1950, the price had been increased to 27.9 cents per thousand cubic feet. Since that time the price has been increased to 34.1 cents per thousand cubic feet at the present time, showing an increase of 36.4 percent, which was permitted under the present act. The major portion of these increases, I am informed, were permitted to become effective because the Federal Power Commission was of the opinion that it had no right to control the prices charged by the producers. If the Harris bill is passed by the Congress, the control which that Commission now has, as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the Philip case, will be eliminated. There would then be no control whatever over the prices that the producers can charge in existing contracts.

It seems quite evident that the Congress was fully aware of the position of the consumer when it provided that the Federal Power Commission should regulate all sales in interstate commerce for resale. Under the act, properly administered, each party, producer to distributor, would receive the cost to him plus a fair profit, and costs to the consumer would rise only in proportion to general commodity cost increases. Under the proposed legislation the pipeline operators and distributors are subject to control, the basis for this control being the prevailing market price in the field where produced. The producer, however, under the proposed amendment would be free from control as regards his selling price and, therefore, could raise the market price at will. As a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, so also control is only as strong as the weakest point of control. The result under the proposed amendment would therefore be lack of control and the vitiating of the intent of the act. For the consumers, some 122,000 families of the city of Newark, there would result the spiraling of the cost of gas until it would be more economical to reconvert to the use of another type of fuel.

I will leave to experts the expounding of the theories and reasons to prove that the Harris bill is detrimental to the interests of the consumer and the public and is only beneficial to the few producers at the expense of the public. I am submitting this plea on behalf of the thousands of residents of my city so that this honorable committee will reject this bill and any other bill which would remove from price control any of the producers or transporters or distributors of natural gas from the wells to the ultimate consumer.

Respectfully submitted.

LEO P. CARLIN, *Mayor.*

Bank Holding Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following are a few typical communications which I have received urging enactment of the bank holding company bill, H. R. 2674, which I hope the House Banking and Currency Committee will shortly report. That bill sponsored by our distinguished chairman, Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, is substantially the same as my own bill, H. R. 685.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 21, 1955.*
Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As representative of small business, we urge that you approve without substantial change H. R. 2674 pending in House Banking Committee. We believe this legislation necessary for survival and proper functioning of independent local banks and their patrons, the independent local merchants.

UNITED STATES WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION,
HAROLD O. SMITH, Jr.
Executive Vice President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 21, 1955.*
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is our hope that in the interests of independent banks of this country and their future that you will report out H. R. 2674 now before your Committee of Banking and Currency. We have just completed a national poll of our membership, all independent business and professional men, the poll reaching approximately 100,000. The vote on the bill was 74 percent for, 16 percent against, and 10 percent no vote. We trust that we may look forward to your support.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Willows, Calif., April 22, 1955.
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Congressman From New York,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: The United States has grown to be the greatest country in the world by reason of its traditional system of free enterprise and independent banking.

Unless the pending bank holding-company legislation (H. R. 2674) is enacted at this session, it may be too late to protect and perpetuate this traditional system. The large bank holding companies are "power mad" and are on the march.

If the bank holding companies are permitted to continue to expand, without proper supervision and regulation, it will mean the ultimate elimination of the independent banking system and ultimate socialization of banking in the United States.

I am sure you do not wish this country to follow in the footsteps of Germany, France, England, and most of the other countries in the world that have nationalized and socialized banking, which will be the ultimate result of permitting the "bank holding companies" to continue to run wild.

For the past 15 years, the bank holding companies have been successful in their strategy of "delay and investigate further."

The independent bankers, and the majority of people in this country who believe in competition and free enterprise, are relying upon your committee (and thereafter the House) to enact H. R. 2674.

Very respectfully yours,

CARROLL F. BYRD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1955.*

Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER,
House Banking and Currency Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thirty-six thousand small independent retail druggists as represented by the National Association of Retail Druggists respectfully urge your support of H. R. 2674. Seventy-three percent of holding companies' income is derived from nonbanking institutions. Independent bankers know local conditions better than holding companies in New York, Chicago, or San Francisco; hence service are flexible and accommodate financial needs of small businessmen at local levels.

GEORGE FRATES,
Washington Representative, National Association of Retail Druggists.

Avoid Hasty Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the New York Herald Tribune carried a front-page editorial entitled "Washington Must Act." I understand that copies of this issue of the Herald Tribune were distributed to Members' offices. The editorial calls for immediate enactment of legislation giving the Federal Government the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producer to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions, and absolute priorities according to need. The editorial also calls for severe penalties for violators, both users and the sellers.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has general jurisdiction with regard to public health, I and the committee have, of course, been concerned over the problems created by the initial scarcity of available Salk polio vaccine.

Several weeks before the Frances report and the licensing of the vaccine by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I contacted Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer with regard to any plans which the Department might have to provide for allocation of scarce vaccine so that the vaccine would go to those classes of persons where it would do the most good. At that time I was advised by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer that no legislative action was required.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a letter dated April 14, 1955, addressed to Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which summarizes briefly the views expressed by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer. The letter also requests the Secretary to review the situation and to advise me whether the Department might feel the need for additional legislation granting the Department power to allocate the vaccine.

This letter will be made a part of my remarks.

I have talked again to Dr. Scheele to inquire whether the Department had reached any conclusion on the question of the need for legislation. Dr. Scheele informs me that the Expert Advisory Committee on the Polio Vaccine is meeting. Dr. Scheele feels that no decision with regard to legislation should be reached until the committee has been in a position to review the situation which has developed. Dr. Scheele expects to report the results of the Advisory Committee's deliberations to Mrs. Hobby, and he promised to keep in touch with me with regard to the situation.

I am making this somewhat lengthy explanation in order to show that this committee has been following closely the stiuation with regard to the Salk vaccine. I believe it would be a mistake for the Congress to rush into action before those in the executive branch who have a great responsibility in this field have had an opportunity to reevaluate the situation and to determine whether in the public interest efforts at voluntary allocation should be abandoned and mandatory controls based on new legislation should be substituted.

I agree that the American public is entitled to an early decision, but I feel that the American public will best be served if the Public Health Service and its advisors are given an opportunity to collect their thoughts and to make appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

The letter previously referred follows:

APRIL 14, 1955.

Hon. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SECRETARY: Several weeks ago reports began to appear in the press concerning an impending shortage of Salk polio vaccine following the generally anticipated positive report on the effectiveness of the vaccine. My attention was called particularly to a resolution adopted by the New York County Medical Society urging the members of the society to cooperate toward the prevention of a black market in the Salk vaccine.

At that time I directed a member of the committee staff to consult with Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer with regard to any plans your Department might have (and for which it might need additional powers) to prevent such a black market and to assure that the vaccine would go to those classes of persons where, in the opinion of the medical profession, it would do the most good. Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer at that time expressed their personal views that a Federal allocation program would be undesirable. The arguments advanced by them were to the effect that (1) the time element was too short between the anticipated release of the vaccine and the oncoming of the polio season; (2) the supply held by drug houses was likely to be greater than had been stated in the press; (3) the production of the vaccine could be stepped up greatly following a positive report on its potency, and (4) an allocation program for the Salk vaccine would constitute an undesirable precedent.

Following the release of the Francis report and publication of Dr. Salk's views that the vaccine should be allocated so that it will reach the groups where it will do the most good, I personally contacted Dr. Scheele yesterday and requested his views with regard to the desirability of enacting legislation empowering the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to allocate the vaccine. Dr. Scheele again counseled against such step. In view of his advice, I have decided to refrain from introducing appropriate legislation.

I assume, of course, that Dr. Scheele's and Dr. Keefer's thinking is representative of the Department's thinking in this matter and I am grateful to have the benefit of the Department's advice on this highly complex and emotional issue.

Should you or your associates feel at any time that the situation has changed and that legislation should be introduced granting the Department additional power to allocate the Salk vaccine, I shall be glad to hear further from you.

In the meantime, I shall appreciate receiving information whether the President, your Department, or any other department or agency of the Federal Government at the present time has the power to allocate, if necessary, the Salk vaccine in an appropriate manner.

Sincerely yours,

J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman.

The following editorial appeared today in the New York Times:

THE SALK VACCINE

Fortunately, medicine is not practiced statistically. If it were, we would have paid more attention to the common cold and some other infectious diseases than we have paid to poliomyelitis. Yet we cannot ignore statistics when we consider the success of Dr. Salk's vaccine. In fact, it was decided to vaccinate millions of school children this year largely on the basis of a thorough statistical analysis of last year's mass experiment. As a result of that analysis the Salk vaccine is considered effective in from 60 to 90 percent of the cases in which it will be used.

Thus considered, it seems that too much has been made of the 29 cases of paralytic poliomyelitis that have appeared in some 300,000 children who have received the Cutter vaccine, temporarily withdrawn. The vaccine was prepared in accordance with the specifications of the National Health Institute and of Dr. Salk. It has been tested before distribution by the pharmaceutical house that prepared it, as well as by the National Health Institute. Nevertheless Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele is justified in withdrawing it for closer investigation. Paralytic poliomyelitis is so terrifying an affliction that parents throughout the country will approve the withdrawal. All told, several million children have been vaccinated thus far. It is remarkable that out of these millions so few have been stricken. In fact, the few fall well within the 60- to 90-percent figure of efficacy that Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., gave out a few weeks ago in his report. A board of experts, on which Dr. Salk sat, has decided that it is safe to pro-

ceed with nationwide vaccination. As for the Cutter preparation, judgment must be withheld. So far there is no evidence of contamination.

All this raises the question of a shortage of vaccine. The drug houses that have been making the vaccine can hardly be charged with negligence. Even before Dr. Francis presented his report some were beginning to enlarge their production facilities, so confident were they of the vaccine's acceptance. By July there will be enough to treat 30 million children—about half the number that ought to be vaccinated. Long before the advent of autumn there should be enough vaccine to meet at least the needs of all children. Tightening controls over distribution will not increase the supply. If there is a black market in the distribution of the vaccine it has not come to light. The physicians who have departed from the "children first" principle and vaccinated those older than the prescribed age are so few that they are negligible. In a word, this is not a time for hysteria but a time to trust public health authorities and permit them to direct the work of vaccination.

This is the editorial previously referred to from the New York Herald Tribune:

WASHINGTON MUST ACT

The Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis is a national blessing which has created a national emergency. Experts have confirmed the vaccine's general efficacy. The demand is far greater than the supply. Every child in America has a right to its protection.

The serum can only be, and must be, controlled nationally.

Prior to the publication of the Francis report on the success of Dr. Salk's discovery, no agency, public or private, had thought through all the problems involved in the production and distribution of this great boon.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which deserves great credit for initiative, efficiency and determination, had made contracts for the purchase of vaccine for free administration to children. It is delivering the serum to communities, but has no authority over private distribution of quantities produced in excess of its own contracts, nor can it effectively control community action after the vaccine is in the hands of local health authorities.

State, and localities have improvised their own distribution systems. For the most part, these are based on voluntary allocations and priorities, and are concerned more with the acquisition of and payment for the vaccine than with seeing to it that priorities are absolutely observed. Only on Friday, after it was clear that the voluntary system was breaking down, did New York City place penalties on the unauthorized sale or possession of the Salk serum. This was a purely local move; the penalities, moreover, are light in view of the great temptation offered by the short supply of the vaccine: $500 fine, a year in jail or both.

The Federal Government, the only authority capable of exercising national controls, made no serious effort, before the release of the report, to anticipate its responsibilities. The Public Health Service licenses and supervises the manufacture of the Salk vaccine under the National Biologics Control Act. Powers under this act have been exercised in withdrawing the product of the Cutter Laboratories from distribution.

But the law applies only to the source, only to quality. It gives the Federal Government no authority over allocation, over price, over violators of agreements. The administration has relied on voluntary cooperation and on advisory committees.

The fear of polio has haunted parents for generations. It is too much to expect of human nature that when the promise of release from that fear appears, voluntary arrangements will hold against a mother's insistence on the protection of her children or the greed of those who want to make money out of that emotion. New Yorkers remember the near riots that were produced by the distribution of gamma globulin, far less effective than the Salk vaccine. They are aware that already supplies of the new serum have disappeared into unauthorized channels and been diverted to adults when the moral right of children to priority is unchallenged.

To bring order out of this explosive situation, a national law is essential. There are five requirements for such a law:

1. It must be simple and sweeping, giving the Federal Government the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producing laboratory to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions, and absolute priorities according to need.

2. It must provide for the prompt dissemination of fully evaluated information on all medical aspects of the program. Doubts have arisen across the Nation over such matters as "provocation" and the timing of shots in relation to the incidence of polio. Parents are entitled to know what disinterested experts think of these questions as they arise. Their children's lives are at stake.

3. It must be clearly limited in time and subject, so that there will be no doubt that this is an emergency answer to an emergency situation, not a step toward socialized medicine. A year, or at most two, will probably bring supply and demand into balance.

4. It must have teeth. Penalties for violators—both users and sellers—should be harsh, several years in jail, some thousands of dollars in fines, so that there will be no prospect of profit in flouting the law.

5. Finally, and of the utmost importance, the act must be passed immediately and administered vigorously. The emergency is now—not tomorrow or next month. Congress can pass a law through both Houses in a single day, if the need is great enough. It should pass this legislation forthwith. The Government should be prepared to put its execution in the hands of the country's top administrators, experienced in allocations and priorities.

Given such leadership, working in harmony with all interested parties, redtape could be cut, the machinery set in motion, and speedy enforcement assured.

The parents and children of the Nation demand it. The whole world is waiting to see whether the United States will use this great new weapon against polio swiftly, efficiently, and—above all—equitably.

Speaking of a Price-Support Farm Program—Land Restoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Izaak Walton League of America, long interested in protecting our natural resources, has contacted me concerning their program of land restoration to replace the present farm-support program. I have been particularly impressed by their suggestions and feel it has considerable merit. There are many details which need to be worked out, but the overall plan appears to me to be an excellent one. The chairman of this organization, George L. Hockenyos, is a constituent of mine residing in Springfield, Ill., and I am proud to have this opportunity to introduce this plan to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following statement concerning the price-support program to remove from 50 to 70 million acres of marginal soil out of production, thereby eliminating the surplus:

A LAND RESTORATION—PRICE-SUPPORT FARM PROGRAM

(Presented for consideration by the land-use committee, Izaak Walton League of America)

Our present use of our agricultural land presents a painful paradox. On the one hand we have a picture of overproduction. Steady technical advances have increased and probably will continue to increase per acre productivity. The full utilization of the possibilities inherent in synthetic nitrogen fertilizer may eventually increase per acre production by another 15 or even 20 percent.

Meanwhile our foreign markets for foodstuffs have dwindled and the immediate outlook is not good in this direction. It is true that our population is increasing at the rate of some 2 million per year and eventually we will almost certainly need all of our potential agricultural resources.

At the present time, however, we have enormous and growing surpluses of our basic commodities purchased as part of a price-support program. Clearly, in the race between population growth and food production the American farmer is far in the lead.

On the other side of the picture, we are using our land resources as if we were faced with imminent starvation. We are cultivating some 360 to 400 million acres per year, and it is estimated that some 70 million acres of this is not suited to cultivation.

Briefly stated, we have 70 million acres of class 1 land that is not subject to erosion by wind or water, 170 million acres of class 2 land that can be protected by simple measures, and 232 million acres of class 3 land that requires careful handling if in continuous cultivation.

In addition, we have 95 million acres that is capable of only intermittent cultivation, and some 30 million acres of class 5 and 194 million acres of class 6 that ought to be kept in permanent vegetative cover.

Unfortunately, we are farming substantial amounts of class 4 land, and even considerable amounts of class 5 and 6 land.

The Secretary of Agriculture recently estimated that our surplus production represented the output of 40 million acres. Assuming that he refers to acreage of average productivity, we can infer that this is equivalent to some 50 to 70 million acres of classes 3 to 6 land.

Putting the 2 sides of the pictures together, we see that we are using 10 percent too much of our potential productivity and misusing and deteriorating a substantial amount of our land resources.

If a workable method could be found to remove 50–70 million acres of class 3–6 land from cultivation and place it in a self-restoring land reserve, we could accomplish two major purposes, both of which would be in the public interest.

1. We would restore a balance between production and demand.

2. We would have one of the most effective soil-conservation programs imaginable.

Admittedly, such a program would be costly, rather difficult to administer, and would not solve all the economic, social, and con-

servation problems that face agriculture. It would, however, strike at the roots of these problems in a way that would benefit all of the people, and at a cost in keeping with the benefits.

PROPOSAL

The proposal is that the USDA lease from the owners and remove from all agricultural production a sufficient acreage of cultivated land to bring production back in line with current demand.

The term of the leases to be a minimum of 5 years in humid areas where the land is devoted to annual crops; leases to be a minimum of 10 years in semiarid or cyclically arid areas, and 20 years where reforestation would be the required land use.

All leases might be terminated at any time by mutual agreement of both parties.

A term of the lease would be that the land be immediately conditioned and planted in accordance with specifications that would assure the highest practical degree of fertility stabilization and restoration.

Payment would not start until the initial conditioning and planting had been completed.

The cost of soil amendments, fertilizers and seeds would be borne by the Department of Agriculture. All conditioning and seeding operations would be performed by the landowner.

To be eligible for leasing, the land must have been in cultivation for at least 2 years and owned by the applicant for 2 years, except where the land had been acquired by inheritance, foreclosure or other means which did not anticipate the opportunity of leasing under this program.

The protective and restorative plant cover could not be harvested or grazed except in case of disaster such as prolonged drought. In such cases the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize such use as an emergency measure.

All or part of any farm would be eligible for leasing but due to administrative costs not less than 10 acres from any 1 farm could be leased.

Applications for leases would be accompanied by a fee, which may be set at $10, to defray part of the cost of appraisal and processing the lease.

The rental paid would be on a sliding scale, based on two factors. The first would be a fair-cash rental price, based on the past productivity of the land, and assuming full parity prices for the products. The second would be a percentage factor of the above, based on the need which the particular plot of land shows for stabilization and restoration.

The following is a suggested percentage table:

	Percent
Class 1	60
Class 2	70
Class 3	80
Class 4	90
Class 5–8	100

The basic rental appraisal to be made by the local USDA with the aid of a professional appraiser.

The capability classification and the specifications for conditioning and planting to be done by the USDA.

If, due to adverse weather or other causes a seeding failed, it would be repeated until successful, the cost to be divided as in the original attempt. The failure of either party to the lease to carry out this provision would terminate the lease.

This program would first supplement and then supplant the present system of price supports. In the first year that this program was placed in effect support prices would be reduced to not over 75 percent of parity, in the second year to not over 70 percent, and in the third year to 65 percent. After this, price supports should not be needed since this program is in itself a price-support program of an indirect nature.

PROCEDURE

To illustrate the working of the proposed program, let us assume the situation of a central Illinois farmer operating 200 acres of land, some of which would fall into class 2, some class 3, and some class 4, under the USDA system of classification.

Knowing that direct price supports are going to be gradually withdrawn, and further that one 40-acre field is eroding badly, he applies for participation in the restoration program. The $10 dollar fee accompanies the application.

The administrative committee, accompanied by an experienced land appraiser, evaluates the field. The land has been producing corn, wheat, soybeans, and occasionally clover. The committee estimates what a fair cash rental would be assuming that corn was selling for $1.82, beans $2.82, and wheat $2.50 per bushel. They might arrive at a figure in the range of $12 to $16 per acre. For convenience, let us assume they set the figure at $14 per acre.

Meanwhile the USDA fieldman classifies the land as class 4 and, therefore, eligible to 90 percent of parity rental. The rental offered the farmer is set at $12.60 per acre per year. This happens to be very close to the average cash rental of all Illinois farmland the last 3 years.

The USDA fieldman also determines what is needed to place this field in proper condition for restoration. He prescribes 3 tons per acre of limestone followed by seeding to a mixture of sweet clover, lespedeza, and redtop. He further prescribes that 1½ pounds per acre of DDT be applied to the field when the sweet clover has formed its first leaves, to prevent loss due to sweet clover weevil.

The application with attendant data is examined by a central USDA office. No evidence of local favoritism or other error is found; and the application is approved. The field is limed, prepared, and seeded by the farmer, with the USDA paying for the lime and seed as well as the DDT.

Since this was the least productive field on this farm, it cuts the farmer's production only 15 percent, even though it removes 20 percent of his land from cultivation. The first seeding is successful; and the farmer draws a check for $504 each year for the 5 years of the lease.

During 1 of the years of the lease a disastrous drought strikes the area in which our hypothetical farmer lives. The hay crop is short and pastures are burned. The Secretary of Agriculture declares an emergency; and the farmer may cut some of the hay as poor quality feed or may pasture the accumulated growth until the emergency is past.

The farmer now has no acreage controls, no compliance or cross compliances, but he does have price supports because if prices are too low for satisfactory returns, he can place additional land in the program until enough land nationwide has been taken out of cultivation to balance supply and demand. Meanwhile all of his land is producing income, most of it by producing needed and not surplus food; and he is being paid to rebuild and restore the remainder of his land against the time when it will be needed. Also, the creek near the farm is just a bit clearer, and the Mississippi just a bit less muddy.

At the end of 5 years the farmer decides that it is better to leave the land in the restoration program and continue to draw his annual payments. One reason is that his oldest son has moved to the city and he himself is getting a bit older. In the eighth year of the lease the terrible tragedy of a major war occurs. The Secretary of Agriculture calls for all out production and consents to termination of the lease. The soil has undergone a buildup of major proportions in nitrogen content and in particle aggregation. The dense sod is plowed and the field is both greatly improved in productivity and the soil less erodable than it had been 8 years before.

The Nation's soil fertility had been banked when not needed and withdrawn with generous interest when it was badly needed. Meanwhile, the farmer had been returned to complete freedom of choice in managing his land.

A second example may be taken from the growing dust bowl of southeast Colorado. Here a bondafide farmer and not a suitcase farmer was involved. He operated 2 sections of wheat land. The dry cycle had hit him hard. He applied for a lease. The land was classified as 800 acres of class 3 and 480 acres of class 5, due to the high sand content. The average wheat production was around 12 bushels per acre when it rained; and the fair cash rental on the class 3 land set at $5 per acre and on the class 5 land at $3 per acre. The rental was therefore set at 80 percent of $5 or $4 per acre for the class 3 land and 100 percent or $3 per acre for the class 5 land.

The United States Department of Agriculture field man prescribed a seeding of the best holding cover known at the time. The farmer decided that a sure return of $4,640 per year was better than gambling on the weather. He moved off the farm as soon as the seeding was permanently established.

There was less wheat to glut the market for the next 10 years; and there was less dust in the air in the Midwest. Of course, when wheat rose to $2.20 on the open market and the rain cycle returned, the farmer wanted to resume wheat growing. His 10 year lease was not terminated, as the wheat was not needed and there was no justification for renewing the hazard of blowing soil.

One can visualize many individual situations. Not all would be entirely desirable. Some land owners would place their land entirely in the restoration program and their tenants would be forced to leave the land for the crowded cities. This is regrettable, but it has been going on steadily for years. In just the last 10 years the farm population has dropped from 18 percent to 14 percent of the total population. With mechanization and industrialization of our farms, this trend seemingly is inevitable.

The cost of such a program is not easily estimated but a few basic figures from Illinois data may give an approximation. In 1952 the average value of all Illinois farm land was $222 per acre. In the years 1952, 1953, and 1954 the farmers reporting from the nine cooperating districts in Illinois gave the following weighted average values for land and the cash rental value thereof:

	Cash rental
1952 farmland value $241 per acre	$11.90
1953 farmland value $231 per acre	12.00
1954 farmland value $249 per acre	13.00

The average value for the 3 years was $240, and the average cash rental was $12.30. This is a little over 5 percent of the value of the land. It is probable that nationwide cash rental does not usually exceed 6 percent of the value of the land.

This program is directed at rental and restoration of less-than-average land. Now, we may assume that during the period 1952–54, the Illinois farmers received approximately 80 percent of parity price for their important cash crops. Thus we may assume that the cash rentals for the reporting Illinois farms would have been one-quarter higher had full parity prices prevailed. Thus, the $12.30 average cash rental would have been $15.37 per acre. Since this program is directed at the rental of land having for the most part a productivity of less than average and less than parity is paid as rental on all save class 5–8, it is a reasonable estimate that the land rental for

this program in Illinois would be less than $10 per acre.

If the rental were $10 per acre in Illinois, it is probable that it would average much less in the Nation. Thus, land in the vast Dust Bowl of the Southwest is currently worth little more than $40 per acre. Rental at 6 percent of value would mean $2.40 per acre. There are at present 12 million acres in the Dust Bowl that definitely should be removed from cultivation in the interest of conservation. Even at the improbably high figure of $4 per acre, it would cost only $48 million to remove this 12 million acres from wheat production and back to stabilizing grass cover. This reduced production would go far toward correcting our most annoying surplus problem.

It seems probable that 60 million acres could be transferred from production to restoration at a cost of not more than $7.50 per acre, or a total rental cost of $450 million per year. This should approximately place production back in balance with demand. The conservation benefits would be inestimable.

It is difficult to estimate the cost of the present price-support program. Part of the difficulty is due to the fact that some of the costs are involved with other parts of the Department's activities.

It is stated that the total losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation are only $130 million, of which $100 million were incurred in 1953. It was estimated, in Newsweek magazine for September 1954 "that the loss on the 1954 crop would be $450 million and that by the time the 1954 harvest was completed the Corporation would have almost $10 billion invested in surplus commodities."

Assuming that the figure is $8 billion, it is probable that the combined interest, storage, and deterioration losses would reach some $500 to $600 million a year, just to hold the surplus.

A positive program that would eliminate the surplus problem and at the same time give soil-conserving benefits to some 50 to 70 million acres most badly in need of conservation should be considered a bargain at $1 billion per year. The proposed program should cost little, if any, more than half this figure.

Since this is a conservation program for the land most badly in need of stabilization, and since the stabilization would be the most complete possible, it would be entirely appropriate to reduce the ACP program to help provide funds for this combined conservation and price-support program.

Existing governmental agencies could be adjusted to carry out this program. This program could be superimposed on the present price-support program with a reduction in the price-support level as the effects of this program were felt.

In October 1954, Mr. D. Howard Doane, head of the Doane Agricultural Service, St. Louis, Mo., wrote the following comment, which we believe of sufficient importance to be added at this point for discussion purposes:

"In reading the outline of this proposed plan I note the absence of proposals affecting the human relationships between landlord and tenant. It would seem important to me to give consideration to those relationships which might result in displacing tenants or seriously upsetting landlord-tenant relationship. I hesitate to make a suggestion for meeting the problem but rules and regulations should be given consideration and then perhaps propose setting up a board of reviews to hear both landlord and tenant when either party or both parties felt that an undue hardship was being created."

Comment with regard to this proposal is solicited and will be welcomed. If requested, comment will be considered confidential. Unless otherwise specified in covering correspondence, comment should be sent to the national offices of the Izaak Walton League of America at 31 North State Street, Chicago 2, Ill.

GEORGE L. HOCKENVOS,
Chairman, Springfield, Ill.
ARTHUR W. SMITH,
Member, Emmetsburg, Iowa.
C. I. VAN CLEVE,
Member, Lynchburg, Va.
JOHN W. SPENCER,
Member, Santa Rosa, Calif.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, May 1, I was the privileged guest of the Washington Pilgrimage at their fifth annual pilgrimage to our Nation's Capital. Before entering into the RECORD the welcoming address of Dr. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, I should like to give a short history of this patriotic organization.

The Washington Pilgrimage was organized in 1950 as a nonsectarian program designed to emphasize the spiritual heritage of our country. By bringing to Washington each spring in ever larger numbers men and women from all parts of the United States, the pilgrimage seeks to focus attention on the visible expressions in Washington of the faith that has made America great. This is done by visiting patriotic and historic shrines, museums, centers of culture, and institutions of government as well as by affording an opportunity for pilgrims to meet with the political and religious leaders of the Nation's Capital.

The theme of the 1955 pilgrimage was, "This Nation Under God." The final session of this year's pilgrimage was held on May 1 at the National Archives where the 1954 joint resolution of the Congress inserting the words "under God," in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States was displayed for the first time in the presence of the assembly. Their tribute to me, as author of the bill, made me humbly appreciative of their testimony in my behalf.

Dr. Grover's address welcoming the pilgrims follows:

FIFTH ANNUAL WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE

It is a pleasure once more to welcome you to the National Archives on the occasion of the fifth annual Washington pilgrimage. We are proud that your dedicated group again has chosen our building as a meeting place in which to reaffirm your faith in the foundations of freedom.

No force has given more sustenance to the growth of freedom than has Christianity. One of the most penetrating commentators on democracy, De Tocqueville, observed that "Christianity is the companion of liberty in all its conflicts—the cradle of its infancy, and the divine source of its claims." In the Christian religion the importance of man in relation to the state, to his fellow men, and to God is recognized. This recognition of man's importance is the basis of the concepts of freedom that are contained in the three great charters of our Nation—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights.

The Christian ethic attaches supreme value to the individual as distinguished from the state. In Christianity we have the idea that every person has his own immortal soul, that each bears a direct relation to God, that each is separately responsible for his own conduct and is, apart from his nation, a matter of individual concern to God. This idea is diametrically opposed to the view of totalitarian regimes, in which the state—an abstraction, without mind or soul—is assumed to have a purpose transcending the welfare and happiness of its citizens.

The principles found in the great charters that are exhibited in the National Archives have a quality of permanence that attaches to the eternal precepts of the Christian faith. These principles are universal in their moral application, and it is my belief that they are indestructible. The human individual, wherever he may be—oppressed by tyranny, manipulated by intrigue and deceit—will somehow assert his God-given right to dignity, to self-esteem, and to freedom.

The Washington Pilgrimage was organized in recognition of the need in these critical times to arouse the spiritual strength of men and women everywhere. It is a recognition of this need that brings you to Washington each year in ever-increasing numbers. We of the National Archives, therefore, welcome you not merely as visitors, for we share with you your faith in the heritage of this Nation under God. We hope that the 1955 pilgrimage has proven even more fruitful than those of previous years, and we extend to you our most cordial invitation to visit us many times in the years to come.

Spend as much time as you can in our main exhibition hall. You will find it not only a source of inspiration, as one of the Nation's great shrine, but truly a hall of learning and public education.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

The Importance of Balancing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech I made today before the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak on the subject: Is it important to balance the budget?

As I see it, balancing the budget without resorting to legerdemain or unsound bookkeeping methods is certainly in the category of our No. 1 problems.

Beginning with 1792, the first fiscal year of our Federal Government, and through 1916, Federal deficits were casual and usually paid off in succeeding years. In this 124-year period there were 43 deficit years and 81 surplus years. As late as July 1, 1914, the interest-bearing debt was less than $1 billion.

In Andrew Jackson's administration the public debt was paid off in toto, an achievement in which President Jackson expressed great pride.

It can be said for this first 124 years in the life of our Republic we were on a pay-as-you-go basis. In that period I think it can be accurately said that we laid the foundation for our strength today as the greatest nation in all the world.

Then, in 1917, 1918, and 1919, World War I deficits aggregated $13 billion. Heavy current taxation in those years paid much of the war cost.

The next 11 years, from 1919 to 1931, were surplus years, and the war debt was reduced.

In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt came into office, and the most outstanding plank in his platform was to reduce Federal expenditures by 25 percent and to keep the budget in balance. He accused Mr. Hoover of "throwing discretion to the winds and indulging in an orgy of waste and extravagance." Mr. Hoover spent $4 billion in his last year, and the record shows that this spendthrift Hoover was the only President to leave office with fewer Federal employees than when he came in.

Mr. Roosevelt added more than $200 billion to the public debt during his administrations.

I took my oath as a Senator the same day Mr. Roosevelt took his as President—March 4, 1933. The first bill I voted on was the legislation recommended by President Roosevelt to redeem his economy pledge by reducing all expenditures 15 percent—a difference of 10 percent less than his original promise, it is true—but I thought this was a substantial redemption of a campaign pledge, as such things go, and I enthusiastically supported him.

The title of the bill was "A bill to preserve the credit of the United States Government." Our debt was then about $16 billion. This economy program was shortlived—about 6 months—and the spending then began to steadily and rapidly increase.

Mr. Roosevelt presented 13 budgets and in every peacetime budget he promised a balance between income and outgo for the next year, but it turned out that next year never came. He was in the red all the way, and in every year of his administration a substantial deficit was added to the public debt.

There were eight Truman budgets. Three were in the black—those for fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1951. Two resulted from war contract cancellations following the end of World War II and the third resulted from increased taxes for the Korean war before the war bills started coming due. Five Truman budgets were in the red.

Mr. Eisenhower has presented two budgets—both in the red but on a declining ratio. The Eisenhower deficit estimates for fiscal years 1955 and 1956 aggregate $7 billion as compared to the last Truman budget which alone contemplated a $9 billion deficit.

The cold facts are that for 21 years out of the last 24 years we have spent more than we have collected. In these 24 years we have balanced the budget in only 3; and these were more by accident than by design.

We must recognize that we have abandoned the sound fiscal policies strictly adhered to by all political parties and all Presidents for considerably more than a century of our existence. It is true that during these 21 deficit years we were engaged in World War II for 4 years and in the Korean war for 2 years. Yet, in the years when the pay-as-you-go system prevailed we also had quite a few wars.

It is the quarter of a century of deficit spending which now makes balancing the budget so imperative. Young men and women, born in 1930, have lived in the red virtually all their lives. Our acceptance of deficit spending for so long a period has weakened public resistance to the evils of this practice. Bad habits are hard to change.

Will the deficits become permanent and continue to pile debt upon debt until real disaster comes? If we cannot balance the budget in this day of our greatest dollar income, when taxes are near their peak, and when we are at peace, I ask, when can we?

It is disturbing these days to hear some economists argue the budget should not be balanced and that we should not begin to pay on the debt because, they allege, it will adversely affect business conditions. Have we yielded so far to the blandishments of Federal subsidies and Government support that we have forgotten our Nation is great because of individual effort as contrasted to state paternalism?

Today the direct debt of the Federal Government is $280 billion. Our debt is equivalent to the full value of all the land, all the buildings, all the mines, all the machinery, all the livestock—everything of tangible value in the United States.

I think no one can deny we are mortgaged to the hilt. If we add to this Federal debt the debts of the States and localities, we have an amount in excess of $300 billion in direct public obligations.

This is 5 times as much as the total public debts in 1939. While public debt has increased fivefold since 1939 the gross national product—the output of our factories, farms, etc.—increased less than fourfold. When debt increases at a pace faster than the increase in the value of all goods and services, the currency is diluted with consequent shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar.

But the direct debts I have mentioned are not all of our obligations. In addition, we have contingent liabilities totaling $250 billion which the Federal Government has guaranteed, insured, and otherwise assumed on a contingent basis. No one can predict to what extent this contingent liability will result in losses which must be paid by the Federal Government.

For example, $40 billion of this contingent liability is in some 40 Federal housing programs, and from recent disclosures of graft and windfall profits in the various public-housing programs, it is evident that a substantial percentage of these contingent liabilities eventually may become a draft on the Treasury.

In addition to the $280 billion in direct Federal debt, and the $250 billion in contingent liabilities, we have on our hands a social-security system guaranteed by the Federal Government involving many millions of our citizens, which is no longer actuarily sound.

The ultimate cost of this system to the Treasury is still unestimated, but the fact remains that when the income from premiums imposed upon those who are covered in the system is no longer sufficient or available to pay the benefits, then regular tax revenue collected from those in and out of the system will be used to finance the deficiency.

EVILS OF DEFICIT SPENDING

Here are some of the evils of deficit spending:

The debt today is the debt incurred by this generation, but tomorrow it will be debt on our children and grandchildren, and it will be for them to pay, both the interest and the principal.

It is possible and in fact probable that before this astronomical debt is paid off, if it ever is, the interest charge will exceed the principal.

Protracted deficit spending means cheapening the dollar. Secretary Humphrey testified before the Finance Committee that the greatest single factor in cheapening the American dollar has been deficit spending.

Since I have been in the Senate, interest alone on the Federal debt has cost the taxpayers of this country more than $75 billion. At present rates, on the Federal debt at its present level, interest on it in the next 20 years will cost taxpayers upwards of $150 billion.

Since 1940 the Federal Government has borrowed and spent a quarter of a trillion dollars more than we have collected in taxes.

Year by year, nearly in direct ratio to deficit spending, the purchasing value of the dollar has declined. Beginning with a 100-cent dollar in 1940, the value of the dollar had declined to 52 cents in 1954.

As proof of the fact that deficit spending is directly responsible for cheapening the dollar, let me mention that in 1942, when we spent $19 billion in excess of revenue, the dollar in that 1 year declined 10 cents in value.

In 1943, another big deficit year, the dollar lost 5 cents more in value, and another 9 cents in 1946. From 1940 through 1952, an era of heavy deficit spending the dollar lost 48 cents in value, or nearly 4 cents each year, and it is still slipping but in much lesser degree.

Some may regard these facts and figures lightly, but the loss of half the purchasing power of its money in 13 years should be a serious warning to any nation.

Cheapened money is inflation. Inflation is a dangerous game. It robs creditors, it steals pensions, wages, and fixed income. Once started, it is exceedingly difficult to control. This inflation has been partially checked but the value of the dollar dropped slightly again in the past year. It would not take much to start up this dangerous inflation again.

Public debt is not like private debt. If private debt is not paid off, it can be ended by liquidation, but if public debt is not paid off with taxes, liquidation takes the form of disastrous inflation or national repudiation. Either is destructive of our form of government.

Today the interest on the Federal debt takes more than 10 percent of our total Federal tax revenue. Without the tremendous cost of this debt our annual tax bill could be reduced 10 percent across the board.

The interest charge would be greater if much of the debt was not short-termed with lower interest rates. Should this debt be long-termed at the 3¼ percent paid on recent 30-year bonds, the interest would be nearly 15 percent of the Federal income. No business enterprise could survive such heavy interest out of its gross income.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES

Since 1934 Federal grants to States have expanded enormously in both cost and functions. They slip in like mice and soon grow to the size of elephants. Every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the control and authority of the States.

Nothing is more true than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs exactly the manner in which the funds are expended, even though the States partially contribute to the project. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy with grants compel the States to do things they did not want to do.

Growth in Federal grants is indicated by the fact that in 1934, 21 years ago, the total of such grants was $126 million covering 18 programs. Now Federal grants total $3 billion for 50 programs. This is an increase of 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost.

These are the figures to date. As to additional grants for the future, President Eisenhower, in his address on the state of the Union, proposed to open up three Pandora's boxes of new Federal "handouts" to the States.

The proposals by the President, if adopted by Congress, would be the greatest increase in grants to States yet undertaken and the longest step yet to Federal paternalism.

Under the administration's road proposal a "dummy" corporation, without assets and without income, would issue bonds for $21 billion, and Washington would take control of 40,000 miles of the best roads in the 48 States.

By legerdemain this $21 billion in Federal agency bonds would be declared as not Federal debt and would be excluded from the debt limitation fixed by Congress.

The interest would be $11.5 billion, or 55 percent of the funds borrowed.

It was proposed to pay the principal of these bonds and the interest on them with permanent indefinite appropriations, which would remove the corporation from annual appropriation control by Congress.

The proposal would abolish the policy established in 1916—39 years ago—requiring States to match Federal funds for roads.

The scheme was predicated upon pledging federally imposed gasoline taxes over a period of 30 years for the repayment of the bonds and the interest.

The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, recently appointed by President Eisenhower, said of this proposal:

"We (the General Accounting Office) feel that the proposed method of financing is objectionable, because * * * the borrowing would not be included in the public debt obligations of the United States. * * * It is our opinion that the Government should not enter into financial arrangements which might have the effect of obscuring financial facts of the Government's debt position."

Comptroller General Campbell also questioned the legality of the proposal.

We all want good roads. The people are willing to pay for good roads, but it is certainly not necessary practically to destroy the fiscal bookkeeping of our country in order to finance our road system.

These bonds would, of course, be a general obligation of the Government. There is no banker in this audience who would buy bonds of such a dummy Federal corporation without the guaranty of the Federal Government.

Should the gasoline tax be dedicated 30 years in advance for the payment of bonds issued to build roads, then, by the same line of reasoning, other taxes could be dedicated for other specific purposes. If this were carried far enough there would be no funds for the more unglamorous but essential functions.

The second of the three administration State-aid proposals involved about $8 billion in direct appropriations and contingent liabilities for payments, grants, loans, and guaranties to States for school construction. The last bastion of States rights and individual liberty lies in the education of our children.

Federal appropriations to public schools followed by the inevitable Federal control will strike a fatal blow at the grassroots of our democracy.

I do not believe that there is a State or locality in the Union that cannot provide for the cost of its public school system if there is the will to do so.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of the President's third proposal. It was for a so-called Federal health payment program. It would be certain to cost millions of dollars annually and it could easily be the beginning of socialized medicine.

NO SUCH THING AS A FEDERAL GRANT

It is well for everyone to understand that there is no such thing as a Federal grant. All of the money comes from citizens in the States. The money goes to Washington and there it is subject to deductions for Federal administration. This money then goes back to the States less deductions, and the Federal Government tells us how to spend our own money.

Proposals have been advocated changing our budgetary system. The Secretary of the Treasury has not approved these proposals and I am certain he will not. But there are two budgetary proposals which recur with persistency, and I want to warn you of them.

First, there is the proposal for a cash budget. Those who advocate the cash budget are suggesting that the Government pay its routine bills with savings of the citizens who have entrusted protection of their old age and unemployment to the guardianship of the Federal Government. These trust funds were established from premiums paid by participants in social security, unemployment insurance, bank deposit insurance programs, etc. Not a cent of these funds belongs to the Government.

Second, some are advocating a capital budget which means that so-called capital expenditures should not be considered as current expenditures in the budget.

Those who advocate the so-called capital budget must start out with the fallacious assumption that the Government is in business to make a profit on its citizens. To my knowledge the Federal Government has never made a bona fide profit on any Government operation.

They must assume that debt contracted by a Federal agency is not a debt of the Federal Government and a burden on all of the taxpayers.

I am an old-fashioned person who believes that a debt is a debt just as much in the atomic age as it was in the horse and buggy days.

A capital budget must assume that Government manufacturing plants, such as atomic energy installations, are in commercial production for a profit, and that Government stockpiles are longtime investments for profit instead of precautions against emergencies when they would be completely expendable with no financial return.

Likewise, it must assume that the agriculture surplus program is primarily a long range investment deal instead of a prop for annual farm income to be used when needed on a year-by-year basis.

While the vastness and complexity of the Federal Government of the United States necessarily makes budgeting difficult, the so-called conventional budget currently in use offers the best approach to orderly financing with fullest disclosure.

What is needed for a better fiscal system is fuller disclosure of Federal expenditures and responsibility for them—not less, as inevitably would be the case with so-called cash and capital budgets.

With full disclosure of the Federal expenditure situation, the American people then would have an opportunity to decide whether they wanted to recapture control and bring the rate of spending into balance with the rate of taxing and thus reduce the tremendous Federal debt burden we are now bearing.

To recapture control we must first reduce unexpended balances in appropriations already made and rescind those which are nonessential. When we started this fiscal year unexpended balances in appopriations already made totaled about $100 billion, including $78 billion in appropriations enacted in prior years and $20 billion in authority to spend directly out of the public debt.

The situation is made even worse by the procedure under which Congress acts on appropriation bills. Not only has Congress lost control over the annual rate of expenditure, but once the President's budget is submitted in January, Congress never again sees it as a whole until after the appropriations are enacted. The first thing Congress does is to split the appropriation requests of the President into a dozen or more bills. Then it proceeds to consider them separately over a period of 6 months or more. In the consideration of these bills attention is given only to appropriations, and these may be spent over a period of years. An appropriation enacted in a year when revenue is high may actually be spent in a year when revenue is low. There is never an opportunity in Congress, in action on appropriation bills, to consider them in terms of annual expenditures in view of estimated revenue.

To correct such an intolerable situation, along with 48 other Senators, I have introduced legislation providing for a single appropriation bill which would set forth not only requested appropriations for the future but also unexpended balances available in prior appropriations. This resolution has three times passed the Senate but has not yet been acted on by the House.

It provides further that Congress write into the consolidated appropriation bill limitations on expenditures in the ensuing year

from each appropriation. And beyond this it provides that in determining the expenditure limitations all proper consideration should be given the anticipated revenue, the cash position of the Treasury and the level of our Federal debt.

By this process, the Congress and the public would have the means of knowing our fiscal position and the facilities would be provided for balancing the budget with reduction in taxes and debt.

Along with this, I have introduced legislation giving the President the authority to veto items within appropriation bills, thus according him a double check on log-rolling which most of the governors in this country have used for years without abuse.

In short, I advocate one budget with full disclosure as to our expenditures, which fixes responsibility not only for the expenditures but also the administration of expenditure programs; I advocate a single appropriation bill in which Congress not only authorizes expenditures but controls them in a manner that can be considered in view of revenue. A budget is not a budget unless it has two sides, expenditure and income. And finally, I advocate an item veto for the President, who is elected to his office by all of the people.

With these provisions, I believe the budget can be balanced, the debt can be reduced and taxes can be lowered.

If, by budgetary and legislative procedure, we could recapture control of expenditures from the bureaucratic agencies, there are obvious places where they could be substantially reduced and eliminated without impairment of any essential function.

President Eisenhower has made a good start. The Truman budget for fiscal year 1953 totaled $74.3 billion. Estimates of the Eisenhower budget currently under consideration total $62.4 billion—a reduction of nearly $12 billion. Our tax income is $60 billion. Our deficits are decreasing, but we are not yet on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Most of the reduction has been in the military, and this is largely incident to the end of the Korean war.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, for whom I have great admiration, and the able Budget Director, Mr. Hughes, are working diligently and making substantial progress toward sounder budgetary procedure and the elimination of waste in expenditures.

We are still practically at the peak of expenditures for domestic-civilian programs and proposals for more are coming forth in a steady stream.

In fact, expenditures for strictly domestic-civilian programs now total $24 billion, and this is more than 3 times the total cost of these programs in 1940, when we started the World War II buildup.

Even this is not the whole story on domestic-civilian expenditures, because these figures do not reflect the liabilities of the tremendous loan insurance and guarantee programs.

Nonessentials in these programs must be eliminated and this clearly can be done, as Mr. Hoover and his two fine Commissions on Government Organization have demonstrated in nearly 500 recommendations to date—some of which have been adopted, while others still await action.

With the pressure for more and more Government which seems to characterize our times, I am convinced that such constant examination of Government as the Hoover Commission surveys has become a continuing necessity.

With budgetary disclosures and congressional control, under current circumstances and conditions, we should reject all new proposals for Federal spending innovations.

In fact, the budget for fiscal year 1956, beginning next July 1, could be reduced $5 billion by eliminating expenditures contemplated under new legislation and by eliminating increases in items under existing legislation. I would oppose all new proposals to invade the responsibilities of States, localities, and individuals and start immediately to liquidate many of the programs already in existence.

Beyond this, I would eliminate as rapidly as possible all foreign economic aid, and I would get military expenditures quickly in hand through control of unexpended balances.

So far we have spent nearly $40 billion for foreign economic assistance. And at this late date, after 10 years of post-war foreign aid, the President has proposed to increase foreign-aid expenditures in the coming year by nearly 10 percent, and he has asked Congress for new foreign-aid appropriations in amounts nearly 25 percent higher than were enacted during the past year.

We are still employing 562,158 civilians overseas. These people are employed all over the world, including 64 in Cambodia.

This foreign aid has got to stop sometime, and so far as I am concerned the time to stop so-called economic aid is past due.

No one favors a reduction of our present burdensome taxes more than I do. I sit on both sides of the table. As an individual, I pay tubstantial taxes on my business operations. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee I have the opportunity to hear testimony of those who protest exorbitant taxation.

But as anxious as I am as an individual for tax reduction, I am opposed patriotically to tax reduction which requires us to borrow and add to the public debt. It seems to me to be a certain road to financial suicide to continue to reduce taxes and then to borrow the money to make good this loss in revenue.

As things are now shaping up, there will be keen competition between the two political parties for tax reduction in the political year of 1956. If we reduce expenditures this is all well and good but, under political pressure, we should not yield to reducing taxes and still further unbalance the budget. Tax reduction should never be made a political football.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I opposed the $20-tax reduction to each individual as passed by the House of Representatives this year. This would have occasioned a loss of $2.3 billion to the Treasury, all of which would be added to the debt. It would have given a tax relief of only about 7 cents a day to each taxpayer and would have removed 5 million taxpayers completely from the tax rolls.

To borrow money to reduce taxes is not, in fact, a tax reduction. It is merely a postponement of the collection of taxes as, sooner or later, the taxes thus reduced will have to be paid with interest. There is only one sound way to reduce taxes and that is to reduce spending first.

At home we can get along without Federal usurpation of individual, local, and State responsibilities, and we can get along without Federal competition in business whether it be hotels, furs, rum, clothing, fertilizer, or other things.

The Bible says if thine eye offend they pluck it out. I say if the Federal Government should not engage in such activities, we should first stop new invasions and then gradually, if not abruptly, eliminate the old intrusions. When we do these things we shall balance the budget, for lower taxes and reduced debt. There will be no further need for trick budgets and debt-ceiling evasions and hiding taxes. The Government will be honest in itself, and honest with the people.

A balanced budget could be in sight if (a) we do not increase spending, and (b) we do not reduce taxes. Assuming no further cut in taxes, only a 4-percent reduction in spending, in terms of the President's budget, would bring us to that highly desirable goal.

Is This Age of Fear Our Destiny?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I respectfully submit an editorial by Mr. Fred Speers, editor and publisher of the Daily Times Advocate, Escondido, Calif., which appeared in that paper on April 28, 1955, under the title of "Is This Age of Fear Our Destiny?"

It is most concise and descriptive of the fears that have gripped our Nation for the past 2 decades. In reading the editorial I am sure you will agree that if we would only supplant these fears with more faith and positive thinking, no doubt there would be unharnessed a force that offers unlimited possibilities to improve our world of today.

The editorial follows:

IS THIS AGE OF FEAR OUR DESTINY?

One cannot help but wonder if we Americans may not have entered an "age of fear" which is conditioning almost every act of our lives. Maybe it started with the depression of the 1930's and efforts to minimize the haunting fears it touched off. The fear of loss of home, the fear of savings being wiped out, the fear of penniless old age, the fear of losing a job, the fear of crop failures, the ever-present fear of illness—all these and others, too, were played upon with more or less success once currency was given the amazing phrase, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." (Think that over sometime; just what does it mean, anyhow?)

Came then the outbreak of the war in Europe in September 1939. Came then a host of new developments, each with its new array of fears: fears that England would go under (and we would be left alone), individuals' fear of being drafted, fear that the United States would be dragged into war, fear of families that their sons would be sent abroad, fear of enemy bombardment and countless, nameless fears that times of great world tensions bring. Came then Pearl Harbor—and the fear on the west coast about being left defenseless. Came then the submarine warfare of 1943 in the Atlantic—and the fear on the east coast that war was coming right to the beaches.

Came then the peace—and are fear of widespread unemployment during the changeover to peacetime activities. Came then the cold war—and the fear of Russian might turning a cold war into a hot war without warning. Came then the Korean war—and fear if we fought it to victory rather than stalemate that we would goad the Russians into a full-fledged world war III. Came then the armistice in the Korean war (that's all it is, you know) and the old fear of widespread unemployment was revived and the same discredited prophets of doom went up and down the land again to play upon fears for political purposes. And in these years, too, there was born the fear that followed the breaking of the United States monopoly in atom weapons—the fear that the Russians might unleash atomic weapons. It gave way to the even greater fear that the Russians might unleash H-bombs.

And now, near Las Vegas, they're testing American-style buildings to see how they stand up under nuclear weapons' effects. The general thought, according to civil defense "releases," is that you're not in any position to feel cocky about an atomic attack

unless you've got at least 3 feet of earth between you and the blue sky.

Is this the measure of our fear? Three feet?

If this, then, be our destiny as Americans, we might just as well make it 6 feet of earth and let it go at that. Have we, the descendants of pioneers who braved Indian arrows, scalping knives, and tomahawks, frightened ourselves into this "age of fear"? Let us pray that this spell will pass.

High Level Garrison Reservoir Gains Widespread Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the widespread support for a 1,850-foot operating level for Garrison Dam Reservoir in North Dakota.

The dam is built, the project is more than 80 percent complete. But because of the opposition of a few people in a limited area the final stages are being held up. These people feel that their fears and their personal wishes are superior to the authority that Congress gave the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Engineers when the dam was designed and built.

This objection has not been important until now when the reservoir is filling; when the first power will come off the generators. The upstream land must be acquired; the protective works must be built. Orderly progress calls for this work in fiscal 1956.

Congress has been asked by the majority of the people of the State not to further restrict this construction. The rural electric cooperatives—all of them in the State, have sent resolutions protesting this curtailment of hydropower; the Upper Midwest Power Forum, with 400 co-ops represented are against any curtailment of the reservoir capacity. The president of the Mississippi Valley Association, Wilbur Jones, of Omaha, says:

> Congressional approval of this restriction would be a clear-cut example of the welfare of millions being sacrificed to the desires of a few.

The county commissioners of all counties east of the Missouri River by resolution are in favor of the full operating capacity of the dam. Likewise 43 cities in the State; the State legislature; the Farmers Union; 43 civic organizations and groups have publicly declared their support of the high operating level.

Other States along the river have an interest in the increased hydropower, the flood control, and irrigation benefits that a high pool level will mean.

Following are the organizations; counties, and city governmental groups that have sent resolutions to me:

REA Co-op Resolutions Favoring 1,850-Foot Level on Garrison Pool

1. North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, Bismarck, N. Dak.
2. Capital Electric Cooperative, Inc., Bismarck, N. Dak.
3. Central Power Electric Cooperative, Inc., Minot (representing eight co-ops).
4. Kem Electric Cooperative, Inc., Linton.
5. Nodak Rural Electric Cooperative, Grand Forks.
6. Slope Electric Cooperative, Inc., New England.
7. South Dakota Rural Electric Association, Leola, S. Dak.
8. Minnkota Power Cooperative, Grand Forks (representing 10 co-ops).

List of Civic and Other Organizations Supporting 1,850-Foot Level for Garrison Dam

1. Anamoose Civic Club, Anamoose.
2. Bismarck Chamber of Commerce, Bismarck.
3. Cando Commercial Club, Cando.
4. Carrington Kiwanis Club, Carrington.
5. Cooperstown Commercial Club, Cooperstown.
6. Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce, Devils Lake.
7. Drake Commercial Club, Drake.
8. Drake Volunteer Fire Dept., Drake.
9. Esmond Commercial Club, Esmond.
10. VFW Post, No. 4251—Benson Co., Esmond.
11. Fargo Chamber of Commerce, Fargo.
12. Greater North Dakota Association, Fargo.
13. Fessenden Civic & Commerce Association, Fessenden.
14. South Cottonwood Farmers Union Local No. 48, Fessenden (53 members).
15. Wells County Livestock Association, Fessenden.
16. Grafton Chamber of Commerce, Grafton.
17. Grand Forks Chamber of Commerce, Grand Forks.
18. Minnesota Dairy Company, Grand Forks.
19. Civic & Commerce Association, Harvey.
20. Harvey Co-op Creamery Association, Harvey.
21. Harvey Kiwanis Club, Harvey.
22. Harvey Volunteer Fire Dept., Harvey.
23. Hillsboro Civic & Commerce Association, Hillsboro.
24. Jamestown Chamber of Commerce, Jamestown.
25. Leeds Civic Club, Leeds.
26. McVille Commercial Club, McVille.
27. Wells County Farmers Union, Maddock.
28. Mayville Civic Club, Mayville.
29. Minnewaukan Commercial Club, Minnewaukan.
30. Minot Chamber of Commerce, Minot.
31. Central Irrigation Development Committee, New Rockford.
32. New Rockford Civic Association, New Rockford.
33. Northwood Commercial Club, Northwood.
34. Sheyenne Commercial Club, Sheyenne.
35. Turtle Lake Commercial Club, Turtle Lake.
36. Upham Commercial Club, Upham.
37. Valley City Chamber of Commerce, Valley City.
38. Velva Sportsmen's Club, Velva.
39. Sheyenne Valley Rod and Gun Club, Warwick.
40. North Dakota Farm Bureau, Fargo.
41. James River Valley Development Association, Huron, S. Dak.
42. North Dakota State Legislature, Bismarck.
43. North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, State Capitol Building, Bismarck.

List of North Dakota Counties Who Have Submitted Resolutions Favoring 1,850-Foot Pool Level

1. Adams (population 4,910).
2. Barnes (population 16,884).
3. Benson (population 10,675).
4. Bottineau (population 12,140).
5. Burleigh (population 25,673).
6. Cass (population 58,877).
7. Dickey (population 9,121).
8. Eddy (population 5,372).
9. Emmons (population 9,715).
10. Grand Forks (population 39,443).
11. LaMoure (population 9,498).
12. Mountrail (population 9,418).
13. Nelson.
14. Pierce (population 8,326).
15. Ramsey (population 14,373).
16. Ransom (population 14,373).
17. Renville (population 5,405).
18. Richland (population 19,865).
19. Sargent (population 7,616).
20. Sheridan.
21. Slope (population 2,315).
22. Stutsman.
23. Steele (population 5,145).
24. Traill (population 11,359).
25. Towner (population 6,360).
26. Ward (population 34,782).
27. Wells (population 10,417).

Cities Supporting the 1,850-Foot Level of the Garrison Dam, N. Dak.

1. Anamoose, N. Dak.
2. Bismarck, N. Dak.
3. Bottineau, N. Dak.
4. Carrington, N. Dak.
5. Casselton, N. Dak.
6. Cavalier, N. Dak.
7. Cooperstown, N. Dak.
8. Devils Lake, N. Dak.
9. Drake, N. Dak.
10. Drayton, N. Dak.
11. Edgeley, N. Dak.
12. Esmond, N. Dak.
13. Fargo, N. Dak.
14. Grand Forks, N. Dak.
15. Harvey, N. Dak.
16. Hazen, N. Dak.
17. Hillsboro, N. Dak.
18. Jamestown, N. Dak.
19. Kramer, N. Dak.
20. Lakota, N. Dak.
21. LaMoure, N. Dak.
22. Larimore, N. Dak.
23. Lidgerwood, N. Dak.
24. Lisbon, N. Dak.
25. McClusky, N. Dak.
26. Maddock, N. Dak.
27. Mandan, N. Dak.
28. Mayville, N. Dak.
29. Minnewaukan, N. Dak.
30. Minot, N. Dak.
31. New Rockford, N. Dak.
32. Northwood, N. Dak.
33. Oakes, N. Dak.
34. Park River, N. Dak.
35. Pembina, N. Dak.
36. Richardton, N. Dak.
37. Rugby, N. Dak.
38. Streeter, N. Dak.
39. Towner, N. Dak.
40. Turtle Lake, N. Dak.
41. Underwood, N. Dak.
42. Valley City, N. Dak.
43. Wahpeton, N. Dak.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in reaching my decision to support H. R. 12, I have given serious consideration to all aspects of the farm problem. I do not claim that the passage of this legislation will result in solving the difficult

problem of overproduction of food, nor that it will result in higher prices for farm products. My criticism of the present policies of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson are based upon information compiled by his own Department of Agriculture as they affect our farm families today in the State of Delaware.

It appears that the Republican administration is leading the Delaware farmer down the road to lower income even faster than the farmers of the country as a whole.

For 20 years we heard from the Republican Party stories of how the Democrats were destroying the economy of the country and how they were particularly bringing "socialistic" ruin to the farmers. Yet under the years of Democratic administration cash income of the American farmer rose to heights that never before had been reached. There was a real increase in the farmer's purchasing power that made him a prosperous consumer for the production of our factories.

I am severely disturbed by the latest figures on the cash income of farmers in the State of Delaware released by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. It seems to me that farm income is dropping in my State and in the Nation as a whole at a rate that gives genuine cause for alarm.

Secretary Benson reports that in the first 2 months of 1955 cash income of Delaware farmers had further declined $2,226,000—a quarter of a million dollars a week. If this disastrous decline in Delaware farm income is not halted, it will mean a cash loss of a million dollars a month, or $12 million for the calendar year ending January 1, 1956.

Figures recently released by the Department of Agriculture show that in 1954 Delaware farm income fell from $103,411,000 in 1953 to $93,708,000—a loss of $9,703,000. These figures indicate that a continuation of the present policies of the Republican Administration will cost Delaware farmers $21 million by January 1, 1956, representing the last two calendar years.

Secretary Benson's farm income report shows that farm income as a whole throughout our Nation was $4,452,000,000 the first 2 months of this year, a drop of $251 million from the same 2-month period of last year. That is a quarter of a billion dollars out of the pockets of America's farmers in just 2 months. There has been no corresponding reduction in their costs of operation in this period. The Department itself admits that most of this drop has had to come out of the farmers' earnings.

But in 1953 when the so-called friends of the farmers were in power, the "friends" who had been telling them how bad the alleged policies of the Democratic Party were, the farmers' income immediately began to decline. It dropped to $31,413,000,000. Last year's farm receipts were down to $29,954,000,000. This year, according to the early indications, the drop will be even further.

It is interesting to note that the Department of Agriculture this week issued a report called The Agricultural Outlook Digest.

I quote from this report:

> With prices a little lower, and marketings nearly as large, cash receipts from farm marketings are expected to be lower in 1954. The net income realized by farm operators will be down in 1955, perhaps by as much as 5 percent.

Why should this be if the economy is prosperous, if income in the country as a whole will be about the level of last year? Why should the farmer's income be cut still further than it already has?

Secretary Benson's Department supplies the answer. I quote from the Outlook Digest:

> Consumer income after taxes so far this year has been running about 3 percent above the same period of 1954. About one-fourth continues to be spent for food. But a little less of the consumer's food dollar is going to the farmer—42 cents in the first quarter compared with 45 cents a year earlier.

And, they might have added, compared with a high of 56 cents that was reached under Democratic administration.

So there is your answer as to why the farmer is going to take another 5 percent cut in his income this year—under the most optimistic circumstances—and as to why the farmers in Delaware may take a cut much deeper than that. The farmer is getting only 42 cents out of the consumer's food dollar. The middleman is getting 58 cents. A year ago it was a 45–55 split. The farmer gets only 42 cents for all the work of planting the crop, raising it, harvesting it, and hauling it to market. The middleman, who takes his crops at that point and puts them on the consumer's table, gets 58 cents out of the dollar.

To make these statistics specific let me cite just one more recent report by Secretary Benson. In his annual report on the production of chickens and eggs, he informs us that Delaware broilermen raised 69,620,000 birds last year, an increase of more than 1 million over the previous year. Weight of these birds was 216 million pounds, a gain of 4 million pounds. But the income received from sale of these birds was $48,816,000 compared with $55,803,000 in 1953.

One million more birds, 4 million more pounds of succulent Delaware broiler meat, and $7 million less income. Most of that drop had to come out of Delaware broilermen's net income. Their costs of production were down a little, but not that much.

So there is the picture in Delaware as in the country as a whole, farm income dropping further every month from an already discouraging level that has been reached under the Republican administration. Farmers will have at least 5 percent less income this year than last. Other people's incomes will be up 3 percent, if we may believe the administration's forecast. The farmer's share is a little less than it was, just 42 cents out of the consumer's food dollar. We see no signs of distress on the part of Secretary Benson or his associates about this situation. They raise no cry of alarm.

A bulletin compiled by the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, dated March 26, 1955, states that—

> Farm prices have declined 7 percent from 1949 to 1954, and in this same period retail food prices have increased 13 percent.

This unprecedented change in producer-consumer prices has taken place under what was promised as an administration pledge to 100 percent parity for the farmers and more food at cheaper prices for the housewife. What a farce these promises have turned out to be. An expensive lesson for the farmers and housewives but perhaps it will be one well learned.

The present policies of the Republican administration with respect to farm prices must be changed by act of Congress. I shall vote for a return to the policies which under 20 years of Democratic administration brought the greatest era of prosperity to not only the American farmer, but to all segments of our economy—farmer, industrialist, businessman and laborer—thus resulting in the greatest consumer buying power the world has ever known. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my vote for 90 percent of parity and in so doing exercise my responsibility to safeguard the economic well-being of my constituents.

The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the following essay by Gene Swartz, of Richwood, Ohio, which recently won the American Legion of Ohio statewide essay contest:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Gene Swartz, Richwood, Ohio)

Church bells ringing, people hurrying, organ music softy playing; this the beginning of a typical Sunday morning in the lives of many Americans. Now, more than ever before, the church is playing a greater part in the lives of more and more people.

What is behind this increasing interest in spiritual activities? Why have so many people in our county become so involved in weekly religious worship?

Perhaps the answer can best be found by looking back into the history of our own country's origin. American was founded and first settled by a group of pilgrims from Europe seeking freedom to worship as they believed. As more and more refugees from the Old World arrived, new churches and religious groups were started along our eastern coast.

When the leaders and officials of our Nation met to construct a Constitution after the Revolutionary War, religious freedom was established as a permanent fact in our Government. Now freedom of religion is found in democracies all over the world.

As our country grew, ministers and missionaries spread rapidly across the face of our land. Now these original churches have grown into what is now one of the greatest systems of organized religious instruction known.

Our Government mirrors the effect of religion in national politics. Each session of the United States Congress is opened with prayer, and President Eisenhower and many

other Government leaders are faithful church members.

Even our type of warfare reflects the spiritual influence in America. Our armies are not trained to kill mercilessly, and by fighting only to preserve peace, we are not disloyal to the commandment "Thou shalt not kill."

Perhaps one of the most noted advances in spiritual guidance is the instruction of religious education in some of our public schools. This is done on a voluntary basis, compelling no one to enroll. By training and educating the youthful minds of the future citizens of our country, we are establishing the trend toward a more religion-conscious world.

The potentiality of religion in the world in the future years is unlimited. New, bigger, and better churches are being constructed continuously. The Word of God and Bible teachings are reaching more people today than ever before through the facilities of radio and television, evangelism, and home missions. If religion in our land continues to grow as it has in the past, the effect of this spiritual growth wil someday overshadow communism and many of the other evils which now exist uncurbed.

Misgivings of the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at least one thing can be consistently said of the Washington Post, now named the Washington Post and Times Herald; it is consistent and unceasing in its efforts to avoid supporting any thought or program which those who wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or the Bill of Rights would have logically thought helpful toward either the establishment or the continuance of the independence, the Republic, and the opportunities which they gave us. Unceasingly, at least since it has been my misfortune to see and read it, the Washington Post has advocated policies which are more suitable to bring about the advance of other nations than that of the United States of America.

Almost without exception, in the slant of its news stories and the trend of its editorials, it has been against practically everything which those living in the Midwest at least have deemed vital and necessary toward the preservation of our constitutional form of government, the prosperity, the happiness and contentment of our people.

Over the same period, it has vigorously and without regard for the truth, at practically every conceivable opportunity attacked and opposed those in public office who have expressed themselves in opposition to the surrender of our sovereignty and independence of our Government.

The Post seldom, if ever, while speaking out against what it construes to be a denial of civil rights, while appearing to combat prejudice and hatred, has condemned lawlessness, violence, or reprehensible conduct on the part of politically powerful groups which support its own—the Post's—pet ideas.

Those who direct the policy of the Washington Post, whatever may be the individual personal beliefs or policies, seem to be more deeply concerned with the welfare of people in other lands, with the well-being and the security of other nations than they are with the people of the United States of America or of the Republic itself.

Typical of the methods of the Communist Party and of its socialistic doctrine is an editorial in this morning's Post, captioned "Curious Choice," and which reads as follows:

CURIOUS CHOICE

John B. Hollister, of Cincinnati, whom President Eisenhower has designated head of the new International Cooperation Administration to be set up in the State Department, is an able lawyer and administrator who has been executive director of the Hoover Commission. In his new capacity, if he is confirmed by the Senate, he will be in charge of all foreign-aid operations, including the technical assistance programs. The post demands unusual energy and special organizational gifts, both of which Mr. Hollister has. But it may be asked whether he wholeheartedly believes in the program he is picked to administer and whether he will bring to it the zeal which is required if the Asian part of it is to strike fire. If rumors concerning a preliminary Hoover Commission report on foreign aid can be relied on, Mr. Hollister's chief interest would seem to be to liquidate it as soon as possible.

Mr. Hollister is a former law partner of Senator Taft and a member of the Taft wing of the Republican Party. His choice for this significant post may have been influenced in part by a desire to keep the Taft wing of the party under the Eisenhower banner. If such is the case, it may prove to be as unfortunate as the appointment of Clarence B. Manion, former Chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, whose resignation the White House requested when he criticized many Eisenhower programs. Mr. Hollister would make an excellent director of the General Services Administration or some other agency chiefly concerned with economy and efficiency. But the foreign-aid chief should be concerned with social and economic development programs as well as with economy and efficiency. He must be interested in bold experiments designed to raise living standards in the underdeveloped countries. These require the Government to take risks with its money in the interest of long-term and sometimes intangible returns.

We hope that our misgivings about Mr. Hollister, who is a man of ability, experience and patriotism, are ill-founded. But the Senate ought to satisfy itself on these questions before it approves him for a task that is of such importance in our foreign relations. The vigorous continuance of some form of foreign aid to the underdeveloped areas is an investment in world stability of vital concern to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, being compelled to admit that Mr. Hollister is a qualified, energetic, industrious, sound-thinking American, it views his appointment as head of the International Cooperation Administration with misgivings.

Apparently the appointment of any loyal American with sound business experience and undeviating devotion to the principles enunciated in the Constitution to any job carrying either the authority to determine policy or direct the expenditure of tax dollars is abhorrent to the Post.

Tiger and the Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Dallas Morning News of Sunday, April 3, 1955:

TIGER AND THE VETERANS

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

Representative OLIN E. (TIGER) TEAGUE doesn't like to see veterans shoved around. But neither will he stand for the men and women who fought the Nation's battles taking advantage of Uncle Sam.

Because of his interest in fair play, the Texas Congressman has been charged by some veterans' organizations with being "anti-veteran."

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Right now TEAGUE is up in arms against a proposal of a Hoover Commission task force to close 19 veterans hospitals, including 3 in Texas—at Bonham, Amarillo, and Marlin.

TEAGUE pointed out that most of these hospitals are practically new. He also said that it would the loss of 175 beds for mental patients at a time when the need for psychiatric care is growing. He protested against the long distances many veterans would have to travel to obtain treatment if the closing program were carried out.

"There is some obligation to provide an opportunity for medical care to all veterans of the Nation, regardless of their location," TEAGUE asserted.

TEAGUE also objected to a Hoover Commission task force recommendation to halt construction of any more veterans hospitals. He said it would prevent replacement of 16 hospitals scheduled for long-range replacement. They include temporary structures, converted hotels and other hastily arranged installations.

He feared the proposal also would prevent major renovation projects covering some 55 hospitals.

TEAGUE's fight on the hospital issue already has brought some success. The House Appropriations Committee raised an administration request of $13,815,000 for modernization to $30 million.

Its action showed Congress is not going to close hospitals, but rather is ready to spend large sums fixing up the existing ones. The Appropriations Committee members knew the position of TEAGUE and his Veterans' Affairs Committee when they acted.

Ever since TEAGUE came to Congress and was assigned to the veterans affairs group he has fought against the exorbitant demands of some veterans groups who have been encouraged by politicians seeking votes.

He had many tussles with former Representative John E. Rankin, Democrat, of Mississippi, while Rankin was committee chairman, and later with Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican of Massachusetts, when she became chairman under the Republicans.

Veterans' bonus bills kept popping up, and TEAGUE, aided by House Democratic leaders, did his best to stop them in committee. One did get through and failed of passage by only one vote on the House floor.

TEAGUE takes the stand that the veterans are not a select group but are responsible citizens. He feels they must consider the cost to their Government of any special consideration they receive and keep their demands within reasonable limits.

The Texan has always been ready to go the limit to take care of the men and women disabled through military service. He's just as determined to bar the chiselers from dipping into the Treasury.

TEAGUE doesn't favor drawing too strict a line between service-connected and non-service-connected cases when it comes to the veteran receiving hospitalization.

"There is no way to establish a direct relationship between service and disease where no actual disease was incurred in service," said TEAGUE. "But where the veteran rendered strenuous service under extremely adverse weather conditions, lost weight, and deteriorated generally in physical condition, it is reasonable to assume his service contributed to later illnesses."

On the average day in 1954 65,000 out of a total of 109,000 occupied beds in veterans hospitals were used by non-service-connected cases.

TEAGUE'S answer to that is that a substantial part of the 65,000 patients are hospitalized for mental disabilities, tuberculosis, and other serious chronic diseases, such as cancer, polio, paralysis, and heart disease. He's particularly concerned over failure of the Government to keep up with the need for care for mental cases.

No Member of Congress has a more distinguished war record than TEAGUE. He took part in the Battle of the Bulge, had part of his foot shot off, and left the service with the rank of colonel.

He has been awarded the Silver Star three times for bravery in action. He can wear six Purple Hearts, but claims only three. He also has the French Croix de Guerre with palm.

His disability doesn't prevent him from being extremely active not only in carrying on his duties as Congressman but in athletics. He's the unofficial paddle ball champion of the House. He plays every year in the Democrat-Republican baseball game and gets around far better than his unhandicapped colleagues.

This Texas Congressman's first love is Texas A. & M. He's a graduate of that school and his Texas address is College Station.

Congressman TEAGUE will be 45 this month. He was elected in 1946 to succeed Luther Johnson, who resigned to go on the tax court.

He's had the nickname of Tiger since high-school days. Says he doesn't know how or why he picked it up.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1955, the people of Poland, long oppressed by the Nazis and now enslaved by the Communists, cry out for freedom. Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday is a symbol and rallying point of her people. A day that signifies an unrelenting search for independence—an independence lost when the Russian Army under the pretext of freeing Poland in reality destroyed her independence.

The Polish people oppose the Communists at every turn and in every way they can. Such opposition is certainly to be encouraged and the people supported in their efforts to be free. The Poles cannot, of course, object in an organized way on a national level, but they can be given the comfort and assistance of the free world. The Polish-Americans of our great country are their greatest source of encouragement and by their example may do much eventually to assist them in their quest for liberation.

The need for a free and independent Poland was recognized by former President Woodrow Wilson when he made it one of his famous 14 points announced in January 1917. Our present Government recognizes this goal and should do everything it can to attain it. The warm friendship of the Polish people for Americans is evident and this mutual admiration is the strongest link in the chain of freedom that will some day replace the yoke of communism.

Upon the occasion of the celebration of this important day in the lives of the Polish people, I wish to add my congratulations and my sincere desire to assist in achieving their complete independence.

Senate Haste Makes Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Friday, April 22, 1955, entitled "Senate Haste Makes Waste":

SENATE HASTE MAKES WASTE

Approval by a 58–23 vote in the United States Senate of an upper Colorado River project initially calling for an appropriation of $1.6 billion and threatening the country's taxpayers eventually with a cost of $4 billion was obtained by logrolling methods and in such haste as to prevent serious consideration of its merits and demerits.

MORE TIME IN HOUSE

Fortunately consideration by the House of Representatives not only will allow more time in which to receive competent testimony on the project but will afford opportunity for opponents of the wasteful adventure to alert the country to its dangers.

In view of known engineering doubts concerning certain aspects of the project, including the unlikelihood of a safe foundation for a proposed dam in Echo Park in the Dinosaur National Monument, the inclusion of this questionable feature of the project was an affront both to conservationists who oppose it as a needless destruction of natural beauty and to those who object to it on sound engineering and economic grounds.

MEASURE OPPOSED

The haste with which the bill was rushed through the Senate undoubtedly is explained by the project backers' determination to get it as far along as possible before a pending report on the entire undertaking by the Hoover Commission can be completed and submitted to Congress.

The Commission's tentative findings are understood to be strongly unfavorable to the reclamation program as set forth in the Senate-approved measure. Inasmuch as the Hoover group is an official instrument of Congress duly authorized to study the problem and submit recommendations, only a successful stampede of the House membership can prevent consideration of the experts' conclusions before the House acts.

Both of California's Senators opposed the measure, viewing it in its present scope as a definite menace to California's rights in the waters of the Colorado, and also presenting their objections to its costly and wasteful potentials.

Senator KUCHEL gave a particularly sound and detailed analysis of the measure in his discussion of its numerous ambiguities and inconsistencies. He made plain that his attitude was not based on any selfish California standpoint but arose solely from opposition to what he considered an unworkable and indefensible experiment.

Senator KNOWLAND took direct cognizance of the propaganda line by some upper-basin spokesmen in which they would have it appear that California is against any development of the Colorado River which does not represent specific benefits for this State.

"It is a gross libel or slander," said KNOWLAND, "to say that the people of California want what does not belong to them." He stressed California's desire to receive only a share of the river's water guaranteed under the Colorado compact.

FANTASTIC COSTS

A more deliberate assessment of the overall objectionable features of the project will bring into focus, among other factors, that a general endorsement given by President Eisenhower to upper basin development does not apply to the measure hurried through the Senate.

Further enlightenment—denied in the Senate—on the ultimate cost of the project also will be possible, including the fantastic fact that the cost of providing water to irrigate acreage not required for productive use in the foreseeable future will be more than 10 times the cost of the land.

It may be unfortunate that California's vital interest in sound development of the Colorado River and in equitable distribution of its waters may give rise to some doubts as to the State's disinterested motives in this instance, but valid objections to the project under discussion are so closely attached to questions of national welfare as to make unnecessary any approach from a purely local viewpoint.

Furthermore, regardless of legislation which Congress may immediately enact, the basic water rights of the upper and lower basin States are now in process of determination by the United States Supreme Court.

Until the court acts, the pro and con arguments of all concerned are largely in the category of preliminary discussion.

The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio is the annual sponsor of an essay project throughout Ohio on vital subjects. The title in 1955 is "The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today." One of the 12 winners is Jane Cash, a senior of Cambridge High School, in Cambridge, Ohio. I recommend her fine essay as a thoughtful, studious treatment of a most important subject:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Jane Cash, Cambridge, Ohio.)

I am spiritual guidance.

My influence has been felt ever since the world began, when God said "Let there be light."

My influence was felt—

When Moses was led by God to the top of Mount Sinai there to receive the commandments which his people were to follow.

When One Great Man gave His disciples the Sermon on the Mount as a pattern of living and commanded, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations."

When such great men as Martin Luther, John Wesley, and John Calvin dared to defy the established church of their day to worship God in the way their conscience guided them.

When our courageous forefathers crossed the stormy Atlantic to found this great Nation of America upon religious freedom and based our Constitution upon religious principles.

When a ragged group of soldiers knelt together in the bitter cold at Valley Forge to fight for the independence of their new country.

When such men as David Livingstone and Albert Sweitzer and countless other missionaries gave up lives of ease and security to help the people of distant lands.

When a Japanese Christian name Kagawa went to live with the poorest of his people in the slums, giving them all that he had and all he could earn and exposed himself to infectious diseases until he nearly lost his life.

When 4 Army chaplains, a Jewish rabbi, a Catholic priest, and 2 Protestant ministers went down with the ship *Dorchester* giving up their place on the life boats that others might be saved.

When our marines landed on a south sea isle during World War II they expected to find cannibals, instead they found a welcome from the natives whose ancestors had been Christianized by missionaries many years before.

When people are concerned for the care of orphans, the aged, and the destitute of this and other countries and give help through such agencies as Red Cross, CARE, and CROP.

When churches are built to meet man's spiritual needs, hospitals are built to care for his physical needs and schools and colleges are built to meet his mental needs.

When the great leaders of our country forget their differences and pray together for guidance.

When the various religious faiths combine their efforts and work together for the good of all humanity in the great number of character-building organizations established for this very purpose.

I am spiritual guidance.

Although my light has at time grown dim, throughout the ages, I have continued to burn in the hearts of those who follow the One who declared, "I am the light of the world." As long as men seek this light, I will live and grow and burn more brightly than before.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 164th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution, and on this occasion I want to pay a justly deserved tribute to the great people of Poland. It is most fitting that we, here in the United States House of Representatives, pause for a moment to contemplate the plight of the brave men and women of Poland now held prisoners behind communism's curtain of repression and brutality.

The constitution adopted 164 years ago demonstrated the faith in democracy and the basic freedoms which characterizes the people of Poland. Their faith has never wavered, despite the continuing ordeals they have undergone throughout the years.

Tragedy begets tragedy. The significance of this statement is readily seen when one recalls the suppression, the dismemberment and the partition of Poland throughout the centuries. In their long history, the people of Poland have had little opportunity to enjoy their inalienable right of freedom. Yet, their devotion to that cause remains paramount.

Today, from behind the iron curtain, we hear reports of heroic action on the part of these people who refuse to bend to the oppressors' demands, and who refuse to accept slavery as a normal state of mankind. The process of freedom is very slow, and although today we do not hear of any violent revolutions, there are definite actions on the part of the people and the Government of this country which are small tokens of assurance to the Polish people, and people of other nations, that are now being denied their God-given right of freedom. These tributes today, I sincerely hope will reach the hungry ears of all freedom loving people everywhere, for it is often said that the fires of freedom burn hottest among the oppressed. Lip service is not enough, however. We, who enjoy full freedom should redouble our efforts to restore Poland to its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Acts of impunity and incidents of disdain are everincreasing. These incidents will grow and multiply until the Polish people will once again shake themselves loose of these parasitic aggressors and regain their rights and the fredom to which all God-fearing people are entitled. Such incidents will become more frequent until atheistic communism is a thing of the past, and once again the Polish people are free to worship their own God—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

It is not within the order of things that wrong shall triumph over that which is right. The day of freedom for that brave country will soon be at hand. The day that every Pole has visualized since the proclamation of their now dormant constitution will return.

Mr. Speaker, in this world beset with atomic hypertension, and with the imminent threat of global warfare let us take heart as we look to the courageousness of our Polish brethren. Let us redouble our efforts for peace in the world and the restoration of liberty and self-government to Poland and other freedom loving nations now under Communist rule.

The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including two essays on the subject the Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today, one written by Miss Jaqueline Scheorer, of Mansfield, Ohio; and one written by Miss Nancy Jones, of Newark, Ohio. These two young people of my district are the winners of an essay contest given by the American Legion and the Ladies Auxiliary of Ohio. There were approximately 80,000 essays written and 12 winners, including the Misses Scheorer and Jones of my district. I want to congratulate the Legion and the Auxiliary for putting this program into effect and I am indeed very proud of Jaqueline Scheorer and Nancy Jones. I recommend the reading of these essays to all my colleagues:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Nancy Jones, of Newark, Ohio)

The effect of spiritual guidance in the world today is felt in many fields; in education, medicine, science, literature, art, music, and government. To understand this far-reaching and powerful influence, we first must know what spiritual guidance is, where it began, and how it grew.

Spiritual guidance is that leadership which is based on the religious beliefs of an individual or of a nation. It started with the teachings of Jesus Christ, who founded Christianity. This faith was nurtured by several employers of Europe, spread by the crusades, and strengthened by the rebellion of the masses under Martin Luther. It led to movements of people from one country to another. The Pilgrims and Puritans came to America in search of religious freedom.

Missionaries also went from one country to another helping the native people in many different ways. One result of the guidance of these missionaries is the development of education. Schools and colleges were founded by churches and today's splendid educational opportunities are the result.

These missionaries were also interested in health problems, and through their efforts, hospitals were built. Scientific research made great progress under the influence of Christian leaders such as Dr. Walter Reed, who risked his life for humanitarian purposes. Many others made similar sacrifices. Today science works toward the same goal. Doctors and scientists are still led by spiritual motives to improve conditions.

The cultural influence of spiritual guidance became evident in such religious paintings as The Last Supper, by da Vinci, and The Madonna, by Raphael. These masterpieces today exert a strong spiritual influence toward all who see them.

Agriculture, too, showed religious influence. The greatest Christian church in the world, St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome, stands on what is said to be the site of St. Peter's tomb. This cathedral today draws Christian worshipers from the entire world and exerts a great feeling of nearness to God upon everyone.

Christian beliefs led to magnificent oratorios. Handel's Messiah concerns the

prophecies and coming of Jesus. It is said that Handel set the Bible to music. Mendelssohn's Elijah is also great religious music. We can safely say that this kind of music always guides us to do and be our best.

Literature always has reflected spiritual guidance. The Bible still is our most beloved book and best seller. It is being translated into every language and every day is becoming a greater guide to life.

The most far-reaching effect of spiritual guidance is felt in the political word today. Various doctrines, facism, nazism, and communism, have sought to rule the world. These doctrines are completely contrary to Christian ideas, and therefore Christians are trying to destroy these isms. Among those who are making their influence felt are Winston Churchill, of England; Madame Pandit, of India; Chiang Kai-shek, of China; and President Dwight Eisenhower, of the United States. One of the most important factors of religious influence in government today is the United Nations. It is here that the doctrines of Christianity are upheld for all peoples to see and follow.

The final goal of this guidance is peace among the peoples of the world. Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who recently accepted the Nobel Prize for Peace asserted, "Neither the League of Nations nor the United Nations has brought us to a state of peace. The spirit alone has the power to bring peace." In other words, world peace will come when we accept the spiritual guidance of One who said, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By Jaqueline Scheorer, of Mansfield, Ohio)

Spiritual guidance. What does it mean? First, you must understand its meaning to become acquainted with its effect on the world. Spiritual guidance is the power of God and religious training in our lives. If all the world had complete faith in spiritual guidance, what a wonderful world this would be.

Have you ever watched a carpenter build a house? A house has so many small things in it that are very important. Without these things the house would deteriorate and fall. The carpenter or the builder watches over the house to eliminate the mistakes that would cause later deterioration and tries to see that all the small things are in good condition. When something is missing, the house isn't going to be as sound as it should be. This principle can be applied to our situation by seeing our house with all the small parts as people and countries. This house needs cooperation, understanding, friendliness, endurance, godliness, faith in God and man, love and affection. The builder is God, who will see the missing parts and defective parts and try to correct them.

For instance, let us compare Russia to a house of faulty construction. Something is missing. Do you feel as I do that spiritual guidance in Russia is the foundation that has deteriorated? They seem to have lost all fear of God and lack faith in His power. The same things have occurred in Germany, Japan, and other countries whose leaders didn't have constant spiritual guidance. They also wanted to rule the world, not with the spirit of God, or with integrity, but with force and ungodliness. They taught their children to spy upon and even to disobey their parents, to worship a man, Hitler. Could they have had spiritual guidance?

Now, today's world is faced with the problem of communism, a proposed plan where every man will have the worth of property equal to every other man. The Bible says that all men are created equal, but that does not mean our lives are to follow the identical pattern, for some must be leaders while others must be followers. Even the followers, though, are guided by God's power. You and I can't understand for what purpose spiritual guidance has seemingly been lost by so many others. But my faith in God tells me that there is a reason. It is evident in the United States that there is less misfortune than in other countries where spiritual guidance has been forgotten. Were we born to be the leaders? Let us hope and pray that we can live the lives of leaders, teaching spiritual guidance as we are being taught.

Panama Canal Needs Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, an instructive and timely editorial on the Panama Canal was published in the March 1955 issue of National Republic, a magazine with offices in Washington, D. C.

The legislative measures mentioned in the editorial are S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Congress, introduced in the present session by Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, and Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, respectively, both of whom are recognized congressional leaders on interoceanic canals.

I include its text:

PANAMA CANAL NEEDS ATTENTION

Congress could well afford to take a little time off from politics to provide for perpetuation of the Panama Canal. The waterway needs the attention of a commission of experts to examine and report what should be done toward modernization, expansion, and permanent choice of type, whether lock or sealevel, for it is a fact, although little known, that agitation for construction of a substitute sea-level type is still active in circles which would profit greatly by the expenditure of the $3 billion to $5 billion which that type would cost.

Time and trial have demonstrated that the lock type is superior to the sea-level type, particularly at Panama where the earth is gravelly and where cuts like Culebra are subject to heavy and unexpected slides. But time also has shown that the canal needs a lake system on the Pacific side, similar to the Gatun system which serves the Atlantic side. When French engineers were studying Panama to determine the type of waterway which DeLesseps hoped to build, one of the experts, M. de Lepinay, urged that the terminals be served by lakes, which would not only take care of water supply for the locks, but also, if kept at a high level, would make it unnecessary to dig more earth from the sides and bottom of the cuts.

"Don't keep digging earth," said de Lepinay. "Keep your water level high and let more water serve you, and you will not be compelled to keep digging earth." So it was agreed by many that lakes should be provided at each end of the canal. But DeLesseps disagreed and undertook construction of a sea-level type. He failed, and some years later the lock type was adopted, with the Pacific terminal lake plan kept in suspense. This was the plan which Chief Engineer John F. Stevens had before him when it became his duty to recommend the type to be chosen. There was a strong movement, however, in favor of a sea-level type, and it became necessary for Mr. Stevens to act quickly in order to induce the President and Congress to adopt the lock type. He therefore recommended the lock type and suspended work on plans for the projected lake or lakes on the Pacific end, substituting the locks which are still operating.

The canal needs at least one additional lock of extraordinary length and width with which to transfer airplane carriers and such vessels as the Queen Elizabeth and Queen Mary, and battleships of extra width. If it is the intention of Congress to maintain the Panama Canal, now is the time to make plans to that end. Senator MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa, and Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of Texas, who have had experience in canal matters as members of House committees, have introduced identical bills calling for creation of a commission of experts to study the Panama Canal and recommended a permanent canal policy and such further work as may be needed. These measures will deserve immediate consideration by the administration and Congress.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, May 4 is a great day in the history of Rhode Island. It is independence day.

Under leave already granted me, I include as a part of my remarks an article on Rhode Island Independence Day which was written by a member of my staff. It follows:

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Edward W. Heroux)

Rhode Island, the southern gateway of New England and the land of Roger Williams, is great in name and historic achievements, in wealth, and in people.

At the session of the general assembly, 1776, an act was passed which reads in part as follows:

"Be it enacted by this general assembly, and by the authority thereof it is enacted, That for the future the stile and title of this government, in all acts and instruments, whether of a public or private nature, shall be the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations."

It was on the 4th of May 1776 that the Rhode Island Assembly proved that it was truly representative of the people, and the members of the legislature that adopted the resolution renouncing allegiance to the British King proved themselves faithful followers of Roger Williams. Like him, they were not afraid to take the initiative in leading the way to freedom by declaring the independence of Rhode Island from England 2 months before Congress took similar action.

Roger Williams was a believer in democratic government and rule by the people. He beckoned the spirit of freedom of thought in all things, religious and civil, and out of his ideas there developed a proud sovereign State. The stern puritanic spirit of New England never penetrated the State of Rhode Island. Rather, the dominating spirit is one of congeniality and resourcefulness. The beliefs and hopes of Roger Williams that "no person shall be in any way molested for any difference in matters of religion and every person may have and enjoy his own judgment and conveniences in matters of personal concernments" are still alive in our hearts.

Rhode Island still maintains the original principles of its founder, Roger Williams, in faith, in freedom of speech, in religious liberties, and in a democratic form of government.

In all the educational institutions of our country today there are evidences of the principles and rules that Roger Williams entertained and introduced to his followers.

The land of Roger Williams—where the spirit of freedom of thought in all things, religious and civil, still prevails—has developed into a proud sovereign State—Rhode Island.

This Is Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has ever visited the great State of Ohio is familiar with its beauties and advantages. We who are from that great State are of the same convictions that it is a symbol of American life as we believe it to be.

One of my constituents, and a very personal friend, known to thousands and thousands of people throughout the entire world, has written a short brief on Ohio entitled "This Is Your Country." I am referring to that great American and author Louis Bromfield, known to us as Louie.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing this brief article and I recommend its reading to all:

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY

It would seem, to judge from various magazines and publications that this is Ohio Week so far as the Nation is concerned. At least three major magazines have this month paid tributes to a State which is perhaps the most typical and symbolic of American life at its best. Holiday, the Saturday Evening Post, and National Geographic magazine have all featured Ohio during the month. Quite naturally, this attention is not displeasing to a native Ohioan who, after knowing virtually the whole of the world, still finds the State of Ohio probably the most satisfactory spot to live.

Again and again somewhere in the world I have been asked by foreigners, "Just where is Ohio?" My answer has always been the same: "It is the farthest east of the West, the farthest west of the East, the farthest north of the South, and it is the North." As the article in the Holiday magazine points out, it was never the last refuge of the migrating unfortunate. It was settled solidly by the most solid of peoples from New England, from Maryland and Virginia and from Germany. Within the past 75 years it has also had heavy migrations from Central Europe which have become rapidly assimilated, while guarding at the same time many of their best racial and national traditions to the benefit of the State itself.

Having just returned from visits to all the western European countries outside the Iron Curtain, I have been impressed as always by the standard of living and the good fortune of the American people and in particular of the Ohio people. It is quite probable that the State of Ohio is the richest area of its size anywhere in the world. Not only is it a rich agricultural State, but between Pittsburgh and Detroit (which means largely northern Ohio) is the largest productive industrial area in the world. Industry in Ohio is not segregated; it exists side by side with agriculture. There are no impossible, unwieldly, half-bankrupt great cities from which it is impossible to escape short of a 2-hour journey by train or car. Within the borders of Ohio, with rich productive fields extending right up to the city limits, lie such great industrial communities as Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, Akron, Youngstown, Dayton, Toledo, and dozens of slightly smaller communities, equally industrialized and rich, such as Warren, Canton, Massillon, Mansfield, and Springfield. The city of Mansfield has the highest average family income of any town or city in the world.

None of the workers in these cities is imprisoned by the size of the city and nearly half of them have houses and small holdings in the open countryside or in friendly suburbs. Available to all of them are some of the finest lakes, streams, forests, parks, and general recreational areas in the world. Most important is the now world-famous Muskingum Conservancy District which provides recreation in the form of fishing, hunting, bathing, boating, camping, and summer cabins for a population which is never much more than an hour at the most from one of its areas. The conservancy also is a model of conservation watershed development and flood control in all its forms. And perhaps the most interesting feature of its development and functioning is that it is a public corporation which is under neither Federal nor State control and costs the taxpayer nothing. At the same time it pays taxes on every acre of its widespread holdings and is wholly self-sufficient and self-supporting.

The most recent development affecting the future of Ohio is, of course, the development of the St. Lawrence Waterway which will make possible the entrance of ocean-going ships of every kind from every part of the world to the Great Lakes and especially to Lake Erie which borders Ohio on the North. It is certain to increase enormously the industrial and commercial potential of all Ohio and to make even the smaller ore and fishing ports seaports of considerable importance.

Ohio is indeed a fortunate area for it is at the same time, and particularly at this time of year, one of the most beautiful areas on earth, as beautiful as the loveliest parts of England, France or Austria.

Behind all this, of course, lie other factors, both political and economic, of great significance to our national life. Chief among these is the fact that the centers of population, industry and general influence no longer lie in the East and Northeast but have been moving rapidly westward for a long time. Beyond Ohio, of course, lies the great and growing importance of rich California and of the magnificent Pacific Northwest. And this drift toward the West affects more and more the whole of our national and foreign policy. But if there is one thing Americans should never forget, it is their good fortune to live in a country so enormous, so rich, so developed that the standards of living and general welfare resembles that of no other country in the world with the possible exception of Canada. Too many of us take this great country for granted.

U. N. Cites Egypt for 30 Border Violations in 7 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following calendar which appeared in the March 1955 issue of Background is deserving of our attention:

United Nations cites Egypt for 30 border violations in 7 months

Date of incident	Incident	Decision
	1954	
Sept. 5, 1954	Murder of Israeli tractor driver, Ruhama	Sept. 13, 1954.—Flagrant violation of armistice agreement by Egypt.
Sept. 13, 1954	Bedouin camp attacked at Beer Malka	Nov. 16, 1954.—Egypt condemned.
Sept. 14, 1954	Bedouin camp attacked near Beersheba	Do.
Sept. 7, 1954	Blowing up of pipeline near Niram	Sept. 13, 1954.—Egypt condemned.
Sept. 20, 1954	Wounding of Israeli tractorist in fields of Givati; blowing up of home by armed infiltrators in Hatzav.	Egypt condemned.
Sept. 22, 1954	Egyptian attack southwest of Nirim	Nov. 16, 1954.—Egypt condemned.
Do	Attack on Abasan	Do.
Sept. 28, 1954	Egyptian soldiers attack an Israel patrol	Dec. 12, 1954.—Egypt condemned.
Sept. 5, 1954	Various infiltrations	Dec. 14, 1954.—Egypt condemned 5 times.
Aug. 13-15, 1954	Infiltration of Arabs from Gaza	Oct. 6, 1954.—Egypt condemned twice.
2 incidents in August	Infiltration into demilitarized zone	Nov. 10, 1954.—Egypt condemned twice.
Sept. 25, 1954	2 Israelis killed and 2 wounded at Beit Shikma	Egypt condemned.
Oct. 25, 1954	Pipeline blown up at Mefalsim	Oct. 28, 1954.—Egypt condemned.
Oct. 29, 1954	Bedouin tribe attacked, 3 wounded at Shifta	Egypt condemned.
Oct. 30, 1954	Automatic fire on Nirim	Do.
Sept. 20-28, 1954	Attack at El Mogazit Sheikh Nab-Hahn	Do.
Nov. 1, 1954	2 houses blown up at Patish	Nov. 5, 1954.—Egypt condemned.
Do	Water tower attacked at Abasan	Do.
Dec. 24, 1954	Egyptian platoon entrenched in demilitarized zone of Nitzana.	Jan. 3, 1955.—Egypt condemned.
	1955	
Jan. 21, 1955	Egyptian soldiers attacked Nir Yitzhak, 1 Israeli soldier killed, 2 wounded.	Jan. 24, 1955.—Egypt condemned.
Jan. 25, 1955	Egyptian attack at Ein Hashlosha, 1 Israeli tractorist killed, 1 wounded.	Jan. 27, 1955.—Egypt condemned.
Feb. 1, 1955	Egyptian attack at Nahal Oz, 1 Israeli soldier wounded.	Feb. 3, 1955.—Egypt condemned.
Feb. 22, 1955	Egyptian Army position fired on Israeli patrol, which was approaching a large group of infiltrators who were harvesting illegally near Nir Yitzhak. Automatic rifle fire and 3-inch mortars used by Egyptians.	Mar. 7, 1955.—Egypt condemned.
Feb. 25, 1955	Rehovot: A bicycle rider, from El Kubeiba, was killed 2 kilometers west of Rehovot; tracks of 3 infiltrators were found by U. N. investigators.	Do.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Jack O'Donnell:

CAPITOL STUFF

WASHINGTON, May 2.—To make any political sense out of the battle on Capitol Hill over repealing the administration's farm legislation (which won't be fully effective until next year) you have to take a long look down the political road—as far as the White House battle in 1960.

Some of the shrewd old boys who've been watching our political world wag for a half century have been taking that long look and have come up with this interesting observation:

"The present attempt by the radical Farmers' Union and the CIO Political Action Committee to join ranks on the House fight to restore rigid price supports for farm commodities is the first step toward the formation of a Farm-Labor party which will put a ticket in the field in the 1960 elections, with CIO's Walter Reuther its White House candidate."

"This is merely the first step," the old boys continue.

"Walter Reuther has now promised the anti-administration farm bloc that he will deliver the votes of big city Democratic Congressmen, regardless of what the housewives scream about increased costs of food. In return, he's been pledged the support of the farm lobby in his demand for a $1.25-an-hour wage minimum. Eisenhower wants a 90 cents an hour minimum.

"But that's only the first step in the big political parade. With the CIO and the A. F. of L. forming a united political front and then entering into a marriage of political convenience with the farmers, you've got the setting for a political picture which duplicates the present scene in Great Britain. That means a pseudo-socialist lineup of labor and agriculture on one side, the conservatives of the GOP and southern Democrats on the other and the so-called liberals lost in the political shuffle as they are today in Britain.

"It can happen here—come party explosions in next year's campaign—and it probably will."

The unrealistic battle being staged at the moment is the effort directed by Truman's former Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. (Baldy) Brannan and Truman's double-dome economic adviser Leon Keyserling to restore the fixed price supports at 90 percent of parity for such basic farm products as wheat and corn.

FEWER PIGS WENT TO MARKET

Also included in the Government benefits—paid out of income tax, natch—are farmers who raise cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice. Getting the money from the Treasury naturally was a safer bet for the farmers than feeding the corn to hogs and steers for the market. Fewer hogs and steers were fattened up. Hence the high cost of pork and beefsteak at the butcher shops and the fantastic mountains of farm surplus which the Government had to buy with public funds and store at Government expense.

The Eisenhower plan, brought forward by farm-trained Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, substitutes a sliding scale for Government support instead of the fixed and mandatory 90 percent.

Next fall, for example, the wheat farmer will get Government support for his crop up to 82.5 percent of parity, parity meaning a Federal standard designed to assure farmers a fair return on their crops in relation to farm costs.

Nobody can tell until the wheat now growing on the Kansas prairies is harvested how the Benson plan is going to work out. It will be a year from next fall when the 1956 crops are harvested, about the time of the big political conventions, before it can be determined how the plan will work out overall. It's already worked out satisfactorily so far as dairy products are concerned, at least we're not adding every month to the millions of pounds of butter, cheese, and powdered milk that we've been stashing away in air-conditioned caves and huge refrigeration plants.

But the leftist farmers who make up the Farmers Union and their allies in CIO and the Americans for Democratic Action don't want to wait and give the plan a trial. They want to kill it now, and strangely enough it is just possible that the votes of Democratic Congressmen from the big cities—Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Chicago, for example—may turn the trick. At all events, the vote will be mightly close. What will happen to the Congressmen who will have to explain their vote to the city housewife is another story.

MINIMUM WAGE AND HIGH COSTS

But a lot of the boys are insisting that the CIO pressure is too hard to resist when you come from a district where the organized labor vote calls the turn. They figure that their vote for Reuther's $1.25 an hour minimum wage will make the constituents forget the increased food prices, and cynically observe that few will realize that a healthy slice of the wages withheld for income tax goes to pay for the mandatory support of farm prices.

The distant gleam of a possible victorious realinement of political forces into a dominant farm-labor group seems to have blinded some of the boys to a few pertinent facts in the immediate hassle.

In the first place, it is the six farm commodities which have received the highest level of tax support which soared to the highest price levels in the consumer market and—this is interesting—created at the same time the biggest storage problems for the surpluses.

Point No. 2 is that in relation to parity, nonsupported farm commodities brought the farmers higher average prices than did the supported commodities.

Speaking politically, it is interesting to note that the flexible support plan now under attack was approved by both the Democrats and Republicans, endorsed by Truman while President, and backed by every Secretary of Agriculture in the last 20 years for peacetime regulation of agriculture.

Austrian-Russian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days there has been considerable publicity given to the four-power Austrian treaty negotiations. It appears that our State Department in its overly zealous desire to secure any type of peace treaty is altering the time honored position of the United States of the protection of oppressed peoples. The United States is about to allow the repatriation of thousands of Russian Nationals who have found asylum from Communist terror in the free zones of Austria. The American people are entitled to an explanation and to a statement of the position of our Department of State concerning article 16 of the Austrian Treaty. They are entitled to know, whether before the United States approves this treaty, the more than 30,000 Russian refugees now living in Austria will be protected, and will not be forced to return to Russia to face the hangman's noose.

Article 16 of the Austrian Treaty provides for the repatriation of all displaced persons now living in Austria; for free visitation to displaced person camps or centers by Soviet representatives for the purpose of coercing such persons into returning to Russia; it prohibits in such camps or centers any propaganda hostile to the interests of the U. S. S. R. and any activities designed to induce such persons not to return to Russia; it dissolves any organizations existing in such camps which may be engaged in activities opposed to the interests of Soviet Russia; and it refuses relief or aid to those persons who refuse to return to Russia.

If article 16 is allowed to remain in this treaty, the United States will be a party to the massacre of thousands of persons whose only crime is a love of freedom. Our State Department must assure the American people of its firm stand against article 16.

I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, May 3, 1955, which I believe clearly summarizes the effect of article 16 of the Austrian Treaty:

THIRTY THOUSAND LIVES

"The Austrian treaty negotiations are a case study for the free world. They can be a lesson for those who still trust the Soviet word. * * *

"They are a story of broken pledges on one hand and frustrated hopes on the other * * * an illustration of the methods employed by the Soviet Union to exploit other people and other nations."

Until a month ago that was the State Department's description of 10 years' futile efforts to negotiate an Austrian treaty with the Soviets.

Those 10 years of Soviet duplicity should not be forgotten unless the Soviets at the current negotiations in Vienna give startling and positive proof of genuine change.

An early test of Soviet intentions—Whether they want an honest, decent treaty or have only another propaganda gimmick up their sleeves—could be made on Article 16 of the draft treaty. It may affect the lives of 30,000 refugees in Austria—refugees from communism—and other thousands who may in the future get through the Iron Curtain.

Article 16 compels Austria "to take all necessary measure to complete voluntary repatriation of displaced persons within its territory"; to enter bilateral negotiations with Iron Curtain countries for their repatriation; to permit Soviet officials to "visit freely" refugee camps; to prohibit propaganda against the allies, meaning Russia. It also prohibits Austria from giving any relief "to persons who refuse to return to their native countries."

There are many legal arguments claiming this article is obsolete and would not apply to refugees now in Austria. They seem to

forget the Soviet ability to twist agreements to their own diabolical uses. There is one certain way to protect these refugees—delete the article from the treaty.

Some argue that it is a harmless article because it refers only to "voluntary repatriation" and therefore, could not be used to force people to return home. But they overlook the tricks the Soviets play on words.

We have signed many agreements and treaties with the Soviets calling for "free elections." But we learned, too late, that in Communist language "free elections" mean rigged elections. Likewise with "democratic" governments, which turned out to mean Communist governments, and "independent" states, by which the Soviets meant satellite states.

What is the Soviet definition of "voluntary repatriation"? Experience should have taught us that it is forced repatriation.

The United States and other Western allies engaged at the close of the war with the Soviets in forced deportation, forced expulsion, and forced repatriation of people. It was a shameful practice then. It would be even more shameful now to be hoodwinked into loosely written treaty articles which would raise any doubts about our opposition to such practices.

Article 16 in the draft treaty must go.

For 10 years the Soviets have ruthlessly exploited the Austrian Nation and people. We understand Austria's overwhelming desire to get rid of the Red army. But a treaty which includes articles like No. 16, which deny Austria full sovereignty, would merely legalize the Soviet right to continue exploitation she has been carrying on illegally for 10 years.

Trans World Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess of Congress it was my good fortune to go on the "press flight" which Trans World Airlines scheduled to introduce to the public its great new airplanes, the super-G Constellations. On this 10-day trip we visited 3 countries—Ireland, Egypt, and Spain. Of course, we saw many interesting places and people. But the most interesting and encouraging experience that I had was to come to understand what an outstanding job of building international goodwill this great corporation, TWA, was doing in the three countries we visited. I found that not only was the company respected and admired for its efficient operations, but that by its employment and other policies as well as the attitude of its American employees, TWA was doing much to build goodwill for the United States of America.

At a time when there are so many reasons to be concerned by difficult problems in the field of foreign policy, it is truly a pleasure to be able to report that an American enterprise on its own initiative and following a policy of intelligent and enlightened self-interest is doing a real job of improving international understanding.

Sam Hadden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, during this period when many of us are trying to work out an equitable road solution we realize that one of the experts on highway legislation because of conditions beyond his control is resting at his home in Indianapolis. I am referring to one who is well known to anyone associated with the highway problem, namely, Sam Hadden, who but a few short years ago attended most of the highway meetings, at least those on the national level, and served us with his excellent counsel and advice.

A few days ago I had given to me an article appearing in the Indianapolis Times, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include herein. May I say that I join with his many friends in this Congress in saying, "Sam, we miss you even though you are not here with us. We trust you will continue to give us your usual good counsel and advice."

The article from the Times follows:

SAM HADDEN KEEPS UP HIS LETTER OUTPUT—FORMER HIGHWAY CHAIRMAN, RECOVERING FROM STROKE, WILL BE OUT OF HOUSE SOON

(By Ed Sovola)

Sam Hadden hasn't been out of the house since Thanksgiving. He's going to be out, though, soon. Sam's feeling better every day.

Even though the former State highway department chairman (two terms) is pushing 73, and was laid very low by a stroke a couple of years ago, his hair is as black as ever, his sense of humor is as sharp as ever, and the fire in his coal-black eyes is returning.

Sam Hadden, always a conscientious letter writer, now often writes as many as eight letters a day. And his letters aren't the hi-thanks-'by type. A letter from Sam Hadden is packed with information.

A batch of mail the other day included letters from Representative J. Harry McGregor, Republican, Ohio; Attorney Will M. Whittington, Greenwood, Miss.; Russell E. Singer, executive vice president, American Automobile Association; Robert H. Baldock, Oregon State Highway Department engineer; C. D. Curtiss, Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, Washington; Hal H. Hale, Association of American Railroads, Washington; Representative Brady Gentury, Democrat, of Texas; Robert H. Harrison, division engineer, Bureau of Public Roads, Chicago; and Mrs. Thelma G. Patterson, executive secretary of the Indiana Society of Professional Engineers.

Subject matter ranges from "third structure tax on heavy freight trucks" to President Eisenhower's billion-dollar road program. Sam Hadden's keen interest in highways is undiminished. Keeping abreast of the developments taking place in the field has high priority in his daily schedule.

There was a time when the voice of Sam Hadden was heard at all important highway meetings on local, State, and national levels. He was one of the earliest advocates of the gasoline tax. Sam Hadden was the first man to tell Congress it was off base by diverting gas tax funds. He told the lawmakers either to abolish the Federal tax on gasoline or return the money collected to the States.

"I hope to resume part of my activities in the not-too-distant future," said Mr. Hadden.

The former teacher of mathematics, history, and civil engineering at Michigan State College used his "company English" to describe how well he is eating and sleeping. He got through it without quoting Shakespeare. It was a fine job of rhetoric.

"In other words," added Mr. Hadden, "I'm eating and sleeping like a horse."

He has a schedule of daily exercises, daily physical therapy treatments and a more extensive session lasting almost all day Tuesday. Tuesday is no day to call on Sam Hadden. Every afternoon he takes a nap for an hour.

On his living room front wall hang two mementos of recognition he received for his contribution to highway development. One is the coveted George S. Bartlett award plaque awarded annually by the American Road Builders Association, American Association of State Highway Officials, and the Highway Research Board to the man who contributed most to highway progress.

Below the Bartlett plaque hangs a framed testimonial from American Association of State Highway Officials to Mr. Hadden upon completion of his term as its president in 1944.

It is significant no other Indiana State Highway Department employee ever received one of the other awards, let alone both.

Mr. Hadden lives alone in his big ol' house at 322 East 47th. He has grass troubles in the front yard. His visitor, an advocate of myrtle for ground cover, advised him how to get it in.

"Sounds fine," laughed Mr. Hadden, "but I can't tramp through the woods gathering it and I know my housekeeper wouldn't."

When a man writes an average of eight letters a day and starts worrying about the condition of his grass, he's getting along fine.

Samuel C. Hadden, consulting highway engineer, is going to be heard from on the subject of highways, toll roads, and gasoline tax again. From coast to coast. Just keep your guard rails up.

Priorities for Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, 1955, I introduced H. R. 5696, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine. I believe that there is no subject before this Congress of more vital importance than making sure that the existing supply of Salk vaccine is distributed and used in an equitable manner. It is imperative that the Congress act immediately before this situation gets any further out of hand. As the able Governor of New Jersey wired me yesterday, no one State can hope to tackle what is essentially a national job. It can only be met effectively by Federal action.

Governor Meyner's telegram reads as follows:

May I respectfully urge your support of a program for Federal control of Salk vaccine to assure safeguarding of the supply equitable distribution to the children of the Nation on the basis of greatest need according to age group, severe penalties for black marketeers and other violators, and the dissemination of vital information concerning this preventive measure no one State can hope to tackle what is essentially a national job.

Extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 has passed the House. Subsequent to its passage I received a letter from the president of an electrical-equipment business who has had considerable experience in the performance of Government defense contracts.

In view of the fact that he has made several recommendations of a constructive nature, I feel that the contents of his letter should be made available to all the Members of Congress.

Under unanimous consent, his letter follows:

HEYER PRODUCTS CO., INC.,
Belleville, N. J., April 27, 1955.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: The House now has pending before it, H. R. 4904, which is a bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (50 U. S. C. Appendix 1211–1233) from December 31, 1954 to December 31, 1956.

This act provides for elimination of so-called excessive profits from contracts made with agencies of the Federal Government having a connection with national defense. All amounts in excess of $250,000 received by contractors are subject to renegotiation.

Certainly it is true that sound execution of the national defense program requires the elimination of excessive profits from contracts made with the United States," as stated in section 101 of the act. However, the standards for defining excessive profits in the present act are unreasonable and inequitable as applied to small business. Therefore, I suggest to you the following amendments to the act which should be included in H. R. 4904, if it is extended:

1. Advertised bid contracts should be exempt. Section 106 of the act contains numerous exemptions, but none for small business. Large companies usually obtain military contracts on a negotiated basis, far above normal profit and cost of operation, and then renegotiate down to a reasonable profit. Small business, on the other hand, must depend on highly competitive advertised bids, far below normal markup, in order to participate in defense work.

If a bidder guesses too low, he is not reimbursed for his loss by the Government. On the other hand, if he is ingenious enough in design and manufacture to make something extra, the Government takes it away. This destroys any incentive to improve methods and deprives small business of a fair return on risk and opportunity to accumulate capital for expansion. The Federal income tax furnishes all of the protection against excess profits that is needed.

2. The act should be amended to make renegotiation a two-way street. Any contract, to be subject to renegotiation, should be required to provide for negotiation upward for relief from loss as well as downward for excess profits.

3. The act should provide for carryforward and carryback of losses on renegotiable business, as a setoff against excess profits. Small business could then make a reasonable profit on Government contracts without the risk of going broke, as so often happens as a result of trying to de business with the Government.

4. A small business with less than 500 employees should be exempt from the act altogether, and the $250,000 minimum should be raised to $1 million.

Small business cannot obtain equity financing for expansion, but must look to surplus accumulated from earnings. The present minimum discourages small business from bidding on Government contracts. There is little hope of reasonable profit as against high risk.

In Senate Report No. 92, February 14, 1951, to accompany the original act, it was stated with respect to a proposed low minimum:

"To make the limitation as low as under the House bill would create a considerable hardship on small business."

The same reasoning applies today with redoubled force because of increased competition among bidders. I trust you will consider carefully these suggestions.

With good wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,
B. F. W. HEYER,
President.

A Reasoned Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the Harvard Crimson of Friday, April 29, 1955, entitled "A Reasoned Budget":

The United States budget system, recognized as inefficient since the time of Alexander Hamilton, has become a mere patchwork of uncoordinated committees. Blind budget hacking is no longer adequate for an intricate economic situation. The congressional budgetary system needs integration, therefore, for appropriations and revenues are handled by separate committees, making a budget tailored to American resources almost impossible. Not only are finances and expenditures not matched coherently, but few of the members of the involved committees are aware of any sort of legislative budgetary policy. Slashes are made in budgets with little regard to the importance of items in any positive economic program, since Congressmen only attempt to avoid rocking the economic boat with overly heavy taxes. Representative G. P. LIPSCOMB has suggested a remedy with his proposed Joint Committee on the Budget, which would join representatives of both Senate and House Appropriations and Finance Committees in a body devoted to the consideration of fiscal policy.

Critics of the Lipscomb bill cite the failure of the now-defunct Committee of the Legislative Budget, set up in 1946. That group, however, wrote its own budget, arbitrarily setting a ceiling on expenditures without even investigating the needs which the Bureau of the Budget had carefully calculated. After having to pass supplementary bills amounting to $6 billion over the ceiling, Congress dropped the committee. Lipscomb's proposed committee, however, would not aim at writing an a priori budget. It would simply determine the best fiscal policy by correlating the reports of the various committees on revenue, appropriations, and the economy. Once having established a policy, it would advise the other committees about the propriety of specific appropriations in a planned economy.

Because the Committee on the Budget would only serve as a policy adviser, there need be no duplication of investigations done by other committees; nor should it threaten members of the four powerful congressional finance and revenue committees who fear loss of their present leviathan power. The danger, on the contrary, is that the group would be too weak because of its diverse membership. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has been virtually ignored for this reason.

To cut down on the diffusion of membership, bills supported by Representatives COLMER and FRELINGHUYSEN advocate the use of reports on revenue, without including Ways and Means Committee members in the policy committee. If the House passed this plan, resulting friction from jealous "revenooers" would nullify the whole purpose.

Another of the myriad proposals for integration is that of the National Planning Association, which proposes that the Committee on the Economic Report assume the function of a fiscal policymaker. The plan is impractical, however, because this committee has always concerned itself with investigations of specific economic details. Traditional procedure would inevitably force questions of policy aside. By including members of several committee—finance, expenditures, and economy—in one joint committee, perhaps the dissimilarity of methods and practices might restrain the legislative instinct for the insignificant. Of all these proposals, Lipscomb's is most likely to unite the various participants in budget planning in a group which can keep its mind on policy.

Justice for Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning justice for the island of Cyprus:

JUSTICE FOR CYPRUS

Last December the United Nations General Assembly voted to postpone indefinitely any further consideration of the Cyprus question. The United States delegation supported the move. Unfortunately, this indefinite postponement has not made the problem melt away, and while it exists, the ill feeling it generates between the NATO partners, Greece and Great Britain, will continue to complicate western unity and give comfort to the Communists.

House Concurrent Resolution 26, introduced on January 6, puts us squarely on the side of justice; it declares that Congress favors the United States delegation to the United Nations taking "all possible steps ex-

peditiously to bring about consideration by the United Nations of the question of self-determination of the population of Cyprus." I wholeheartedly support this positive stand. Cypriots ask only their God-given right to determine for themselves under which flag they wish to live. They should not be denied the rights that many of them, as well as Americans, defended on the battlefield.

For many years residents of Cyprus have been pleading for reunion with Greece. They have good reason: The great majority, or about 80 percent of citizens of Cyprus, are Greek, that is, Greek in language, Greek in church, Greek in culture. Although the island has been governed throughout the ages by a succession of foreign powers, Cypriots have clung to their Hellenic ties. Centuries of domination by Egyptians, Assyrians, Persions, Romans, and Turks could not eradicate the Hellenic inclinations of the people of Cyprus. The present occupying power, Great Britain, first got a foothold on the island in 1878 under an agreement with Turkey to defend the Ottoman Empire against Russia, but Cyprus remained a Turkish possession. Great Britain formally annexed Cyprus in 1914 when at war with Turkey. The ensuing 4 decades of British rule no more erased Cypriot yearning for reunion with Greece than had previous occupations. Over the years various appeals made to England to permit union with Greece were to no avail. As late as 1950 in a plebiscite organized by the Archbishop of Cyprus, the vote showed that 95.7 percent of the 215,000 voters favored union with Greece.

The British have sought our support in denying self-determination to Cyprus on the grounds that the island is vital to safeguarding Mediterranean bases. The strategic value of the island is undeniable. But Western defense will not be affected by a transfer of sovereignty. Greece is a vital partner of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and has already demonstrated how valiant it can be against the Communist threat. It seems to me, also, that the base could be better maintained if the surrounding population were friendly citizens of Greece rather than hostile subjects of Britain.

It behooves the United States to boldly uphold those principles of freedom and independence for which Cypriots cry out. Although the island is small and the population only a little more than 500,000, it is unworthy of our traditions to turn a deaf ear to Cypriot pleas. To continue to ignore Cypriot aspirations would be a mockery of the ideals we cherish. Let us, then, support House Concurrent Resolution 26 so that we may hasten the day when justice is done in Cyprus.

The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio is the annual sponsor of an essay project throughout Ohio on vital subjects. The title in 1955 is "The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today." One of the 12 winners is Bertram Sippola, a junior of Marietta High School in Marietta, Ohio. I recommend his fine essay as a thoughtful, studious treatment of a most important subject:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

Not long ago a friend of mine emphatically asserted that the effect of spiritual guidance in the world today is practically nil, and he went on to prove it. He gave as examples such things as the apparent lack of morals in Government officials, the tremendous rise in crime and juvenile delinquency, and the terrible dog-eat-dog state of affairs in the entire world. However, I believe that today many people are turning to spiritual guidance for help for themselves and others.

But first of all just what do we mean when we speak of spiritual guidance? Our western civilization is built on certain moral virtues, some of which, according to Arnold Toynbee, are "outward visible signs of inward spiritual graces; a devotion to truth that is prepared to follow an argument honestly, wherever it may lead; an ideal of integrity in workmanship; and, perhaps above all, a feeling of respect and charity for one's momentary opponent." Then how do we express these spiritual graces as individuals, since most improvements start with the individual? There are different definitions of spiritual guidance, but to me it means making God my partner in everything I do. By this I mean not just on Sunday, as is usually the case, but every day, in everything—school, work, and play.

To show its effect in the world today, spiritual guidance should first start with the individual. With the individual, there must be prayer power—affirmative prayers. To accomplish something, prayers must be accompanied by faith—faith that God can do anything through us—upon which all spiritual guidance depends.

In our families and homes we are bound together by Christian principles, such as cooperation, love, respect, honesty, responsibility, and dependability.

In the community we have several examples of the effect of spiritual guidance. One of the most important is the church and its influence. In addition to the church are our schools and hospitals, our YW and YMCA's, and our welfare agencies, often grouped under the Community Chest, in which are embodied our Christian ideals and principles.

In industry we have evidences of spiritual guidance at work. Many firms have chaplains and chapels to aid their personnel in seeking spiritual help. Many of our industrial leaders are men who call on God for spiritual guidance. As an example, LeTourneau, maker of giant earthmoving equipment, is a prominent Christian lay leader.

In our Nation we can also see the effects of spiritual guidance. We are fortunate in having a President and Secretary of State who are religious men and who believe in the power of prayer. For instance, our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, stopped an important business discussion to take time to pray with his pastor, for whom he had sent. Our public welfare and pension programs are based on the Christian belief of helping one another; we have them through the work of men who were spiritually guided.

In the world we have the United Nations with all its various branches, founded on the belief that nations could live and work together in peace. The United States has contributed much in the way of aid to other countries, both materials and technical skills, to help them help themselves.

Again I say that I believe that the world of today is influenced by spiritual guidance. Its effect may not be highly publicized, or even readily seen, but from a few, it spreads out, changing the lives of others. If our Nation and world are guided by leaders who conscientiously seek spiritual guidance from God, then we have nothing to fear, for "If God is for us, who is against us?" (Romans 8: 31).

Gen. Milan Rastislav Stefanik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eulogy on the anniversary, May 4, of the death of Gen. Milan Rastislav Stefanik, outstanding Slovak scientist, statesman and soldier, who met an untimely death in an airplane accident on May 4, 1919:

MILAN RASTISLAV STEFANIK, SLOVAK SCIENTIST, STATEMAN, AND SOLDIER

For all the misery and suffering that war visits upon the world, it does, nonetheless, have some compensatory effects, not least of which is that it often brings out some of the best qualities in men and makes them heroes. Undoubtedly, the friends, neighbors, and relatives of Milan Rastislav Stefanik would never been dreamed that this young Slovak, slight of build, scholarly, personally attractive, with a quiet disposition, who had left home to prepare for his doctor of philosophy degree at Charles University in Prague and later was to win fame as an astronomer in France, would have emerged from World War I as a war hero, liberator, and a cofounder of the new state of Czechoslovakia.

As a young man Milan Stefanik loved his native Slovakia as much as, if not more than, any Slovak. But, in his country which was then under foreign domination, success in science, as in anything else, required abandonment of one's loyalty to Slovak traditions. This Stefanik would not do, and so, in 1902, Milan left the land he loved for France. After many trials and personal disappointments, the young Slovak scientist at last gained recognition, and by 1914 he was in fact regarded by continental learned societies as "one of the brilliant young astronmers of Europe." In science, Stefanik had made notable progress, and not only did his scientic expeditions take him throughout Europe and Africa, but to North and South America and the South Sea Islands as well.

When war came in 1914, Stefanik, who was then only 34 and a naturalized citizen of France, volunteered immediately for the French Air Service. Throughout the war, the young Slovak airman distinguished himself for his skill and courage and rose from a humble private to the rank of major general, and later, minister of war in the new state of Czechoslovakia. Wounded many times—sometimes severely, Stefanik fought heroically on many fronts and for his tireless efforts received many military decorations. Outstanding was Stefanik's work in organizing the Czechoslovak military forces in Italy and Russia which played so effective a role in the war against the Central Powers. Outstanding also was his work in organizing, together with Thomas G. Masaryk, his former teacher at Prague, Eduard Benes, and Stefan Osusky, the Czechoslovak National Council from which the independent state of Czechoslovakia was to evolve. And as minister of war in the new state General Ste-

fanik dedicated himself selflessly to the task of reorganizing the Czechslovak army.

Only 38 years of age when the great war came to a close, Milan Stefanik had indeed a brilliant career before him both in the service of science and in the service of his country. But unfortunately this Slovak hero, termed by a British friend and admirer "the most romantic" of all "the great figures of the war," met an untimely death. Returning to Slovakia from Italy on May 4, 1919, General Stefanik and three Italian officers were killed when the plane in which they were flying crashed as it was about to land in Bratislava. Tragic it was for a grateful nation to lose a hero of such great brilliance at the height of his career. Tragic it was, too, for the aged mother of this son of Slovakia, who while awaiting at the airfield for her returning son, witnessed the ill-fated crash.

On this anniversary of the death of Milan Rastislav Stefanik, scientist, statesman, and war hero, I wish to join with all my Slovak friends and mourn the loss of a great national hero; for that is what Milan Rastislav Stefanik was, a great national hero. And I wish further to repeat what was said of Milan Stefanik at the time of his death:

"By his death the Czechoslovak cause sustains an irreparable loss. He was in every respect a gentle knight, whose record and example will be an inspiration to future generations of his fellow-countrymen."

Loyalty Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by me at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day program in Oshkosh, Wis., on Saturday, April 30, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DANGER OF "SUBVERSIVE INACTIVITY"

I am pleased to address this great patriotic occasion.

This is the climax of a great and unforgettable day here in Oshkosh.

Today, the people of this industrious area have participated in and have themselves been thrilled by an inspiring demonstration of Americanism.

You have seen in the musical units, the impressive floats, the marching uniformed heroes—a living symbol of the real strength of America.

TRIBUTE TO VFW

It is particularly a delight to appear here under the auspices of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, among other outstanding groups.

Certainly, there is no group in our Nation which is more entitled to hold aloft the banner of American patriotism today and any other day—than is that group of men who served this Nation on the field of battle—in foreign lands, on foreign seas and in foreign skies.

You gentlemen of the VFW and your wives and children and other loved ones know directly what it is to give your all for your country.

Today you are reaffirming your own fervent dedication to America. And everyone here, taking inspiration from what you have personally achieved previously on the battlefield, and what you are doing today joins in this rededication.

In Washington, it has been a pleasure to cooperate with the Veterans of Foreign Wars national office in securing observance throughout the Nation of May Day—Loyalty Day.

This day is but one of a great many achievements which are well-credited to the outstanding record of the VFW. That record is part and parcel of the overall American saga—a saga which dates from Lexington and Concord onward through Belleau Wood and the Argonne Forest and Normandy and Inchon. It is the saga of sacrifice which has helped make America the strongest, the freest, soundest nation in the world today.

LOYALTY FROM WITHIN

Now, although we here today have concentrated on the outward evidences of patriotism—with the Star Spangled Banner flying before us, we know that the real meaning of loyalty is the meaning from within.

Loyalty is a quality of mind, an attitude of heart. Loyalty is the unseen flag which waves silently within us. It is the national anthem on our lips, even though it is not being sung at that very moment.

Loyalty is gratitude for the most priceless blessings that any people have ever enjoyed. Loyalty is the determination that this magnificent heritage which is ours, shall not be bartered away or dissipated, but rather that it shall pass on—in fact—to succeeding generations.

Loyalty is something that you cannot force; it either exists spontaneously or it does not exist. Either men and women really believe in their country; either they would honorably live and, if necessary, die for it; or they have doubts about their country and a feeling that there is some superior system—some totalitarian system.

Fortunately, the number of individuals with such doubts is relatively few, and yet I shall speak to you today on those in our land who are loyal but do not live their loyalty. They sincerely love their country, but they do not lift their hands and their hearts for it, and so their loyalty becomes an idle thing which lacks real meaning because it is not applied.

LOYALTY WEAKENED BY INDIFFERENCE

It is a loyalty weakened by ignorance and indifference.

Ignorance of what?

Indifference to what?

Ignorance of the problems and the dangers and the challenges of our time.

Now, let us turn to the dangers, first of all.

THREE DANGERS TO US

There are, as I see it, three great dangers to us today. They are:

1. The foreign threat of international communism — the menace of aggressive Soviet imperialism;

2. The menace of subversive activity right here at home; and, finally,

3. There is a menace which I shall call the threat of subversive inactivity.

THE MENACE OF RED IMPERIALISM

Now, you are all familiar with the first phase of the threat—the danger of Soviet imperialism—which already controls one-third of the world's people and one-fourth of the world's land surface.

You are aware that the Soviet Union has the largest ground forces in the world at its command: The 175-division Red army; the massed millions of Red China; the half-million men of the Soviet satellites in eastern Europe.

You are aware that the Soviet Union has the second largest navy in the world, including the largest of all U-boat fleets and the largest air force in the world.

You are aware that the Soviet Union is proceeding at full speed for the development of a program of intercontinental guided and ballistic missiles.

The ballistic missiles in particular may be able, in a matter of years, to reach the city of Oshkosh at a speed of 10,000 miles per hour. Thus, possibly in half an hour, after being fired from a Red launching site, they could explode with nuclear warheads right in our midst.

Against intercontinental ballistic missiles, flying at supersonic speed, there is today no known defense. Not even the Nike guided missiles, which today ring Milwaukee and other major cities, are defense against the ballistic missiles which may be produced in a matter of years. Why? Because the intercontinental ballistic missile is like a bullet.

It would not be guided by electronics and so it probably could not be jammed by electronics. It would simply be fired like a bullet or an artillery shell and once it were to start, it might not be stopped except by hitting something.

This, then, is an example of danger of Soviet imperialism.

But there is a danger more immediately confronting us.

BEWARE OF RED CHINA'S WORDS

Today, our eyes are principally directed against the menace of aggressive Red China. For weeks and months, the Peking radio has been shouting boastfully of its intention to use force to capture the key island of Formosa.

The United States, in solemn treaty and by near unanimous resolution of its Congress, is soundly determined to defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas. Why? Because they are bulwarks of our chain of defense.

Then, at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia came the indication from Chinese Red Premier, Chou En-lai, that he was willing to talk over the attainment of peace in the Formosa Straits.

Because we want peace, we hope that he means what he said. However, the past Communist record is full of such chronic treachery, such double-crossing, so many repeated reversals that we must remain wary and vigilant. The Reds blow hot, and the Reds blow cold. They talk peace one day and war the next day, and peace the third day. Obviously, we can never place real confidence in their words. The only thing which speaks is their deeds.

Let them therefore agree to an immediate cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. Let them release the unjustly imprisoned United States airmen, and other American prisoners. Let them prove their words. Let them not try to use Formosa peace talks as a cover for aggression elsewhere—as in Southeast Asia.

And let us not be gullible. Let us not be naive.

Let us not of course assume that peace in the Formosa Straits is impossible and that nothing can be done to prevent a United States-Red Chinese collision. But at the same time, let us not go to the opposite extreme of assuming that the Chinese Red dragon is overnight going to change its fundamental, imperialistic character.

Vigilance requires us to be as wise as serpents and as gentle as doves.

The loyal American is the vigilant American. He is loyal in support of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, in whose hands lie one of the heaviest responsibilities which has ever been conferred on an American President.

THE DANGER OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY

But, now, I want to turn to the second danger to which I earlier referred. It is the danger of Soviet-directed subversive activity here at home. It is the danger of the Alger Hisses, the Judith Coplons, the Klaus Fuchs, the Julius and Ethel Rosenbergs, and other traitors in the midst of the free world.

John Edgar Hoover, able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has estimated that there are 22,000 members of the United States Communist Party today.

This means 22,000 agents of Soviet imperialism, 22,000 individuals whose loyalty is first to the Soviet Union—first, last, and always to the Soviet Union.

Moreover, the estimate has been that for every member of the Communist Party, there are up to 10 fellow travelers.

They are ready, willing, and eager to do the Communist Party work, but they are not willing to be identified outright with the Red conspiracy.

They are, however, just as much a menace, if not more so, than the active Reds.

And let me point out that there are uncounted numbers in what might be called the Communist reserve. They have never been identified directly or indirectly with the Communist conspiracy, even as fellow travelers.

These are really the top servants of the party. They have been instructed absolutely to avoid all contact with Communist publications, individuals, or groups. They are entirely held in reserve for top-secret work and for the most critical future occasions. These are the sort of secret agents who might even slip through a security-screening system, because their record might show no subversive affiliation in the past.

Against the domestic menace of Communists, fellow travelers, and secret Red reservists, I, for one, have introduced numerous anti-Communist bills in this Congress, as in previous Congresses.

One of my bills is to increase the penalties for seditious conspiracy. Still another bill is to strengthen the statute for immediate registration of foreign agents who have been trained in espionage, sabotage, and similar efforts.

I hope these bills will be enacted in the 84th Congress.

THE MENACE OF SUBVERSIVE INACTIVITY

But finally now, my friends, I want to refer to a third threat, and this is one which may not have occurred to some people.

I refer to the threat of subversive inactivity.

What do I mean by that?

I refer to the type of do-nothing, think-nothing, sense-nothing American citizen who nonetheless feels he is loyal to our country. He says he loves America and everything it stands for. He does despise communism and all things totalitarian.

But this type of American is unwittingly subversive, because of his sheer inactivity.

Unlike active Americans such as you in this fine audience, the type of person I am describing just doesn't bother about his civic responsibilities. He won't stir himself except for his own selfish needs.

He probably doesn't vote. He doesn't have an interest in government. He never shows up at public meetings. He doesn't inform himself. He doesn't take any interest in his neighborhood or in his community or in his church.

He doesn't know the names of his public officials. He doesn't work in his Parent-Teacher Association. He doesn't look after proper thinking and behavior by his youngsters. He doesn't know much about the world.

He is only interested in making a living for himself, but not in make a real life.

Now, preoccupation with one's personal problems may be understandable because, after all, each of us gets tied up now and then in personal affairs.

Let us be frank and admit that all of us at times may be somewhat remiss in doing our share as active citizens. No one is perfect. All of us can achieve still more in service of our country. But I am not talking about occasional oversights or missing a few responsibilities now and then. I'm talking about the man who chronically doesn't care at all. This type of care-nothing, do-nothing individual does his country no good, does himself no good, because he is unwilling to take active steps to protect his country.

By his inactivity, he unwittingly weakens America, weakens its fiber, its vigilance, leaves it and its institution unprotected.

And so, I say, my friends, let us reduce the ranks of this man I have described as unwittingly subversive. Let us all recognize that we can become even better Americans like the heroes whom you and I have seen with pride today—the heroes of our battlefields.

The man who is truly loyal to America is the man who fights as well on the battlefield of peace. He tries to take an active role in government, to the extent that he can. He is a constructive citizen. He is a churchgoer and religion really is a force in his life. He tries to do his part to make his community the finest possible community in which he and his family can grow and thrive. He encourages good influences in his neighborhood—wholesome sports and recreation.

He keeps himself informed about what is going on in his country and in his world. He casts an intelligent ballot. He listens to public speeches. He reads and listens to the news carefully. He doesn't accept anybody's synthetic thinking. He thinks for himself. He is not afraid to trace ideas down to their lair, instead of merely thinking superficially.

This is the sort of patriot we need—the man who fulfills his American role in the finest sense of the term.

CONCLUSION

We can all strive to be like this man. We can all improve. And seeing this wonderful audience today assures me that Oshkosh will never be found lagging in doing its part.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today. It is a pleasure to join with you in this rededication to all that we hold dear. Rededication is the loyalty from within.

It is thanks to efforts such as your own that we will keep our country strong and free. Thus, forever more, freemen everywhere can look to this land for that standard to which, in the words of the father of our country: "The wise and the honest may repair."

Dillon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I appeared before the Civil Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to urge that the committee amend the pending appropriations to include funds for the Dillon Dam. At this time, I should like to call the attention to the Members of this House to the situation which exists with respect to this worthy flood-control project. I believe those Members whose congressional districts are periodically visited by flood disasters in the Ohio and lower Mississippi Valleys may be particularly interested in this issue. My remarks are as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the occasion for my appearing before this committee this morning is to appraise the membership of the status of one of the important flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers, which is a part of the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers.

The particular project to which I refer is known as the Dillon Dam or Reservoir, located on the Licking River, in the 15th District of Ohio, at a point 5.8 miles above the confluence of the Licking and Muskingum Rivers near Zanesville. The project was authorized in section 4 of Public Law 761 of the 75th Congress, enacted on June 28, 1938.

Work was commenced on this project in 1946, and after an expenditure of $9,189,800 it now stands at about one-third of completion. Approximately $17,900,000 is yet required to complete the project. Active construction work on the project was suspended several years ago, and since the suspension the area has been permitted to erode and deteriorate.

The purpose of my appearance here this morning is to recommend to the committee that the appropriation bill under consideration at this time be amended to include provision for this project—at least to the extent of the $2 million figure last sought by the Corps of Engineers to provide for continued construction for the ensuing fiscal year.

In support of my urgent recommendation, I would prefer to direct the committee's attention to the need for the project, rather than to the dimensions and detail of the dam and reservoir. The plans have been in existence for a great number of years and are contained in the planning report, Dillon Reservoir project, Licking River, Ohio, Ohio River Basin, prepared by the Huntington, W. Va., district office of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, in January 1954. The project and its jurisdiction have already received the approval of the Congress many years ago. This approval was endorsed in succeeding years through the provision of funds aggregating $9 million in authorizations for construction.

Those questions having been disposed of in the past, my purpose today is to point out the compelling need which lies behind the project. If any of the members here have witnessed the devastating effects of a flood along the Ohio or Mississippi River, they are aware of the waste, the death, and the destruction which are regularly visited upon this area. It is not difficult to understand that the waters which create those flood conditions do not originate with the major rivers, but come from the waters of smaller streams many miles away. The floods cannot be controlled by dikes or dams along these major streams. Control must come from upstream along the tributaries draining the area where the floods originate.

In 1938 the Flood Control Act was passed to provide a comprehensive flood-control plan for the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers. An integral part of this plan included safeguards for the people and property of Zanesville, McConnelsville, Marietta and the other communities along the Muskingum River. Through the control of the rampaging Muskingum, a large measure of protection could be achieved for those who live in the major river valleys below. Congress then saw the validity and need for the plans contained in the legislation and authorized sufficient funds to build the dams and reservoirs to help hold back the floods and relieve the burden of the Ohio River at peak times. Fourteen dams were constructed on other tributaries of the Muskingum River. Dillon is 15th and the last link to complete the control program. It was designed to hold the Licking River, a major tributary of the Muskingum. The Licking River forms 29 percent of the uncontrolled watershed area. Until it is finished, the Muskingum is still rambunctious. The floods continue to have

their devastating effect along the 77.6 miles from the city of Zanesville to the mouth of the Muskingum at Marietta, inundating, destroying, killing, and wasting. Industries and homes in the communities feel the periodic effect of the floods. Had the Dillon Dam been completed this last link in the control pattern would prevent this regular and unnecessary visitation of disaster and havoc in the river valley.

I readily understand that it is indeed difficult for this committee and the Corps of Engineers to make a decision as to the relative merits of the projects to be considered. In a plan so widespread in its effect as this one for the flood control of the Ohio and lower Mississippi Rivers, each individual reservoir is doubtlessly a worthy one. But I must respectfully point out that with Dillon, it is not a question now of making a decision. That decision was made by Congress in 1946 when construction was begun and by succeeding Congresses which voted approval of the more than $9 million that has been expended. After that great sum of money had been expended, after approximately 800 landowners have been faced with the prospect of displacement and have abandoned any long-range plans with respect to the use of their properties, the Congress has failed to authorize additional funds to complete the project. The temporary halt occasioned by the Korean conflict has begun a permanent deferment of Dillon. As a result, $9 million of the taxpayers' money has been spent with no benefit realized. No benefit will be realized from the investment until the project is completed. Instead of sorely needed flood control, costly confusion on a broad scale has resulted. Eight hundred landowners along the Licking River do not know whether to plant corn, fertilize, build fences, improve their buildings or to await the condemnation proceedings they have expected for so long. Meanwhile, work costing $9 million is deteriorating and depreciating by erosion and rust and the destruction of periodic floods continues inexorably. The expenditures have had the same futile effect as though we had flung them into the raging, muddy floodwaters of the Muskingum.

Mr. Chairman, I know you will be the first to raise your voice against such a glaring waste of Federal funds—the tax money of your constituents and mine. The Corps of Engineers has justified the expenditure, but there is no benefit from an uncompleted project.

Here are cold facts with regard to the Dillon project, in addition to the compelling ones of the previous approval by the Corps of Engineers and of the Congress. Dillon would reduce the crest of the 1913 flood by 4 feet at Zanesville, a city of more than 40,000 people, and would have reduced the peak flow into the Ohio River by 32,000 cubic feet per second. Control of those 32,000 cubic feet per second, now, one-third completed at Dillon, would play an important part in controlling the flood level at Ironton, Portsmouth, Cincinnati, and Cairo. Dillon would raise the controlled drainage area of the Muskingum watershed from 62 to 73 percent. The present completed reservoirs have reduced the frequency of damaging floods, but Dillon would reduce this frequency to once in 50 years. No flood of record subsequent to 1913 would have inundated, even the low-lying areas, had Dillon been completed.

The reasons of 1938 when the plan was authorized and the reasons in 1946 when the first money was spent are still valid and compelling reasons for the completion of the dam today. The need was imperative then. It is imperative now. In fact, there are new and additional reasons along the banks of the Muskingum and Ohio Rivers. These valleys have assumed new importance industrially with the completion of the new $40 million power project at Beverly which, combined with the Philo powerplant, provide a tremendous source of electric power. These installations have, in turn, spurred industrial interest from all over the Nation and new industries are going up all along the rivers to use the electric power generated there. The coal and chemicals to supply and supplement the huge atomic-energy project in southern Ohio and to carry into effect America's new program for the decentralization of industry are a significant segment of our national defense planning in which the Dillon Dam is a valuable key.

Mr. Chairman, with these as my reasons, I urge and earnestly request that this subcommittee recommend the amendment of the present appropriation bill to include a sufficient amount for the Dillon Reservoir project to permit construction to be carried out in the ensuing fiscal year.

Supplying Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 3, 1955, headed "Supplying Salk's Vaccine." The editorial is an excellent one.

Serving, as I do, as a member of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare Funds of the Committee on Appropriations, I have the utmost confidence in the Surgeon General, Leonard A. Scheele. I know he is sincerely concerned about the various aspects of this new medical discovery. He was before the committee on the afternoon when question was raised as to the possibility of the polio vaccine containing live virus. I know that the Public Health Service is working with its utmost ability to try to control the vaccine and make certain that it will be made available to all areas of the United States in such a manner that all the younger children and those most susceptible to the disease will have vaccinations in due time, as soon as the vaccine can be made available to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLYING SALK'S VACCINE

Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, has done a good and timely thing in calling upon the American people to display their usual patience and commonsense in connection with the problem of distributing the Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis. During the past few days there has been a great deal of inexpert and extravagant talk on this subject, but all such talk—as Dr. Scheele has indicated—seems clearly to do violence to the facts of the situation.

Thus, by way of example, there have been rumors to the effect that many doctors have been giving the vaccine to adults in violation of priorities voluntarily agreed upon for the present temporary period of limited supply—priorities under which children in the most susceptible age groups are supposed to receive it first. And so, acting on the basis of these rumors, and accepting them as evidence of widespread black marketing operations, more than a few people—including Democratic Representative CELLER, of New York—have demanded the immediate enactment of a stringent Federal policing law to control the flow of the great new antipolio agent and to crack down severely on all violators.

But Dr. Scheele, with the support of other health authorities here in the District and elsewhere throughout the country, has kept the situation in perspective by declaring that there is nothing to justify the fear that a significant black market may be built up in this field. True, a tiny minority of unethical doctors and mean and selfish adult coconspirators may break the voluntary rules, but that is a possibility that can and should be dealt with effectively by medical societies and similar local and State agencies. A new Federal law could hardly be of much help in that respect. On the contrary, it could easily do more harm than good. Further, as rightly emphasized by Republican Representative BROWNSON, of Indiana, in a debate with Mr. CELLER, such a law would not produce a single additional cubic centimeter of the vaccine.

Actually, as Dr. Scheele has declared, the Salk vaccine is now being turned out at a rate that should make enough of it available to take care of all American children, aged between 1 and 9, by August 1. And by November 1, or December 1 at the latest, there will be a sufficient amount of it for everybody in the older groups, up to 19 years. Thereafter, within a relatively short time, its supply will be as abundant as needed. Certainly, despite the alarmists, such a situation adds up to something less than an emergency or crisis requiring extraordinary Federal action.

Guaranteed Annual Wage and the Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by F. G. Gurley, president of the Santa Fe System Lines, before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in Washington, D. C., on May 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY F. G. GURLEY, PRESIDENT, SANTA FE SYSTEM LINES, BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 3, 1955

The two outstanding issues on the national labor front today are described as the guaranteed annual wage and the right to work. I have been asked to direct my attentions to the latter.

Few subjects have become as beclouded by misinformation and misunderstanding, as the right-to-work question. I hope we may make a contribution to clearing the issues.

There are two Federal acts which govern labor relations. These are (1) the Railway Labor Act, which applies to the railways and some other transportation companies, and

(2) the Taft-Hartley Act, which applies to other industries.

Section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act provides that nothing in the National Labor Relations Act shall be construed to authorize the execution or enforcement of collective bargaining agreements requiring compulsory union membership in any State where such agreements are prohibited by State law.

Now, there is nothing complicated about a right-to-work law. Although all those currently in force in a number of our States differ in minor details, the net of each is the same. They simply provide that no individual can be required to belong to and support a labor union in order to hold a job. They mean that no man can be made to join a union in order to get a job and no man can be forced to join a union to keep his job. There are now 18 States prohibiting compulsory unionism. The number has been growing in recent years and there are certain to be more in the future. This alone indicates a widespread and growing public opposition to the notion that any man should have to join a union in order to exercise his right to earn a living.

The Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, N. J., in April 1955 reported upon a general public survey on the question and the great majority believes that a man should hold a job whether or not he is a union member. The survey included 645 respondents in a group classified as "strongly socialistic." The vote from this group was 47 percent in favor of the proposition, and it was the only group where the majority voted against the proposition that a man should hold a job whether or not he is a union member.

The unions and certain political people try to show that these right-to-work laws are a grave threat to organized labor. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Those who seek to overthrow right-to-work laws assiduously avoid their paramount feature, which is the fact that they accord statutory protection to basic and fundamental human rights protected by the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution. The proponents of compulsory unionism, in fact, have done everything in their power to obscure this facet of right-to-work laws in a cloud of propaganda. But when pressed to it, they go so far as to deny that the Constitution of the United States protects a right-to-work.

In this denial these people come into square conflict with the Supreme Court of the United States. The Court has repeatedly held that the Bill of Rights protects a right to work and a freedom of association as well. These have also been given express universal recognition in the declaration of human rights of the United Nations. It is abundantly clear that these fundamental rights are abridged by compulsory unionism. A right or freedom exists in name only when it can be subjected to unreasonable and arbitrary conditions. The Supreme Court has flatly ruled that the right to work, like other constitutional liberties, cannot be subjected to such conditions. The same perforce applies to freedom of association.

We are told that elections have shown that the union shop is desired by the majority of union members and that the wishes of these majorities should be respected. Let us assume, as it is claimed, that the majority in favor of the union shop is ordinarly overwhelming. The principal point demonstrated by that is that a compulsory membership requirement is not required for a strong union membership, and the coercion and infringement of liberty of the objecting minority serves no really useful purpose. If nearly everybody belongs to the union anyway, no substantial purpose is served by forcing a handful of objectors to conform.

A union is not, as many people suppose, purely an agency for collective bargaining with the employer. It is partly that, of course, but it is also more. Sometimes it is partly a social club, partly a secret society, partly an insurance company, and of course it has definite relations with political organization. To join it a man has to give up some of his freedoms, and some people just don't like to do that. Their reason, good, bad, or indifferent, is entitled to respect.

You will find that as a unionman the employee is expected to contribute to an associated political organization, and otherwise toe the line politically. This means an assertion of control by the union over matters without direct bearing on the union's role of collective-bargaining representative, and as to which the leaders assume to know better than the individual himself what is good and what is bad for him.

However appropriate this might be where membership in the union is on a voluntary basis, it becomes intolerable when it applies to one who is forced into the organization against his will. It is bad enough to force a man into a good union. But what about forcing fine American citizens into a union dominated by Communists, or one dominated by racketeers?

That to our disgrace is being done in this country today, and the doing of it is being facilitated by the laws and the institutions established during the thirties and forties. To the credit of the CIO it has expelled a number of large and important unions because of Communist domination, but that has not ended their power or the power of other Communist-dominated unions under union-shop agreements to force workers into their ranks. In the last 10 years we have spent untold billions to protect the people of the free world from Communist domination, and yet we ourselves follow a labor policy that forces our own people into organizations ruled by Communist leaders. We would never think of doing it in any other field, yet we persist here, largely I think, because of the timidity of politicians in consideration of these policies.

In New York and elsewhere public attention has been focused in recent years on unions controlled by racketeers and criminals, where honest men because of union-shop agreements have to bow the knee to these criminals and racketeers to earn their living.

One of the arguments advanced by those who oppose right-to-work laws is that management and labor should have the freedom to engage in collective bargaining on the question of compulsory union membership.

Let us examine this freedom of contract. There are three parties whose interests are affected by compulsory union membership—management, unions, and employees. The management and the union have no right to make an agreement which serves to deprive the employees of their basic constitutional rights, such as the right to work and the freedom of association.

Many years ago freedom of contract was thought to protect the right of management to include in a contract of employment a provision under which the employee bound himself not to join a labor union. A great many people who classified themselves as liberals objected to this. They called it a "yellow dog" contract. They said that it enabled the employer to use his freedom of contract to destroy the freedom of choice of the employee in joining an organization. They said it violated his right of association. I think they were quite right and I am glad they succeeded in securing the passage of statutes which outlawed the practice.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act contained a ringing declaration of policy to the effect that every man should have the right to freedom of choice in joining or staying out of a labor union.

But today those who were against the freedom of contract which produced the "yellow dog" contract are dissatisfied with what they have done. They want to restore the supremacy of freedom of contract, or at least so long as it moves along the other side of the street and permits interference with freedom of association by means of compulsory union membership. What they are trying to do is to turn the clock back.

Actually there is no such thing in this country as freedom of contract with respect to the union shop. The majority of employers in the country are opposed to any form of compulsory union membership. many of them have nevertheless agreed to the union shop. It is a matter of common knowledge that they have done so not of their own free will but because of coercion—by strikes or threats of strikes. In any field where the ruling influence is coercion of contract is a misnomer.

While the Taft-Hartley Act clearly recognizes the right of individual States to pass right-to-work laws, the Railway Labor Act is different. From 1934 to 1951 the Railway Labor Act specifically forbade a closed shop or a union shop. Under an amendment of 1951 the union shop was sanctioned under certain conditions, any other law, State or Federal, to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under this amendment the nonoperating unions on the Santa Fe sought an agreement for a union shop. Similar action was taken on other railroads. Such an agreement would require the Santa Fe to serve notice on all present employees who are not union members that they must join the union representing their craft within 60 days or be fired from their jobs. The agreement would require that new employees join the union within the 60-day period.

It is clear that the proposed agreement contemplates we would use the power of an employer to deprive individual men and women of a freedom which is theirs as an unalienable right. We are asked to fire people for exercising their rights. A right to pursue happiness—a right to get the means of sustaining life—a right of property—a right to work. It is a freedom of individual men and women which it is not our right to bargain away.

The Santa Fe has several thousand nonunion employees who, for reasons good or bad or indifferent, but at least satisfactory to them, do not belong to a labor organization.

When the unions pressed their demands for a union-shop agreement, a class action was instituted as a test suit by 13 Santa Fe employees at Amarillo, Tex., against both the unions and the railroad. Santa Fe subsequently alined itself with its employees and against the unions. The district court at Amarillo found that the proposed union-shop agreement would deprive the individual employees and the Santa Fe of rights guaranteed to them under the Constitution. The court granted a permanent injunction enjoining the signing of a union-shop agreement. Also, the order of the court restrains the union from demanding such agreement through use of a strike or through other economic sanctions.

The court of civil appeals reversed the findings of the district court and the case has been appealed to the Supreme Court of Texas and it will be argued on May 11.

Now, I do not propose to talk too much about this specific case. It is an important case because it raises a question that has never, so far as I have been able to learn, been squarely presented to or decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, namely, whether compulsory union membership is compatible with the fundamental liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

There have been State court decisions, some one way, some another, but none by the Supreme Court of the United States. What is important is the principle of liberty that so thoroughly permeates the case. The

very fundamental liberty which is involved is the right to work without complying, as a condition of employment, with any requirement of membership or nonmembership in a labor union.

We are not opposed to unions on the Santa Fe. We have recognized railroad unions beginning in the 1880's, and we think that they have a useful and legitimate place among American institutions.

These railroad labor unions are among the very best of the labor organizations in the country. I know most of their executives, and they are good people. I have no quarrel with them personally. My difference with them relates to the question of principle on this specific issue.

We are resisting the demands for a union shop because we think they are contrary to the principles under which this country has been founded, because we do not wish to be a party to depriving our employes of their rights, and because we believe that the subjugation of the individual is contrary to the best interest of all concerned. We think that yielding to the demands would work injury, tangible and intangible, to the company and to the employes, both those who are presently union members and those who are not.

It is an obvious infringement on the liberty of a man to force him against his will to belong to any private organization. This is scarcely denied, but an attempt is made to justify the deprivation of liberty in the case of a labor union on a number of special grounds.

Earlier I mentioned the principle of majority rule. It is said that if the majority of employees unite in organizing a union on democratic principles their decision is binding on all. But this is no more true in a labor union than in any other type of private association.

There is nothing absolute about the principle of majority rule. It is not unlimited. Under free institutions the majority may not encroach upon the fundamental liberties of the minority. The very purpose of our Constitution and of the Bill of Rights is the protection of minorities. Tyranny and oppression are as bad at the hands of a majority as at the hands of George III or a dictator heading a modern police state.

There is reason for believing that in America today the danger to liberty from outside our borders is not the only one we face. There is also the inside danger which has its origin in the impulses and emotions which impel the crowd to infringe on individual rights.

Compulsory union membership is also supported by an appeal to the equitable theory that since the union confers benefits on all employees by acting as their collective-bargaining representative and otherwise, each of them should be compelled to bear a share of the burden of supporting the organization.

Those who stay out, it is said, are free riders who get unjust enrichment at the expense of the members. Drawing an analogy between union dues and taxes, those who take this view say that democratic principles require nonunion men to contribute financial support to the union which represents them. They go so far as expressly to classify union dues as taxes.

These reasons no more support compulsory membership in a labor union than in any other type of association.

The payment of dues to the union cannot properly be likened to taxes. Taxation is a sovereign power and may be exercised by the Government alone. There is not the slightest basis for the levying of taxes by a labor union or by any other private association.

Every chamber of commerce, every board of trade, every trade association, every taxpayers' league, many fraternal organizations, and many service clubs provide benefits for a group of persons. Quite a few people think one political party or the other provides inestimable benefits to all of the people of the country. Yet, would that justify making membership compulsory in these associations, including the political parties?

The theory of the free-rider argument is that when an organization is protective or promotive of the interests of a class or group, every member of that class or group should be compelled to join and support the organization. This idea is opposed to the fundamental theory of private organization. A group of people associate themselves to advance their common interests. They try to persuade as many others as they can to join with them but since the undertaking is wholly private and voluntary they can use nothing but persuasion to obtain or retain members. According to the compulsory union-membership theory, however, whenever an organization becomes representative of a large number of persons having a common interest, everyone having the same interest should be compelled to join the organization.

For the sake of testing the free-rider theory, let us look for a moment at the benefit bestowed upon workers as a class by the investors who raise the capital to build the plant and provide the management whereby workers are given employment. Suppose a law were passed providing that management could require as a condition of employment that all employees must belong to an industry protective association, formed to advance the welfare of the industry as a whole. A strong argument could be made that the corporate employer, by financing, organizing, and managing the business, is providing the opportunity for employment which is so vital to the employees, furnishing them as it does with the means of earning a livelihood. It could be argued that the employer is not only investing money and taking risks for the benefit of the employees or the corporation, but is supporting the industrial association to look out for the welfare of all of those engaged in the industry, and therefore, the employees should not be free riders in the organization which likewise functions for their benefit. One could argue that they should be compelled to join the association, to pay their dues and to submit to the charter, bylaws, and rules governing the other members of the industry association, which some might argue confers greater material benefits on employees than any labor organizations. Despite the apparent absurdity of this illustration, it has fully as much logic as the case for compulsory unionism.

The final ground that is urged for supporting compulsory union membership is one I touched upon eralier, i. e., that it is necessary for union security. Labor leaders have frequently placed their demands for security on the basis of need. They have said in effect: "We must have the closed or union shop to guarantee our existence and thereby insure protection of the gains of organized labor." Where this idea has been accepted, the acceptance has generally been uncritical and without question. But now that the union shop form of compulsory union membership has spread beyond mere local situations, it is time to evaluate the theory of the need for the union shop as essential to the survival of the union, or to its prosperity and well-being, or its successful operation. It is time to test it and reappraise its role as an instrument of union security.

Fortunately, the yardstick of ample experience in the railroad industry is at hand to test the validity of the assumption that the need for compulsory union membership continues under modern conditions. From 1934 to 1951, the Railway Labor Act specifically forbade closed or union shop contracts in the railroad industry. If the old assumptions about need were sound, one would expect to find that railroad labor organizations fared rather badly in that 17-year period. We all know, at least in a general way, that railroad labor unions have made considerable progress in recent years, and have enjoyed marked success. But we need not speculate—let us see what the record shows.

It is interesting indeed to examine membership figures of the 3 largest nonoperating railroad unions during the period when the union shop was forbidden by legislation. They show a threefold gain during this very time. The other rail unions expanded in a comparable fashion during the same period.

Membership is not the only area in which these unions have enjoyed outstanding success. By 1952 each had collective bargaining contracts covering substantially all—between 94 and 99 percent—of the railroad mileage in the country.

This experience in the railroad industry does not stand alone. It has its parallel in the growth in the ranks of organized labor in industry after industry without the coercive influence of the union shop or any other form of compulsory union membership.

Dr. Frederick Meyers of the University of Texas, testified for the unions in the Texas case I have mentioned. Later, in 2 addresses, Dr. Meyers described a study he had made which revealed that labor unions have experienced a remarkable growth in Texas in recent years, including 1947–1953, when the union-shop statute in that State was in effect.

The statute not only did not wreck the unions but did not so much as impede the rapid rate of their growth. There is good reason for believing that compulsory union membership harms rather than helps the union cause. Louis D. Brandeis, a great liberal, said many years ago that, "The objections, legal, economic, and social, against the closed shop are so strong, and the ideas of the closed shop so antagonistic to the American spirit, that the insistence upon it has been a serious obstacle to union progress."

We hope that we have made a contribution to an understanding of the issues and have made clear the reasons why we feel that compulsory unionism runs counter to the basic institutions of our form of society.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	...do	Election of Speaker, (MARTIN, 220; RAYBURN, 201)	MARTIN.
3	Feb. 3	H. R. 1979, amending the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before Apr. 1, 1955. (Passed, 389 to 5.)	Yea.
4	...do	S. 243, providing for an Under Secretary of State for Administration. (Passed, 341 to 18.)	Yea.
5	Feb. 19	H. R. 3053, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1953: On motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for VA medical, hospital, and domiciliary services from $10 million to $20 million. (Rejected, 180 to 201.)	Nay.
6	...do	On passage. (Passed, 369 to 2.)	Yea.
7	Feb. 24	H. Res. 119, providing $300,000 for expenses of House Un-American Activities Committee. (Adopted, 315 to 2.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 25	H. R. 2332, requiring an annual review of military personnel requirements: On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed, 370 to 0.)	Yea.
9	...do	H. J. Res. 160, amending the National Housing Act by increasing FHA's title I loan insurance authorization by $500,000,000 and providing for repayment of the $8,300,000 Government investment in this fund to Treasury on or after July 1, 1953: On motion to recommit with instructions to fix interest rate at not to exceed 6 percent per annum on unpaid balance. (Rejected, 70 to 290.)	Nay.
10	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
11	...do	H. R. 3575, admitting Hawaii to statehood: On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 182 to 227.)	Nay.
12	...do	On passage. (Passed, 274 to 138.)	Yea.
13	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
14	...do	...do	Present.
15	...do	...do	Present.
16	Mar. 18	...do	Present.
17	...do	H. J. Res. 223, providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall take effect 10 days after date of enactment of this joint resolution. (Adopted, 291 to 85.)	Yea.
18	Mar. 19	H. R. 3053, the 2d supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (conference report): On motion to agree to an amendment decreasing borrowing authority for rural electrification program from $50,000,000 to $35,000,000 and increasing borrowing authority for rural telephone program from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000 (instead of to $40,000,000 as proposed by Senate). (Rejected, 165 to 191.)	Yea.
19	...do	On motion to agree to amendment increasing borrowing authority for rural telephone program from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000. (Rejected, 171 to 174.)	Nay.
20	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
21	Apr. 1	H. R. 4198, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands and resources within their historic boundaries: On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 106 to 283.)	Nay.
22	...do	On passage. (Passed, 285 to 108.)	Yea.
23	Apr. 15	H. R. 3480, extending for 3 years the period during which Mexican agricultural workers may be made available for employment in this country. (Passed, 259 to 87.)	Yea.
24	...do	H. R. 4004, providing for national banks to furnish lists of stockholders to the Comptroller of Currency upon request in lieu of annual filing: On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 79 to 239.)	Nay.
25	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
26	Apr. 22	...do	Present.
27	...do	H. R. 4663, making appropriations for Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year 1954 (1st independent offices): On motion to recommit with instructions to authorize the start of 35,000 units of public housing in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. (Rejected, 157 to 245.)	Nay.
28	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
29	...do	H. R. 1432, providing price support at 90 percent of parity for 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco. (Defeated, 110 to 212.)	Nay.
30	Apr. 27	S. 1419, authorizing the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District: On amendment allowing the Commissioners to institute daylight saving time each year. (Adopted, 250 to 99.)	Yea.
31	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
32	...do	H. R. 4828, making appropriations for the Department of Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954: On amendments: To provide an additional $50,000 for expenses of planning in connection with the Southeastern Power area. (Adopted.)	Nay.
		On motion to recommit with instructions to increase by $3,786,000 the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration and to increase from $38,300,000 to $42,728,000 funds for Bonneville Power Administration. (Rejected, 167 to 212.)	Nay.
33	May 5	H. R. 4974, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete the sections authorizing the Secretarys of the 3 departments to terminate the employment of any employee whenever they deem such termination necessary in the interests of the United States. (Adopted, 181 to 168.)	Nay.
34	...do	On passage. (Passed, 344 to 5.)	Yea.
35	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
36	...do	H. R. 5134, amending the Submerged Lands Act and establishing title of Federal Government and its right to develop resources in submerged lands in the Continental Shelf. (Passed, 309 to 91.)	Yea.
37	...do	H. Res. 242, providing for House agreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 4198, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands and resources within their historic boundaries. (Adopted, 278 to 116.)	Yea.
38	May 14	Quorum call	Present.
39	May 19	...do	Present.
40	May 20	...do	Present.
41	...do	H. R. 5227, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954: On amendment reducing from $195,000,000 to $140,000,000 the funds provided for soil conservation payments. (Rejected, 196 to 201.)	Yea.
42	...do	On passage. (Passed, 384 to 12.)	Nay.
43	May 25	Quorum call	Absent.
44	May 26	H. R. 5246, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related independent agencies for fiscal year 1954: On amendment increasing from $60,500,000 to $66,500,000 the funds allocated for payments to school districts in federally impacted areas. (Adopted, 237 to 156.)	Nay.
45	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions designed to increase by $25,000,000 the amount allocated for construction of hospitals. (Rejected, 197 to 203.)	Nay.
46	...do	On passage. (Passed, 395 to 2.)	Yea.
47	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
48	June 3	...do	Present.
49	...do	H. Res. 236, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2, simplifying operations of the Department of Agriculture and adapting its administration to regional, State, and local conditions: On motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of bill (in effect, to force consideration of the unfavorable resolution by the House). (Rejected, 128 to 261.)	Nay.
50	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
51	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
52	...do	On motion to recommit with instructions not to increase membership of the U. S. Tariff Commission from 6 to 7. (Rejected, 185 to 215.)	Nay.
53	...do	On passage. (Passed, 363 to 35.)	Yea.
54	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
55	June 18	H. R. 5660, 2d independent offices appropriation for fiscal 1954: On motion to agree to amendment deleting language authorizing the VA to investigate non-service-connected veterans statements of inability to pay for treatment or hospitalization. (Adopted, 217 to 180.)	Nay.
56	...do	On passage. (Passed, 394 to 2.)	Yea.
57	...do	H. Res. 292, providing for consideration of H. R. 5710, extending the Mutual Security Act for 1 year. (Adopted, 340 to 35.)	Yea.
58	...do	Quorum call	Present.
59	June 19	...do	Present.
60	...do	H. R. 5710, providing 1 year extension of the Mutual Security Act: On passage. (Passed, 280 to 41.)	Yea.
61	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
62	June 23	...do	Present.
63	...do	H. R. 5659, providing price-support wheat for Pakistan. (Passed, 310 to 75.)	Yea.
64	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
65	June 25	...do	Present.
66	...do	H. R. 5728, authorizing disposal of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities: On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 58 to 317.)	Nay.
67	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 27	...do	Present.
69	...do	H. Res. 295, disapproving of Reorganization Plan No. 6 relating to Department of Defense. (Rejected, 108 to 235.)	Nay.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District, Michigan, 83d Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
70	June 27	H. R. 4654, excluding top department and agency officials from provisions of law permitting lump-sum payments for annual leave. On adoption of conference report (which, in addition, repealed requirement that employees use annual earned leave by Jan. 30 of next calendar year). (Adopted, 269 to 65.)	Nay.
71	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
72	June 30	do	Present.
73	July 1	do	Present.
74	July 2	do	Present.
		H. R. 5969, Department of Defense Appropriation for 1954:	
75	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase Air Force funds by $1,175,000,000. (Requested, 161 to 230.)	Nay.
76	do	On passage. (Passed, 386 to 0)	Yea.
77	July 7	Quorum call	Present.
78	do	do	Present.
79	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5173, providing for return to States of all Federal unemployment tax collections in excess of amount sufficient to pay administrative costs and to maintain $200 million reserve in Federal unemployment account:	
80	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit use of excess taxes to payment of unemployment compensation and to provide for delaying repayment of advances to States. (Defeated, 93 to 292.)	Nay.
81	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
82	do	H. R. 6054, amending act of Apr. 6, 1949, to provide for additional emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen in drought areas. (Passed, 387 to 4.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4351, providing for the development of private power facilities on Niagara River:	
83	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 130 to 254.)	Nay.
84	do	On passage. (Passed, 262 to 120.)	Yea.
85	July 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5898, extending until Dec. 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess profits tax shall be effective:	
86	do	On motion to recommit with instructions designed to substitute the provisions of H. R. 6100, permitting companies formed after 1947 to choose any 3 years as the "base" years in figuring the tax. (Rejected, 127 to 275.)	Nay.
87	do	On passage. (Passed, 325 to 77.)	Yea.
88	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
89	do	H. R. 5710, extending the mutual security program for fiscal year 1954: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 221 to 109.)	Yea.
90	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6200, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.	
91	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for international information and educational activities (Voice of America) from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 and to remove language providing for reduction of employees. (Rejected, 154 to 244.)	Nay.
92	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
93	July 17	H. Res. 262, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 8, providing for reorganization of foreign information functions and the creation of a new agency to be known as the U. S. Information Agency: On adoption. (Rejected, 11 to 310.)	Nay.
94	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4974, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for fiscal year 1954:	
95	July 21	On motion to agree to amendment stating it to be the sense of Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to the U. N. as the representative of China. (Passed, 379 to 0.)	Yea.
96	do	On motion to agree to amendment providing additional $12,500,000 for Federal aid to airports. (Rejected, 160 to 230.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4663, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year 1954:	
97	do	On motion to agree to an amendment limiting to 20,000 the number of public housing units to be started in 1954 and barring any future commitments for such housing. (Passed, 239 to 161.)	Yea.
		H. R. 5376, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1954:	
98	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to agree to Senate amendment adding $2,200,000 to the $278,670,000 recommended by the conferees for flood-control construction projects. (Rejected, 137 to 252.)	Nay.
99	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6391, making appropriations for Mutual Security for fiscal year 1954:	
100	do	On passage. (Passed, 288 to 115.)	Yea.
101	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
102	do	H. Res. 347, providing for the consideration of H. R. 5894, amending the Trade Agreements Extension Act: On adoption. (Adopted, 219 to 183.)	Nay.
103	do	H. R. 5894, amending the Trade Agreements Extension Act and certain other provisions of law to provide adequate protection for American workers, miners, farmers, and producers: On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 242 to 161.)	Yea.
104	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5141, creating Small Business Administration to take over lending functions of RFC in this field and to consolidate other activities in behalf of small business:	
105	July 27	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 161 to 226.)	Nay.
106	do	H. Res. 217, creating a special committee to conduct investigation and study of educational and philanthropic foundations and other comparable organizations which are exempt from Federal income taxation. (Adopted, 209 to 163.)	Nay.
107	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
108	do	do	Present.
109	do	H. Res. 353, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6481, authorizing admittance of 240,000 special-quota immigrants: On adoption. (Adopted, 250 to 152.)	Yea.
110	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6481, authorizing the admittance of 217,000 special quota immigrants:	
111	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 186 to 222.)	Nay.
112	do	On passage. (Passed 221 to 185.)	Yea.
113	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6016, authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States:	
114	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 114 to 321.)	Nay.
115	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6391, making appropriations for the Mutual Security Administration for fiscal year 1954:	
116	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to insist on disagreement with Senate amendment which added $211,000,000 aid for Europe. (Rejected, 192 to 200.)	Nay.
117	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 237 to 156.)	Yea.
118	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 6672, increasing the statutory debt limit of the United States from $275,000,000,000 to $290,000,000,000:	
119	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit the increase to the period of Aug. 1, 1953 to Dec. 31, 1954. (Rejected, 173 to 225.)	Nay.
120	do	On passage. (Passed, 239 to 158.)	Yea.
121	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
122	do	H. Res. 361, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6413, permitting withholding by the Federal Government from wages of Federal employees certain taxes imposed by municipalities: On adoption. (Adopted, 192 to 161.)	Yea.
		H. R. 6200, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1954:	
123	Aug. 3	On amendment authorizing dismissal of certain employees of U. S. Information Agency. (Adopted, 147 to 139.)	N. V.

Six Good Reasons Why There Is Danger in Colorado River Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Milo E. Rowell, president of the California Taxpayers' Association, listing "Six Good Reasons Why There Is Danger in Colorado River Projects," which I thoroughly agree with. These are the most costly and fantastic irrigation and reclamation projects which the Congress has ever been called upon to consider:

SIX GOOD REASONS WHY THERE IS DANGER IN COLORADO RIVER PROJECTS

(By Milo E. Rowell, president, California Taxpayers' Association)

Because the bills now pending in Congress seeking to authorize the upper Colorado River Basin projects (S. 500 and H. R. 270) and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project (S. 300 and H. R. 412) are economically unjustifiable and financially infeasible, and because they would, if enacted, be wasteful of water, the lifeblood of California, the executive committee of California Taxpayers' Association has acted to oppose these measures.

Information in minority reports of California Congressmen shows that:

1. Current upper basin bills are not the same as originally approved by the President. There are 4 additional major dams, bringing the total to 6, and 16 additional irrigation projects, bringing the total to 30, raising the cost from $920 million to $1.6 billion, as a starter.

2. The Interior Department would be permitted to bypass the Agriculture Department in the reappraisal of some of the projects. Considering the vast investment in the land involved, it would seem essential for the Congress to have the best sort of soil appraisal by that Department.

3. Under the proposed plan of financing, the construction costs and concealed subsidies to be paid by the Nation's taxpayers would be more than $4 billion. This would be to supply 730,000 acres of land, of which 450,000 acres would receive only a supplemental water supply. The subsidy would cost $5,000 an acre. The cost to taxpayers for each 150-acre farm would be $750,000.

4. The lands in all of the participating projects would be in high elevations with a limited growing season. With water, their average value would be about $150 an acre. They would be suitable for crops already in great surplus in this country.

5. The same method of financing is proposed for the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as above described for the upper Colorado River Basin projects, except that repayment of costs allocated to irrigation would be permitted for a 70-year period instead of the 50-year period provided for the upper Colorado projects. This extension of the repayment period to 70 years more than doubles the interest subsidy under the 40-year repayment permitted by existing law.

6. Congress created the Hoover Commission for the purpose, among others, of investigating and making recommendations as to all water and power policies. The Commission is expected to make its report on water and power policies within the next 4 months. No legislation should be adopted by the Congress establishing new policies as sweeping as these, at least until it has received and considered the report of the Hoover Commission.

The threat of $4 billion in further entirely unnecessary Federal expenditures is of concern to every citizen. For Californians, such expenditures are of more than ordinary concern, for while we are 7.7 percent of the American people, we pay 9.4 percent of the Federal tax bill. A $4 billion expenditure by Uncle Sam means a tax cost of $372,800,000 for the people of California.

We hope California Congressmen will be able to protect the people of our State and the Nation from these dangerous and costly enterprises.

The Weekly Newspaper Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the April 15 issue of the Piggott, Ark., Banner, my good friend, Mr. Laud Payne, in referring to the fact that with the publication of that issue his newspaper would be entering on its 63d year of continuous business in Clay County, Ark., makes some cogent statements in connection with the business of the weekly newspaper.

Writing in his column, Picked Up Here and There, Mr. Payne says:

With the publication of this issue, the Banner enters its 63d year of continuous business in Piggott. This gives this paper one of the longest records in this area of being continuously in business under the same firm name. A lot of people have thought the paper has been continuously owned by the Payne family, but that is not the case. My father, the late Charles Payne, came to work for the Banner when he was a boy, not over 16 years of age. He started as a printer's devil, working for 50 cents a week and board and sleeping on a cot in the back of the office. This was around 1900. He worked almost continuously for the paper until his death in 1940. The only time he was out for any time was during the 8 years he served the county as a public official—county court clerk and sheriff and collector.

During the very bottom of the depression, the early thirties, he purchased the paper, took over as editor. Not too many years later he purchased the present building and we moved over here.

I came to work here in May of 1925—30 years ago.

After my father's death, the Banner became a partnership concern, with my mother, Mrs. Amanda Payne, and I coowners.

During the past 14-plus years, while I have been serving as editor, the only time I have been off duty here for extended times was the 60-day term of the legislature on four occasions.

The history related by Mr. Payne can be matched throughout the Nation, for our so-called country newspaper editors have always been noted for their endeavor and their public service. In addition to the publication of news and the chronicle of life in the community, these fine men and women have given generously of their time in civic affairs.

I would like to call to the attention of the House Mr. Payne's comments regarding the glamour of the newspaper profession. He states:

Unfortunately, operating a country weekly is not at all like is pictured in the movies or on television. Their stories would leave you to believe that all papers have a large outside staff of reporters, that are on call for any and every event. These stories do not depict the story behind the scene. The backshop activity, where the mechanical work is done is not so glamorous to depict. But it is the workshop and where the money must be made. All of us in the Banner work in the front and back. Not one (and that includes the gals, Mrs. Robbins, and my mother), are excluded from getting "ink in the hair."

So if you don't see us out on the streets too often; don't see us at every accident scene; at every fire; at every social function; it isn't our lack of interest—but lack of time. We try to get the stories in, and have various sources from which we get information.

This is true, the business of operating a weekly newspaper is not the wild and discordant hustle and bustle as pictured in popular print, but the everyday operation of the paper—recording the loss of the community's citizenship, the birth of its future leaders, and the happy news of weddings and anniversaries, the location of new business, and the everyday events that make America—this is the life of our newspapermen on the small weeklies. The editor usually writes most of the news, being the confidant of the civic officials, and he is to be seen up and down the streets of the city with his blunt pencil and fold of copy paper. He may have the help of the pony wire from the wire service and, at best, he may be opulent enough to have a teletype machine—but, primarily, his news is of the community. He edits the newsletters from the various rural communities surrounding his town, and he thinks it right to leave in the copy local news of a litter of pigs and the visit of a relative from just across the county.

The local newspaper retains the flavor of our historic past for stories in the newspaper reflect the character of the editor and modern objectivity in news is not permitted to make the items impersonal. If they like a man they say so.

The greatest gems of journalism are not found in the large metropolitan papers. The true essence of life in these United States is found in the columns of the weekly newspapers.

The news is gathered and many times set up in type by the same editor. Or, in a pinch, he can still pick up a stick and handset the type and measure out the heads without worrying about a layout man. He is as familiar with the stone in the composing room as he is with his desk in the editor's cubbyhole.

He is the voice of his community. He is the conscience of his community. And he is a bulwark in the Nation.

To the Laud Paynes of this Nation—the editors of our weekly newspapers, I pay tribute, and I congratulate the Piggott Banner on its successful history of service to Clay County. May our Nation remain a free and democratic country where the voice of such editors will continue to be heard and the news of our communities be recorded without censorship or restraint.

Poland Crucified

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to join with many of my colleagues in observing Poland's Constitution Day.

This is no new subject for me. Well do I recall March 2, 1945, the day after President Roosevelt addressed both Houses of Congress and reported the results of the so-called Yalta Conference. We know, today, that there were many secret agreements made at the several conferences, Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, notwithstanding Mr. Roosevelt's denial that secret agreements had been made. And so it was on the very next day after his appearance that I was privileged to address this House on the subject Yalta—A Moral Retreat—Poland and Small Nations Crucified.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to repeat what I said on that occasion, I would, however, take the opportunity to point out some statements I made regarding the treatment accorded Poland and other small nations by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin.

I said:

The determination by the conferees—

Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill—

to settle the boundary lines of Poland before the question was submitted to the people of Poland constitutes a retreat from high moral ground that we have steadily maintained throughout the war. To say now that free elections are to be held and that Poland will receive a long shore line carved out of Germany is to rob Peter to pay Paul and is a feeble effort to fool the people.

Mr. Speaker, I was referring, of course, to a very important article in the so-called North Atlantic Treaty whereby the great powers pledged that all peoples would have the right of self-determination. This principle was denied the people of Poland and the other small captive nations. I further pointed out that a great mistake had been made at Yalta and one which, if not rectified, would lead to world war III. We know how close to another war we are today. Poland and these small nations had no representation, no spokesman for them at the conferences to which I have referred.

Again, I repeat what I said on that occasion, that there were three cardinal provisions of the Atlantic Charter violated:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Mr. Speaker, at Yalta it seems quite clear today that we acquiesced in every demand made by Russia for concessions in Europe and in Asia. We agreed to the establishment of the Curzon Line as the easternmost boundary line of Poland which was contrary to an agreement made between Poland and Russia subsequent to World War II and which violated the rights of millions of Polish people. We knew that, by that agreement, Russia was to continue to dominate and control Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, all of which was an unlawful grab of those countries in 1940.

We were parties to the unholy crime, notwithstanding the noble pronouncements of our State Department in 1940 to the contrary. Britain and the United States acquiesced foolishly in the demands of Stalin in his selected sphere of influence. This, I repeat again, constitutes the retreat from the high moral ground upon which we had pledged ourselves in the war.

There was little doubt that Poland was crucified at Yalta, and with that crucifixion American idealism was also defeated. Our leaders scorned our American constitutional system and the pledges made in the North Atlantic Charter that no nation, neither Russia, Britain, nor any other country would seek territorial aggrandizement, were flagrantly violated at Yalta.

Mr. Speaker, on this sacred occasion those of us who live today can only pledge that we will exert every influence and every power available to repudiate the moral retreat of our nation at Yalta, where Poland and the other small nations were crucified.

Low Strike Record in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a release from the Department of Industrial Relations of the State of California calling attention to the State's outstanding 1954 labor-management relations record. In actual man-days lost on account of strikes, the 1954 record was the lowest in 10 years. The time lost in 1954 represented a 64 percent decrease from the 1953 figures. This splendid record is even more remarkable than it seems at first glance when we take a look at some of the other factors involved.

In the 10 years since the war California has had a tremendous influx of people finding new jobs in the State. There has been a corresponding increase in new industries and plants, and a terrific expansion in size of existing industries in California. Nonagricultural employment in the State varied between 3,800,000 and 3,900,000 wage and salary workers in 1954. The corresponding figure in January 1946, following the war's end, was 2,787,000—so we have over 1 million more nonfarm workers at this time. Normally, with such conditions industrial unrest could be expected to follow. This is well demonstrated in other sections of the country right now, where an expanding industrial economy is plagued with serious labor-management difficulties and where such difficulties can be expected to multiply unless a way is found to promote harmonious relationships.

It might be well to look for a moment at the reasons for California's stable labor-management picture. Let us remember that the tabulations in the release accompanying these remarks do not tell the whole story. While the numerical decline in strike situations shown is encouraging in itself, when we consider the great expansion of industrial activity and total employment in the State at the same time it is truly remarkable. California is one of the most highly organized States in the country, unionwise. Through a long period of years, during which I played an active part, labor organizations and management groups in the State have worked out a highly effective technique for composing their differences and negotiating issues with a minimum of strain and violent reaction. The methods used require that each of the groups recognize and respect the rights and position of the other. The statistics in the accompanying release show how this mutual respect has paid off in dollars and cents for both sides, to say nothing of the avoidance of tension and physical violence now widespread elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a lesson in this from which other areas in the country might well profit. As a tribute to a successful labor-management cooperation in my own State, and for the benefit it may have for others, I ask that the release to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

TEN-YEAR LOW OF STRIKE ACTIVITY IN CALIFORNIA

Idleness in California due to labor-management disputes was lower in 1954 than in any of the last 10 years, Ernest B. Webb, California director of industrial relations, announced today. Work stoppages during the last year caused 1,070,000 man-days of idleness. This represents a 64-percent drop from 2,960,000 man-days idle in 1953.

The number of workers involved in California work stoppages beginning in 1954 was 88,100, well under half of the 1953 figure of 210,000. In only 1 of the last 10 years did fewer workers participate in strikes. That year was 1949.

Altogether last year there were 206 stoppages compared with 269 which began in 1953. In only 2 of the last 10 years, 1945 and 1948, California had fewer strikes than were counted in 1954.

The largest work stoppages in 1954 in terms of man-days idle resulted from 3 disputes, 1 in the lumber and 2 in the rubber industry. These were 3 multi-State disputes affecting California; they accounted for more than 40 percent of all man-days idle in the State in 1954.

Major issues: Nearly 90 percent of California's strike idleness in 1954 resulted from disputes over wages, hours, and wage supplements, such as welfare and pension plans. Inter- and intraunion disputes (sympathy, jurisdictional strikes, etc.) played a very small role in the strike picture of last year, resulting in less than 1 percent of all man-days idle.

Los Angeles metropolitan area: Strike idleness in the Los Angeles metropolitan area decreased sharply last year. Man-days of idleness dropped by 61 percent between 1953 and 1954—from 957,000 to 373,000.

The number of workers involved in Los Angeles strikes in 1954 was 44,700, about 22 percent less than the 57,000 workers idled in 1953.

Last year 88 work stoppages occurred in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. This was nearly one-third less than the 122 stoppages counted in 1953.

San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area: A similar sharp reduction of strike idleness occurred in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area where 186,000 man-days idle were reported in 1954. This was 75 percent below the 731,000 man-days idle in 1953.

The number of workers involved in strikes decreased even more sharply, about 80 percent. In the past year 11,100 workers, contrasted with 58,900 workers in 1953, participated in strikes.

Work stoppages beginning in 1954 numbered 70 compared with 81 in 1953.

Area	Stoppages beginning in year				Man-days idle during year	
	Number		Workers involved			
	1954	1953	1954	1953	1954	1953
California	206	269	88,100	210,000	1,070,000	2,960,000
Los Angeles metropolitan area	88	122	44,700	57,000	373,000	957,000
San Francisco metropolitan area	70	81	11,100	58,900	186,000	731,000

Federal Aid No Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a most enlightening editorial appeared recently in a very fine Long Island weekly newspaper. The editor of the Suffolk County News, Joseph Jahn, has presented a very clear and interesting analysis on what the proposed plan for Federal aid to education would mean to the State of New York and its taxpayers. It follows:

[From the Suffolk County News of April 22, 1955]

FEDERAL AID NO BARGAIN

We believe the Federal Government has a responsibility toward relieving the crisis that exists in the system of public school education but the present plan is not a sound one as far as New York State taxpayers are concerned.

Congress is being urged to pass a Federal aid plan to provide $20-a-child now and $80-a-child in 1965. The author of the plan is Beardsley Ruml, whom most of us remember as the "father" of pay-as-you-go Federal income taxes.

According to Mr. Ruml, his plan would cost the Nation's taxpayers $764 million in 1957. By 1965 it would cost $3,500,000,000. What does that mean to New Yorkers? How much would we give and how much would we get back?

To begin with, we had 2,246,967 children enrolled in all the State's public schools at the beginning of this school year. That's 7¼ percent of the Nation's total public-school enrollment. Assuming this proportion stays constant, we'll have 22,500,000 schoolchildren in 1957 and 3,200,000 in 1965.

In 1957, under the Ruml plan, we'd get $20 a child, or $50 million. By 1965, at $80 a child, we'd get $256 million a year. That sounds pretty good, so far. But when we check into the matter of cost, we get an entirely different picture.

New York taxpayers provide an estimated 12.44 percent of all the tax revenue collected by the Federal Government. If Congress appropriates $764 million in 1957, we'd have to pay more than $95 million. Since all we'd get that year would be $50 million, New Yorkers would have to take a net loss of over $45 million. By 1965, when we'd be getting $256 million we'd be paying $435 million. Our loss would be $179 million a year. If the Federal subsidy per child goes up after 1965, our annual loss would be even greater.

Before joining the Federal aid bandwagon, Empire State parents and taxpayers should ask themselves this question: "Do we want our school tax money sent to Washington, which will return only a fraction of it to us, or would we rather see all our school tax money spent right here in New York for our own children?" The answer should be obvious.

Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Max Abelman has been called Brooklyn's ambassador of good will. On the occasion of his retirement as secretary to the president of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn and director of public relations, many tributes extolling his years of service were paid to him.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters of additional commendation which have been sent Mr. Abelman in recognition of his services to our community:

MALACANANG, MANILA,
February 14, 1955.

MY DEAR MR. ABELMAN: It appears from your letter of January 29 that you are a good friend of my esteemed colleague, Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo. Since you are yourself Brooklyn's ambassador of good will, your acquaintance with him is not in the least surprising. I have also noted with great interest the excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD paying tribute to your accomplishments upon your retirement from your post at the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital and I therefore join your many friends in conveying congratulations for your splendid record.

My cordial good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

R. MAGSAYSAY.

HEADQUARTERS OF THE
COMMANDANT THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT,
FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING,
NEW YORK, N. Y. *April 20, 1955.*

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I am sorry that I had to miss the ceremony in which Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, our beloved commandant, presented to you a Certificate of Merit on behalf of the Navy.

An arrangement had been made for me, several months ago, to speak at the same time, before the combined women's auxiliaries of several churches, in the Union Presbyterian Church, Upper Montclair, N. J. I asked the admiral's aide to convey to you my regrets verbally.

Permit me to join your host of friends in congratulating you on the new honor that has come to you. You have given matchless service for many years to the Jewish Community and the American Community at large. We are all grateful to you.

Mrs. Goldberg joins me in wishing you many years of good health and spiritual joy that you may continue to serve as heretofore with that consecrated devotion and effective performance for which you have been known to all who had the privilege to come in contact with you.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSHUA L. GOLDBERG,
Captain, CHC, USN, District Chaplain.

FARVUE FARM,
SOUTH SALEM, N. Y., *April 16, 1955.*

DEAR MANNY: It was kind of you to include me in the guest list of the party you are giving for Max. He has been a true friend of so many people in so many different walks of life. It is good that Max should be honored in this way.

Unfortunately I have a speaking engagement at the Agricultural College at Storr's Conn., the evening of April 18 and it appears altogether unlikely that I shall be able to get back to Farvue in time to set out for New York.

Please give my warmest greetings to Max and our good friends.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. WALLACE.

Deputy United States Marshal Jobs Should Be Under Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to place the position of deputy United States marshal in the classified—competitive—civil-service system.

During the 82d and 83d Congresses bills were introduced in both Houses to exclude deputy United States marshals from the competitive civil-service system, but in each instance the Congress refused to act upon these bills because they were without merit. In November 1954, however, the United States Civil Service Commission, contrary to the intent of Congress, removed the deputy marshal positions from the competitive civil-service system. In taking this action, the Commission made these jobs subject to political patronage.

In my opinion, it is essential that law-enforcement positions of this type should remain under the regular civil service merit system. Applicants for such positions should be required to qualify in a competitive examination, instead of having to depend on political patronage. In this way, we shall insure continuity of service in a most important adjunct of our judicial system.

My bill provides that those marshals who have acquired competitive civil-service status prior to November 30, 1954, will retain their status under the measure. Deputy marshals appointed to such positions after that date without having taken a qualifying examination will be required to compete within 90 days following the enactment of the bill.

By enactment of my bill, all deputy marshal jobs will be filled through regular civil-service examinations in the future. In this way, we shall be able to restore these positions to the civil service merit system, instead of subjecting them to the inequities of the spoils system.

I trust we can have early committee action on the bill so that it can be brought before the House for consideration and approval.

Chicago Daily News Commends a Statesman From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the lead editorial in the Chicago Daily News, Thursday, April 21, 1955, as follows:

GOP SQUANDERBILL

In all of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' record of fighting governmental waste, no chapter does him more credit than his valiant efforts against the upper Colorado River project on the floor of the Senate Monday and Tuesday.

With 8 of the arid States represented by 2 Senators apiece, the $2 billion squanderbill passed the Senate despite DOUGLAS' efforts. These Senators were joined by most of the supporters of public power.

Senator DOUGLAS himself is a strong supporter of TVA, but he deplored the doctrinaire attitude of those colleagues who favored the upper Colorado project just because it includes vast sums for public power as well as irrigation. He urged them to discriminate on the basis of return.

No other public power project, existing or contemplated, is so expensive per unit of power to be produced. The current will cost 4½ times as much as current produced on the Columbia; 3 or 4 times as much as current produced by the single unit dams in the Tennessee Valley, and 4½ to 6 times the cost at the TVA multiple-purpose dams.

The irrigation costs are even more fantastic. The average, he estimated, will be $2,142 an acre to bring irrigation to land which cannot possibly exceed a value, when irrigated, of $150 an acre. In Utah, the cost will reach $3,953 an acre.

This is high-altitude land with a short growing season and the principal crop it can produce is hay. As DOUGLAS pointed out, the top price for the richest agricultural land in the world (Illinois and Iowa) does not exceed $650 an acre.

Senator DOUGLAS made the most of the curious fact that the administration pushes this monstrously high-cost project while complaining about "creeping socialism" in the TVA and other public-power areas.

When the Government first got into the reclamation business, the beneficiaries of irrigation projects were expected to pay interest on what the Government spent. Then the interest was deferred, for short periods, and for a longer time with every new project.

The Colorado project sets a new record for deferring interest. There will be a 10-year development period in which nothing will be paid on either interest or principal. Then there will be a 50-year period in which the beneficiaries will (theoretically) pay back principal but not interest.

Interest, in other words, is deferred for 60 years. If you assume a 10-year construction period, it would actually be deferred 70 years. Yet the Government will be paying interest on its obligations all the time.

It is hardly conceivable that fiscal irresponsibility could be pushed further.

The New York Mirror Youth Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest character-building programs of activities for our citizens of tomorrow is the youth program conducted by the New York Mirror, one of the great newspapers of this country. Through this program of 20 different activities, the youth of New York City is learning to assume greater responsibilities of citizenship and sportsmanship.

The youth program was first launched by the Mirror in 1942 and has since then been expanded into a series of year-round activities and events aimed at the spiritual, intellectual, and physical development of our youth. Each year this program is enhanced by the addition of new events and larger numbers of participants. In 1954 these events attracted some 84,000 participants and about 1,100,000 spectators.

The importance of this program is now recognized by many character-building organizations and authorities in the field who also appreciate its value in combating juvenile delinquency. New York City's park department and its board of education are cooperating with the Mirror in sponsoring many of the activities.

A brief listing of the Mirror youth program of events will indicate how much this program has been expanded and the many ways in which youth can be interested in healthy and constructive activities. The program includes:

First. A youth forum, in which hundreds of teenagers from school and youth groups discuss national and international affairs.

Second. A citywide basketball tournament in which teams from the elementary and high schools participate in a series of elimination matches. The championship finals are played in Madison Square Garden. In 1954, 1,872 teams made up of 18,651 players took part.

Third. A marbles tournament for boys and girls attracted 12,360 youthful participants last year.

Fourth. The all-city high-school chorus and symphony orchestra presented its fifth annual concert at Carnegie Hall, sponsored jointly by the Mirror and the board of education.

Fifth. A citywide softball tournament is conducted annually with championships decided in the men's and women's divisions.

Sixth. A handball tourney attracted 6,150 entrants in all 5 boroughs of the city. Awards were made for individual and doubles championships.

Seventh. A little fellas baseball league included 183 teams and 2,562 players last year. A little "world series" decided the city champs.

Eighth. A folk-dance festival was staged on the mall in Central Park, in which 3,500 gaily dressed children from all parts of the city presented a program of the folk dances of many lands.

Ninth. A sports-editors forum is held annually, attracting some 100 young writers from the high schools who discuss problems of mutual interest.

Tenth. A model flying boat is held each year. The 1954 fair attracted 150,000 spectators and 1,000 entrants.

Eleventh. Swimming classes are conducted in 17 park department pools. Last year 7,126 learners took swimming lessons.

Twelfth. A citywide swim tournament is held annually. In 1954 there were 2,225 entrants in the tournament and some 200,000 spectators.

Thirteenth. Horseshoe pitching tournament attracted 2,725 entrants in the city's parks and throngs of spectators.

Fourteenth. Boy Scout awards are presented to First-Class and Eagle Scouts in recognition of their achievement in citizenship training.

Fifteenth. Junior olympics, an annual event, pits contenders of various age groups in a program track and field sports. In 1954, 2,800 youngsters participated in the junior olympics.

Sixteenth. A golf tournament is conducted all summer long at a dozen city golf courses. Last year, 2,888 participated in this tournament.

Seventeenth. A tennis tournament attracted 3,103 contestants who competed for titles and awards.

Eighteenth. The annual youth festival was held in September in Central Park in the presence of an audience of 50,000. Boys and girls who emerged victorious in the various events sponsored by the youth program were honored publicly by civic and political leaders. Honors were handed out to the winners by stage, screen, radio, television, and sports personalities.

Nineteenth. Annual Christmas Carols Festival was held on the Mall in Central Park in December.

Twentieth. A Winter Carnival is held annually in Central Park for winter sports. Hundreds participate and thousands come to watch.

Mr. Speaker, such is the long list of activities sponsored by the Mirror youth program. Much of the credit for the success of this program is due to two individuals who take a personal interest in the program, Charles B. McCabe, publisher of the New York Mirror and Hinson Stiles, its managing editor. Mr. McCabe is chairman of the youth program executive committee and Mr. Stiles is the administrator. Other members of the committee are William Detlef, W. N. Thomas, and Glenn Neville. The committee has just published a fine brochure, entitled "citizens in the Making," which describes the youth program in detail.

In sending me a copy of the booklet, Mr. Stiles wrote me as follows:

NEW YORK MIRROR,
New York, N. Y., April 22, 1955.

DEAR JUDGE ANFUSO: Another year has slipped by and I am pleased to send you our new brochure of the Mirror's youth program, largest character-building enterprise in the Nation conducted by a newspaper.

The Mirror is particularly happy to have participated with the department of parks, the board of education, and approximately 35 youth organizations in cosponsoring the various events.

This expanded program now embraces 20 separate activities, and during the past year more than 500,000 New York City school children either actively took part in or were spectators at the various projects, which ranged from a youth forum through the field of sports to a high-school concert in Carnegie Hall.

Funds to support this elaborate program were provided by the Mirror and more events and an expansion of present facilities are contemplated.

I hope that the little book will give you a dramatic picture of our investment in "citizens in the making."

Mr. Charles B. McCabe, publisher of the Mirror, joins me in thanking you for your support of the program.

Cordially yours,

HINSON STILES,
Managing Editor.

Mr. Speaker, many of our large and medium-sized cities throughout the country would benefit a great deal by adapting the Mirror youth program to their local needs, and thus help to shape the lives and thoughts of American youth, building muscle and character, and giving them the opportunity to absorb lessons in citizenship which would be of inestimable value in later life.

Resolution Urges Federal Control of Daylight Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, much confusion has arisen throughout the length and breadth of our country as a result of local option for daylight-saving time. I have been contacted by many of my constituents urging a Federal study to be made of this problem in an effort to alleviate the confusion in various small communities throughout our country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following resolution on this subject from the Arthur J. Quick Post No. 278, the American Legion, of Divernon, Ill.:

"Whereas at the present time and under the present two time setup, people of adjoining communities are living under a time difference of 1 hour; and

"Whereas this condition has resulted in confusion, causing a double standard of time for schools, mail, trains, working and social conditions which are not necessary; and

"Whereas this condition would not exist should our Government take a step to put the whole country on one time, either standard or daylight savings, so that all may be on one time thereby doing away with all the time confusion: Therefore be it

"*Resolved* That we, the members of the Arthur J. Quick Post, 278, of the American Legion, Divernon, Ill., on the 11th day of April 1955, do petition our Government to make a ruling, or enact such necessary legislation that will put our cities, trains, mails, schools, industry and our social activities on one time, either daylight or standard, so as to end this friction of two standards of time in our lives, and that copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen and to our State and national headquarters."

Passed this 11th day of April 1955 in a regular meeting of the Arthur J. Quick Post, 278, the American Legion, of Divernon, Ill.

LOUIS F. BOLOSH,
Commander.
JOHN M. PARKER,
Adjutant.
HARRY W. MOORE,
Finance Officer.

Who Really Wants Peace in the Middle East?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the March 1955 issue of Background:

WHO REALLY WANTS PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

EGYPT

Saut El-Arab, the official radio station, on November 16, 1954:

"Egypt sees Israel as a cancer endangering the Arab people. Egypt is the physician who can uproot this cancer. Egypt does not forget that it is its obligation to take revenge, and it is mobilizing all its forces in anticipation of the hoped-for-day."

Premier Abdul Gamal Nasser, on October 27, 1954:

"When the Suez issue has been disposed of, Egypt will be concerned with one problem only, the problem of Palestine.

"* * * The Palestine problem will not be solved and there will be no peace between us and the Jews as long as a single grain of your soil [i. e., the Palestine Arabs'] remains in enemy hands."

Al Gomhouria, official mouthpiece of the Egyptian regime, October 15, 1954:

"Egypt and the Arabs must turn in the name of humanity and its culture to all nations of the world who will aid in wiping Israel off the face of the map because of its barbarism."

Mohammed Naguib, former President of Egypt, on June 1953:

"Peace with Israel will only increase this danger, since she will be able to crush the Arab countries en masse. The only solution is Israel's disappearance."

Major Salah Salem, Egyptian Minister of Propaganda, on January 28, 1955:

"Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestinian War, even if Israel should fulfill the United Nations resolutions."

ISRAEL

Abba Eban, Israel Ambassador to the United States, May 11, 1954:

"We affirm our willingness to enter into positive and constructive relationships of peace. A Middle East at peace within itself and resting upon the contentments of honorable reward could be a citadel of strength amidst the turmoil of a darkened world."

David Ben-Gurion, then Premier of Israel, October 19, 1953:

"We are a small and young state, and although we knew how to defend ourselves when we were attacked 5 years ago by the Arab States, we do not wish to base our relations with our neighbors on force and * * * arms.

"Like all past Jewish generations we have faith in the vision of peace of Israel's prophets."

Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel, November 29, 1953:

"My government continues to uphold the vision of a Middle East at peace within itself, uniting the efforts of its two kindred peoples to heal the wounds of aggressive violence and reawaken economic and cultural progress."

Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, President of Israel, May 21, 1953:

"Lasting peace in the Middle East, security and economic development of this region, as well as social and cultural developments of its peoples are of real concern to * * * Israel."

Premier Moshe Sharett, December 15, 1954:

"Israel belongs spiritually to the West, but territorially to the Middle East and peace with the Arabs is our paramount aim."

Benson Chalks Up Another Landmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me and I know it must be a welcome change to the American taxpayer to read the following editorial from the April 13 issue of the Knoxville Journal. The example set by Secretary Benson could well be followed by all public servants. It is a necessity if Congress is to achieve a balanced budget and adopt needed tax reductions.

The editorial follows:

BENSON CHALKS UP ANOTHER LANDMARK—HE PROTESTS INCREASING HIS BUDGET

The country has known almost from the time of his appointment that it had an unusual public servant in the person of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. Almost overnight he established himself as a man of moral courage which surpassed that of ordinary men. His convictions, once embraced, are never forsaken.

When certain farm groups were 2 years ago crying for his dismissal by the President,

Mr. Benson stood as firm as a rock. There is no doubt in the mind of anybody who knows him that he would quickly have resigned had the President put any pressure on him to yield to the devotees of political expediency who found fault with his farm program.

Now Secretary Benson is in the news again, and for a reason which will be considered remarkable by most. He is complaining that Congress is about to appropriate more money to run his Department of Agriculture programs than he has asked for or needs.

Yesterday in hearings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee studying the Department's $880 million budget, Benson noted that the House had hiked the Department's requests by $27,500,000. He didn't like that, and suggested that the Senate whack off the overage.

"In preparing our budget," he told the committee, "we did our very best to arrive at a well-balanced program in the light of all our responsibilities to the farmers and the Nation."

What a difference there would be in Government at all levels if more public servants objected to having more money dished out to them than they originally requested.

Many City Parents Favor United States Control of Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the May 1, 1955, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

My bill, H. R. 5969, which I introduced in the House yesterday would accomplish this purpose:

WANT PRIORITIES MAINTAINED—MANY CITY PARENTS FAVOR UNITED STATES CONTROL OF VACCINE

A survey of parents in the metropolitan area revealed yesterday that a majority would favor Federal control and allocation of the Salk antipolio vaccine to insure that children are vaccinated first.

Many of the parents questioned referred critically to the revelation, through the Cutter vaccine roundup, that a small number of doctors had disregarded the medical profession's voluntary system of priorities for children and had given the vaccine to some adults.

In general, most of the parents agreed with Mayor Wagner, who, on April 12 when the Salk vaccine was reported a success and again on Friday, had urged President Eisenhower to see that the Federal Government take on the job of "making the vaccine available to those in greatest need."

SOME OPPOSE CURBS

A few parents came out strongly against Federal controls. One expressed the opinion that government red tape would delay the vaccination program, create a shortage of vaccine and lead to a black market.

Mrs. George Damashek, of 523 East 14th Street, the mother of 2 children, said her feeling is that the vaccine should be controlled by the Government. "There is evidence that it is going to adults and people without any priority," she said. Mrs. Damashek added that Secretary of Welfare Oveta Culp Hobby was "evading" her responsibility because "the word 'control' is not socially acceptable."

"The more central control on the vaccine, the better chance for the proper use of it," replied Mrs. George Forman, of 422 East 20th Street. "That's happened in the city with the Cutter vaccine."

"I have 1 child, under a year old and not eligible for the vaccine if a system of priorities were used," Mrs. Forman said. "I haven't tried to have my child vaccinated and I'm in favor of Federal controls and priorities."

A strongly dissenting opinion came from Bernard Eisenstein, an automobile dealer, of 188 Ocean Terrace, Dongan Hills, Staten Island. "Personally I think if the Federal Government got control, there would be more of a black market than if the vacicne were controlled by cities," he said.

"If you tie this thing up in red tape," he said, "you will create a shortage. There will be enough for all if the Government stays out. The vaccine should go right to the doctors and be controlled by them."

DRUGGIST'S OPINION

Albert Friedrichs, a druggist, of 392 William Street, East Orange, N. J., said, "I feel the supply is limited and where you have a problem of a limited supply, the Federal Government is the best agency to handle it. After a while, when the supply becomes more plentiful, this problem will disappear and it can be handled like any other serum."

Fred Brown, a State liquor inspector of New Hyde Park, Long Island, said, "I know from experience that the Federal and State governments have the machinery to exert controls. Some grown-ups got the vaccine, which is unfair. That shot might have saved the life of a child. That couldn't happen under Federal control."

A Scarsdale mother of three children, Mrs. Stuart N. Updike, of 407 Fort Hill Road, said: "The Federal Government should control, since the distribution would then be fairer all around."

In Garden City, Long Island, James McGowan, a hotel owner, also favored Federal controls "for the basic reason that we would have equal distribution; that the age groups involved—those 5-to-9 kids—would get it. I believe that these doctors who have given the vaccine to adults should be prosecuted."

James G. Blake, a Baldwin, Long Island, attorney with two children, expressed the opinion that there are too many Government controls now.

"It is already the responsibility of the Government to establish standards," he said. "It is the continuing responsibility of the Government to see that those standards are met. But governmental control of distribution, in my opinion, would be an error. Private industry could better see to distribution, having the experience. Because a man is in Government does not make him smarter or more honest."

William C. Reilly, of 12 Pen Bryn Road, West Orange, N. J., said: "I think the Federal Government should handle it because they are in a position to know what areas are in most need of the vaccine. For that reason they should set up a system of priorities and allocations."

A Glen Ridge, N. J., lawyer, James E. Fagan, said the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis should have the confidence of the people because without its effort there would be no vaccine.

"By allowing the foundation to distribute the vaccine," he said, "it would avoid any political juggling. Under Federal controls, every Senator would want the vaccine for his State even if it were needed in another State where polio strikes first."

Albert J. Defemio, of 600 Tuckahoe Road, Yonkers, said: "The Federal Government should control because there would be more equality in the distribution to the people and any possibility of black markets would be eliminated."

William J. Keyes, of Valley Stream, secretary of the Nassau County Real Estate Board, came out for Federal control because "the Government has machinery set up now, such as the Public Health Service, that could swing into this at once. It would be for the good of everybody."

Louis Schwartz, of 663 Forest Avenue, Larchmont, expressed the opinion that the Federal Government should exercise control of the vaccine through State and county health authorities. "The Government would have better control of the distribution than any other agency," he said.

Social Responsibilities of the Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, our American businessmen are becoming more and more conscious not only of their direct responsibilities in our free enterprise system, but of their obligations in the broader aspects of our problems as a people.

We have had in Minnesota a highly successful businessman, whose vision and understanding in many other fields of our Nation's life have been an inspiration. He is Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc.

One of the finest addresses at the 43d annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which has been conducted this week in Washington, was Mr. Bullis' address on Social Responsibilities of the Businessman. It is an approach to extending business horizons that merits wide attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Bullis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE BUSINESSMAN

(By Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.)

Basically, the social responsibilities of a business are no different from those of an individual—except perhaps in degree. The individual's primary social responsibilities are to the family group and to his community; those of the modern business are to its employees, its stockholders, its customers, its suppliers, and to the cities in which it operates, which may stretch across the Nation from coast to coast.

SOCIETY EXPECTS MORE OF BUSINESS

Society expects more and more of the individual, as he benefits from the fruits of our dynamic economy and the group living made possible by the combined social units of many families. In a similar manner, society expects more and more of business, almost in direct ratio to the economic climate made possible by the specialized and mass markets of the Nation.

Business operates by permission of the people. Government may issue a charter, but the charter does not guarantee the success of the enterprise. It can prosper only

as it gains the confidence of the public and performs an economic function.

Business in this country still operates, for the most part, under a free market. Some will say it is a seriously abridged free market. Others will call it a free market only in name, and cite various Government controls. But the overpowering fact seems to be that in almost every instance in which the free market has been modified by Government, it has been done to compel business to accept added social responsibilities. Consider our social welfare legislation, our antitrust laws, or our minimum wage laws. All of these are attempts to legislate social responsibility.

And so we must ask ourselves—if business had shouldered voluntarily more social responsibility several decades ago, would we have had these controls? I do not know. But we can all think of businesses which have taken the lead in adopting themselves to social changes and which have been cited by social reformers as examples of what should have been achieved by all business on a voluntary basis. And in almost every case, these businesses have continued to accept additional social responsibilities of their own free will—and most of them still continue to be ahead of Government's compulsory legislation.

FORMALIZED PUBLIC RELATIONS

The question that is now suggested concerns formalized public relations, and its place in the recognition and the acceptance of social responsibility by business. I do not believe that a formalized department by the name of public relations has any concrete value unless it both activates and reflects the thinking of the management. If it does not—if it is merely a "Jiminy Cricket" type of thinking like the conscience of the little wooden puppet Pinochio—then it has no value. Plainly, it is a hypocrisy, and the sooner it is dispensed with, the better.

What I am trying to say is that the recognition of social responsibility and doing something about it, does not depend on a public-relations department. At this point, I am reminded about the proprietor of a small plant in a midwestern city. The man had 30 or 40 employees and a few trucks. His business volume was perhaps not over $100,000 a year. He did not have a public-relations department—but he had wonderful public relations. It was he who organized a drive to cover up the scar left by an abandoned gravel pit near a residential section of the city. He endeared himself to schools and parents alike by conducting economic educational tours of his little factory. He did that because he wanted teachers to understand the need for his trucks rumbling by the schools, and students to eventually buy from and work for him. He contributed of his time and effort to his community. He knew where he was going, and he usually got there. His acceptance of social responsibilities was as much a part of his way of doing business as his need for 3 or 4 salesmen. He regarded both operations equally essential.

What I am endeavoring to emphasize is that there is no magic power in the idea of a program of public relations itself, even though great sums of money are poured into it. We have all seen too many programs fail because they were based on an almost cynical attitude toward the public, an attitude which assumed that noise, intellectual sleight of hand, fancy advertising, and big headlines could stampede the man in the street. We all know that the public cannot be fooled.

We have learned, as these distinguished public-relations spokesmen here today have helped us learn, that only when a company has perfected its product in terms of consumer needs, when it has established sound labor, research, and plant expansion policies, and when it affords a fair and steady return to its stockholders, is it ready to start thinking about the broader aspects of public relations.

WHAT'S IT TO ME?

There are other achievements a company must have to its credit, too. The public is asking many questions about industry, questions that must be answered clearly and intelligently and in a manner to advance the general public's understanding of the basic economic principles of our competitive capitalism. Every question that consumers and the men and the women who make up the public ask is based on that strongest of all motivations—"What's it to me?"

Here are some of the "What's it to me?" questions we in industry must be, and in most cases are, prepared to answer forthrightly and with pride: Is industry planning well ahead to be able to absorb future job hunters in our rapidly increasing population? Is it giving equal opportunity to everyone who is willing to pay the price in intelligent hard work, regardless of color, race, or creed? Is it providing opportunities for our handicapped citizens who are capable of limited employment? How much of its profits is industry turning back into research, so that the public can have better products and better services in our constantly improving way of life? We face the threat of war today. Is industry just striving for profits, or is it really thinking of helping in the overall defense effort? What about funds and scholarships from industry to help deserving youth secure a better education?

These are difficult questions to answer, and in attempting to answer them, we in industry should let the public see our problems. We should show not only processes of manufacture, through "open houses" and otherwise, but we should also acquaint the public with decisions that must be made. We in General Mills have been fortunate to witness positive results through our informal regional stockholders' meetings conducted every other year in 10 or 12 cities where we have a goodly number of stockholders. I believe that if the informal regional stockholders' meeting idea were universally adopted, it would have a tremendous impact on the thinking of the country. I say this not only from a stockholders' standpoint, but from the standpoint of informing the public about the company's efforts and projects.

BUSINESS SHOULD EXPLAIN ITS OBJECTIVES

Business should be presented to the public in the role it really occupies so that its importance to the Nation may be thoroughly understood.

Business should play its cards face up. If it has a difficult problem which affects the people, such as a chemical exhaust at a plant, it should tell the public what it is doing to correct the condition. It is a major responsibility of business to create new jobs at satisfactory wages with good working conditions. It is also a major responsibility of business to do everything possible to reduce the costs of production and distribution so as to lower the price of its products to the consumer and at the same time help to increase the productivity of its employees. While business drives forward in such an environment of self-respect and self-confidence, it should not neglect to explain its motives, its aims and its policies to its many large and varied audiences and publics.

It is axiomatic that the most progressive companies are those that take the public into their confidence and let their customers and stockholders "see the wheels go 'round." I think that we must carry to the people, to our employees, to our stockholders, the story of industrial progress and achievement as it affects them.

We know that public good will cannot be written on the books overnight. And it can never be written on the books so that it can stay there without subsequent entries. All ink tends to fade in the great ledger of public opinion; we must make our entries each and every day if we are to create and hold the good will which we must have.

Business cannot stow this ledger of public opinion away on a shelf and assume that all the balances are in its favor. If we are so proud of what we have accomplished that we assume we have gained a secure and favored place in the public mind for all time, we shall be sadly disillusioned.

While business is now doing a good job of selling itself and our industrial system to the public, we all know that the task has just started. The goal toward which each man and woman is working is a simple one—a better standard of living. The goal of business is identical with that of the average man, a better standard of living, not just for a chosen few, but for everybody. The job is to convince the public that this simple statement is the truth.

BUSINESS MUST KEEP ITS HOUSE IN ORDER

But in our zeal to tell the story of business to the public, we shall not overlook one fact. Business must keep its own house in order. No amount of money or effort spent in a campaign will accomplish lasting results if we condone practices within our own ranks which we know are wrong. In any selling campaign, the product and the service must be right.

We know that the profit motive is not purely a mercenary force, since profits are the reward which come to those who furnish the public with what it wants in the most efficient and economical manner. Business renders genuine service—good service. There is no need to allow the public to learn this truth for itself, when we can make the facts known and keep them constantly in the public mind. Business must speak, and continue to speak.

We all know that man cannot live by bread alone—though we in General Mills sometimes wish he did. Businessmen are learning that industry cannot live by simply operating its plants and selling its products. It must sell itself—its aims, its achievements, and an understanding of its problems.

IMPORTANCE OF MOTIVATION

Wherever public-relations campaigns have been unsuccessful, you will find that they had not been carefully thought out in advance. Motivation had not been considered. What was the purpose of the campaign? What results were hoped for? What motives did the campaign endeavor to arouse in the stockholder, the employee, the consumer or the public that would be to the company's benefit?

The Advertising Research Foundation has launched a penetrating study of motivation, that may ultimately shed some light on the relationship between the ability and willingness of business to accept and honor social responsibilities, and the result of these business attitudes upon the public's opinion of industry generally. The preliminary research indicates that for the most part we have aimed quite wide of the mark in all of this effort. We have not struck within those concentric rings of self-interest girdling every human being. We have failed, somehow, to relate the social consciousness of business to the interest of the individual, be it selfish or otherwise.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOCIAL SERVICE

The social responsibilities of business, large or small, are existent because the public says they are. Now the question is—what can we do about them? How can we so focus our efforts, whether our business be modest or extensive, so that we will get credit in the public ledger for doing something for society above and beyond the

sale of a product? How can we cement and reinforce the franchise of quasi-free market operation with which we are endowed by society? In other words, how can we motivate people to further condone and accept us?

The answer is for every business, large or small, to get out its broom. The next step is to take that broom and sweep the walk clear of inertia and do-nothing philosophy in front of its own front door. In short, every business should do something to discharge its social responsibility. And the amazing fact is that with everyone doing something, there is no doubt that the effect will be magnificent and compelling. Such combined effort will register with great impact, and the motivation for increased public support and approval of our enterprises is bound to grow.

But how, you say, can I develop a project with social consciousness? I am taking the liberty of suggesting a few opportunities that are before the door of everyone.

1. Education: This is the No. 1 social problem of our day. Inadequate school plants. Lack of trained teachers. Unsatisfactory teaching curricula. Lack of funds for liberal arts colleges. The need for scholarships. No candidates for school board jobs. There are innumerable opportunities here.

2. Employee self-improvement: Is the paycheck the end-all of your employee plan? How about night study courses, subsidized? How about credits for ideas, communication seminars, and promotion meetings? Is stabilized employment a factor in your planning? Do you schedule orders to maintain level job rolls? Do you tell employees of your problems, and take them into your confidence on matters affecting job fluctuations?

3. Community service projects: Are you willing to volunteer your company's services to augment your local community fund agencies where necessary? Do you cooperate with service clubs on special projects? Are you interested in creating more jobs in your community and in working with other groups to achieve this?

4. Contact your chamber of commerce office: Have you ever considered that your local chamber of commerce office needs help on a number of worthy projects involving social responsibility? Have you ever considered writing the national office for suggestions? There are innumerable opportunities here, if you show a willingness to shoulder them.

CONCLUSION

Yes, the opportunities for social service are legion before the businesses of America today. Truly they are numbered in proportion to the opportunity enjoyed by the enterprises themselves. It behooves us, therefore, to move confidently and enthusiastically forward, and each to do his part. It matters not that the role we play may be a minor one; it isn't necessary to set the world on fire, so to speak. But it is essential that every business yoke itself to the implement of social responsibilities and then pull forward down the furrow of public appreciation and understanding. And it is time for every businessman to speak up and report on the way he fulfills his responsibilities to society.

Only thus, with a public believing that we understand the problem, can we hope to motivate people to act in their enlightened self-interest and ours, at the polls and elsewhere. Only then can we lead aggressively on voluntary social amenities, instead of staggering blindly as we are driven by compulsory legislation.

It has been said that the future belongs to them that prepare for it. Just so, as business faces up to its social responsibilities, will society stand up for business. In this combination rests the destiny of our expanding economy, and an America with increasing opportunity and happiness for all.

Historic National Policy Requires Improvement of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor as a Full Federal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the Delaware port area:

THE DELAWARE PORT AREA: ITS ECONOMY AND THE CONGRESSIONALLY AUTHORIZED IMPROVEMENT OF ITS SHIPPING CHANNEL

The Delaware is one of the world's great estuarial harbors. Already it is the leading port of the United States in the handling of import tonnage. And it stands second only to New York in total waterborne commerce.

As a harbor, the Delaware reaches from the open sea at Cape May, N. J.-Cape Henlopen, Del., north to Morrisville, Pa.-Trenton, N. J.—a distance of 132 protected miles. But, as a first-class international seaport capable of handling all types of cargo vessels, the harbor's vast potential has been only partly realized, because its 40-foot channel ends abruptly at the southern edge of Philadelphia.

This leaves 37 miles at the upper end of the harbor in urgent need of modernization and improvement. (Seventeen of these miles pass through Philadelphia.)

The Congress of the United States, in August 1954, recognized the urgency of this need when it passed legislation authorizing the deepening of the upper Delaware. And it further recognized that this harbor improvement should be the full responsibility of the Federal Government in the national interest and in keeping with long-prevailing national policy. The bill carrying the authorization was signed into law on September 3, 1954.

Legislation is now before the 84th Congress to appropriate funds to begin the channel deepening. The ratio of benefits from this project to the cost of it will be almost 2 to 1 (1.93 to 1).

STRONGLY RECOMMENDED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The deepening of the upper Delaware has been strongly recommended by the Corps of Engineers and has been endorsed at every level of the Federal Government concerned with responsibility for such an improvement.

The present Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., has officially appraised the improvement of the Delaware estuarial harbor this way:

"The present impetus of the national defense program, the accelerated demands of defense and civilian needs, and the strategic location of the Trenton-Philadelphia-Camden area with respect to sources of materials and labor and markets for processed goods, together with the definite possibility of increasing the national wealth in this highly industrialized area, now combine to require further modernization of the waterway."

The United States Bureau of the Budget has described the projected 40-foot channel as "the only satisfactory solution" and has advocated that the project be carried out as a single undertaking in the interest of construction and transportation economies.

Similar endorsements have come from the immediate past Chief of Engineers, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the North Atlantic division engineer, three successive Philadelphia district engineers, State and local officials, civic groups, labor unions, newspapers, and the citizenry of the Delaware port area.

DETAILS OF THE AUTHORIZED IMPROVEMENT

As recommended by the Corps of Engineers and authorized by the 84th Congress, the Delaware shipping channel would be dredged to 40 feet for 32 miles upstream from the southern limits of Philadelphia to Newbold Island and to a depth of 35 feet from there to Trenton Marine Terminal, a distance of 5.5 miles. (Depths of 25 to 37 feet were provided by past authorizations.)

In authorizing this channel improvement, the last session of Congress debated and rejected an unprecedented administrative proposal that local interests make a large cash contribution (of at least $18 million) to the cost of improving a seaport of established and long-proven national and international importance.

That same proposal, however, has been advanced again by the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, contrary to the clearly expressed wishes of Congress. Again, the Joint Executive Committee is asking Congress to uphold the historical congressional position that the development and maintenance of our waterways of demonstrable economic and military importance is, and should remain, a Federal responsibility.

A BULWARK OF NATIONAL SECURITY

The diversified industrial power of the Delaware port area—and the highly visible potential for greater industrial and maritime activity—constitute an important bulwark of the Nation's security. That is so because much of this well-balanced industrial capacity is equipped for military production.

The Delaware harbor is protected by a bastion of land extending for as much as 60 miles back from the coast line. It is a natural fortress for protected loading of supplies and embarkation of military personnel in the event of a national emergency. The Delaware breakwater where the bay meets the Atlantic Ocean, plus almost 100 miles of deep water to Philadelphia, and the projected deep channel to Trenton are impediments against penetration by enemy warships and underseas craft. During World War II, the port facilities of Greater Philadelphia alone handled 15 to 20 percent of all the goods shipped in and out of the United States.

The Delaware offers, in fact, a higher guaranty of security than any other port in the Nation.

Another great advantage to national security offered by the Delaware port area is the dispersed industrial construction that has taken place—and will take place to an even greater extent when the channel is deepened to 40 feet over the upper reaches of tidewater.

In a report on the bill that became part of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the 79th Congress wrote: "We should prepare now for the probable trend of the port-war era to decentralize major national activities by making available innumerable sites for the dispersal of industrial expansion along the banks of our important waterways and ship channels."

In keeping with this policy, one of the larger steel works in the United States has been built on the upper reaches of the harbor—away from the traditional areas of concentration of steel production. Other industries, attracted by the easy availability of steel, will be installed along the upper harbor in sections reserved for industrial usage. Others will be drawn by deepwater shipping just as soon as the 40-foot channel is assured.

The deepening of the Delaware Channel to facilitate efficient, low-cost transportation of imported raw materials for industry is in accordance with national defense policy calling for the conservation of those materials against time of emergency. The President's Materials Policy Committee put it this way in mid-1952: "The overall objective of a national materials policy for the United States should be to insure an adequate and dependable flow of materials at the lowest cost consistent with national security and with the welfare of friendly nations."

THE ECONOMIC PICTURE IN BROAD STROKES

The Delaware has constituted an important seaport for domestic and foreign commerce for more than 300 years. Along its shores have grown dozens of important cities—such as Philadelphia, Wilmington, Camden, Trenton, and Chester—and hundreds of thriving enterprises representing 87 percent of all the official categories of American business and industry.

The 14 counties in 3 States (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) that form the Delaware port area will yield the Federal Government in taxes during the next fiscal year more than any of 40 whole States. Federal tax revenus from those 14 counties for fiscal 1956 will total an estimated $2.1 billion. That supplies a new and graphic measure of the economic importance and potency of the area flanking the harbor.

In this same compact area, 88,000 business and industrial establishments are situated. And business is growing in the area faster than in almost any other section of the country. This is attested by the fact that industrial construction in Philadelphia and 7 adjacent counties of Pennsylvania and New Jersey ran 12 percent above the nationwide average in 1954.

Three-quarters of the way through 1954, the Delaware port area surpassed New York in tonnage of imports—22.4 million tons for this port area in the first 9 months of last year to 21.01 million tons for New York.

The value of imports and exports handled in the Greater Philadelphia port area was recently calculated at more than $1 billion a year. It was estimated that more than 14,000 workers in just Philadelphia and 4 peripheral counties of Pennsylvania were directly dependent on export sales for their livelihoods. And a total of 341,000 workers were found to be employed in firms engaged wholly or partly in import-export trade.

Customs collections in this area (totaling over $2 billion since 1874) have averaged $45.75 million annually for the last 5 years. While it has never been suggested, nor will it be, that customs revenues be committed to waterway improvements within the port area where they are collected, the plain fact is that the total estimated cost of deepening the Delaware (approximately $91.4 million) is the equivalent of less than 2 years' customs collections in the Philadelphia district.

In all the growth that has taken place along the Delaware Harbor, there is a striking contrast which is directly tied to channel depth. Below Philadelphia, where a 40-foot channel project has existed for many years, industries of all types and sizes have located at the water's edge. Desirable sites for further expansion are steadily diminishing.

To the north of Philadelphia, however, where the previously authorized channel depth has been only 25 feet, the economy has remained predominantly agricultural. Yet this section of the Delaware Harbor offers as fine an area of opportunity as the Nation possesses for creating more commerce, more industry, more jobs—more production of goods and services to help carry the American people to the goal of healthy economic expansion—and higher standard of living—envisioned by the President of the United States.

HISTORIC NATIONAL POLICY REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT OF THE DELAWARE ESTUARIAL HARBOR AS A FULL FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

American history provides the answer to the question of a local contribution toward improvement of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor. There can be no such contribution unless we are to revert to the conditions of the early 1800's. Congress recognized this fact in the act of September 3, 1954, which authorized the expansion of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor. Congress then prescribed that the expansion is to be a full Federal responsibility.

Our country has grown and prospered until it is now the leader of the world. This was not always the case. We grew from small beginnings.

The Constitution was adopted in Philadelphia by men of tremendous acumen and foresight. That document stands out in the history of governments as the most perfect political instrument ever devised by the minds of men. The strongest factor that impelled the forging of the central Government was the vital need for free and uninterrupted commerce in our ports and harbors and on our rivers. The attention of our Founding Fathers to the pressing needs of waterborne commerce was paramount, because it was then, and it is today, the economic lifeblood of the United States.

The Constitution vested in the central Government the responsibility for commerce and navigation. This responsibility must be exercised today by the Federal Government in the manner shown by our historical development. That is, the Federal Government must, in order to discharge its historic duty, expand the Delaware Estuarial Harbor as a full Federal responsibility.

Over the spread of years from 1787 to 1955, the prosperity of this country has been directly related to waterborne commerce—with foreign nations and among the States. Today's export commerce accounts for $15 billion a year of the national wealth. It must be promoted and fostered by the Federal Government in the same way that has brought its growth to this substantial proportion. Lacking this, our country will take an irreparable step backward.

Any suggestion that the Federal Government require any money contribution by local interests to the expansion of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor is wholly inconsistent with the Federal Government's own historic assumption of responsibility for waterborne commerce. It was through the influence of Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Gallatin, Madison, Monroe, Clay, Calhoun, and John Quincy Adams that the United States began the improvement of its ports, harbors, and waterways.

In the very early days of the growth of the Republic two means were employed to bring about the improvement of ports, harbors, and rivers and the building of canals:

1. The States themselves were encouraged by Congress to levy tonnage duties to pay for port improvements. Such laws were adopted by Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. The State exactions of tonnage duties, which created chaos in commerce among the States, ceased when the Federal Government properly undertook its responsibilities for commerce and navigation.

2. Congress made extensive grants of Federal lands to the States and private investors to develop the navigation of rivers and the building of canals. These occurred in Alabama, Wisconsin, Iowa, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, and Ohio. This system resulted in the charging of tolls on our waterways. And tolls were forever and finally abolished by the Congress in 1884 because of their suppressive effect on waterborne commerce.

These two methods of bringing about river and harbor improvements were of necessity discarded by the Federal Government well before 1900.

In 1822 Congress was impelled by sheer force of economic necessity to appropriate substantial sums for river and harbor improvement. This policy has continued annually almost without interruption to the present day. It did not come about, however, without a protracted constitutional debate which was resolved and finally put to rest by Abraham Lincoln in 1848 and by the United States Supreme Court in 1876. The policy then affirmed has always continued in full vigor—and that policy is the full Federal responsibility for our ports, harbors, and waterways.

In the early 20th century, Congress became concerned with the lack of public marine-terminal facilities in our ports and harbors and gave attention to the need for provision by local interests of these necessary land adjuncts. It was then that Congress adopted the concept of local cooperation and embodied into our organic laws positive requirements for such forms of local cooperation as: suitable public marine-terminal facilities; berths, wharves, and piers; necessary land for spoil disposal; rights-of-way and easements; access channels; relocation or rebuilding of bridges; rail, highway, and street connections; assumption of damage claims; and, occasionally, cash contributions. The cash contributions by local interests were limited to those situations where there was a direct, purely local benefit, as, for example, that local land values would be enhanced.

Local cooperation then and today means the same thing. Congress in 1925 authorized a deepening of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor from Philadelphia to Trenton—and required in the form of local cooperation that local interests provide public terminals at Trenton, satisfactory rail and highway connections therewith, and suitable areas for the disposal of dredged materials. This is precisely the type of local cooperation that Congress prescribed in 1954 for further deepening of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor.

As the basis for a suggested departure from the Federal Government's primary responsibility for improvement of our ports, seven so-called precedents have been officially reported. These all have been carefully examined. They are totally inapplicable and should not be considered. In five cases the local cooperation is no more than is required of any port; in the other two cases, there was no port to start with and local interests helped the Federal Government build artificial channels in order to bring deep water inland. (A factual analysis of each of these so-called precedents is available upon request to the joint executive committee.)

The Delaware Estuarial Harbor since early colonial times has been a natural asset of this country. It belongs not just to the people in Delaware Valley but to the whole United States, as a natural outlet to the ocean highways. In thinking of this great harbor and the other natural ports of the country, recognition should be given to the facts that every third bushel of wheat raised by American farmers goes to sea, that 102,000 farm machinery workers in Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin owe their jobs to exported machinery, and that more than 75,000 men and women in auto assembly plants of those 3 States earn $30 million a year through the shipment overseas of 1 out of every 20 cars they produce.

The Federal Government already has borne the whole cost of navigation on the Ohio River and its tributaries at a cost approaching $400 million. Navigation on the Mississippi always has been recognized as a full Federal responsibility. How, then, can the Federal Government fail to shoulder its full responsibility for the Delaware seaport?

The harbors and rivers of this country are national and not local. If we are to retrogress to the 1800's, it would be appropriate to revive the tonnage duties levied by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania under its law of 1805. Thus, every ship which enters or clears the Nation's second to the largest seaport would help pay for the expansion of the Delaware Harbor. History has overtaken such lack of perspective—and our historic national policy has long since established the full Federal responsibility for the Delaware Estuary.

LOCAL INTERESTS HAVE ALREADY CONTRIBUTED GENEROUSLY TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DELAWARE PORT AREA

Local interests in the Delaware port area—the cities of Philadelphia, Camden, Trenton, and Wilmington, and the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware—have provided more than one-half billion dollars to the development and usefulness of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor.

The half-billion-dollar investment by local interests in marine-related facilities, which have given the Delaware channel its great national economic value, is in addition to investments by private enterprise that are described by the Corps of Engineers as "an unprecedented industrial expansion" in a section of the country "that obviously is of great importance to the economy of the Nation."

Along the estuarial harbor that is the Delaware, there are 282 piers and wharves. Of these, 224 were built by private enterprise. They are in addition to such facilities as the Philadelphia municipal piers, in which upward of $50 million have already been invested, and for which a capital improvement program of $8 million is set. They are in addition to such facilities as the $1.5 million Trenton Marine Terminal; the Camden Marine Terminal, worth some $3.5 million; and the Wilmington Marine Terminal, valued at an estimated $7.7 million. Also, the Philadelphia City Bureau of Port Operations has invested close to $2 million in a fleet of watercraft to help maintain the harbor in good operating condition. And dredging to maintain adequate depths in the various docks is carried out by the city at a cost running to $263,000 a year.

The recommendations of the Corps of Engineers for the improvement of the Delaware Harbor left with local interests the obligation to provide a new Tacony-Palmyra Bridge. This aspect of local cooperation is already being developed, and the cost of this new facility is estimated at approximately $25 million.

Another form of cooperation by Delaware port area interests was the creation of a committee for study of the Delaware River. The committee was composed of representatives of the American Water Works Service Corp., the Campbell Soup Co., and United States Steel Corp., and Mayors G. T. Becton, of Riverton, N. J., G. E. Brunner, of Camden, N. J., and H. W. Peterson, of Woodbury, N. J.

This committee financed an exhaustive inquiry to determine scientifically whether the deepening of the harbor channel to Trenton would have any adverse effect on water supplies. That inquiry, conducted by Leggette and Brashears, consulting groundwater geologists, and Sheppard T. Powell, consulting engineer, confirmed the conclusion of the Corps of Engineers that the quality of the ground water would not be damaged by the enlargement of the channel and that the salt content of the water at Philadelphia and above would be reduced, in fact.

An elaborate scale model of the Delaware, reproducing conditions as they will exist when a 40-foot channel has been completed, was constructed at the United States Waterways Station in Vicksburg, Miss., the world's finest center of hydrographic research. The scale-model studies yielded the same conclusions as the other investigations; and these findings were further confirmed by an eminent geologist retained by the Corps of Engineers—Dr. Arthur B. Cleaves, consulting geologist of the Department of Geology and Geological Engineering, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., who reported that the channel program will not change the condition that already exists.

The Corps of Engineers also conducted intensive studies which demonstrated that the possibility of any damage to the shoreline or riverfront structure is remote. However, recognizing even an insignificant possibility of such damage at Bristol and Florence Heights, the corps, as a matter of policy, has assumed any such damages to be a Federal responsibility—and has earmarked more than $1.1 million in the estimated total cost of the channel deepening for any necessary remedial work or shoreline stabilization.

COOPERATION ALREADY COMPLIED WITH

When the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommended the 40-foot channed, it imposed the condition that the existing steel plant provide, at its own expense, "suitable terminal and transfer facilities," including a turning basin, at Morrisville, in Bucks County, Pa., opposite Newbold Island.

Such terminal and transfer facilities and turning basin have been provided, at a cost greater than the combined total of cash contributions by local interests to the seven navigation projects officially listed as the "precedents" for requiring such a contribution to the authorized improvement of the Delaware Harbor Channel.

THERE WILL BE NUMEROUS BENEFICIARIES OF THIS PROJECT

The proposal that local interests in one seaport, as against others, make a heavy cash contribution to the improvement of a shipping channel of long-established national and international importance is discriminatory and contrary to the best interests of the American economy.

To impose over one port area the threat that local interests may be required to contribute, in addition to their heavy Federal-tax requirements, uncertain amounts in public or private funds toward the cost of improving a main shipping channel tends to discourage employment creating industrial investment in that area.

The retarding influence of such a threat is illustrated by a public statement made on March 28, 1955, by an outstanding industrial realtor of southern New Jersey. He reported that title to some 850 acres of land north of Burlington, N. J., had been assembled by his firm to make it available for a new plant when the improved channel permits movement of large, deep-draft cargo ships. He further stated that an industry interested in a site on the Delaware had informed his office that plans for a new plant will be drawn when Congress approves the initial appropriation for the 40-foot channel.

The certainty of industrial expansion and increased usage of the Delaware Harbor when the channel is deepened is attested by these words of Col. B. B. Talley, North Atlantic Division Engineer of the Corps of Engineers, in a paper[1] prepared for the American Society of Civil Engineers:

"Private industry has already invested its resources in an unprecedented expansion in the region, and there is substantial evidence that the expansion is only in its initial stages. In the course of the investigation, existing and prospective private industries in the area were open and frank in the disclosure of confidential future plans to a degree unequaled on any other project with which the author has been associated. Such information was furnished in writing over the signatures of responsible heads of large industries."

Footnote at end of speech.

Foreign ores from many sources will come to Morrisville in increasing volume. A substantial tonnage of these imported ores will move by rail from Morrisville to various inland steel centers for use by different steel producers. The same ships bringing these materials to Morrisville will seek to carry cargo from the Delaware estuary back to the scores of ports throughout the world from which they came.

Thus, the marine terminal facilities already constructed by private capital toward the northerly end of the Delaware Harbor will become an important port for the receipt and distribution of strategic raw materials and will be the nucleus from which important trade relationships will develop toward the east into New Jersey and toward the west into Pennsylvania.

All the foregoing conclusively removes the whole basis on which the recommendation was made for a cash contribution of at least $18 million by local interests toward the cost of the 40-foot channel. The facts make insupportable the premise on which that recommendation was based. As is so often the case in the dynamic expansion of the American economy, the facts have overtaken a conjecture and make it obsolete and invalid.

To require a cash contribution to the improvement of a navigable waterway open on equal terms to all users means that the contributors would be required to pay a levy over and above their taxes. This is the same as requiring a special contribution by homeowners or storeowners whose properties are so situated that they receive a greater measure of police or fire protection than other nearby property owners. It is like requiring establishments whose business attracts an especially large number of customers arriving and departing by automobile to shoulder an uncertain extra payment for street maintenance.

This is contrary to a fundamental democratic principle of meeting the cost of Governmental functions by taxation levied according to uniform laws and regulations.

Moreover, the proposed requirement of a cash contribution to a public improvement like the authorized Delaware channel deepening is indefensible, because the contributors, while assigned the financial obligation of "paying partners," are not permitted any voice whatever in the construction, maintenance, or operation of the project to which they have been required to give funds.

Impressive and expert testimony that a cash contribution to the 40-foot channel is unjustified and unjustifiable is supplied by the district engineer of the Corps of Engineers who made the detailed, grass-roots study resulting in the recommendation that the project be carried out as a full Federal responsibility:

"The importance of increased steel production to the national economy and the widespread use of the finished products resulting from the operations at the steel plant result in the conclusion that benefits to be derived from the proposed improvements have national application rather than local. The resulting benefits to the locality directly will be of a secondary nature, such as increased land values, larger tax revenues, and higher level of business in general.

"Ordinarily a finding that the benefits are primarily general rather than local warrants the conclusion that a cash contribution toward the first cost of the project should not be required. In this instance further consideration has been given to the issue. Although it is clear that the benefits which would accrue to the steel company are large in relation to total benefits, it was concluded that a cash contribution by that company should not be required."

In listing his reasons why a cash contribution should not be required, the district engineer said:

"The channel improvement that has been presented for consideration will not be for the exclusive use of the company, nor will the company have any jurisdiction over the waterway, nor can it be considered a capital asset of the company obtained through a subsidy. Instead, it will be a waterway open to all on equal terms, and it cannot be doubted that its existence, along with the impetus generated by the presence of the steel works, will cause an industrial development of much of the 58 miles of deepwater frontage between Philadelphia and the Trenton Marine Terminal. This development will result in a more general use of the deeper channel for the transportation of commodities in foreign and widespread interstate commerce, as evidenced by the potential benefits. On the lower river a somewhat analagous development took place. The rapid expansion of the oil industry would not have occurred without the prior existence of the 40-foot channel. There is considerable evidence from credible sources that a number of large concerns are planning to move or establish plants on the Delaware River in this reach if and when the deeper channel is available but who are unwilling for business reasons to reveal their plans at this time."

THE COMPELLING CASE FOR A 40-FOOT CHANNEL

In one of the most broadly based movements of its kind the Nation has ever seen, labor and industries, public officials of three States, civic organizations, and newspapers have united in urging that the Philadelphia-Trenton segment of the Delaware Harbor be improved and modernized.

They are asking for a necessary, logical, and economically justified modernization of the remaining small fraction of the harbor, which imperatively needs a 40-foot channel.

The other great seaports of the United States, such as Boston, New York, Norfolk, New Orleans, and San Francisco, owe a great deal of their economic well-being to 40-foot main channels, which were provided by Federal funds.

The Delaware Port area constitutes a great international seaport. We must, therefore, look beyond our own shores to see what foreign ports have. There we find that more than 50 ports in foreign countries carrying on ocean commerce with the Delaware Port area have minimum harbor depths of 40 feet.

It is a demonstrable fact that the area adjacent to the upper fraction of the Delaware estuarial harbor has everything that is needed—except the channel for modern deep-water commerce—for the economic growth required by a steadily expanding population. It has excellent rail and highway connections; a goodly supply of skilled, responsible labor; economical building sites; proximity to large markets; sources of power for industrial production; and an unlimited supply of fresh water that is so necessary to industry.

When the upper section of the harbor obtains a 40-foot channel, industry will expand there. Proof of that is found in the concentrated utilization of waterfront lands along the lower stretches of the harbor by reason of the 40-foot channel.

From Philadelphia down to the sea there are 244 piers and wharves. But from Philadelphia on up to the head of tidewater, there are only 38 such facilities. This comparison graphically illustrates the concentration of waterfront establishments where the 40-foot channel prevails, and the lack of it where shallower depths exist.

Actual development that followed the deepening of the Delaware shipping channel from Philadelphia to the sea will be repeated when the deeper channel is provided from Philadelphia to Trenton. In the case of the lower part of the harbor, commerce has increased by 135 percent since the 40-foot channel in that section was authorized. Commerce on the lower reach is 7 to 8 times greater than that on the upper; but the Corps of Engineers confidently estimates that commerce along the upper portion will triple in volume as soon as deep water is provided. This same pattern also has been expericnced by such harbors as Albany, N. Y., where the port cargo more than tripled since the provision of a deep-water channel reestablished Albany as an estuarial seaport, and by Lake Charles, La., where port commerce has increased 15 times since 1929, thanks to a deep-water connection with the Gulf of Mexico.

THE YARDSTICK MEASURING THE ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION

Congress has provided a standard to measure benefits from an improvement such as the 40-foot channel for the upper three-tenths of the Delaware Harbor. This yardstick is called the benefit/cost ratio.

In the case of the authorized modernization of the upper part of the Delaware Channel, the benefit/cost ratio is 1.93 to 1.00. That is extremely favorable, for it means that the benefits will surpass the cost almost 2 to 1.

In terms of dollars, the benefits are estimated at $8,450,000 (1.93), as against estimated annual charges (including maintenance) for the project of $4,370,000 (1.00).

These figures are predicated on existing industry to be served by the channel deepening; they do not take into account the additional industry certain to follow the deepening and add substantially to the benefits. One of the principal benefits will be to the Federal Government, which will receive in taxes a large part of the savings outlined by the Corps of Engineers.

According to the Corps of Engineers, when the authorized channel improvement is completed, commerce for just the upper section of the harbor will rise to 22 million tons a year. This is virtually triple the present volume—and for the entire Delaware port area will mean a total commerce of almost 100 million tons per year.

The relative importance of the commerce that will be generated by the channel improvement in the upper harbor area can be better appreciated when it is understood that it alone will exceed the tonnage handled by the following important ports and harbors, as shown by the latest report of the Chief of Engineers: Portland, Maine; Providence, R. I.; Albany, N. Y.; Newport News, Va.; Wilmington, N. C.; Charleston, S. C.; Savannah, Ga.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Tampa, Fla.; Mobile, Ala.; Baton Rouge, La.; Lake Charles, La.; Galveston, Tex.; San Diego, Calif.; Stockton, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; plus all other ports on Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers; and Seattle, Wash.

SHIP DRAFTS ARE GETTING DEEPER AND DEEPER

It would be neither practical nor economical to carry out the urgently required and completely endorsed improvement of the Delaware shipping channel by providing a depth any less than 40 feet.

To believe otherwise is to be unrealistic about the merchant marine tonnage of the United States and the rest of the world that is now in being and certain to be constructed through the foreseeable future.

The JEC made an analysis as to draft of all the major ships, domestic and foreign, launched or delivered in 1952, 1953, and 1954. It showed a total of 258 vessels all of which have drafts of 30 to more than 36 feet.

And of the 13 major merchant vessels listed as still under construction or on order in American shipyards on February 1, 1955, 9 will have a loaded draft of 31½ feet or more.

In an official report related to improvement of the Delaware, the Corps of Engineers stated that at least a 40-foot channel is required for a ship drawing only 30 feet while at rest in salt water. The channel requirements are shown on the next page. However, even a 40-foot channel is inadequate for today's large vessels with a loaded draft in excess of 30 feet. Consequently, these large vessels must reach their berths in the harbor by navigating with the tide or by reducing their pay loads.

"For economic reasons," said the research director of the National Federation of American Shipping, "the trend is definitely to larger and deep-draft vessels."

When the new Lloyd's Registry of all the ships of the world was issued in mid-February of 1955, the authoritative marine columns of the New York Times said the Registry showed that "the trend is toward mammoth vessels."

Or read the statement made recently by Brigadier General Emerson C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of the Corps of Engineers in charge of the Corps' civil works program:

"The move toward deeper-draft, larger deep-sea uspertankers and ore carriers, and the outlook for increased transportation of the commodities they cary, has created a pressing demand for correspondingly deeper and improved channels in our major seaports."

Or witness the recent announcement that the famed Suez Canal must and will be deepened to permit efficient transit "of vessels drawing up to 36 feet."

Or take the report issued in 1953 by the United States Committee of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses—a committee headed by Colonel Talley, the North Atlantic Division Engineer of the Corps of Engineers. That report included these definite conclusions:

For general cargo vessels, the trend is "toward a draft of 30 feet," and the same is true for combination passenger-cargo vessels. (The Mariner-type, which has been adopted as the desirable United States-flag dry-cargo vessel, has a loaded draft of 32 feet.)

As to tankers, the trends is to deeper drafts and increased speed, while bulk ore carriers will have drafts of 37.5 feet in salt water.

When it comes to bulk carriers, the committee held that if there were no limitations as to channel depths the draft of many of these vessels would be designed far in excess of 40 feet.

The general conclusion of the Talley committee was that the requirements of bulk cargo ships will "determine desirable channel depths because of the tremendous and widespread commerce" in the materials and products they transport.

And, finally, look at the specifications listed by the United States Maritime Administration for the seven classes of vessels into which the future merchant navy of the Nnited States will be divided: In 5 of those 7 classes, the design depths will be up to 33 feet in salt water. The only two exceptions are the class of merchant vessels for trade with small islands having shallow harbors and a special type of ship to transport loaded trucks and trailers.

To a greater extent than for any other United States seaport, the Delaware Harbor is a port of call for supersized cargo vessels. The vastly increased use of the Delaware Port area by the titans of ocean commerce is illustrated by the fact that, while the number of vessels arriving in and sailing from this port area rose only 21 percent betwen 1938 and 1954, the gross registered tonnage (size) of those vessels was 95 percent greater last year than it was in 1938.

IMPOSITION OF TOLLS ON SHIPPING IS UNTHINKABLE

The imposition of tolls on shipping has been suggested as a possible means of financ-

ing the improvement of the Delaware Harbor. This is contrary to the expressed policy of Congress, which decided that the improvement should be carried out in the traditional, historic way—by the Federal Government, with Federal funds.

Among the powers denied to the Federal Government by the Constitution is the right to permit any preference in the regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another. American history scholars say: "The purpose of this clause is to establish uniformity for all ports." That uniformity would manifestly be destroyed by a requirement of tolls as a means of supplying money toward the improvement of a given port.

The idea of tolls is emphatically opposed by the Corps of Engineers. The Assistant Chief, in-charge of civil works, expressed the policy of the corps, in no evasive language, in an address to the American Association of Port Authorities, in San Francisco, on October 25, 1954.

"I can tell you," said General Itschner, "that our opposition to tolls is not based on mere preference, or stubborn insistence on blind tradition, but upon acute, detailed, and up-to-date realization of some of the staggering problems that would be involved in any attempt to impose such charges.

"The economic factors involved are complex," he continued. "There are places where the investment cost of an improvement for the benefit of navigation is so low and traffic is so heavy that it would require an insignificant charge indeed to repay the Government's expenditures. In the same general vicinity there may be other communities whose navigational improvement works cost more, and whose traffic is not as heavy, and whose businessmen, shippers, and carriers consequently would have to pay perhaps many times as great a charge. This would make a mockery of free competition between the two areas."

Summing up the policy of the corps, General Itschner said it believed that the results of charging tolls on shipping "would not be worth the immense adjustments and the costs that would be involved"; that "whatever theoretical defects there may be in our present policy of no tolls, we believe they are less than the defects which could be found in an attempt to impose tolls."

SPECIAL AND DIFFERENT

On two waterways within the province of the United States Government—one of them in existence for half a century, the other only now beginning to take form—tolls are, or will be, charged.

They are very special international cases, different from all other navigation facilities under United States jurisdiction. They are, of course, the Panama Canal, which was opened 40 years ago last August, and the St. Lawrence seaway, which is scheduled for completion in the late summer of 1958.

In order to obtain clear rights for the building and operation of the canal across the Isthmus of Panama that links the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the United States Government had to pay out some $75 million. And for a lease in perpetuity of the canal right of way and a 5-mile strip of land on each side that forms the Panama Canal Zone, our Government pays the Republic of Panama an annual rental of $430,000. It was raised to that figure, as of 1934, from $250,000, so that by the end of last year the rental payments had amounted to some $16 million.

Those outlays are in addition to the canal's first cost of $337 million. In order to operate and protect the canal, the United States must maintain business management and civil government administrations employing more than 2,000 persons, to say nothing of the military safeguards that are prudent and necessary.

On March 19, 1955, the chairman of the United States Maritime Board disclosed that the Board was working toward the complete elimination of reduction of Panama Canal tolls—by the end of this year.

The St. Lawrence seaway, on which tolls will be collected in order to cover as nearly as practicable the amortization of $105 million in revenue bonds, plus operating costs, is in no way analogous to any other United States waterway. It is an international, or intergovernmental, undertaking by the United States and Canada, jointly.

One of the principal reasons advanced for Congressional approval of United States participation in the seaway that came last year was that Canada had officially determined to construct the seaway alone and would, if that took place, have sole determination of toll rates. The corporation created by Congress to direct construction of the United States portion of the seaway is required to negotiate with Canada on determination of a toll schedule and equitable division of revenues.

In the light of all the facts presented in this brochure, the Joint Executive Committee for the Improvement and Development of the Philadelphia Port Area urgently recommends:

Reaffirmation by the Congress of the United States of the traditional and historic responsibility of the Federal Government for the improvement of the shipping channels in the established seaports of the Nation, by:

Enactment in the present Congress (84th, 1st sess.) of the legislation to appropriate funds ($25 million of the total estimated cost of approximately $91 million) for the first year of work on the authorized improvement of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor, as a project in the interests of the Nation's economy and its military defense. The amount provided in the pending legislation is the amount that the Corps of Engineers believes could be most efficiently expended during the first year of work on the project.

WHAT IT IS

For almost 70 years—since 1888—the Joint Executive Committee for the Improvement and Development of the Philadelphia Port Area has been devoted to the upbuilding and expansion of the Delaware Estuarial Harbor.

The JEC has striven through all those years to encourage continual Federal improvement of the Delaware shipping channel and locally sponsored improvement of the marine-related facilities that give the channel its high degree of usefulness—to the people of this region and the people of the United States.

The member organizations of the JEC broadly represent local government agencies, business, and industry of the area.

The membership of the JEC is Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, Board of Harbor Commissioners, Wilmington, Del.; Bureau of Port Operations, City of Philadelphia; Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia; City Business Club of Philadelphia; Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia; Commercial Museum of Philadelphia; Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia; Lumbermen's Exchange of the City of Philadelphia; Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce; Philadelphia Bourse; Philadelphia Marine Trade Association; Philadelphia Maritime Exchange; Philadelphia Port Bureau; Pilots' Association for the Bay & River Delaware; Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society; South Jersey Port Commission; Vessel Owners' & Captains' Association.

---

[1] Development of the Delaware River for Commerce; vol. 80, No. 503, pp. 503–504 of the society's proceedings.

Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article entitled "Air Power," written by Maj. Alexander P. DeSeversky.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR POWER

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Severksy)

Air power is the ability of a nation to assert its will via the air medium. The military instrument by which a nation applies its airpower is an air force. In time of peace the very existence of an air force of proper size and capabilities—what is termed an air force in being—can be used by a country to implement its national policy.

In time of hostilities, the primary use of airpower is for the establishment of command of the air, the condition in which one side retains its freedom of air navigation and has the ability to deny that freedom to the enemy. Freedom of air navigation when maintained by one side through successful, sustained combat is known as air superiority.

Because the aim of war is to impose the will of one side upon the other, the enemy must be disarmed; his industrial power to make war and the stockpiles of his Armed Forces must be neutralized. For that reason, the offensive air force must carry the threat of a lethal dose of destruction.

Though the main objective of war is to disarm the adversary, it must be assumed from the outset that the belligerents' industrial vitals and other sinews of war will be properly shielded by a defensive air force and that access to the decisive targets will be challenged. It is for this reason, as well as to deprive the enemy of his retaliatory capacity, that the primary mission of the air force must be the elimination of the opopsing air force, through (1) the destruction of its operational facilities and equipment on the ground and (2) combat in the air. This is termed air battle.

In the past, when the range of aircraft was limited, it was possible to maintain local command of the air. Global command of the air could be achieved only after the establishment of a world-wide complex of air bases so located that, in terms of a given practical range of aircraft, their air peripheries would interlock to form an uninterrupted air canopy over the theaters of operation. This arrangement was not unlike the system maintained in the nineteenth century for seapower, which, for the exercise of its global functions, required the establishment of bastions of naval strength on foreign soil throughout the world.

There are emerging among the major powers, however, aircraft that, for all practical purposes, possess global range. They can rise directly from their respective home bases, strike at any traget in the Northern Hemisphere, and return nonstop. At the current rate of advance in aeronautical science, it is only a matter of a short time before aircraft of a truly global range (25,000 miles) will be a reality. In the meantime, global range is being achieved through the perfection of in-flight refueling.

Because of this global range, air power can be applied directly from the continental base of its industrial origin without intermediary bases and the international complica-

tions attendant upon their establishment and maintenance on foreign soil. In that respect, air power represents, diplomatically, an instrument of national policy that is superior to its predecessor of the last century, sea power, the world-wide deployment of which was often branded as imperialistic and aggressive. With the development of the global range of aircraft and the advent of nuclear weapons, local control of the air anywhere on the face of the earth, except over the continental base of air power containing the source of its industrial origin, can no longer be maintained. Thus, intermediary bases have become not only unnecessary but actually untenable. It follows that the base of air operation should be so located that any attack against it will involve for the attacker the risk of engaging the entire air might of the Nation. (This proposition, incidentally, defines the air power of the British Isles. Although an insular nation, Britain possesses a vast industrial complex and a large, technologically skilled population. She is a source of air power of global significance that is capable of accepting a challenge to her air sovereignty.)

It follows, also, that because local control of the air cannot be maintained, air power can no longer be applied on a sustained basis against a continent from intermediary bases located on its periphery, whether those bases are fixed on land or are floating, as aircraft carriers. If, for example, a floating base ventures beyond the protective canopy of a friendly continental air force, it becomes untenable. It stands to reason that, like an intermediary base, a floating base can never contain enough air power to challenge or ward off the entire air force of a hostile continent. Further, with the development of nuclear weapons of a size conveyable by small supersonic aircraft, the floating base, like any other intermediary base, becomes extremely vulnerable and once destroyed has no powers of recuperation.

From the above assumptions, it becomes clear that command of the air means a global command, exercised directly from the continent of its industrial origin. Either one controls the entire air ocean clear around the globe or one controls nothing.

In defining air power military experts have invariably paraphrased the historic definition of sea power, maintaining that air power includes a nation's air force, the military aviation of its other services, its civil aviation and civil air transportation system, its aircraft industry, and the aeronautical skills of its population. In other words, they have held that air power comprises that entire portion of the national effort that expresses itself in aircraft, their crews, and their operational facilities.

In the strict military sense of differentiating the respective strategic roles of the land, sea, and air forces, such a definition of air power can be challenged. The reason the sea-power formula is not applicable to air power is that the movement of ships is naturally confined to their medium, the water, and cannot directly participate in, or compete in parallel with, overland movement. It is logical, therefore, that the national effort that culminates in ships, their crews, and their operational facilities constitutes strictly sea power. On the other hand, it has never been claimed, for example, that army ordnance facilities and skills, although applicable to the production of naval guns, constituted sea power—the reason being that those facilities were irrevocably committed to the maintenance of the army.

Unlike seacraft, the aircraft is an extremely versatile vehicle, which not only participates in and competes with all methods of transportation on land and sea but, with the development of hovering machines such as helicopters, extends its application to other forms of motion, serving in effect as gigantic elevators, escalators, and hoists. As in the foregoing example of army ordnance facilities in relation to sea power, it can be argued that aircraft designed for and committed to surface forces do not constitute air power. It is quite possible for a nation to have an amorphous mass of aircraft, even in prodigious numbers, and still have no air power.

To put it another way, it is utterly immaterial whether an airplane rises from land or from water or from a catapult. What determines its definition as a land, sea, or air weapon is what it is designed to do after it becomes airborne. If designed to assist and increase the efficiency of land and sea forces in attaining their objectives, it is not an instrument of air power. Only when an aircraft is designed to assist and increase the efficiency of the air force in its task of establishing command of the air is it an instrument of air power.

A strategic force can be defined as a military force capable of assuming the command of its own medium by its own combat resources. Until the advent of the airplane, the army and navy were valid expressions of the nation's ultimate military power on land and sea, respectively. With the development of aircraft, however, that ceases to hold true. No longer the masters of their own mediums, in which air power can at will decisively interfere with their functions, those forces have lost their strategic significance. Conversely, the surface forces cannot on their own initiative interfere decisively with the functions of the air force. Consequently, the air force is the only strategic force, because it is the only force that can attain command of its own medium by its own combat resources. Thus, the air force has become the primary instrument of the nation's military strength.

Because in a major conflict surface forces can no longer successfully fulfill their missions unless the air above them is controlled by a friendly air force, command of the air becomes the crux of war and an end in itself. (This principle, of course, is not applicable in the case of limited, localized conflicts, the conduct of which is often governed by political considerations in defiance of military logic. Thus, in Korea, the United Nations air forces were confined to the support of ground forces and were prohibited from attacking the enemy's air bases or the industrial sources and stockpiles of his military strength.) Only when undisputed command of the air has been established can these other military services carry out their mission of exploitation, on the surface, of a climactic decision won in the air. Until then their efforts must be directed toward supporting and assisting the air force in its primary task.

In order to acquire maximum air power, a nation must adhere to these principles of military art: singleness of purpose, unity of command, and concentration and economy of force. This means that the entire airpower potential of a country must be unified, under a single air command, into a single force—an air force in being that can go anywhere and do the necessary.

Therefore, it can be stated that air power may be considered the supreme expression of military power and rests upon the entire human and material resources of the nation. See Aeronautics; Air Force; Air Force, Canadian; Air Force, United States; Air Warfare.

Bibliography—W. Mitchell, Winged Defense (1925); G. Douhet, The Command of the Air, translated by D. Ferrari (1942); A. P. de Seversky, Victory Through Air Power (1942), Air Power: Key to Survival (1950).

AUTHOR'S NOTES

1. The term "defensive air force" embraces defensive aircraft and their ground operational facilities, together with the Nation's entire detection and warning complex and ground-to-air missile and vehicle systems.

2. An important fact to be kept in mind is that the advent of nuclear weapons does not change the nature of airpower. With atomic warheads becoming common to all military forces, the supremacy of the Air Force as an instrument of war lies not in the nature of the explosive it employs, but in its superior and global combat mobility through the air medium, as contrasted with the inferior and geographically limited combat mobility of land and sea forces in their respective mediums.

The acquisition of aircraft by land and sea forces for logistic purposes does not alter that axiom. The acquisition of aircraft by those forces for air combat is tantamount to creating separate, competitive Air Forces, an act which defies the basic military principles of economy of force and unity of command, with resultant overall weakening of the airpower of the Nation.

What You Should Know About World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are people in our country today who would surrender our national sovereignty to a fictitious form of world government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appears in the current issue of the American Legion magazine by Zane B. Thurston:

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT WORLD GOVERNMENT

At its 1951 national convention the American Legion adopted a resolution which said in part: "We reiterate our opposition to the participation of the United States in any form of world federation, world government or in any intermediate federative organization • • • which would, in whole or in part, involve the sacrifice of sovereignty of the United States." The Legion again amplified this strong opposition in a resolution at its 1954 national convention.

In so doing the Legion has rendered a great service to our constitutional Republic by calling our attention to the inherent dangers of the world government notion.

It is well to establish at the outset that the world government theory is not merely an idealistic and nebulous abstraction hovering in the minds of intellectual daydreamers; it is a very real, high-powered and liberally-financed movement supported by many groups—here and abroad—dedicated to the task of creating a federal union of the world.

My personal interest in the world government idea (over and above the prompting of my natural religious and patriotic instincts) stems from the fact that one of its main protagonists is a fellow townsman; indeed, much of the spade work which has been done in this country was done less than 2 miles from my home at the so-called "Dublin Conference" in early 1945. The climax of the work at these conferences, and since, will be the attempt by the United World Federalists, Inc., (one of the most powerful groups pressing for world government in this country) to expedite their plan of transforming the United Nations into a world government when its charter comes up for amendment in July of this year.

It is not my purpose to analyze critically the many specifications, requirements, provisions, and restrictions of the various world government schemes which the American Legion obviously considers to be inimical to the continued sovereignty and independence of our constitutional Republic; rather, I shall dwell upon those inherent contradictions, false premises and ridiculous notions that render the theory of world government impracticable in itself.

The avowed supreme goal of world government advocates is the creation of a federal government embracing all the nations of the world; this, they consider to be the only conceivable way to establish and preserve world peace. Extremely vocal prior to and during World War II and in the late forties, they found expression in such organizations as: Federal Union, Inc., the Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., United World Federalists, Inc., and various other lesser groups. Before any valid argument can be made against the theory, the best possible case for the opposition must be fairly and objectively established and can best be accomplished by quoting directly from their literature, speeches, and public pronouncements.

A brochure entitled, "Let's Not Make the Same Mistake Twice" (published by Federal Union, Inc.) very aptly states their reason for existence and can be fairly presented as representing the motivations of all world government agitators even though not all would subscribe to the federal union plan.

The brochure says: "after the war will come something called 'peace.' And, it is equally the duty of every American to bear in mind that the fate of democracy, and our own future, will depend not alone on the outcome of the war but on the outcome of that 'peace' also. We need a peace-aim no less than a war-aim, for victory. We helped to win the last war. We lost the peace. Now we are at the crossroads again! Why? Do we, the free peoples of the earth, know where we expect to go? Have we a plan to attain an orderly, peaceful, prosperous world based on freedom? Up until now the answer has been, no * * * But there is an answer now. Federal union is such a belief. Federal union is a faith in an expanding democracy, and in an expanding, embracing, democratic way of life for the whole world. Federal union proclaims for the free peoples. 'We do know where we want to go and how to get there.'"

The organ outlines "A strong but flexible union" composed of the "English-speaking democracies" to be open to other nations "as they develop or restore democratic rights." It further proposes that "the union would guarantee every citizen the individual rights set forth in our Bill of Rights—the rights of free men." And it graciously suggests that "it be abandoned for something better if something better [can] be found." Not being a "true" world government plan—that is, not including all the nations of the world—this plan has been forced into oblivion by a larger and more aggressive group, the United World Federalists, Inc. (the main contenders in the world government arena in this country today).

Such prominent figures as former Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, shouted for world government; making an impassioned plea on the floor of the Senate in July 1949, he called for the ratification of the Atlantic Pact, eventual Atlantic federal union and ultimate world government. Owen J. Roberts, retired Justice of the United States Supreme Court; Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War; Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior; Will L. Clayton, Joseph C. Grew, William Phillips, and Robert Woods Bliss, all former Under-Secretaries of State were all officers of the aforementioned Atlantic Union Committee, Inc.

This committee sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, House Concurrent Resolution 26 with the active support of 28 Senators and 84 Congressmen. The resolution stated that whereas Federal union in this country had secured prosperity and abundance for Americans, the President be requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to a convention to explore the possibilities of forming within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union, the avowed end result of which was to establish an Atlantic federal union as a necessary first step toward ultimate world government.

From all the foregoing it must be conceded that the world government proponents were keenly aware of the need for a definite and concrete plan to win the peace, and they were predisposed to act. This is all to their credit as the majority of us were either hoping that the war would soon be over so that we could get back to business as usual or that it would never end since we never had it so good.

From the outset the world government schemers have been awed by the greatness and tremendous success of this country but have made the fatal mistake of reasoning that the mere fact that our forefathers joined together in a Federal union was the underlying reason for its unbelievable success and prosperity; that this joining together, in itself, brought law, order, peace, harmony, and abundance to our shores. That it failed completely to prevent one of the bloodiest fratricidal wars in history is a fact they seem to ignore. Confusing cause and effect, they have consistently failed to make the main plank in their platform the real reason why our form of government breeds peace, law, and order; in attempting to give everyone as fine a cornfield as we enjoy they fail to grasp the inviolable rule of law that the same kind of seed corn must be planted.

Before our Founding Fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or Bill of Rights, they were in general agreement on one great principle—that God is the source of all law and authority and that His law is supreme in the order of things. They went on from there. Representing many divergent religious views, economic backgrounds, political convictions, customs, traditions, manners, and habits, they found a common ground on which to meet, a mutually acceptable moral standard defined with reasonable clarity, and made it the heart and soul of the new Government. That, and that alone, is the secret of our tremendous growth and success as a Federal union.

Having found an organic unity, an indestructible cohesive element, they founded our constitutional Republic upon solid rock; agreed on the supremacy of God and His law as well as their absolute dependence upon Him, they wrote into our Constitution the inviolable principle that certain institutions and human relations are outside the authority of government.

All world government schemes are notoriously conspicuous not only for their ignorance of God as the highest authority but even for the need of a universally acceptable standard of morals and ethics, if the world is to be held together in one inseparable unit subject to a single government. There are many broad hints and generalizations about "embracing democratic principles," "peace, security, and abundance," "universal brotherhood," etc., but no mention of the creative source of these ideals. Herein lies the greatest weakness of the world government notion; herein lies the breach through which seeps the corrosive elements that dissolve the highest ideals, the best intentions, and most profound achievements.

Keeping in mind that those first plans for world government were designed primarily for the free peoples and left open to other nations "as they develop(ed) or restore(d) democratic rights," let us examine to what extent these essentially sound ideals have become corrupted because their champions have chosen to build on sand.

At the second London Parliamentary Conference on World Government, foreign world government groups in collaboration with the United World Federalists, Inc., drew up plan A and plan B for transforming the United Nations into a world government. Plan A stipulates that membership should be open to all states of the world, and all must be urged to join. This would include all the Communist nations. The UWF would have us join with the enemy in a worldwide socialistic organization to preserve liberties which he is unalterably committed to destroy, even when he has candidly admitted that this is easiest of accomplishment by getting the free nations to join with him in just such a coalition. Once membership has been accepted, continued membership must be compulsory. There must be no right of secession. If our enemies chose to vote our freedoms down the drain we couldn't even shoot our way out as a provision on disarmament precludes the possibility. And what a notorious repudiation of our Declaration of Independence; that great document states that when any government becomes destructive of man's unalienable rights it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government. The lower chamber, of the proposed world legislature, should consist of representatives of member states in numbers proportionate to population. The lethal aspects of this provision are obvious when we consider that the United States has a population of roughly 160 million; the combined population of the Communist nations and those disposed to follow the dictates of the Kremlin number well over a billion.

Another provision of plan A is that taxes should be levied proportionately to national income. No comment needed.

Plan A, ostensibly designed to extend democratic ideals throughout the world, also provides that members of the upper chamber, or senate, of the proposed world legislature be appointed rather than elected, as this would tend to secure the representation of some valuable men and women who are not willing to submit themselves to popular suffrages. A sobering thought when we consider that Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, John Stewart Service, John Carter Vincent, William Remington, Harry Dexter White, and others, were able to convince essentially loyal American administration officials that they were valuable people worthy of sensitive posts, and that only those who were willing to submit themselves to popular suffrages had the courage to bring the facts to light and convince administration officials that those others weren't as they had represented themselves.

That this plan, and plan B (which is only slightly less radical and for which they will press if plan A fails to get the necessary U. N. support) threatens the continued existence of our constitutional Republic goes without saying. For, as the law now stands, a treaty supersedes our Constitution and the U. N. Charter is a treaty. And the United World Federalists plan to put over this blueprint for national suicide in July 1955—this year.

It is perhaps an oversimplification, but it would seem that the world government notion is an attempt to produce godliness (or goodness, peace, harmony, and abundance) without God. Having thus started off on the wrong foot each successive step has led its apostles farther afield.

But world government supporters are not willing to start over. They continue to err by reasoning that goodness (or peace, law,

order, and abundance) must be produced by government. This flagrant error in judgment is well illustrated in the aforementioned brochure published by Federal Union, Inc.:

"Law and order have never been attained by depending on the good will of good people. It requires government to enforce law and order whether in village or nation."

On the contrary, genuine respect for equitable law and the achievement of true order can only be realized by depending upon the good will of good people. The very heart and soul—the underlying principle—of all order, peace, harmony, and cordiality is that good will generated by good people. Granted, when those disposed to ill will outnumber their opposites or are much more aggressive in their designs, the inertia and lethargy of good-willed good people render the maintenance of peace and order much more difficult, but this in no way alters the basic principle involved.

The fallacious tenet that it requires government to enforce law and order is the tar pit which will fossilize all world-government champions. This is the Old World concept which prompted our Founding Fathers to establish a new government. There is peace, harmony, law, and order in Russia; law and order are enforced under total government. There is peace, harmony, law, and order of a truer nature under our free system; but, it is a byproduct of our constitutional Government—it doesn't have to be enforced. Our Government creates not law and order but an atmosphere where law and order can find expression and enforces only the penalty for breaking the law and disturbing the order.

World government advocates, having reasoned that it requires government to enforce law and order, proceed on their dizzy course by reasoning that if worldwide law and order are desired we must have world government.

Force (which is the ultimate of government) will not only defeat the peace and well-ordered lives of the people, but in the end will destroy itself; every appeal, except the appeal to God, the source of all law and authority, will bear evil fruit.

Another inexcusable trait of world-government theorists is to frown upon history. Because no practicable solution to world peace has been expedited in the past they reason that the solution must necessarily be a new, novel one.

If nothing else, an objective study of history should certainly convince us that the world government notion is impracticable: Alexander the Great made a heroic attempt to unify the world under one governmental head; he failed. The great Roman Empire under the Caesars, Caligula, Nero, Domitian, Aurelius, and Atoninus Pius was a world government in the strictest sense; spreading from the great wall of Hadrian in Scotland to the sphynx and the headwaters of the Nile, from the Iberian Peninsula to the Tigris and Euphrates, it embraced most of the then-civilized world. The Roman Government "enforced law and order; it failed to unite the world and create Utopia. Including numerous races, 10 times as many religions and a multitude of cultures, it had no universally acceptable moral code or standard of ethics. It failed; rotted from within. There can be no vital unity without, at least in substance, a unity of religions, morals, customs, and traditions as there was in Colonial America.

Those who champion world government also fall into the great error of our day of making a fetish of "democracy." A democracy is a form of government in which the supreme authority is vested in the will of the majority. Under such a system the interests of the minority groups and the individual are subject to the dictates of the majority. The "majority" favored the rise of Hitler in Germany; the "majority" of the United States Supreme Court decreed that a Negro had no right to American citizenship (*Dred Scott* v. *Sanford*—1857); the "majority" on the front porch of Pilate's house shouted: "Crucify Him. Crucify Him." Rome and Germany have since fallen. But America, unalterably committed to the absolute supremacy of the laws of God, at great sacrifice and unprecedented suffering inscribed in human blood the inviolable rule of natural law that all men, regardless of color, have a right to be free. She stands today infinitely stronger for her sacrifices; man's last best hope of freedom on earth; not a "democracy," but a constitutional Republic.

Another pitfall of the world government advocates is the outrageous notion that security is the birthright of every individual. The only security that government is bound to guarantee its citizens is security in their freedom to provide for their own security. If a person is relieved of the duties, obligations, and anxieties necessary for the maintenance of his material welfare, he is also relieved of his dignity as an individual. Remove the consequences which befall the man who refuses to provide for his own security; remove the rewards for those who diligently labor for themselves and their families and the world would soon be populated by fools.

The motive power of the world government movement—that driving force which impels its adherents to passionate action—is not entirely the updrafts generated by the fluttering wings of the dove of peace. Its supporters are driven primarily by fear; fear that the present-day exalted position of the mind of man which manifests itself in our unbelievable technological accomplishments shall be utterly destroyed. They exult over our mental giants and spiritual pygmies making up what they worship as "modern civilization" and live in constant fear that their golden idol may be destroyed.

A particularly cogent example of this "fear psychosis" is the speech by Cord Meyer, Jr., United World Federalist vice president, delivered to the UWF and Federation of American Scientists at Washington, D. C., in April 1947. Among other things he maintained that, "Whether our fate is to be peace or atomic-biological warfare is the issue." He claimed not to overstate the case in saying that "the lives of more than one-third of humanity and the survival of what we have chosen to call civilization is at stake." Ruling out our preparedness program, the balance of atomic power theory, the abolition of atomic weapons and a preventive war as dependable foundation stones of world peace, he concluded by observing: "While there is still time and room for hope, let us present to the people of this country the real choice, the destruction of civilized society or some measure of world government. When they understand that choice, I have confidence in their decision. Men are sufficiently rational to acquiesce in their own survival."

Mr. Meyer gives us a choice of experiencing a blowout or accepting a slow leak; we end up riding on the rim in either case. He doesn't even allow that there might be a third choice, but there is. We can stop the car, find the root cause of the tire trouble, and repair it. Of course, our trip will be delayed; we'll get our hands dirty; run the risk of being run down by a passing auto; we may even bark a shin or bruise an elbow. But we will be engaging in the only activity that will insure beyond any shadow of a doubt that we will reach our destination. Any other course, prompted by fear, would be a temporary expedient at best and would only prolong the inevitable: ultimate failure. Let us not forget that fear has given us the only military defeat of our glorious history—Korea; fear has resulted in the enslavement of millions in Viet Nam; fear has always been a harbinger of slavery.

The fact that many world government advocates have positive subversive affiliations is a disturbing factor. Many of them, of course, are merely yard birds in that vast army of joiners who are more to be pitied than condemned. The law of averages, however, dictates that some are knowingly subversive and have good reason to espouse the world government cause. A statement of Stalin best explains that good reason.

In his Marxism and the National Colonial Question Stalin called for the "amalgamation of all nations in a single world economic system which is so essential for the final triumph of socialism." The Communist program clearly states: "That dictatorship [of the proletariat] can be established only by a victory of socialism in different countries, after which the proletariat republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence, and this system of federal unions would expand and embrace colonies emancipated from the yoke of imperialism until, at length, they formed the World Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and united all mankind under the international domination of the proletariat organized as a state."

In conclusion, let us resolve with the world government theorists that there is a definite need for a positive and constructive program of action if enduring peace on earth is to become a reality. But here let us part company; let's not try to produce moisture without the element of water. Permanent peace can never be realized by joining with the devil, hoping, like Faust, that we will outwit him when the showdown comes. Peace—lasting and on a worldwide scale—can be achieved only as it has been achieved here in America: not by merely joining together in a federal union, but by prefacing our actions by subscribing without reservation to the kingship of God and the absolute supremacy of his law in the order of things; by acquiescing to nothing else. Only when the majority of the governments of the world are willing to do this will a world government setup be even remotely practicable.

Here, under the most perfect government in the annals of human history, we must be dedicated to but one aim: the preservation of the way of life given to us at great sacrifice by our Founding Fathers. We must courageously stand by our convictions and contend, as did our forebears, that even death is preferable to a loss of liberty. We must depend upon the good will of good people to bring about the peace which we all so passionately crave, for we have it on better authority than all the world government agitators rolled into one that there will be "peace on earth to men of good will."

Policy Statement of the New England Governors Relative to a Proposed Federal-Aid Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

POLICY STATEMENT OF THE NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS RELATIVE TO A PROPOSED FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Governors of the six New England States assembled in Boston, Mass., on March

15, 1955, reviewed in detail the highway needs of the New England area and the merits of the bill which are being considered by the Congress of the United States, pertaining to Federal aid for highways, and are in agreement with the following statement of policy:

A survey of these needs indicates conclusively that notwithstanding the fact that all six States have sizable programs in effect, improvements on our highway systems are not keeping pace with the increasing demands of traffic. Bold action is called for, with new concepts and higher aims. The popularity and success of the several throughway-type highways indicates that a development of the Interstate System, as a first step toward an overall highway-improvement program, is timely, logical, and bears promise of being an excellent way to win popular approval for the whole program.

However, inasmuch as the resources of the respective States are limited and it would be several years before the 40,000-mile national system could be completed with the current financing methods, we believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to take the initiative in an accelerated interstate program and to bear the major cost for improving this system to the desired standards within a 10-year period. We do believe that the 40,000-mile system as now established should not be increased and that the matching funds of the States should not be less than 5 percent or more than 10 percent of the total costs.

The survey of the Interstate System in New England shows that our needs amounted to 8.20 percent of the needs of the Nation. This relatively high percentage is occasioned by the fact that many of the interstate routes pass through or near large centers of population and industrial areas where land takings and construction costs are well above the average. For this reason, we believe that any funds allotted for the Interstate System should be distributed on the basis of need rather than on arbitrary ratios as provided for under the Federal Highway Act of 1954.

Inasmuch as several States have already constructed portions of the Interstate System to the required standards, it is believed that in order not to discriminate against these States a credit reimbursement should be allowed for any road so constructed whether it is a free road or toll road.

The credit reimbursement so allowed should be 90 percent of a fair depreciation value of the road at the time of its acceptance into the system, minus any Federal funds that entered into its construction. This provision should not extend to toll roads where the financing has not been authorized prior to December 31, 1955.

We believe that the Interstate System should provide safe, fast and economical transportation for a period of at least 20 years after its improvement and should therefore be constructed upon a right-of-way having control of access. Because of the need for expediting the construction through all States simultaneously, provision should be made for the Federal Government, upon petition of the State, to acquire the necessary right-of-way where State laws are inadequate for this purpose.

In order not to impede the improvement on the other Federal systems, namely, the primary, secondary, and urban systems, we believe the funds provided in the 1954 Federal-aid act for these systems should be continued, except that the apportionments should be made for a 6-year period to permit the States to properly plan and staff their programs.

Also, it is believed that it would be advantageous to the States in solving their problems of funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems if a transfer up to but not exceeding 25 percent of these funds between the systems were permitted. If an accelerated Federal highway program is approved and a national highway corporation commission or authority is created, we believe its activities should be restricted to financing of the program only.

We believe the program should be administered and constructed by the State highway departments with the Bureau of Public Roads acting as the coordinating agency for the approval of final plans. The relationship between these agencies has been highly efficient and outstandingly successful.

The governors of the New England States believe that the completion of an interstate system in 10 years is a necessity in order to maintain the economic growth of our region and the Nation; to reduce the high death and accident toll on our highways, and to provide for our military and civilian defense needs if the occasion arises. It is reasonable to assume that the New England States are prepared to provide the matching funds that will be required.

Israel: Key to Middle East Security—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the first of a series of 5 articles on Israel: Key to Middle East Security, which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Express, one of the newspapers published by William Randolph Hearst, Jr. The articles were written by former Congressman Sam Yorty, of California:

ISRAEL: KEY TO MIDDLE EAST SECURITY—YORTY TELLS ROLE TO BE PLAYED BY NEW NATION

(Tension in Asia, in recent months, has obscured another potential volcanic outpouring of international trouble. It is the Middle East where for 7 years Israel and her Arab neighbors have been at gun point. This is the strategic area that Hitler sought to overrun on a trek through North Africa. With its Suez Canal and its vastly rich oil lands, it is now inviting to Soviet Russia. The free world's principal claim to a firm friendship in this area is Israel, the key to security and peace in the Middle East. A report on this trouble spot has been made for the Herald-Express by Samuel W. Yorty, an attorney and former United States Congressman from the 26th District, who recently returned from an extensive Middle East visit. This is the first of several articles.)

(By Samuel W. Yorty)

Israel is an island of democracy surrounded by hostile Arab neighbors in a world of its own. With a circle of guns at its back, it stands firm guard over its small bit of land, and it is determined that those Arab armaments will not carry out the Arab threat to "drive the Israelis into the sea."

The complicated ideological problems of Jew and Arab now look interminable, but those problems which appear to the western world as purely diplomatic relations must be resolved if a war already 7 years old is to end.

We have a stake in the solution, because Israel-Arab peace is the real key to the building of security in the Middle East. And, more than that, we have a stake in the success of Israel's democracy.

Despite the strategic importance of the Middle East, borders of which are common to those of Communist Russia, I feel it is the area least understood in the United States. I am more than ever convinced of this since I have completed a tour of Israel and those Arab enemy countries which bound it on three sides.

The Moslem Arabs, at least most of them, even refuse to recognize the existence of this foundling country, Israel, which proclaimed its existence in 1948. The Arab hate for Israel as a country is unreasonable. It is fanatical. It is dangerous.

The United States, since first recognizing the Government of Israel on May 14, 1948, has had to face Arab resentment. Ordinary diplomacy is out of the question. There can be no friendly sitting down at conference table and working out problems. With the Arabs there can be no unemotional discussion of Israel.

GRAVE CONCERN OVER ARMING

Israel, while favoring economic assistance to raise the standard of living of Arab peoples, is gravely concerned about our supplying of arms to any Arab State. First before arms, say the Israelis, the Arabs must prove they really stand with the United States in defense of freedom and unequivically renounce blockade, boycott, and threats of renewed war against Israel.

I was in the Arab countries of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan. I soon learned that Arab emotions are so volatile where Israel is concerned that even seemingly entrenched Arab political leaders dare not openly make a conciliatory gesture toward their new neighbor.

As far as the Arabs are concerned, Israel is an illigitimate child which should never have been conceived and which would have died in the process of being born if not instantly rescued and adopted by the United States.

The once deep-rooted friendship and admiration Arabs held for Americans now appears to be more superficial and more closely related to their need for the financial and technical assistance we can and do supply to shore up their shaky economies.

Today there is no break in the border between Israel and the Moslem States of the Arab League, which, incidentally, does not include Turkey or Iran, and the Arab door is slammed in the face of any visitor who has either been to Israel or is bound there. An armistice agreement was signed in 1949, but it is a very shaky armistice. The war is still very real.

ARAB LEAGUE HATES ISRAEL

There has been little drifting away of bitterness. It is still almost as fanatical as in 1949 when Arab leaders were murdered in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan, including King Abdullah, of Jordan, for their part in the armistice. Even this act of formal halt to shooting was taken as softness toward Israel.

Among members of the Arab League there is unity on but one thing—hate Israel. It is not strange that this hysterical mob madness is nurtured and exploited, for behind the facade of political sovereignty lies poverty, illiteracy, technical backwardness, and disease. These are the very things that the State of Israel has proved can be overcome within its own borders. It is a Middle East beacon of progress.

Only on the hate of Israel are the Arab States united. On other matters they are split by dynastic feuds, conflicting ambitions, and jealousy. The Moslems are divided into sects. There is heated rivalry between the ruling Hashemites of Iraq and the Saudis of Arabia. All are cross-currents that further muddle the Middle East problem.

I talked with most everyone, from prime ministers and kings to chauffeurs, refugees, and guides. I asked:

"What is the solution? How can we establish peace between the Arabs and the Israelis? What do you want the United States to do?"

There were no identical answers to my questions. But generally the solution revolves about the 1 million Arab refugees who lost their homes as a result of the United Nations decision to partition Palestine and the Arab's effort to prevent partition by resorting to war, a war we dare not consider ended.

But what is right and what is wrong? In Arab countries it matters little, because there is no reason, there is only hate. Quite naturally, Arab bitterness causes a reaction in Israel.

Typical of the thinking of the Moslem refugee is that of a former Haifa businessman, now a Palestine refugee in a camp near Beirut, Lebanon.

This man admitted that the Israelis did not drive him and his family out of Haifa. He admitted that some Moslems remained, but he was convinced that they faced unfair discrimination.

"We heard of a massacre; there was terrorism, bombings, and panic. We fled," this man told me.

He continued:

"Our leaders told us to leave. They said we could return in 2 weeks. The Arab leaders betrayed us, their own people. They said they would drive the Israelis into the sea and we could return. They lied to us."

This man, who sees his future in a dirty, crowded refugee camp without the simplest of comforts and without enough food, volunteered the information that he did not believe the Israelis did the bombing which caused Arabs to flee their homes.

"They didn't have airplanes," he said. I don't know who did it, but there were people who wanted us out of the way besides Israelis. The British and the Americans were for the Israelis."

He is one of a million men, women and their children displaced by a war on the fields of Biblical Palestine, a war that nobody really understood.

To further complicate and confuse the problem, this man and his Moslem brothers in the refugee camp are unacceptable as citizens in the Arab League State of Lebanon. Additional Moslems would upset the delicate 50–50 balance in that country between Moslems and Christians.

Israel: Key to Middle East Security—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the second of a series of articles on Israel: key to Middle East Security, which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Express, one of the newspapers of which William Randolph Hearst, Jr., is publisher. The articles were written by former Congressman Sam Yorty, of California:

JERUSALEM, LAND OF BIBLE, STANDS DIVIDED AS BATTLEGROUND

(By Samuel W. Yorty)

Jerusalem, the land of the Bible, is holy to three great religions—Christian, Moslem, and Jewish. Today it stands divided. It is a battleground.

On one side stand the Israelis, an ancient people reunited, with a modern concept of living and a new representative government to implement their ideals. In the leading city of Israel, Tel-Aviv, the tempo is fast, dynamic. It might be a city in the United States.

But threatening to crush Israel and all the Israelis with it is the heritage of the Middle East, feudalistic governments primarily based upon despotism, military dictatorships, and ruling cliques exploiting carefully inflamed irrational hatred of Israel.

This threat to western-oriented Israel comes from bordering Arab States which are typified by squalor, wooden plows, beggars, donkeys, ragged people, illiteracy, sluggishness.

It is a pressing threat by force of numbers. Israel's six hostile Arab neighbors—Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Egypt, plus Iraq, which is nearby but not contiguous—have a combined population of 40 million and a total area of over 1,500,000 square miles.

Israel has a population of 1,700,000 living in an area of 8,000 square miles. These Arab countries have a population 25 times greater than Israel. They control a land area almost 200 times larger.

To the north of Israel is tiny Lebanon, its 1,320,000 population in delicate balance between Christian and Moslem. It is a land of strange contrasts, neither east nor west, a land of Cadillacs and burros. The full impact of 1,000 static years is not realized, however, until one reaches Syria and its capital, Damascus, the oldest inhabited city of the world.

SYRIA POLITICS IS TURBULENT

All of Syria, with a population of 3,500,000, is a land of turbulent politics and low living standards. There are constant student demonstrations and clever Communist agitation. Hatred of Israel is intense and serves to distract attention from otherwise glaring shortcomings close to home.

Syrian people could benefit greatly from the American technical assistance their government has refused to accept. Syria's attitude is influenced by the claim that the United States has been more friendly to Israel than to the Arab countries. Still, Syria with its 70,500 square miles has a greater economic potential than any of the Arab states except Iraq.

The Soviets have slyly increased their influence in Syria by siding with the Arabs against Israel in disputes before the United Nations. This, too, has influenced Syria's reluctance to accept American aid.

Oil rich Saudi Arabia, in contrast to Syria, is politically stable. The stability comes from King Saud, an absolute ruler, an oil magnate with a royalty income of $200 million a year and protector of Mecca and other holy places of Islam.

Recently King Saud joined in the who hates Israel most competition with some very threatening and belligerent statements concerning his tiny neighbor.

King Saud, who tours in a modern Arabian caravan—of Cadillacs—is a friendly, reasonable appearing man. From my meeting with him I would have no hesitancy in discussing any mutual problem—but if I had possessed a visa to enter Israel, he would not have permitted me to even enter his kingdom.

RAISED FROM RAGS TO RICHES

His personal power over 7 million people is typified in his royal decree establishing prohibition. It is rigidly enforced. The decree against alcohol was issued because one of the royal family got into trouble while drinking.

Saudi Arabia became a rags to riches country in 1933 when the late Ibn Saud granted an oil concession to the California-Arabian American Oil Co., now known as Aramco. It is fortunate that this oil is being controlled by American companies. It has aided in establishing our friendly relations with Saudi Arabia which has allowed the United States military use of the important Dhahran airfield.

It goes without saying that a negotiated settlement between Israel and the Arab nations would make maintenance of goodwill in Arabia much easier for Aramco. This controversy is a disturbing element in all Arab-American relations much to the joy of the Kremlin which delights in helping to keep the pot boiling.

Iraq, stormy petrel of the Arab league with a population of 5 million and an area of 171,000 square miles, does not have a common border with Israel, and partly for this reason, it was the first to receive military supplies from the United States under our program calling for arming of the weak and vulnerable Arab states against the Communists in spite of the Arab-Israel war.

OFFERS KEY TO REFUGEES

Historically known as Mesopotamia, Iraq is one key to solution of the Palestine Arab refugee problem. The fertile Tigris-Euphrates Valley once supported a population many times the present Iraq population. All who have studied the problem agree that properly developed, this area could easily empty the camps of refugees.

Also an oil-rich nation, Iraq is pro-western and recently severed diplomatic relations with Moscow. It has entered into a defense agreement with Great Britain and Turkey, a non-league state, much to the consternation of other Arab League states. While this may still prove to be a "soft spot" of the "hate Israel League," a secret letter exchanged at the time of the treaty has been disclosed which appear to leave the Iraq-Israel dispute unaffected.

Iraq's neighbor to the east, Iran (Persia) is a non-Arab nation, and it has recognized the government of Israel. Ambassadors have not been exchanged, however, probably because of the influence of the tenuous but existent religious bonds with the Arab Moslem states. During my stay in Iran the Israeli question was never mentioned.

Inflammation of the Arab-Israel illness has spread itself throughout the Middle East. But nowhere was it more apparent than in Jordan, where the Arab refugee problem is a tremendous and potentially explosive human and political problem.

Israel: Key to Middle East Security—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the third of a series of articles on Israel: Key to Middle East Security, which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Express, one of the newspapers of which William Randolph Hearst, Jr., is publisher. The articles were written by former Congressman, Sam Yorty, of California:

PALESTINE CRISIS CENTERS IN JORDAN, DISPLACED ARABS

(By Samuel W. Yorty)

Jordan is in the center of the Middle East muddle. Except for the River Jordan valley, it is a barren and mountainous country not much larger than Indiana.

But it is here that the Israel-Arab crisis centers.

West Jordan, on the Israel side of the Jordan River is a part of Palestine that was still held by the Arabs at the time of the Arab-Israeli armistice agreement in 1949.

If the United Nations decision on the division of Palestine had been accepted by the Arabs, this area would have been an Arab state, but not necessarily part of Jordan. The holy city of Jerusalem would have been under international control.

Arabs say they fear that Israel may use military force to straighten out this Jordan bulge which divides Jerusalem on the west side of the river. The concern with which Jordan views this real or fancied threat to this bulge area can be understood when it is realized that 800,000 of Jordan's 1,400,000 population live in West Jordan, or "Arab Palestine," as it is called.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND ARAB REFUGEES IN JORDAN

There are 450,000 Arab refugees in Jordan. This is one-third of the country's entire population. This large refugee population is a political force to be considered in any attempt to settle the festering Arab-Israeli controversy.

Once in Jordan, you soon discover that the one central, dominating, irritating, inflammatory theme underlying all activity, whether religious, economic or political, is the Israeli war and the refugees.

On the Jordan side of the armed border is the old city of Jerusalem and most of the holy shrines. There I visited the Church of the Nativity, the Holy Sepulchre, the Mount of Olives and the Garden of Gethsemane.

My guide was an Arab Moslem refugee, a young man who had been an accountant until he left his home during the fighting.

He sounded the cry of all refugees: "The Jews took our property. They have paid us nothing, and they use it while we try to exist. The Jews should be forced to let us return to our homes or pay us for them."

SICK OF FIGHTING FOR THE SHRINES

Another man, white-haired and well dressed, told me here in Jordan, "It is incongruous to have all of this fighting for possession of our Christian shrines. We're sick of this Arab-Israeli war."

He bitterly criticized the British for walking out in 1948 at the end of their 25-year mandate and leaving a "vacuum for violence."

A solution to this war in the Middle East might be found if it were merely a matter of paying the displaced Arabs for their properties, as the guide suggested, and getting Israelis together with those Arabs both Moslem and Christian, who are "sick of this war" in the Holy Land.

Prime Minister Moshe Sharett of Israel told me his country was prepared to pay these Arabs for their properties as part of an overall settlement. Estimates of this cost range upward from $500 million.

FANATICISM BAR TO SETTLEMENT

But it is not as simple as that. The fanaticism of some Arab leaders, many of them refugees, does not allow this solution today.

This was made pointedly and painfully clear in a conference I had at a refugee camp near Jericho. I talked to the Mukhtars.

The Mukhtars are former Arab mayors, village leaders. Some are now refugee camp leaders. They consider the United States to be on Israel's side. I was warned that Communist agitators are helping to inflame them against the Americans. They are getting desperate in their frustrations, for some have been in camps for 6 years. Many of their children were born there.

I told the group that I was interested in a solution to their problem. I asked, "Assuming, and I repeat, assuming you cannot go back, then what solution can you suggest?"

There was a conference, a nodding of heads, and the interpreter said, "They all agree. There is only one solution: Return to their lands."

I put the question again, and the answer was the same—"We must go back."

I asked, "But if you cannot go back, will you accept compensation for your property?" There was the same answer, but the cross-chatter amongst them indicated a difference of opinion.

On the other hand, the Mukhtars declared emphatically they would not go back and live under the Israeli Government. An older, bearded Arab among them said heatedly: "The Jews were our slaves. They worked for us. We will not live under them."

Here again they accused the United States of friendliness toward Israel and declared: "We would drive them (the Israelis) into the sea."

I tried to explain that we are friendly toward Israel, that the United States gave the country early recognition but that we were friendly with the Arabs, too. I told them we were not responsible for the fighting, that we wanted to end the war and that we wished to be fair but that "if you are unreasonable, the American people may lose patience and wash their hands of your problem."

"Then what will you do?" I asked.

One rumbled his reply, "The older ones among us will die. But our sons are taking an oath to carry on the fight.

"Let me end the meager rations. We are humiliated standing in line for little food. We are merchants and farmers We had our own lands. We can die. But we will never give up."

Israel: Key to Middle East Security—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the fourth of a series of articles on Israel: Key to Middle East Security, which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald Express, one of the newspapers published by William Randolph Hearst, Jr. The articles were written by former Congressman Sam Yorty, of California:

BLOCKADE BY ARABS, MIXED REFUGEES PERIL NEW NATION

(By Samuel W. Yorty)

Israel, which came into being 7 years ago, has left its doors open to all persons of Jewish faith.

It has been swamped with immigrants of divergent customs, culture, color, language and beliefs. This flood of immigrants had to be fed, housed, oriented, taught the Hebrew language and provided with an opportunity to earn a living.

During these years the new state was fighting a shooting war for existence. A tight squeeze was put on Israel by a blockade and boycott carried on by adjacent Arab nations. In fact, the Syrian Army chief of staff made an appeal to all Arab states to tighten the blockade even more as the best way to kill Israel peacefully.

ISRAEL SIZE OF NEW JERSEY

Israel is only about the size of New Jersey, but the Negev Desert in the south constitutes nearly 60 percent of the total area. Of the country's 1,700,000 population, about 175,000 are Arabs of both Moslem and Christian faiths.

More than 700,000 Jews have migrated to Israel since 1948 when it was founded and a republican form of government established. Approximately half of the immigrants to Israel came from the Moslem countries of the Middle East and Africa where they had lived in ghetto slum and squalor.

ISRAEL FIGHTING FOR EXISTENCE

Approximately 200,000 Jews came out of World War II concentration camps, survivors of the 6 million brutally murdered in the horrifying Nazi gas chambers and furnaces.

Now the Israelis are in another war in which they are fighting for their existence. Shooting and violence often flare up along the tense border that is lined with truce markers to separate the belligerents.

A high official in the Israeli Army told me it is well known that many Arabs living in Israel have contacts across this guarded border.

"We can't stop them," he said. "The border is too long. We don't care about family contacts, for some families are divided. Some members stayed here and others left. But of the Arabs who stayed here, we are not sure which ones we can trust. After all, we are still technically at war."

I asked him about the Arab charges that those Moslems who remained in Israel now face discrimination.

He explained, "Those who always lived here are still farming their lands. We do require that Arabs get permits to travel in certain areas, but otherwise there is no discrimination.

ARABS GIVEN RIGHT TO VOTE

"Their children, including girls, are in school, we permitted them to vote as inhabitants at the last election. They could have elected their own people to the Knesset (legislature), but they were so divided amongst themselves that they didn't enter their list (of candidates)."

At the basis of the Arab-Israel problem is the refugee, but in this Middle East muddle nothing is clear cut, nothing black and white.

While I was touring Israel I asked my driver what he was before coming to Israel. He told me that in Iraq he was an Arab, an Iraquian, who spoke Arabic, but of Jewish faith.

"When the fighting started," he told me, "some feeling against us developed in Iraq, and we had to leave. We lost everything. The only place to go was Israel."

RACE MIXUP POSES PROBLEM

An expert on Arab lands defined the term "Arab" as an Arabic-speaking Moslem. But in Nazareth we talked about Christian Arabs. My Jewish driver had said that in Iraq he was an Arab. With this tremendous mixup of races, religions, nationalities, and languages it is understandable that the Middle East and its problems are so little understood.

The Arab refugees charge they were all driven out of Palestine when the Arab-Israel war started in 1948. I asked a highly educated, well informed and forthright Israeli if this were true.

URGE RETURN HOME OF ARABS

"That's a tough question to answer with a flat 'Yes' or 'No'," he said. "Some were, I suppose. There were small bands of terrorists whose acts frightened them. But I, myself, manned a sound truck and begged the Arabs to stay. We felt their presence in cities would prevent our being bombed by the Arab countries. There was a lot of confusion."

The Israelis contend that most of the 1 million Arab refugees, many of them in camps outside the borders of Israel, left their properties either at the behest of Arab leaders because of sympathy with the Arab side, or out of fear. Many Arabs will admit this is true. But the Arabs now declare that these refugees should be returned to their former Palestine homes—and the more fanatical leaders of the Arabs insist that this return can be possible only when the Israelis are driven into the sea.

There is a general agreement among the Israelis and among objective observers that the Arabs cannot come back, except, possibly, for a token return. As one highly respected Israeli told me:

"We can't take all the Arabs back. They would be an unreliable mass. They would constitute a huge fifth column. Then, too, we are crowded. There is room for them in Iraq and Syria. Of course, we will have to pay them something for their properties when there is an overall settlement."

The Arab-Israel war may stifle progress in this new country even if another shot is not fired across the troubled border.

BLOCKADE HITS ISRAEL ECONOMY

Nearly all Israelis agree that the country is badly in need of outside help, that there still is so much to be done.

"Right now German repatriation payments are a favorable factor," I was told. "But in time we'll have to get along on our own. To do that we must expand our economy. The Arab blockade and boycott really hurts. Revenues from the oil pipeline would be a big help, but the flow has been cut off by the Arabs.

"We are surrounded by hostile neighbors who greatly outnumber us, and the Communists, we are convinced, are helping to keep the Arabs stirred up against us. Russia would like to get at Arab oil."

Only settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute can ultimately determine the question of a sound defense system for security in the Middle East, I am firmly convinced as a result of my tour of this strategic area. It also will determine the economic future of this small, independent democracy.

More than anything else, Israel needs peace. It needs relief from military costs. It needs time to consolidate and work out domestic problems. It needs again freedom of trade, including trade with its Arab neighbors.

But before this is possible, the Middle East muddle in which Israel is unwillingly embroiled must be slowly, carefully, and patiently untangled.

Israel: Key to Middle East Security—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the last of a series of five articles on Israel: Key to Middle East Security, which appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Express, one of the newspapers published by William Randolph Hearst, Jr. The articles were written by former Congressman Sam Yorty, of California:

ARAB NATIONS MUST RECOGNIZE NEW STATE, SAYS SAMUEL W. YORTY

(By Samuel W. Yorty)

The Arab States of the Middle East must face reality before peace in that corner of the world will be possible. Lasting settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute is possible only after the Arabs recognize Israel's existence and the permanent place she holds in the community of Middle East nations.

Most reasonable people will subscribe to this statement, and I am convinced of its truth as a result of my recent tour of Israel and the Arab countries of the Middle East.

My talks in Israel also convinced me that the Israelis have seriously attempted to settle the long-standing dispute with their Arab neighbors.

While the Arabs have clung to fanatical hate, Israel has shown a readiness to meet legitimate claims. The government "unfroze" blocked bank accounts and safe-deposit boxes of displaced Arabs, but the property and money of Jewish refugees who left Arab countries are still frozen.

Israel reunited split families through their return to Israel territory and gave full citizenship status to 19,000 Arab refugees in Israel. In addition, Israel has offered to help large-scale plans for permanent settlement of the million Arab refugees now beyond her borders under plans approved by the United Nations. As part of an overall settlement, Israel is also willing to pay these refugees for the property they left behind.

The Arabs, who refused even to recognize Israel's existence, stubbornly insist that Arab refugees be returned to the area of Palestine which is now part of Israel.

OPEN ARAB BANK ACCOUNTS

When I talked to Moshe Sharett, Israel's Prime Minister, he said:

"They can't come back. We have no place for them. There is room in the Arab countries."

Sharett said:

"We have tried to be fair, and we are willing to make reasonable payments to them for their property as a part of an overall settlement. We recently agreed to unblock Arab accounts in our banks and let them draw out their money."

On this point of Arab bank accounts, I was told in Lebanon that the Arabs who negotiated that agreement did not then dare return home. To some fanatical Arabs any discussion with the Israelis is treasonable.

That is why it is virtually impossible to conduct reasonable round-table discussions leading to an agreement for the conservation of Jordan River waters. With proper conservation of this water resource, from 150,000 to 200,000 Arab refugees could be resettled in the Jordan Valley.

The Israelis also desire to utilize the Jordan River water for irrigation. But Jordanians claim this would violate their water rights. The result has been an American special envoy to try to get these two countries to agree on a plan for conservation despite the fact that they are technically at war.

In the area of the Dead Sea there are minerals which Jordan would like to develop, but a stumbling block is the cost of building an expensive new road entirely within Jordan in order to haul the minerals to the Gulf of Aqaba. But for the Arab blockade Jordan could easily haul them on a good road across a narrow strip of Israel to the excellent Mediterranean port of Haifa in Israel.

ARABS HOLD UP FLOW OF OIL

Also, there is a long oil pipeline running from Dhahran on the Perisan Gulf in Saudi Arabia to Haifa. In spite of the loss of needed revenue to Jordan as well as to Israel, the pipeline is kept empty because the Arabs will not let the oil flow through their lands to Haifa.

In view of such an atmosphere of fanaticism on the part of the Arabs, Israel strenuously objects to American plans to supply arms to Arab nations as part of a security program. The Israelis are afraid that arms would be misused, that the guns would be turned on Israel and not any Communist aggreessor.

Sharett said that giving arms to Arab states which refuse to make peace becomes a premium upon their policy of permanent warfare against Israel and that these arms enhance their capacity for mischief.

The Israeli Prime Minister said it is not a step in the direction of peace but a step away from peace.

Sharett has been strong in his opposition to such a policy of arms, but he does not oppose technical aid which would help develop Arab countries and raise their living standards.

No Arab State has ever taken up arms against an aggressor in modern times, Sharett brought out. The Arabs did little to fight Turkey in World War I, although they achieved independence as a result of the war. During World War II they did nothing to help the Allies.

CANNOT RECONCILE ARMS POLICY

It is his feeling that arms given the Arabs are arms directed against Israel. He said Israel cannot reconcile such an arms policy with America's declared policy and concern to see Israel prosperous and secure.

Prime Minister Sharett firmly believes that the root of the problem is the persistent refusal of Arab States to make peace with Israel and thus reestablish stability within the Middle East.

Here is what some say:

First of all, the Arabs must be made to realize that Israel exists. Like it or not, they must face this fact. Next the killing on the borders must be stopped.

Some observers believe that the border incidents will continue to delay peacemaking unless the United Nations is enabled to effectively stand guard. Once border incidents end, things will quiet down, they believe.

Others feel that Israel should consider permitting a token repatriation in northern Palestine of some Arab refugees and also consent to certain minor border rectifications.

Israel would have to pay for Arab properties the Israelis now hold and the Arabs would have to lift their blockade and boycott of Israel. Arabs would have to pay for properties held by the Arabs of dispossessed persons of Jewish faith.

One thing is hopeful—and helpful. The Israelis were willing to sit down and talk, willing to admit responsibilities and even errors. But at the same time they rightly insist on recognition of the fact that Jewish people now at long last have a national home—and must keep it and protect it.

It is all too plain that the birth of Israel was made a needlessly painful process to the United Nations and to Jews and Arabs alike by the Arabs' rash resort to war against this tiny new state.

Four-Power Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following

editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the May 6, 1955, issue of the U. S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR-POWER FANTASY

(By David Lawrence)

The spectacle presented by the governments at Paris, London, and Washington in seeking a conference with the Government of Soviet Russia is that of a hungry suppliant begging for almost any crumbs from the table of the absolute monarch.

This is said not so much in criticism of the sincere men who are trying to formulate the policies of Great Britain, France, and the United States as it is of the many leaders of public opinion in all three countries who have fallen victim to some unfortunate illusions.

For there is no denying the fact that the threats of a political opposition—selfishly seeking in each country to ascend to power by almost any means—are influential in compelling the incumbent administrations of the three Allied Nations to negotiate for peace with the enemies of our civilization.

The governments themselves lack the courage to lead and instead meekly follow the will-of-the-wisps of popular fancy. The line goes something like this: "We cannot refuse to sit down and talk. If nothing comes of it, at least the air will be cleared and we shall know where we are."

We have heard this form of self-deception expressed again and again just before each successive failure of the scores of conferences we have held in the past with representatives of the Soviet Union.

When will the statesmen of today begin to heed the lessons of yesterday?

For it is written in the blood-covered pages of history that in the periods preceding the outbreak of World War I and of World War II, respectively, vacillation and cringing fear on our side encouraged the aggressor and brought on the very conflict in arms that nobody wanted.

A third world war would be horrible, and it is the obligation of free peoples to assert constantly their abhorrence of mass killing. But we must do more. We cannot assume the transformation of evil men into saints.

The simple fact is that gangsters are in control of the Governments at Moscow and Peiping, and they have intensified the cold war throughout north Africa and in the Middle East and in southeast Asia. They have torn to pieces the armistice agreement they signed in Korea. They have stirred up rebellion in the south of Indochina. They are actively fomenting trouble on every continent.

Meanwhile speeches by some of the leaders of the Democratic Party in America, by Socialist Labor Party leaders in Great Britain, and by opposition parties in France tell the Communist strategists that the free world is yielding to their propaganda and is being misled into the belief that a four-power conference is a magic device which will bring peace to the world.

What a terrible example of the craven spirit that has so often preceded the decline and downfall of empires in the past. What a frivolous indifference to the proved crimes of present-day aggressors.

If, to be sure, a four-power conference was to be a real negotiation such a diplomacy has many a time tried with useful results, it would not be conducted amid the fanfare of publicity which surrounds such occasions today. Ambassadors would canvass beforehand the possibilities and indeed lay the basis for mutual agreements. But the Soviets want to show their contempt for the West in public conferences to be reported by the press of the world. What better proof do we need of the insincerity of the Communist rulers?

Why do we shut our eyes to the facts of today? Is it because we prefer not to look at the truth and because we believe the aggressor has really changed? Does the recent resumption of the Berlin blockade and the imprisonment of our fliers in defiance of a written pledge for their release indicate that the leopard has changed his spots?

The big question involved in deciding whether or not to hold a four-power conference is this: Shall we enhance in their own lands the prestige of the temporary rulers of the Soviet Union and China by sitting down with them, and, by so doing, shall we encourage these same rulers to believe that, despite our military strength, we are willing to accept almost any concessions to avoid a war?

The people of Soviet Russia and of China want freedom just as we do. We must not tighten the hold of their oppressors on them. We must open the way for their liberation by refusing to deal with gangster governments. For those governments constantly threaten the peace of the world, and there can be no safety for anybody as long as they remain in power.

There is but one way to force the disintegration of the Communist empire. It is by forgetting four-power conferences and imposing a complete quarantine on the Communist regimes. This means extermination of their agents and conspirators from all free countries.

These enemies must be driven from within our gates. It makes no sense to endeavor to negotiate with the master minds of world conspiracy.

Our Living Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Living Constitution." It was delivered by Miss Sylvia McKenzie, of Lake City, recently before the Wilbur Jones Post, No. 73, of the American Legion at Lake City, S. C.

With this address, Miss McKenzie won the post and district Legion declamation contests. I believe it is an original, impressive, and thought-provoking essay on our Constitution which many others will be interested in reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LIVING CONSTITUTION

(By Sylvia McKenzie)

"America—land of the free, home of the brave, the land of opportunity, a land whose government is 'of the people, by the people, and for the people,' a land whose basic principles are freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, and freedom from fear, a land whose people believe that 'all men are created equal.'"

Thus read the caption on the marble plaque outside the exhibition room. The milling crowd viewed with awe the strange and curious sight before them.

"Could they actually be so ignorant," one asked, "as to try to carry on commerce, build national security, and increase military power with such a government?"

"It's a mystery to me how they've existed so long," said another. "How thankful I am that I am not an American."

Inside the large-scale plan of America—its people, its government, its laws, beliefs, and ideals—was attracting and holding more spectators than any other booth at the exhibition. How carefully the skilled scientists and technicians had worked over the past months to perfect minutely this model America. There was land spread out before them. The typical industrial area, the large city, complete with suburbs and shopping centers, the small town with all its simplicity, the farm and dairy sections—all were there, complete in minute detail. With such delicate technical instruments as theirs it was no problem to portray America as it actually is. By means of lights and electrical devices they were able to see an actual demonstration of a session of the House and Senate. They heard the President address Congress and watched the citizens as they voted. The schools, colleges, and universities were given a most important role in this all-important portrayal. The manner of worship in the many different churches brought astonished exclamations from many.

"This God, do they actually believe in a power greater than themselves? How foolish they are to trust and have faith in something or someone they can't even see."

"They even spend hours worshiping Him and in talking to Him."

This remark brought roars of laughter from the crowd. They just couldn't believe their ears. They had heard of some strange land by this name, yet a land and a people this strange were completely beyond their comprehension. Some felt pity; others were amused; yet they all possessed that amazed feeling that bordered on disbelief. So this was the country that was always trying to push its so-called freedom down everyone's throat. These were the people who believed their way was the only way and always the right way. It really was amusing to think how they tried to bring everyone else to their way of thinking.

"It's really unbelievable," said a little old lady who had been jostled and pushed until she was almost at the front of the exhibit. Then, with tears in her eyes, "Oh, if I could only do something to help them see the light. Those poor men, women, and children with their distorted principles and ideals. Oh, how unhappy they must really be."

One by one the people made their comments. Some were too speechless to utter a word. They just shook their heads sadly and walked away. Others had just begun to realize how much they had to be thankful for. On all their faces was clearly seen the fact that they considered themselves most fortunate.

Night was beginning to fall—slowly the crowd began to dwindle and soon the room was empty. But if one looked closely in the gathering dusk, there could be seen a small old gentleman over in the corner near the door. There were traces of tears on his withered old cheeks and he clutched his cane tightly in his hand. He was distinguished looking and his black homburg made him seem taller than he actually was. His suit was of the finest material fashioned by the best tailor within the hundred-mile area. As he stood there, he thought back over the years. Over his years. You could, perhaps, call him successful. You might say he had made his mark in the world. Yes, he was well known, by name and by sight.

He stood there a moment and sighed, then straightened his shoulders, clicked his heels, and gave a brisk salute. He opened the door and stepped into the waiting limousine, scarcely perceptible in the blackness, and vanished into the night.

Let's follow this distinguished gentleman who displayed such emotion while watching our America. What right has he to be so concerned?

The speeding limousine soon reached its destination and with a sad expression the passenger stepped out, once more alone in the darkness of the Square. With a leaden heart he began his climb up the steps toward the huge building. Massive lamps embedded in the concrete lighted the path of the lone figure. At the entrance the military guards saluted and continued their watch. His heels made a clicking noise on the cold marble floors and their echo resounded through the building. Guards were stationed evenly along each hall, and the sickle and hammer flaunted its banner over each doorway.

The gentleman made his way slowly to a door at the end of the hall marked "Office of the Prime Minister." Without turning on the light, he sank into the chair behind his desk, buried his face in his hands, and wept silently.

Form your own opinion as to why our friend is so sad. I think he weeps because he realizes that there is something amiss in his life, his ideals, and his country. Without being conscious of it, perhaps, he has admitted that liberty and happiness are worth far more than power, prestige, or military advancement. He realizes that America is truly the land of the free, the home of the brave, the land of opportunity. He sees the heritage that is ours, the men who have died that they might give life to those of us who would follow. He sees our brave leaders, present, past, and future, who devote their entire lives to guiding America. He sees the Constitution, ordained by free men, sustained by free men, worth having and worth defending. He sees us. He knows that there are those of use who perhaps don't fully understand the technical terms used in its writing but who fully appreciate and love the very name, "Constitution." That name stands for America. It represents us. It represents our past and our future. There it stands, written in the blood, sweat, and tears of those past yet ever-present Americans—the beacon of liberty, the hope of the oppressed, the promise of the free, our Constitution, the framework, the foundation of America—proclaiming the rights of every individual and stating that truly, "all men are created equal." But this is not all our friend sees. He sees that we have a greater love for our country than we realize and that we are truly Americans in the full and glorious sense of the word. He believes that the love of our country has not died, and he knows that as long as we, the Americans of today and tomorrow, shall live that we will keep her what she was meant to be—a "land of the free." It seems to take one on the outside to see what really goes on on the inside, and it doesn't take long for any outsider to see the deep love, appreciation, and admiration that we hold for our America. Our younger generation is not lacking in patriotism. No true American will ever be. May we realize as time passes on that there is truly more than that which meets the eye. Americans of yesterday—Washington, Lincoln, Madison, and Revere; Americans of today—Eisenhower, MacArthur, Rayburn, and Dulles; Americans of tomorrow—Jones, Brown, Smith, you, and I, under the Stars and Stripes we stand united, and with one accord. We, the Americans of today, are just as brave and patriotic as those of yesterday. And whether you realize it or not, you are no exception.

I say as did Josiah Gilbert Holland:

"Give us men!
Men who tread where saints have trod,
Men for country, home, and God!
Give us men!
I say again, again, Give us men!

God grant that as long as America shall live she will have those spirited, freedom-loving, God-fearing sons she so deserves.

An Appeal to Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a very fine editorial treating with a speech made some time back by Adlai E. Stevenson on foreign relations. The title of the editorial is "An Appeal to Reason." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL TO REASON

Adlai E. Stevenson's address is a thoughtful, clear, elevated discussion of the hard dilemma that the United States faces in the Far East. This is not to say that Mr. Stevenson's address does not have its political side. The former Illinois Governor carried the Democratic Party banner in 1952. That alone lends some political color to almost everything he says.

But after full allowance is made for this fact of political relationship, the Stevenson address remains an earnest—some doubtless will say brilliant—analysis of what to do about the offshore isands of Quemoy and Matsu and how to proceed generally in world affairs.

Outstanding in Mr. Stevenson's presentation of the Far Eastern problem is his recognition of constitutional responsibility of the President to make the final decision. As he reminds the country, Mr. Eisenhower "asked for and got from Congress the sole responsibility for making this decision" in the Far East.

It is not that this recognition is remarkable in Mr. Stevenson; he knows enough about the power and responsibility of the Executive to understand this fully. What is notable about this part of the address is that Mr. Stevenson's position is in such contrast to that of the KNOWLANDS, BRIDGESES, JENNERS, MCCARTHYS, and WELKERS who, though voting for the Formosa resolution, oppose the President's cautious course.

Mr. Stevenson also properly gives the Eisenhower administration more credit for gains on the international scene than the anti-Eisenhower wing of the Republican Party has been willing to bestow on its own President.

Having done this, Mr. Stevenson goes on to present a potentially hopeful program for extricating the United States from the predicament in which we now find ourselves in the Strait of Formosa. He comes very close to saying that the islands that are as close to the Chinese mainland as Staten Island is to New York should be evacuated to improve not only the position of the United States but also that of Chiang Kai-shek's refugee Nationalist forces.

Mr. Stevenson does this by differentiating sharply between Formosa, where we have a right to be, and the offshore islands, which we have neither the historical nor legal right to occupy. The basic question is the one he puts: Whether it is defensible to risk world war III for these Chinese islands, particularly when we would find ourselves without allies if war came over such a pretext.

On the matter of allies, Mr. Stevenson drives home basic facts. Allies may be, as he says, "irritating," but we need them. We need them because, among other reasons, we have only 6 percent of the world's population; because allies are the source of indispensable materials; because their territories provide us with airbases.

But we need them above all, as he says, because of "the weight of moral opinion" which "can be more penetrating than bullets, more durable than steel." And to support this reliance on something greater than arms, he quotes no less a soldier than Napoleon: "In war, moral considerations are three-quarters of the battle."

Mr. Stevenson performs a particular service in calling for a renunciation of "go-it-aloneism" and in delineating the failures of the sloganeering method of bluff and bluster that has characterized too much of Secretary of State Dulles's conduct of foreign policy. He is also sound when he emphasizes the potential for the United States and the free world in the point 4 program of economic and technical assistance for the peoples of southeast Asia and elsewhere whom we still hope to save from falling to communism.

But most hopeful of all are his specific proposals, first, that the United States and its allies in Europe and Asia sumbit a resolution to the U. N. General Assembly calling for a condemnation of the use of force in altering the status of Formosa, and, second, that the U. N. seek a formula for the future of Formosa, "consistent with the wishes of its people, with international law and with world security." And we see no objection in attempting, as Mr. Stevenson suggests, to recruit Russian participation in this effort to restrain the Chinese Communists in their dangerous course.

One immediate result, we hope, will be to recognize the need for correcting the distorted impression that is growing overseas as to the true character of the American people. For as Adlai Stevenson says, we seek only "a chance for all to live and let live," we are "champions of peace, not harbingers of war."

Mr. Stevenson's address came from the political opposition, but his is the kind of loyal opposition that a democracy requires.

America's Summons to Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Thursday, in the city of Los Angeles I was highly honored to speak to a distinguished group of citizens and award-winning students attending the Southern California Christian College. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S SUMMONS TO RESPONSIBILITY

I am highly honored to speak to each of you tonight. I congratulate the Forest Lawn Foundation on the civic service which it performs in this educational undertaking, and I congratulate, too, the award winners in this 1955 journalism awards contest.

The foundation brochure suggests that "good writing is the key to leadership." I agree. Good writing depends upon clear thinking. Each is increasingly indispensable to families and to nations alike in their pursuit of a free and contented life on earth, and both represent laudable goals for all of us.

Your brochure also suggests that if 5,000 words are required to cover a given subject, then 10,000 words devoted to it represent wasted time and effort. I agree again. There are some, however, who disagree. I know, because I've seen them.

Two years ago, as a new Member of the United States Senate, I sat in my seat and listened while a new footnote to current political history was being made. One of my colleagues was establishing a new record in the length of a single Senate speech.

He spoke continuously for upwards of 22 hours, commencing early 1 afternoon, proceeding throughout the night, and concluding the following day. I confess I did not hear all of it. I went home to bed around midnight, but when I returned to the Capitol the next morning, he was still going strong. He broke the existing record. Until a Texan talked for 28 hours several weeks ago in his State legislative assembly, my colleague remained the undisputed world champion, in length at least.

In my judgment, my colleague consumed at least 20 hours more than he should have on that occasion. Time is precous; none of us has too much of it. So the purpose of your contest—to write trenchantly and tersely and clearly—is praiseworthy. And what applies to the written word has equal application to the spoken word.

By the way, I recall the story of the great Winston Churchill during the war. He received a memorandum from a young naval officer that a certain war material was "in short supply." Sir Winston scribbled across the bottom of the memo "What is wrong with the good old anglo-saxon word 'scarce?'" I rather imagine that that awkward phrase was not utilized thereafter in official memoranda emanating from at least one member of His Majesty's Royal Navy.

Tonight, I wish to speak to you about the responsibilities of our country and of our people which the passage of time has placed upon us. Our frontiers of pioneer days have long been gone, and western America is on its way toward overtaking the rest of the Nation both in people and in production. Our population continues to grow, and our people live longer than before, and we produce more abundantly than ever. Fulfilling the needs for air to breathe, water to drink, and food to eat constitutes a different problem than our forebears faced. For example, air contamination—at least, to the extent that it poses a hazard to the health of society—is a modern byproduct of industrial progress and it is not indigenous to this community alone. The artesian wells of my grandfather's days in California are vanished; today, our millions of Southern Californians live only because of a vast importation of water into this area. We face the need of a realistic national policy on these problems. Food is a little different. We produce more than we can eat, a tragic paradox in a world which still knows starvation. Our National Government has begun to accept such modern problems in this 20th century. Air pollution has become a matter of Federal, as well as local, concern. Our national Government is undertaking the study of water supply and water conservation on a national basis, and the Congress is grappling with that subject. On the problem of food, we've made progress. Part of our food surplus goes into the schools of this country to assist the underprivileged and the undernourished. Part of it will be channeled into foreign trade, and some of it has been used to prevent starvation abroad. Our Nation's gift of surplus wheat to Pakistan averted a tragic human disaster and helped to cement an international friendship. And our new agricultural legislation is designed to protect the farmer, without bankrupting the taxpayer or putting the Government in the food business.

I need only cite the great change in our Nation's fiscal situation to demonstrate how, in this field, our responsibility is far greater than ever before. Deficit spending has been a modern curse. It never plagued past generations. In 1915 we owed a little over $1 billion, and today we owe more than $271 billion. In 1915, we spent less than three-quarters of a billion dollars, and last year over $67 billion. Forty years ago, just before our involvement in World War I, the public debt amounted to $10 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. Today, the comparable figure is just under $1,650. Thus Government spending has an increasingly greater effect on our people. Our fiscal policies have a direct impact on the value of our money. They affect private credit and private business. Our Government has attempted—I think with creditable success—properly to discharge this highly sensitive responsibility. We've taken steps towards a balanced budget without attempting to turn back the clock. Federal spending is subject to additional control, and where practicable, has been reduced. Some tax reduction has been adopted to provide an additional stimulus for an expanding economy. If you will let me say so, there is a general aversion, or at any rate a considerable aversion, in Washington, against fiscal irresponsibility, and that, in itself, is real achievement.

Without question, it is in the field of foreign relations that America's summons to responsibility is of greatest concern. The summons has not been thrust suddenly upon us. As in matters of domestic concern, so too in international affairs, the passage of time has altered our country's responsibilities in the world.

We have been placed into a position of leadership among nations whether we like it or not. Prior to the World Wars in which this country has engaged, our people, through their Government, abstained from the role of a great world power. Our Federal Government was responsible for laws and administration of national problems and internal rights of our people, and very little else. We insulated ourselves in our early days with the Monroe Doctrine, and we saw our interests as a free people confined pretty much to the Western Hemisphere and the North Pacific Ocean. That was what Americans desired. That is what they received from their Government. We held ourselves understandably aloof from international quarrels abroad. Our two oceans afforded us the luxury of separation from European and Asiatic strife. And then we were drawn into a world conflict. Our Government broke off diplomatic relations with Germany by reason of her unrestricted submarine war which caused American ships to be torpedoed and American lives to be lost. American sovereignty had been assaulted and the Congress of our country, at the request of the President, took the Nation into a war and thus we were embarked on a whole new era for our people.

When victory came, the American people, quite understandably, wanted to return to their old way of living. We still enjoyed the barriers of two great oceans. Why muddle and meddle in European affairs? was the question asked in those days. No one offered a satisfactory answer. The United States refused to join the League of Nations. In the decade which followed, "isolation" and "economy" were our national watchwords.

After World War I, our Government made repeated attempts at cooperative international disarmament. But with no great success. While we began to evince some interest in European affairs, our people did not believe that our own security and prosperity depended very much on them. We followed a policy of neutrality with respect to all the world.

World War II brought with it a growing recognition that the security of the United States is affected whenever and wherever the destruction of free government or free people occurs. When that conflict was concluded, and our enemies surrendered unconditionally, we watched with growing apprehension and unbelief as the Soviet Union took advantage of a distraught European Continent, and undertook destruction of the freedom of European countries and the extension of communism all around the globe.

Meanwhile, technological developments were destroying our traditional concepts of space. The protection afforded us by our dividing oceans was disappearing. The American people were brought face to face with the fact that their favored geographical position was no longer any guaranty to their peace and security.

Thus, in the 1940's, the United Nations was created, and our country, through overwhelming Senate ratification, joined it. We took the lead in its formation. We began to discuss with free peoples our common concern on our common problem of maintaining our respective freedoms in a world at peace. If the future were to bring more acts of brutal aggression, we were determined to agree, in advance, that together we would repel them. Mutual security treaties came into existence. NATO was born. Our country applied the old principle of "in union there is strength." Collective defense arrangements in many areas of the world were made by our Government. And, thus, what was almost undreamed of in the years gone by became a new United States policy with a great new responsibility.

I wish now to speak with you on one facet of American foreign policy of great importance to the American people today. It concerns the Far East and Asia. I am neither a military expert nor an expert on foreign relations. I speak as an American and as a Member of the United States Senate who has been required to sit in judgment there on matters of American policy in that area. I do not speak in either a political or a partisan manner.

We are agreed, I am sure, that the most important objective of our country's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable world peace.

In the far Pacific and Asia, our summons to responsibility in accomplishing this objective represents a continuing challenge of this Nation's ability to lead. The summons and the challenge have been answered with measurable success, with enlightenment, and with a spirit of helpfulness which characterizes our people; we became a pace setter in creating independent, self-governing nations. We led the march away from colonialism. I wish to recall that on March 22, 1934, Congress granted independence to the Philippines, and on July 4, a fitting date, 12 years later, the Republic of the Philippines was proclaimed a new member of the family of nations. We have no firmer allies in our goal of freedom and of peace than the Filipino people.

Our acceptance of that responsibility in Japan is a demonstrated fact. We set an unprecedented and an inspiring example to the Japanese people almost from the moment occupation forces arrived in those islands. Instead of vengefully punishing an entire race, the United States undertook—and with heartening success, I am proud to observe—to guide, to encourage, and to advise a former foe on building a new government along democratic lines, on rehabilitating a ravaged economy, on lifting the standard of living and on recognizing the dignity of human beings.

We played an important role in establishing SEATO in the Southwest Pacific, as we

did in the establishment of NATO. We have led free powers into combining together to deter Communist aggression or Communist colonialism.

Last January, by reason of the critical situation developing in the Straits of Formosa which posed a serious peril to the security of America, our Government stood united in the declaration of our policy in that area. In a message to Congress asking for such a declaration, President Eisenhower recalled that ever since June 1950, when communism committed armed aggression against Korea, this Nation determined to defend the island of Formosa against possible Communist invasion from the mainland of China. He said: "We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its Charter for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body. * * * The danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores." He concluded by saying that this country "shall remain faithful to our obligation as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not in danger."

I quote from the resolution introduced immediately in the Congress:

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

"This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions, created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress."

The resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives almost unanimously, and on January 27 debate commenced in the Senate. Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, argued that it was not a question of how much power the President had under the Constitution. In his judgment, the President was right in asking the Congress to pass such a resolution "even if the only reason for so doing was to secure the moral support of the American people."

I want to recall what I said earlier this year in discussing this situation. Every thinking professional military man has unequivocally concluded that Formosa and the Pescadores must not fall into Communist hands. Those islands constitute what they call a part of the defense perimeter of the United States.

That conclusion is not a political conclusion. It was not made by party-minded people. It represented the best thinking of those best qualified from a military standpoint to render it. I assume that our people do not require assurances that the President adopted those conclusions as an American statesman dedicated to our own welfare, and not as a politician. And I am sure that our country approves the bipartisan manner in which the Congress, after debate, adopted the resolution on a basis of your and my right to freedom.

As I listened to the debate, I recalled the phrase which General MacArthur used during Korea when he referred to the area north of the Yalu River as a "privileged sanctuary." And I want to recall again his own words on the stake of our country in Formosa. "Under no circumstances," he told our country, "must Formosa fall under Communist control. Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan and might well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

During the debate, a number of amendments were proposed. One of them was offered by a Republican Senator who was joined by two Democratic Senators. Let me read the text of the amendment: "Nothing in this resolution shall be construed to authorize the President to us our Armed Forces on the mainland of China, or to intervene in defense of any islands controlled by the Chinese Nationalist Government within 12 miles of the coast of China except for the specific purpose of helping to withdraw nationalist troops and civilians from such islands."

The amendment apparently accepted the importance to our own freedom of deterring Communist aggression in that area of the world so long as we voluntarily prevented ourselves from such deterrence at an imaginary 12-mile offshore limit. If the Communist Chinese were to set off a conflagration aimed at Formosa and the Pescadores, such an amendment would shackle our President with a ridiculous restriction in attempting to deter it. Furthermore, it would present to the Communists a legislative guaranty, in advance, of what we would not do to protect our perimeter of American defense.

Suffice to say, the amendment was defeated overwhelmingly. Other amendments were offered and they, too, went down before bipartisan majorities. A grave conclusion on America's responsibility was reached not by political entitles but by an American President and an American Congress who agreed upon an American policy to protect the freedom of the American people.

Our Government, through both the executive and legislative branches, agrees it is in the interest of American security that Nationalist China shall not be abandoned to communism and that, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores, the President is authorized to use our Armed Forces as he deems necessary in their behalf and that authority includes the related islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

By whom do the American people desire to have this authority discharged? Do they wish to have it discharged by our elected Chief Executive as he may determine in accordance with the terms of the bipartisan congressional resolution? That is the way our Constitution provides.

I am convinced that they want this authority exercised, in accordance with the law of the land, and by the head of our executive branch who, after all, is the only person I know possessed of all the facts from day to day, who is the elected head of our people, and who during his lifetime has known the horrors of war and has demonstrated a devotion to peace.

I will not challenge the good faith of those who disagree with me, but I venture to suggest that our bipartisan policy, upon which peace or war could well depend, be not subjected to partisan criticism from either of the two great American parties of our land. The President will make the decision if the exigencies of the days ahead require them. That is the responsibility which the Senate and the House placed upon him. We can be thankful that he has declined to spell out in advance what his decision and his strategy would be under different sets of circumstances if he deemed it necessary to take action.

Some of our citizens have suggested that the United Nations assume jurisdiction of this free-world problem. I believe that it should, and I have included in my remarks tonight the Presidential position that it would be welcomed.

In this connection, I have received an informative letter from Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., our Ambassador to the United Nations, in answer to my question of America's position.

Ambassador Lodge wrote that the United States has followed a consistent policy of trying to get the U. N. to take up the question of a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits. The United States worked for a meeting of the Security Council, which finally was held. When the meeting occurred, this country showed its good faith and earnestness and took an unusual step to dramatize our desire to bring about a peaceful solution. We voted formally to invite the Chinese Communists to sit in at the talks we hoped would be held about arranging a cease-fire. Ambassador Lodge recalled, and I am quoting his exact words, that "this invitation was contemptuously rejected, to the accompaniment of flagrant untruths and cynical impugning of our motives."

Results of the recent Bandung Conference are heartening. While Communist China has announced somewhat of an about face, only time can tell us whether her spokesmen are in good faith. Yet at the conference, ministers of sovereign nations spoke out against aggression. We had friends there, people of different colors, creeds, and religions, who share our goals of freedom.

Fear of retaliation is not the only deterrent to war. The opinions of peoples are important. The forthright stand at Bandung by the Philippine, the Pakistan, the Ceylon and the Iraq delegates unquestionably had a telling effect on the Communists. They—like others—gathered strength and courage for their stand, I believe, from the leadership which our country and the fraternity of free nations have provided. We are measuring up to the responsibility that destiny has given to us. We are responding to the most important summons of our national life.

Harry S. Truman Gains in Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Anniston Star, of Anniston, Ala., May 1, 1955, entitled "Harry S. Truman Gains in Fame."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRY S. TRUMAN GAINS IN FAME

It may be because he has come to be viewed in contrast to the indecision and lack of political courage demonstrated by the present occupant of the White House, but whatever may be the cause, it is now evident that Harry S. Truman is beginning to be recognized as one of the greatest of American Presidents.

And it is of considerable moment that one person who recently has voiced the opinion that Truman is far above the average is none other than Alfred M. Landon, the man the GOP chose to oppose Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936. He says Mr. Truman's true worth will be revealed when all official records are made public.

Admittedly, Mr. Truman espoused several measures that made him unpopular here in the South, among them being his attitude on civil rights and racial segregation. But it remained for a Republican appointee as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to attempt a disruption of the separate but equal status in our public schools by a decision that was in direct contravention of the rights of the States.

It may be said of a certainty, that Mr. Truman would not have countenanced a Senate leader who opposed him on important administration measures. Nor was it difficult to know where he himself stood on given issues. He had positive views on international affairs and he was represented by a Secretary of State who maintained the leadership of this country in foreign relations—a position we since have lost to Great Britain.

Mr. Truman did not regard a balanced budget as an absolute essential of good government. Yet he did balance the budget without resorting to the subterfuges that characterize the Eisenhower administration. And while he did cut down on defense expenditures, as demanded by Congress, our national peril was not as great then as it is today, due to the losses abroad we have sustained under Eisenhower.

Congressional Medal of Honor Awarded Posthumously to Pfc. Charles H. Barker, of Pickens, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release from the Defense Department announcing the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously to Pfc. Charles H. Barker, of Pickens, S. C.

Private, First Class Barker's actions on June 4, 1953, in Korea exemplify the fighting spirit and courage of other South Carolina and American heroes who have rendered wartime services above and beyond the call of duty. In World War I South Carolina sons won more medals of honor, proportionately, than any other State in the Nation. They have also served their Nation heroically in World War II and the Korean conflict, as the record of Private, First Class Barker demonstrates here today.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1955.

SOUTH CAROLINA INFANTRYMAN AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR POSTHUMOUSLY

An 18-year-old infantryman from South Carolina, who sacrificed his life so that a patrol of his unit could withdraw from intense enemy fire in Korea after its ammunition was almost completely expended, has been awarded the Medal of Monor, the Department of the Army announced today.

Pfc. (then Private) Charles H. Barker, of Pickens, S. C., earned the highest award the Nation can give when he "distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and indomnitable courage above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy" at Sokkogae, Korea, during the early morning hours of June 4, 1953. He was assigned to Company K, 17th Infantry Regiment, 7th Infantry Division.

Private Barker was a member of a screening patrol of 11 men led by 2d Lt. James B. Tomes, Jr., of 1330 Indianaola Avenue, Bowling Green, Ky., now assigned to Fort Knox, Ky., which moved out from an outpost called "Pork Chop" at 4:30 a. m. on July 4 to screen the north finger of hilly terrain where enemy activity had been reported.

The patrol started out in a diamond formation. Lieutenant Tomes was the point man, with Private Barker on the left flank. Soon Private Barker alerted the officer to sounds coming from the left flank. Maneuvering to the north, the patrol surprised a number of the enemy digging in on the finger and immediately opened fire. The enemy ran for cover and weapons.

"During the fierce fire fight which resulted, Private Barker, with utter disregard for his own personal safety, crawled to a position within 15 to 20 feet of the enemy's dug-in position," according to Sgt. Eugent D. Mull, of Buchanan, Va., then acting as assistant patrol leader. "From this position, Private Barker fired his automatic rifle and threw grenades with deadly accuracy. Under the cover of this base of fire, the patrol maneuvered to a more advantageous position from which to fire."

While the higher ground which had been gained as a result of Private Barker's heroism enabled the men to concentrate more deadly fire on the enemy, the patrol's ammunition was beginning to run low. As a result, Lieutenant Tomes ordered the unit to reorganize in order to withdraw.

"As we began our withdrawal," Sergeant Mull reported later, "the enemy noticed the lessening of our fire power and began to come out of their covered positions. Private Barker remained in his position and with a stream of automatic rifle fire kept the enemy pinned down. The actions of Private Barker enabled us to set up a perimeter defense and withdraw from the finger.

"The last time I saw Private Barker was as he stood up and charged at the onrushing enemy, firing his automatic rifle and throwing his few remaining had grenades. When the patrol got back to the outpost, I discovered there were only 12 rounds of ammunition left among the patrol members. The unselfish actions of Private Barker in my estimation saved the lives of every man on that patrol."

The South Carolina Infantryman's heroism made him the 76th recipient of the Medal of Honor for fighting in Korea. Details of the presentation ceremony will be announced at a later date.

Private Barker, on of Mr. and Mrs. Norvin N. Barker, Pickens, S. C., was born on April 12, 1935. He enlisted in the Army on October 29, 1952. Prior to entering the service he was employed in the textile industry.

The text of the citation accompanying the award to Private Barker follows:

"Pfc. (then Private) Charles H. Barker, Infantry, United States Army, a member of Company K, 17th Infantry Regiment, 7th Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and indomitable courage above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Sokkogae, Korea, on June 4, 1953. While participating in a combat patrol engaged in screening an approach to "Pork Chop Outpost," Private Barker and his companions surprised and engaged an enemy group digging emplacements on the slope. Totally unprepared, the hostile troops sought cover. After ordering Private Barker and a comrade to lay down a base of fire, the patrol leader maneuvered the remainder of the platoon to a vantage point on higher ground. Private Barker moved to an open area firing his rifle and hurling grenades on the hostile positions. As enemy action increased in volume and intensity, mortar bursts fell on friendly positions, ammunition was in critical supply, and the platoon was ordered to withdraw into a perimeter defense preparatory to moving back to the outpost. Voluntarily electing to cover the retrograde movement, he gallantly maintained a defense and was last seen in close hand-to-hand combat with the enemy. Private Barker's unflinching courage, consummate devotion to duty, and supreme sacrifice, enabled the patrol to complete the mission and effect an orderly withdrawal to friendly lines, reflecting lasting glory upon himself and upholding the highest traditions of the military service.

One-Sided Digest of Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 29, 1955, there is a letter written by Mr. Frank Ahlden, executive editor of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn. It is entitled "One-Sided Digest of Dixon-Yates." It deals with an article recently appearing in the Reader's Digest which presented a very one-sided view of that contract.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-SIDED DIGEST OF DIXON-YATES

DEWITT WALLACE,
Publisher, Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: The mail brings us a a proof from your April issue of William Hard's account of the Dixon-Yates deal. Your memorandum calls it an "informative overall story" and a "complete picture."

It is nothing of the kind.

It is complete only in its presentation of the power trust lobby version of this situation. It ignores questions of sound public policy as asked by the numerous objectors during months of controversy.

Leaving to one side the unquestionable fact that fears for the future of the Tennessee Valley Authority have a bearing on the views of the objectors, and the fact that the Democratic Party is using the question for political advantage, this is a purchase contract for payment of more than $500 million in tax money for electricity ($20 million a year for 25 years—and then the plant goes to the company).

The very size of the purchase demands close examination on its own merits and demerits. For your account to lump this examination as "hot air" is a disservice to the public interest.

Your account tells of an earlier Dixon offer to sell power to TVA, without saying what his price was, or how very much higher it

was than cost of other power to TVA, or how high this price was in comparison with prices offered by Mr. Dixon a few months later, or the price now mentioned after the spotlight was turned on.

TWO ADMIT "GUARANTEED PROFITS"

Your account says the Dixon-Yates deal obtained approval of all present members of the AEC. The record shows only 2 members of a 5-member board approved and that 1 of them has since attacked it, saying he only approved in the hope of getting AEC back to the atom business and away from the power-brokerage business. (There was 1 neutral member, 1 unconfirmed appointment, and 1 vacancy at the time of the vote.)

You say the Federal Power Commission approved without mentioning that this action was taken over the strong opposition of the head of FPC's Bureau of Accounts, Finance, and Rates—the very man most likely to understand what the contract says.

You say the General Accounting Office approved. You do not record that the GAO appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in violent protest which resulted in partial modifications.

You put negotiation for power at Paducah and Portsmouth, when the war situation demanded more atomic plant production at any cost, on the same basis as negotiation for West Memphis power, after the war situation had calmed.

You explore timidly the "guaranteed profit" angle of Dixon-Yates, without mentioning the fact that two former high officials of Mr. Dixon's companies have said for publication that the company is guaranteed against loss.

There is nothing in your "complete picture" to indicate that one interpretation of a clause in this contract requires the AEC to pay the full price of power even though the plant produces none.

Neither is there any hint of the contract clauses which give the Dixon company the chance to take power it is selling to the Government at 3.99 mills for its own use at 1.863 mills, under terms which could mean as much as $12 million a year profit to the Dixon companies. These figures have been published, without challenge, by Walter von Tresckow, who is biased to be sure (because he wanted to bid but was brushed off), but an experienced man in electricity and finance nonetheless.

ABOUT AN "INFORMATIVE STORY"

Your "informative story" mentions the tax clause, without saying that the Dixon-Yates proposal was so far out of line with precedent in years of Government purchase contracts that the United States Senate adopted special legislation to bring it back into line.

You do not mention the many "adjustments" made in favor of the Government after objectors such as the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Milwaukee Journal, and the Commercial Appeal brought the deal before the public.

We further object to this "complete account" leaving out the announcement of Memphis city officials that Memphis will answer its own power needs by financing its own generating station, if necessary. This one fact removes the whole objective of the Dixon-Yates deal. It has a place in any fair summary of this situation.

AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST

And if you use some of your space to tell of the protective attitude of this region toward TVA, you surely should let your readers know that Middle South is the present-day heir of the very company which Memphis voted out when TVA was voted in.

We are close to this situation. We have worked through its details at great length and we are thoroughly convinced that it is against the public interest.

You have only to ask: Why was there no opportunity to bid on this job? to realize it was rigged from the start.

We are surprised that Mr. Hard, ostensibly a reporter, would approach the story with so little regard for objectivity—that he, and you, would violate the primary rule of journalism that requires examination of both sides of a controversy.

Yours truly,

FRANK AHLGREN,
Executive Editor,
The Commercial Appeal.

The Job Harold Stassen Leaves Unfinished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article written by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, which appeared in the April 7, 1955, issue of the Reporter magazine.

Representative WILLIAMS again demonstrates in this article the keen insight that he possesses and his expertness in the field of foreign affairs. We are privileged that he is serving as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOB HAROLD STASSEN LEAVES UNFINISHED
(By Representative HARRISON A. WILLIAMS)

Now that Harold Stassen has been shifted to the post of Special Presidential Assistant for disarmament problems, I am more concerned than ever about what is to become of the important work now handled by the Foreign Operations Administration. Mr. Stassen has been the most consistent spokesman within the administration for aid to Asia. The FOA, of which Mr. Stassen has been the chief since its creation on August 1, 1953, is scheduled to expire on June 30.

Does Mr. Stassen's departure foretell the liquidation, or at least the fragmentation, of FOA? Do we have anything to offer the Asians except threats about tactical atomic weapons?

Along with a number of my colleagues in Congress, I have been trying for some months without success to get a clear picture of what the administration plans to do about technical assistance and economic development in Asia. One day Mr. Stassen would seem to favor a Marshall plan or possibly a Stassen plan for Asia. The next day Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, guardian of "responsibility," would deny that any such plan existed. Then Secretary Dulles would clear up the whole issue, as he did during a stopover in Laos, by hinting that all Asia needs on the economic side is a little more trade.

Recently the dust has settled somewhat. In a press conference on March 17, Mr. Stassen announced an administration decision to send up to Congress a foreign-aid program that is to include more public-investment funds for Asia than ever before. Its most striking and praiseworthy feature is to be a "regional fund" amounting to perhaps $200 million.

Although this is still a compromise bold new program—a little long on statements of the compelling need (Stassen) and a little short on substance (Humphrey)—it will probably resolve the administration's internal fight. But, as Mr. Stassen himself said, it is only a first step in meeting the requirements of our foreign policy in Asia.

CHINA VERSUS INDIA

Economic assistance to Asia is both a necessity and an opportunity for the United States. The final answer to communism is neither conventional nor unconventional weapons but the fulfillment of Asia's economic needs by democratic means. The contrast is already there—in the respective means by which China and India are trying to catch up with the industrialized nations of the world.

The nations in the non-Communist crescent of Asia must find ways to improve the economic well-being of their people. All of them are watching this competition between India and China.

In China, the Communist leaders are trying to industrialize their nation by imposing greater sacrifices on those who have least to give—the peasants. That, of course, is exactly what Stalin did in Russia. His Chinese followers are now facing the same stubborn fact he faced. No police state has ever figured out a way to force farmers to grow more food. It shouldn't take long for Mao Tse-tung, applying Stalin's theories in a country that has long suffered from large food deficits, to produce a severe food crisis in China. Already there is bitterness and despair.

It is now becoming clear, even to the overseas Chinese scattered throughout southeast Asia, that Communist land reform is strictly a phony; that the tenants who thought they were getting land of their own have wound up as sharecroppers for the Government. No wonder the Communists are beginning to complain in their own newspapers about "dangerous spontaneous tendencies toward capitalism" among the peasants.

The Indians, on the contrary, build up the agricultural sector of their economy rather than exploit it. Nehru's 5-year plan still has a year to run, but it is already possible to talk of its success. Aided by good weather, better fertilizers, more irrigation, some technical advice, and a widening participation in village community projects, India's farmers have already increased grain production by 21 percent, substantially reducing a deficit that ran close to 5 million tons before the plan got under way. According to a New Delhi dispatch in the New York Times, "It can be said now that India is self-sufficient in food." Nehru's government still has many problems to face, but it has clearly demonstrated for the rest of Asia to see that a democratic state can make a success of economic development.

INEVITABLE CONCLUSION

When we turn to Japan we find that a solution to that nation's economic distress lies in the rapid development of south and southeast Asia. Japan's problem is simple: An island crammed with industrial machinery and skilled workers, it needs markets for what it produces and has to import a wide variety of food and raw materials. The Japanese would like to increase their trade with us. But even if we had no tariffs at all, the United States would be a good market for only a small part of what Japan has to export.

The Japanese would like to increase their trade with Red China, too. But here again the potential amount of such trade has been vastly overrated. The Chinese would certainly be eager to buy what Japan has to sell, but China cannot offer much in return except coal and a few odd commodities like tung oil and hog bristles. What would provide a real answer to Japan's trade problem

is the rapid economic development of the rest of Asia.

Considerations of both politics and economics thus lead us inevitably to the same conclusion: A vigorous program of economic assistance to Asia should be at the core of United States foreign policy.

THE COLOMBO PLAN

How can the program be carried out? A new and hopeful means is now available to us. The Colombo plan, which was originally a family affair within the British Commonwealth, has now been expanded to take in practically all of non-Communist Asia.

The Colombo plan has now become the center where a dozen national-development plans are synchronized. What's more, it allows Western nations to help Asians without arousing their suspicions. The Asians themselves are spending about $2 billion this year on the Colombo plan, and loans and grants from the United States, Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have amounted to $1 billion since 1950. Alongside this investment program there is a thriving program of technical assistance: Five thousand Asians are being trained, and 2,500 British and Commonwealth experts are building dams, making geological surveys, and applying the West's skills to the East's problems in a hundred fields.

This existing association of Asian nations could be expanded into a source of investment capital for the entire region with the backing of United States funds. A unilateral United States program might be called imperialism; a multilateral program under U. N. auspices might be sabotaged by Soviet participation. The Colombo plan avoids both dangers.

THE OBSTACLES

What's keeping us from doing what obviously needs to be done in Asia? It seems to me that there are three obstacles—apart from the administration's own indecision. One obstacle is our own fixed prejudices about foreign investment. Another, not so widely known but equally damaging, is Mr. Stassen's injection of party politics into the supposedly nonpartisan Foreign Operations Administration. The third obstacle has been and continues to be an absence of clear lines of authority in administering the program.

The illusion persists in the present as well as in the previous administration that private investors can meet most of the need for capital in the economically underdeveloped areas of the world. It is an attractive idea, but the simple truth is that right here at home, to say nothing of prospering Canada, the investor finds more lucrative and far safer investment opportunities than are to be found in any underdeveloped area. Foreign countries are now paying us half again as much return on past investments as American citizens are currently investing abroad. I am afraid that continued efforts by the Government to entice American investors abroad will have little effect. Private investors will go into the less developed areas only after some advance has been made on the basic problems of transportation, communication, and health. This can only be done by some form of public investment.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development does part of this job—the part that a strictly banking operation can appropriately do. The Export-Import Bank exists to promote United States trade rather than investment in other countries; so it too can meet only a limited need on a limited scale.

The proposed International Finance Corporation would be an excellent further step in the right direction. By investing in enterprises that Asians themselves start and manage and then selling off its holdings locally when the enterprises become profitable, such a corporation could promote industrial development and help to create a capital market at the same time. It would, however, leave still unsolved the problem of where the money for basic economic development is to come from.

For too many years, our Government has suffered from a lack of imagination in grappling with the whole problem of public investment in less developed areas. Only two forms of assistance have generally been thought feasible: direct grants, which are onerous to the recipients as well as to United States taxpayers, and dollar loans that have to be repaid directly in dollars.

And yet there are other forms of dollar assistance that could be used. We need to learn to use them in Asia.

Suppose we should adopt a program to help finance a regional-development bank under the Colombo plan. The United States could provide the bank with a major share of its initial capital, and loans to the participating countries could then be paid back to the regional bank in local currency. This money could then be loaned out again for further development projects. Such a scheme would have several advantages:

It would create a long-term revolving fund to meet the need for continuous investment in such fields as public health, education, agriculture, and communications.

It would avoid the difficulty of repayment in dollars.

It would avoid the onus of "charity" for the recipient and some of the equally onerous "giveaway" implications for United States taxpayers.

It would clearly indicate a permanent interest on our part in helping Asians to realize their economic aspirations.

THE PORK BARREL

The second obstacle to moving ahead on an Asian program has been the way Mr. Stassen, the man who has advocated a new and bigger program, has been running the one he already had. To put it bluntly, political and patronage considerations have had a devastating effect on the operations of FOA.

Last year, I sponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Act specifically prohibiting the application of "political tests" to FOA appointments abroad, including technical-assistance positions. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), sponsored the amendment in the Senate, and the provision is now law. Despite this legal restriction, FOA filled more jobs by the patronage method in the last half of 1954 than did the entire Departments of Defense, State, Treasury, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare combined. As a matter of fact, nearly 29 percent of all those given Federal employment under the "jobs-for-Republicans" program found a haven in Mr. Stassen's supposedly "nonpartisan" and relatively small agency.

In a 6-month period FOA found 237 job openings to refer to the Republican National Committee. Furthermore, funds appropriated for economic development and technical assistance have been diverted to pay for "observation trips" of Republican clubwomen. "Operation Reindeer" sent four prominent Republican women and their husbands to Europe during the Christmas season of 1953—at a cost of $19,000—to observe the Christmas package program.

"Operation Crewcut" brought 16 young men into FOA last October to study local investment opportunities around the world. All 16 appointees were cleared with the party leadership. At this writing only three of the young men have been assigned. Thirteen remain on the payroll in Washington. The reason is simple: Small FOA missions abroad fight against the assignment of relatively unnecessary personnel whose salaries will cut into their meager staff allowances. The total cost of this program to date has been close to $60,000, and the only benefit from it seems to have accrued to the Republican National Committee.

Since political affiliation has become an important criterion for recruitment and promotion, many competent technical and administrative people have left the agency, and those who remain find politics constantly interfering with their work. Efforts to find a worthy Republican for a particular job frequently hold up important projects. It has never been easy to find qualified specialists who are willing to go abroad; the intrusion of partisan considerations makes it even more difficult.

Ever since the appointment in 1948 of Paul Hoffman, a prominent Republican, to head FOA's predecessor agency, the Economic Cooperation Administration, there has been a sort of gentlemen's agreement between Republicans and Democrats in Congress that overseas economic and technical-assistance activities are to be conducted on a nonpartisan basis. Mr. Hoffman's successor was another Republican, William C. Foster. This was good politics: The whole program depends upon bipartisan support in the Congress. Mr. Stassen's deviation from the nonpartisan approach has dangerously undermined congressional support.

UNDER ONE ROOF

The third obstacle to an effective program has been disagreement over how the program should be administered. There are those who believe that foreign economic programs should be administered by the State Department and other established Government agencies. Many, though by no means all, of those who want to partition all foreign economic operations into the old-line agencies hope that if the program is split up it can soon be killed altogether.

In my opinion, there are a number of reasons why it is desirable to keep the operating parts of an economic program separate from the regular duties of the State Department and the Foreign Service. The diplomatic responsibilities of Foreign Service officers require that they avoid any action that may be considered interference in the internal affairs of other countries. They cannot be expected to perform their primary duties effectively while operating a program, even one requested by the participating country, that by its very nature is involved in changing the internal affairs of that country.

But some kind of central direction is required. Although it is essential to use all the facilities and knowledge of other Government agencies, the program cannot be "farmed out" section by section to the various old-line agencies—Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, Interior, and so on. Unified administration is esential. The best plan would seem to be a separate agency under an administrator who is responsible to the Secretary of State.

PROPOSALS

To this end, I propose that the Congress enact the following legislation:

Establish a permanent Technical Cooperation and Economic Development Agency under an administrator responsible only to the Secretary of State. Under this plan, economic and technical-assistance programs would be separated from military-aid activities, which would be transferred to the direct control of the Defense Establishment.

Authorize the continuation of the technical-assistance and development programs for periods of at least 4 years. Some degree of long-range planning is absolutely essential for any degree of success.

Authorize a regional fund for Asia, loans to be repaid in local currency. The funds should be used to further economic development through an agency like the Colombo plan.

Congress should furthermore make sure that all the facts about the administration

of FOA are brought to light before new funds are appropriated. If it meant what it said last year about keeping politics out of economic and technical assistance, it should impress its attitude upon the new chief of whatever agency is set up to handle these matters.

Such a program will certainly not solve all our problems. It is only the beginning of a long process. But since so many of the obstacles we face are of our own making, an effective program in Asia must necessarily begin right here in Washington.

World Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Birmingham News of May 2, 1955, entitled "All Participating Nations Gain Under Wise World Trade Program."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL PARTICIPATING NATIONS GAIN UNDER WISE WORLD TRADE PROGRAM

Economic stresses obviously have been responsible for much of human conflict. They have led to wars. They have brought revolutions. They have caused some people to turn to communism and other totalitarian systems. It may be going too far to say that if the peoples of the earth generally achieved a satisfactory economic situation there would be no more world wars. But it is evident in even a superficial study of history that unsatisfactory living standards have been major factors in innumerable international struggles.

It is also readily apparent that no nation is really sufficient to itself economically. Every country can advantageously use many things provided by other countries. Business and industry, of course, may be generally summarized as involving the mutually advantageous exchange of goods and services.

The soundest economy, of course, is based on exchanges that advance the interests of all concerned. If any nation tried to get along exclusively on its own economic activities it could not possibly realize its maximum economic possibilities. Generally speaking, the greater the mutually advantageous trade in which a nation participates, the stronger and more prosperous its own economy.

Such considerations may be obvious enough but still, in striving to advance peace and economic progress in the world, they need to be reiterated over and over again to the end that our people will not fail to see the immediate and vital significance of our Government's efforts to increase international trade.

President Eisenhower, now seeking congressional approval of an extended and improved reciprocal trade program, last week described such trade as "a broad avenue by which all men and nations of good will can travel toward a golden era of peace and plenty."

He emphasized that the expansion of trade should be sought with great care not to weaken our own industry. Such weakness would not strengthen the economy of either the United States or the world.

What he is striving for is the kind of international trade progress that is generally constructive.

Such progress cannot be achieved without producing some problems and pinches and some sacrifices. It calls for the broad view, for devotion to the common interest and for imaginative resourcefullness. Good neighborliness always calls for such things. What soundly advancing world trade requires, in fact, is a continuing growth in good neighborliness.

When two neighbor families are cooperative, both profit. As the nations increase their advantageous trade, good will and peace in the world as well as economic progress are served.

This week the Senate is due to take up discussion of the Eisenhower administration's reciprocal trade extension program. It has been approved by the House and by the Senate Finance Committees. We hope the legislation soon reaches the President's desk without crippling or unduly restrictive provisions.

The Need for an Adequate National System of Civil Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on April 27, 1955, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] delivered a very interesting speech before the Airport Operators Council in Seattle, Wash., concerning the need for an adequate national system of civil airports. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON BEFORE AIRPORT OPERATORS' COUNCIL, SEATTLE, WASH., APRIL 27, 1955

I can see no reason for telling this audience how pleased I am that you invited me to be your speaker tonight. Give a Senator the opportunity of coming home, add to that the opportunity to make a speech, and arrange that his home is the State of Washington, and you have made him happy. I know you can see how good I feel over the whole business.

You know, we deal in superlatives on the Senate floor—sometimes. My Kentucky colleagues have a poem they quote now and then which is loaded with superlatives, and I often feel like rewriting it for my State. They say "Moonlight falls the softest in Kentucky, and summer days come oftenest, in Kentucky."

Well, I doubt that, it's just an example of exaggerated State pride.

But I do know that here in Washington we have the biggest, most beautiful dogwood blossoms in the whole land. And none of you has ever seen a city with more perfect reasons for picture windows than my home town of Seattle.

That same Kentucky poem has some final lines that I think all of us here will deny. I've heard some of your discussions and I know now that every one of you face problems much greater than those faced by the other fellow. But Kentucky says:

"Mountains tower grandest, politicians are the blandest,
And politics the damnest in Kentucky,"

Now we all know that isn't true. I'll stack the great Northwest up against any other part of the country, politics, airports, aviation developments, and all.

Of course, you cannot take a sectional view of aviation. This industry is nationwide; yes, worldwide—too big in scope for us to narrow our vision. Each of you can be most interested in your special airport, but you will agree that your airport's most important aspect is its relation with the rest of the world.

Not long ago, speaking on transportation, before State officials of the western States, I pointed at a few of the special conditions that obtain in these States in relation to transportation. I said that airplanes are contemptuous of distance and terrain obstacles, and that—along with the great distances we have out here—makes air transportation especially valuable to us. The results are good loads for the air carriers, and widespread use of the airplane in agriculture and business.

The CAA estimates that owners of 35,070 planes, 57 percent of all that flew in 1953, reported that they did some business flying in that year. That is not surprising to us here in the West. Every day we see ranchers, farmers, contractors, oil-well operators, doctors, merchants, and salesmen using their personal planes to cover great distances and transact business. This business use of what we might call the private plane is growing steadily—rising from 29 percent right after the war to 57 percent in 1953. The personal airplane is doing what the personal automobile has been doing—a promising development, I think.

The airplane is doing great things in agriculture out here, too. At least five new planes, new in design and structure now are being produced for the aerial applicator—a very practical and businesslike example of how firmly this use of the airplane is established in this Nation's food- and fiber-producing business. The CAA estimates that every person in the United States eats, touches, or wears something every day of the year that an agricultural airplane has treated beforehand.

So we have a great stake in the airplane out here where our business transportation needs are great and our crops include food, forests, fruits, and forage crops.

And thus, it follows, we have a great stake in airports. Growth of aviation depends always on adequate airports.

I would commend you men for the progress you have made with your airports. You share a great part in the progress we have made in air transportation. You helped produce the record volume of nearly 35 million air passengers in 1954, and the safety record of eight-tenths passenger fatalities per 100 million passenger-miles. Without fine airports, properly run, neither of these records would have been possible.

But we must again refrain from taking a narrow view in aviation. Yours are the large airports—but what of the small one?

The CAA has prepared three interesting charts which show most graphically how interdependent all airports are in this country. One chart is centered on Los Angeles, and the cities and towns of the rest of the country are represented by dots of various size indicating how many passengers flew from those places to Los Angeles. You would expect many people to fly from Chicago or New Orleans to Los Angeles, but what about traffic from the smaller towns? All the figures surprised me. From Presque Ile, Maine, 800 passengers flew to Los Angeles; from Savannah, 500; from Spokane, 10,000; from Kokomo, Ind., 500; from Des Moines, 5,000; and from Huron, S. Dak., 600.

A second chart showed, with the same surprising results, the traffic from big and little places all over the country to New York.

These two charts show, for instance, that people in Scottsbluff or North Platte, Neb., are interested in there being adequate airport facilities in New York, Los Angeles, and for that matter in all major cities. Likewise, the people in both New York and Los Angeles are interested in adequate airport facilities in Scottsbluff and North Platte.

The third chart showed another aspect of today's aviation in which you are actively interested. The CAA checked on the business flying of the J. I. Case Manufacturing Co., and drew lines on a map to show where the executive planes of the company flew. Despite the fact that Case has but three planes, and many companies have five times that many, they covered practically the entire country in this 1 year of business flying—using 395 airports.

These charts point up, impressively, a point which you already know—that the importance of any airport must be measured in its relation to every other airport. How would you like to be the proud owner of the only telephone in the United States? Or how long would you hold the job of manager of the only airport in the United States?

Airports, as such, mean no more to me than to the average air traveler or citizen, but I have worked long and hard in Congress to bring about a more intelligent and more productive attitude toward the problem. For that matter, I worked hard for the airport here in Seattle.

I can assure you the Congress recognizes the full importance of the airport program. Its record of legislation and appropriation has been commendable and has reflected the conviction that Federal aid is an essential.

Niggardly Federal assistance in airport development to meet the facility demands of skyrocketing air transportation and interference with Federal commissions in carrying out the expressed will of Congress are two of the most important handicaps we are faced with.

We have before our present Congress a request for $101 billion for highway construction—but we have also a request for only $11 million for the entire airport system of the United States. This will hardly provide one airport like the Seattle-Tacoma Airport.

It is true that the need for a nationwide system of superhighways is actual and pressing. That this system should be provided with borrowed money and to 11 roads is a matter for Congress to decide. You are going to have a lot of trouble persuading Wyoming and Montana, for example, to pay their share of such a system. But we need the roads to keep pace with our national growth.

We also need airports. Just as much—if not more than highways. They provide the key to the most essential facility of our national defense. What is more—with our new jet planes we must have large airports and only a few municipalities can provide these.

Unforunately, the desires of Congress are subverted by actions of the executive branch of Government, and I believe this has been the case in the airport program. The Civil Aeronautics Act and the Federal Aid to Airports Act calls for "the establishment of a nationwide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aviation."

The whole intent of this policy can be changed, however, when the criteria for allowing Federal aid to airports is arbitrarily set by some official in the executive department. I am becoming more and more convinced that Congress should determine these criteria. It would seem to be the only way in which its wishes can be directed and insured, and the actual intent of its legislation carried out.

In particular, I disliked the exclusion of such items as airport buildings, roads, parking areas and fences, all of which were authorized by the original Airport Act. Nor do I favor the criteria under which the program now is operating—of 30 based airplanes or 3,000 enplaned airline passengers for the airport to be eligible for Federal aid. This criteria can exclude whole classes of airports, which are important in our national system. I know you men recognize that your fine big airports would be decreased in value if we did not have the thousands of smaller airports that serve the people of this country along with you, and send traffic to your fields.

I do, however, look for a change in the administration of this program. When the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate questioned Mr. Louis S. Rothschild before approving his appointment as Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation, we learned that he had a different attitude toward his duties than his predecessor. Mr. Rothschild told us he considered his new post to be one that is concerned with policy matters and should not be an administrative function in any sense of the word. The Secretary of Commerce had previously written me that he conceived of the job of Undersecretary for Transportation in exactly that light—a position of policy supervision, and not of administration. In spite of that we saw continued interference with the CAA and the CAB in their administrative actions. I was especially pleased to hear Mr. Rothschild say that such agencies as the CAA and CAB "have their own powers which should be carried out without leadership or interference from anyone."

I think the CAA and the CAB are in for much more peace of mind and productive effort in carrying through their good work than they have enjoyed heretofore. As I did in the hearings, I want publicly again to commend Fred B. Lee, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, for the good job he has been doing under difficult situations.

Let me review the history of the Federal aid to airports program to illustrate these difficulties. Congress originally authorized $500 million for a period of 7 years, with not to exceed $100 million to be appropriated in any 1 year. Now, Congress does not intend that the exact sum of money authorized shall be appropriated and used, but exercises its best judgment year after year in annual appropriations. But note how these appropriations have varied: In 1947, the largest appropriation was made, $45 million; followed by annual appropriations of $32,500,000; $40 million; $39,500,000; $24,200,000; $18,700,000; and $14,321,154 in 1953. Then, the new administration, in its passion for economy, asked for nothing in fiscal 1954, and our airport development stood by for a year while a committee studied the whole philosophy of Federal aid to airports. That committee, in effect, said to the administration, "Go on as you were with Federal aid, with some changes." Then in 1955, we were asked for $22 million to help with the rather small program we now have under way. And for next year, the administration has asked for $11 million.

I would greatly appreciate hearing the views of you men on this matter. Is the Federal Government going about its job intelligently in producing an adequate national system of airports? Is it committed to a sensible, long range policy?

The contrast between our attitude toward highways and airports is disturbing. The administration has asked for $101 billion for roads and $11 million for airports. But the contrast is greater than that. We establish a carefully considered policy in Federal aid to roads that extends 5 years into the future. With airports, we make jittery jumps from year to year, our appropriations ranging from zero dollars to $45 million in Federal aid. It would seem perfectly sensible to me to treat these two forms of transportation with the same intelligent approach.

This would make for much greater stability in the planning done by airport owners. They face the problem of stage planning in almost every case, and some assurance of Federal participation in these heavy expenses would be beneficial to the whole air transportation industry and to the people who need its services.

Of course, we're outgrowing highways and they have to be replaced, but the same argument holds true for air traffic.

Take Seattle as an example. In 1945, we had 221,426 passengers taking off from Seattle-Tacoma Airport and Boeing Field on passenger planes. Last year, this passenger traffic had doubled that figure, reaching 422,618. Of course, a lot of that traffic was generated on the far-eastern schedule of Northwest Airlines and reflects the Hawaiian service, too.

But it also points up why the CAA has Seattle-Tacoma Airport down for $310,560 in the Federal aid to airport program to acquire 80 acres of land to clear the approach to the field. And King County Airport—or Boeing Field is in the Federal aid program for $136,000 to reconstruct a 10,000-foot runway. These Federal funds will be matched locally.

In a matter as important as this, we have to know where we are going.

Congress knew what it wanted and where it was going when it authorized Federal money for aid to airports. For full development of aviation, we must have an adequate national system of civil airports. And I believe Congress feels we have received good value in the airport system so far produced. Since 1947 when the present airport program started, a total of $236,221,154 in Federal money has been shared with the States to carry through 2,641 projects on 1,204 airports. It is not possible to estimate the value of these airports to the Nation. Presence of an airport has saved the lives of military fliers and their expensive planes in emergencies. New businesses have grown up at airports. Business has accepted the airport as a necessity, and we have classic examples like that of Hickory, N. C., which was selected instead of a nearby town for location of a big manufacturing concern, merely because it had a good airport and the rival city had none. All this in addition to the amazing records broken every year by the scheduled and nonscheduled air carriers.

I do not begrudge Federal money spent in this way. We labor for the future when we build and improve our airports, and it is a future almost too broad and promising for us to imagine.

Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner of April 29, 1955, entitled "GOP Suddenly 'Loves' the Farmer."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP SUDDENLY LOVES THE FARMER

We congratulate the President and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson on their poor-man's farm program, but cannot restrain a persistent questionmark about the seriousness of the program.

It's all very well to come forth with trumpets about a poor-man's farm program, but why is it that the administration's policies to date have been directed against the little farmer?

The Republicans have attacked farm-price supports at every opportunity.

They have attempted to kill off the Soil Conservation Service.

They are now hard at work in an effort to strangle the Rural Electrification Administration by lack of adequate appropriations.

They are going full tilt against the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has brought unprecedented prosperity to farmer and factory worker alike in that area.

One is forced to wonder whether, having left the corpses of poor farmers strewn about, the GOP now seeks by this high-sounding program to draw a clever cover over it all. Remember, the elections of 1956 are not so far away, and farmers are not as of now in love with the elephant.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*...The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*...
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*..
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*...The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*..
Eastland, James O., *Miss*...5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*...
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*...
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*...
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*...Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*...
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*...
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*...3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*...
Langer, William, *N. Dak*...The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*...Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*...
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*...
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....The Capitol Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont*...The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*...
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*..
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*...
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*..2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*...Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*...
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*...Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*--------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*--------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*-------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*------1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*------The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*---------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*------
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*--------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*----
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*----
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*------
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*------The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*-------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*---------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*----------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*-------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*----------
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*-------The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*-------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*---------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*---
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*-----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*------2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*------Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*------
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*------
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----The Coronet

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—3130 Wisconsin Ave.

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*—3250 T St. SE.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4420 Dexter St.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*

Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill.*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—The Dorchester
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*

Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—The Senate Courts
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—3202 So. Stafford St., Arlington, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Commemoration of the Inauguration of George Washington as First President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech delivered by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay in New York City on April 29, 1955, commemorating the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States, in 1789. In his address, Secretary McKay enthusiastically endorsed S. 732, which I believe is on the calendar, and which I had the privilege of introducing on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and myself. This bill would promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area. I urge that the Senate favorably consider this needed legislation in the near future.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS MCKAY TO THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, FEDERAL HALL MEMORIAL, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 29, 1955

Since February, when Gardner Osborn of the New York Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, persuaded me to get excused from the regular Friday Cabinet meeting in Washington today to come here, I have been looking forward to this occasion with great pleasure.

I am delighted to be here.

To me it is a distinct privilege to join with you at this national historic site to commemorate the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States 166 years ago tomorrow.

For the Department of the Interior I extend sincere thanks to the New York Chapter of SAR for sponsoring this annual observance.

In this way the chapter is helping to keep alive in the minds of the people the import of the historic events which occurred here.

It is a particular pleasure to recall the events which led to the establishment of the three significant areas which we administer in New York as national shrines for the inspiration of all Americans—Federal Hall Memorial, Castle Clinton, and the Statue of Liberty, and to assert my strong support of pending legislation directed at adding to their usefulness.

As you have just noted, there is now an added reason why I am pleased to be here today.

Though I do not minimize the major importance of the historic event we celebrate, I would be less than human if I did not rejoice at receiving this handsome Chauncey M. Depew medal for public service.

I am profoundly grateful to my compatriots in the SAR for the signal honor which has been bestowed on me.

As a Son of the American Revolution in the Oregon chapter for many years past, I have deemed my affiliation with that organization as an extraordinary privilege.

It is a privilege enjoyed by virtue of my great great grandfather, Joshua Armstrong, a Philadelphian, who fought in the Revolutionary War.

It is with a deep sense of humility, therefore, that I accept this significant SAR award, the Chauncey M. Depew medal.

I shall always cherish it as a remembrance of this occasion and as a symbol of the public-service achievements of that honorable American whose memory it perpetuates.

This medal shall serve as a constant reminder of his achievements and an inspiration to strive for greater personal attainment for the public good in the years to come.

It is because of the spirit of a free people is formed and animated out of the storehouse of historical recollections that Federal Hall Memorial has been set apart here as a national historic site.

This is the site of some of the most momentous events in American history.

But more than any other of the historically important occurrences, the inauguration of George Washington as our first President in the old Federal Hall has perhaps given this site its chief claim to fame.

Reviewing these momentous events, we know that we are on truly hallowed ground here. Because of this, the site and this building, which was completed in 1842, were designated in 1939 as the Federal Hall Memorial National Historical Site, under authority of the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935.

As such, it is preserved as an area of the national park system and administered by the National Park Service with the cooperation of the Federal Hall Memorial Associates.

All of us who are interested in our historical heritage are indebted to the Federal Hall Memorial Associates for helping to rescue this historic place from possible sale as surplus Government real estate and for aiding substantially in its preservation and development over the past 15 years.

We also are indebted to many other civic and patriotic groups in New York City—the city council, the office of the mayor, the office of Manhattan Borough president, the honorary commissioners of the department of Commerce, the Sons of the American Revolution, the Downtown Manhattan Association, and numerous others for their interest in the development of Federal Hall and the Castle Clinton and Statue of Liberty National Monuments which are closely associated geographically here.

We in the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service take very seriously our obligation to preserve these three historic places for the benefit and inspiration of the American people.

We believe, as do the city and State governments, and the patriotic organizations, that the full development of these sites will be of immeasurable help in making Americans more conscious of their past history and will strengthen their devotion to their country.

With funds available, work of restoration and for interpretation is going forward but much remains to be done at each of the sites before they can provide their full measure of benefit and inspiration.

Along with Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Federal Hall occupies a site so rich in historic events of national importance that very few others are comparable to it.

While we have made admirable progress here, the physical fabric of the memorial building itself is in need of rehabilitation. The great rotunda—an impressive setting for patriotic gatherings—badly needs rehabilitation and furnishing. Displays and exhibits, done by modern methods, are needed to interpret the founding of our Government and the characters and accomplishments of those great personalities, such as Washington and Jefferson, so closely associated with it.

The Peter Zenger memorial room and the inspiring exhibits installed there through the generosity of fourth estate have set the pattern for what is needed to make this site fulfill its memorial function with maximum effectiveness.

Castle Clinton was the last of a series of forts which guarded lower Manhattan from the time of the Dutch settlement in 1624 until after the establishment of the Republic.

Through 146 years of our history as a Nation, it has had intimate association with a succession of historical figures—General Lafayette, President Jackson, Samuel F. B. Morse, Jenny Lind, and many others.

Named for DeWitt Clinton, Governor of New York when George Washington was inaugurated, it was the Nation's principal immigrant depot in the last half of the 19th century.

Since it was established as a national monument in 1950, the exterior of Castle Clinton has been restored yet only a start in its development has been made. It needs some of the military character it had when it was a fort. It needs a museum to interpret how the old forts protected New York Harbor. We hope to succeed in these endeavors.

Out on Bedloes Island, in New York Harbor, stands the statue of the Goddess of Liberty holding aloft the flaming torch of freedom. It was given to America by the French people, paid for by their schoolchildren and their workingmen. It was sent here in 1886, 110 years after Thomas Jefferson had formulated the Declaration of Independence proclaiming to the world the equality of all men and their inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

When the statue was erected, it symbolized the friendship between the Republics of France and the United States. In the intervening years its significance has deepened. To many millions of the oppressed and of the venturesome of other lands who have crossed the ocean in hopeful search of greater freedom and opportunity, it has become the symbol of those ideals of human liberty upon which our Nation and its form of government were founded.

Because of its significance to those of all nations and peoples who have come to these shores in their search for a better way of life, the plan to establish in the base of the statue a Museum of American Immigration seems to be a peculiarly happy and suitable

conception. This Nation of ours has been good to millions of her adopted children, and I am deeply confident that many of them who have prospered here will be glad to contribute to the funds required to make a reality of this plan.

State and city authorities and a group of some 20 organizations of New York are now working to help us solve the problem of further financing the development of these three significant properties in the New York area. As a move in that direction, they have sponsored identical bills, introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives, which look to public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the historic sites.

The bills, known as S. 732 and H. R. 3120 propose the establishment of a special advisory board which would endeavor to determine what is needed to increase the public benefit and inspiration from the three areas. The legislation, if passed, would authorize the acceptance of donated funds and the appropriation of such Federal funds as may be necessary to match funds donated contingent upon that requirement.

I have studied this proposed legislation and am heartily in favor of it.

We have recommended its enactment, believing that it will provide an appropriate method for enlisting and encouraging private and public cooperation with the Federal Government in the preservation and satisfactory development of these historic shrines.

In this effort you and other Americans can be of much help.

Federal Hall, Castle Clinton, and the Statue of Liberty belong to you, to me, and to all the people.

They are important parts of our heritage.

Whatever you can do, whatever I can do, to help impart that feeling of pride in our historic past in all who visit them will redound to our own benefit and the benefit of those who will follow us in the years to come.

Massachusetts Heritage Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Massachusetts delegation in the Congress have been reminded by Albert West, chairman, Massachusetts heritage program of the Massachusetts Bar Association, that the constitution of the Commonwealth will be 175 years old on October 25.

The Massachusetts Bar Association is planning an extensive program for this occasion and hopes that all Massachusetts churches, schools, libraries, and organizations will join with them in their efforts to spread a greater awareness of our Massachusetts heritage to our fellow citizens of all ages.

His Excellency the Governor, Christian A. Herter, former Member of Congress, will officially proclaim October as Massachusetts Heritage Month. Last year, it will be recalled, December was thus designated, and in this connection the chief justice of the supreme judicial court, the Honorable Stanley E. Qua, and the bishop of Worcester, His Excellency John Wright, were the speakers.

Following is a copy of the great words spoken by the chief justice of Massachusetts and the bishop of Worcester in this connection:

ADDRESS OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF MASSACHUSETTS AND THE BISHOP OF WORCESTER AT THE DINNER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BAR ASSOCIATION INAUGURATING MASSACHUSETTS HERITAGE MONTH AS PROCLAIMED BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR, BOSTON, NOVEMBER 30, 1954

ADDRESS OF HON. STANLEY E. QUA, CHIEF JUSTICE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

When I asked myself what is this heritage about which we talk and which we celebrate, I have been unabe to define it, I can only see it as a sort of vision. It seems to me to be a sort of shining light which comes from the distant past and shines down through the corridors of time into our day and on into the generations that are to come after us. It is a continuous thing. Nevertheless each generation has a duty toward it. It is the duty of each generation to pass that light along undimmed for the benefit of the future.

I suppose that it may be expected that I would say something about our judicial heritage. I am sure that no State in this country has a greater heritage than Massachusetts has and I feel too that that statement holds true of our judicial heritage. You doubtless all know that our history is really divided into three periods.

First there was the colony of Massachusetts Bay, the little struggling colony around the shore of Massachusetts Bay particularly centered around Boston. They were governed under a Colonial Charter given by the King from 1629, although the charter didn't come here until 1630, until the charter was finally declared void in England in 1685. There was a period of approximately 55 years under the old Colony Charter. During the earlier part of that time the conditions of turmoil in England were such that immigration to this colony was rather rapid so that it is said by people who perhaps know something about it, that between 1630 and 1640 over 30,000 people came to these shores. After the troubles in England subsided the tide of immigration was slowed down. Then came the longer period when we were a Province and we were governed under the so-called Province Charter of 1691 or 1692, depending on whether you take the date of its arrival here, and that lasted until the Revolution, we'll say until 1776, a period of somewhat under 100 years. During that time it was slow and steady growth. Then, of course, you know the Revolution came along and after the fighting in this vicinity ceased, people began to think more of ordering their affairs. Then came the constitution of this Commonwealth of 1780, and we have since lived under that constitution up to the present time. And that I call the third period in the history of the Commonwealth.

Now during all these periods we had a judiciary. At the beginning for the first 4 or 5 years, the general court did everything, passed the laws, decided the lawsuits, did everything pertaining to government. But soon that became inconvenient and colonial courts were established in the different counties which soon came into existence and there was a rather elaborate system of courts. Then under the province charter there was a system of courts.

I must not be betrayed into speaking too long because I know that others are following, but I just want to trace down very briefly the story of our judicial history and heritage.

The supreme judicial court, of which I have at the moment the honor to be the chief justice, had its origin in the statute, a provincial statute, of 1692, which established what was then known as the superior court of judicature. It was not called supreme court because there was the Privy Council or the King's Council in England which stood over it and to which appeals might be taken in the most important cases. But when the constitution of the Commonwealth came along in 1780, it did not create the supreme court, it recognized it as already existing and assigned to it, its place in the constitutional system. So we claim that our court has had a continuous existence from 1692 to the present day.

Now after the constitution in 1780, came what I think was the greatest judicial opportunity that was ever offered to any of our States. Remember that at that time the country was new. We were among the older settlements. We had a more stable system than some of them and we had the great good fortune in our very early years as a Commonwealth to have most able men appointed to our supreme court. I mention the name first of Chief Justice Shaw. He wasn't among the first but he held the office of chief justice from 1830 to 1860, a period of 30 years, and that was the formative period of American law and we had here a nucleus, an established system with the great man that Shaw was at its head, so that his influence went all over the country. The decisions of our court were read and had a profound influence on the developing law of a new country far beyond our borders. Then after Shaw's time we had other great men. I'm not going to mention them all but some are well known. Chief Justice Horace Gray subsequently appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; Chief Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, subsequently appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; Chief Justice Knowlton; and in recent times for a period of about 26 years, Chief Justice Arthur P. Rugg, of Worcester, one of the most widely known of all American jurists.

And so I say looking at the judicial side that we have a history of which we can well be proud and I am proud of it. There were 2 things that were in the constitution of 1780 to which I wish to draw your attention, because these were especially important.

In that constitution it is written, "It is the right of every citizen to be tried by judges as free, impartial, and independent as the lot of humanity will admit." And then the instrument goes on and provides for permanent tenure of office on the part of the judge in order to secure that necessary independence. The second provision is one that has been called by students, the greatest contribution America has made to political science and that is the so-called separation of powers. And that clause reads, "In the government of this Commonwealth the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers or either of them, the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers or either of them, the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers or either of them, to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men." There you have your checks and balances, the three great departments of government, each in its own sphere, neither having any right to trespass upon the other. So far the system has worked.

And now we look around us and we see the troubled times that we are in and we sometimes wonder about the future and we ought to feel the responsibility that rests upon us, particularly in these difficult times, to keep this heritage pure and strong, to hand it down unalloyed and, in every respect, as fine as it came to us, to those who succeed us. And in that connection I want to read to you a little verse and then I shall be through:

"We that have faith to look with fearless
eyes beyond the tragedy of a world at
strife
And trust that out of night and death shall
rise the dawn of ampler life,

Rejoice whatever anguish rends your heart
that God has given you for a priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your
part in freedom's crowning hour
That you may tell your sons who see the
light high in the Heavens their heritage to take
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight, I
saw the morning break."

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN WRIGHT, BISHOP OF WORCHESTER

Ours is a Commonwealth of venerable and enviable traditions. Many of these are traditions concerned with the things of the mind and the spirit. It is therefore fitting that a month be devoted to the education of our young people in the nature and the richness of the heritage which comprises our State traditions, and it is equally fitting that this month of such education be sponsored by the members of the Massachusetts Bar Association if only because our legal traditions form a major part of the proud heritage of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and provide the protection of the rest.

It is also fitting that you should have invited a preacher to speak on this occasion, though you might easily have found a better one. The reason why such an invitation is appropriate is because the ultimate fountainhead of the postulates, cultural, social, and legal, of the authentic Massachusetts heritage remains the teachings of Christ. His gospel, illuminated by His own sublime example, prefigured by the fidelity of the people from whom He sprung and illustrated in the example of the saints to whom He gave direction, remains the heart of our heritage.

I am confident that the generation of the Pilgrim Fathers, despite the great differences between their theology and mine, would concur in the thoughts that I shall venture to express this evening. I also think that their generation would have been appalled by any repudiation on the part of the later Massachusetts community of the debt of our heritage to the Christian gospel. Massachusetts began as a kind of theocracy. It was really a parish before it was a civil community. It was a religious community in its earliest settlement. Its historical circumstances have almost inevitably altered the proportions of religious and what we might call secular or civil emphasis in the Massachusetts tradition. But for all that, the roots of our heritage remain as they were with the Pilgrim Fathers and their immediate descendants, religious roots. It was that generation which first caused a prayer, rather than a political slogan or a social formula, to be chosen as the motto of the capital city of our Commonwealth, the prayer from the Scripture, "As God was with our fathers so may He be with us."

The God whom the Seventeeth and Eighteenth Century Bostonians invoked was the God of Jesus Christ and if their prayer meant anything it meant what I propose to recall to you this evening.

Because God was with their fathers, because they and their fathers strove to be with God, those who founded our heritage did not build in vain. Their work was blessed and it bore abundant fruits, fruits of faith and of freedom. Unless God be with their children and their children's children, unless He be with us and unless we be with Him, we shall forfeit the inheritance we have from our fathers and shall annul the achievement that has theirs. Unless God is with us as He was with our fathers, no power on earth will enable us to preserve the heritage which the powers of Heaven were needed to accomplish here in Massachusetts.

The men who wrote the basic law of Massachusetts were typical of those whose thought became in such great measure the mentality of the American Republic. If we would recall how religious that mentality was, we need only examine the thinking of the men of Massachusetts as that thinking is reflected in the basic and traditional law of this Commonwealth. Our fathers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts knew that the divine attributes of liberty and authority, analogously present among men, could only be reconciled in our topsy-turvy world if God himself would somehow work among us unto their reconciliation. Our fathers did not believe that it is enough for God to be in His Heaven in order that all be well with the world. They knew that Heaven and earth must work together if the earth is ever to achieve something, at least, of the order which prevails in Heaven and if the sons of men are finally to win the freedom of the sons of God.

The men who made the Commonwealth of Massachusetts realized that in God's holy providence all society, religious and civil alike, and all legal traditions, both those of authority and those of liberty, must exist for the perfection of human personality. They would have understood the magnificent political and social implications of the doctrine which the late Pius XI so briefly summarized when he said, "It is according to the dictates of reason that ultimately all things should be ordained to man as a person, that through his mediation they may find their way back to the Creator." It is in this wise that we apply to the human person the words of the Apostle Paul, "For all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos, or Cephas; or the world, or life, or death; or things present or things to come, all are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

Our Massachusetts legal tradition so respects this concept of the centrality of human personality that even before a child is born our State protects his human rights, his right to life, his right to be born, even, in accordance with a famous decision of a century ago, his right to inherit. Indeed the rights of the unborn child are sacred to our State under a double title; they are the rights of a human, but also of a human incapable of pleading his own rights and therefore with a greater claim, not lesser, on the protection of the State as our fathers understood it.

The law's insistence on the right of a child to be born has demanded in our medical and moral tradition certain acts of heroism which many profess to find superhuman. But our forefathers in Massachusetts considered heroism to be a duty where there is a question of the inviolable rights of human personality.

A child, in the thinking of our tradition, is not born immediately into civil society. Logically, at least, he enters that society, as our forefathers understood it, through the medium of his parents or, more precisely, through his family.

In the Massachusetts tradition of law the family is the elementary social unit. For our forefathers democracy meant a plurality of families cooperating by consent for the collective protection and promotion of those God-given natural rights which the family by itself might be powerless to secure for the individual person. Democracy meant, even more, the sovereignty of the family in its own essential work of the rearing of children. The development of the child's faculties, the formation and refinement of his character, his initiation to the requirements and the disciplines of existence in society, all these are, in our tradition, the work of the normal parent and no agency should be encouraged to supplant the normal parent, our fathers considered, in these works.

The consequent amount of legislation in our State designed to protect the right of the parent over the child is impressively large. Our forefathers followed Blackstone in his suggestion that the positive precepts of the law should correspond accurately to a natural necessity decreed by Divine Providence which has provided for the welfare of children, as never could the State or any other agency, by implanting in the breast of the normal parent an insuperable affection, more imperious than any written law, which not even the wickedness, ingratitude or rebellion of children can totally suppress or extinguish.

And so Massachusetts has always recognized that the normal family is, in its own way, sovereign. Only the abnormal inadequacy of a particular family places its members within the competency of our courts. Even then, whenever possible, it is the tradition of our State to do all that artifice can possibly do to supply the defects of nature by providing the homeless child with the nearest possible approach to family life and family rearing. Our State was, I believe, the first in the Union to provide legislation which abolished, so far as possible, compulsory, institutional, and wholesale bringing up of children. Our State preferred the plan of foster homes where foster parents could, in some degree, supply for natural parents in the training of the human person within a human family.

In our tradition it is recognized that the strength of the State, the good of the child, and the rights we call democratic are best served when the family is protected in its liberty to choose the schools in which the personality of its children may be brought to perfection. Our fathers in the Bay State possessed an extraordinary appreciation of the manner in which the power of education to perfect personality makes education the right of every person.

In our State constitution they wrote, with homely and historic words, their reasoning: "Wisdom and knowledge as well as virtue diffused generally among the body of the people being necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties, it shall be the duty of legislators and magistrates in all future periods of this Commonwealth to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all seminaries of them; to encourage private societies and public institutions, rewards and immunities, for the promotion of agriculture, arts, sciences, and a natural history of the country; to countenance and inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty and punctuality in their dealings; sincerity, good humor, and all social affections and generous sentiments among the people." These are archaic phrases, redolent of a more placid age, but God save this Commonwealth when other sentiments impel us to pursue educational objectives contrary to this constitutional directive and the ideals, human and divine, which inspired it.

A graduate from our schools finds himself protected on every hand by the legislation which our forefathers wrote to guarantee his right to choose his own work, to contract at will for payment, to acquire property and otherwise to enjoy the fruits of his toil. If these personal rights be struck down or arbitrarily interfered with there is a substantial impairment of liberty in its long established consitutional sense, a sense to which Massachusetts men made historic contribution.

Behind this tradition is the testimony of human reason in its highest moments of the wisdom of Greece, the law of Rome and the hopes of Israel. Behind it, above all, is the revelation made by Jesus and the traditions preserved by Christendom. The basic law of this Commonwealth, as our forefathers wrote it and as our courts have transmitted it, is religious in its spirit and in its very letter. Nowhere is the religious inspiration of the American tradition better

typified than here in Massachusetts. Again, the men who most contributed to the early building of our State subscribed to a theology which we of the ancient faith can only find heretical. They preached certain moral conventions which their own sons and daughters have felt impelled to relax as excessively austere. But question as one may their dogma and fret as one may at their restraints, for this may their names never die: The men who wrote the law of Massachusetts feared God and they were resolved never to fear any man.

They feared God with a holy and wholesome fear and because they did they wrote into the preamble of the constitution of their State devout words of homage to the Creator. They acknowledged their dependence on Him; they included in our State constitution, almost uniquely among such documents, a formal prayer for His direction in the mighty task of building the heritage that you will ask our children to remember with grateful loyalty. They feared God, and so they did not talk glibly, as our generation is sometimes prone to do, of a mere freedom to worship God, a freedom which they themselves had no intention of implementing. Rather, they wrote in the second article of their constitution words of duty as well as of freedom. They wrote, "It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society publicly, and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the Universe."

These men feared God, but they were determined to in no necessity of ever fearing man. And so they wrote in the 30th article of our State constitution their high resolve that this was to be a government of laws, not of men; of objective constitutional statutes, not subjective arbitrary impulses however high-minded or however immediately beneficial. They resolved that the moods and the passions of the people must never be permitted to overthrow the institutions which represent their own deliberate development and their own deepest convictions. Our written laws, basic among them our Constitution as interpreted by the judiciary, constitute at once the fruit of our deepest convictions and the safeguard of their survival.

These objective constitutional controls our forefathers committed to the courts. On no point should a people who cherish their freedom be more vigilant than on the character, the background and the philosophy of the judges appointed to these courts.

It was an act of almost superhuman prudence so to place in the hands of judges the security of our liberties. Elsewhere, even in constitutional governments, the judicial power is almost invariably subordinate to the legislative. Even in England, as Chief Justice Taney once remarked the courts are bound to enforce the acts of Parliament even if they believe them in conflict with Magna Charta or the Petition of Rights. But our forefathers built more wisely. They acknowledged in the executive and legislative branches of government only those powers specifically delegated to them in the Constitution and the interpretation of the Constitution they entrusted to the courts.

Most of these New England men, in the case of Massachusetts all without exception, had long since ceased, for reasons of sad history, to concur with the pronouncements of the Roman Pontiff. But all of them, I think, would have endorsed with full understanding a typical declaration broadcast in these latter years from the Vatican. It was a declaration directed primarily, of course, against the dictatorships of the hour, but it set forth a principle inconsistent with arbitrary and totalitarian government of any kind. The Holy See, said this broadcast, indicts attempts to subordinate juridical and legislative activity to the requirements of particular groups, classes, or movements for these must be subordinated in turn to the establishment of justice and to the service of society as a whole. Therefore, the Holy See condemns the political philosophy of those who dare to place the fortunes of whole nations in the hands of one man alone, or of one party subject to a man who, as such, is the prey of passion and error. It is essential that a preestablished set of laws be placed above the governor and the governed alike, far outside the reach of arbitrary action.

It was for like reasons that our New England forefathers providently impowered their courts to test, in accordance with well-settled and familiar principles of law and equity, every demand for political power, political action or for departure from tradition made by any executive, however wise or however popular, or by any legislature, however capable or however representative. Through their courts, as our forefathers constituted them, the American people themselves protect themselves against themselves.

Our courts represent, as one critic has said, "the settled habits of thought and action of our people." An executive might easily be powerfully influenced by the disillusion, the discouragement or the dreams and passion of the mob. He might be deluded by the siren song of the elusive future and forget the warning voice of the sane past. A Congress might easily be stampeded by a madcap outcry and a majority might readily be found to demand crude and even cruel legislation. And so our forefathers looked to the courts to decide whether a popular but passing whim had resulted in political action inconsistent with the considered and secure tradition. If so, even the majority must withdraw their demand or give their apparent wish the time for such patient meditation and cautious procedure as are required to revise the Constitution. But to override the Constitution, to despise the tradition, would be revolution and our forefathers, though they might and did revolt against men, permitted no revolution against the basic law. No political dream could be so dazzling, no social need so urgent, no executive so capable, no majority so overwhelming, that our forefathers would permit any or all of these to put aside the clarified tradition of the Constitution and its authentic interpretation. That is what the men of Massachusetts meant when they planned a government of laws, not of men. These prudent provisions were typical expressions of the shrewd conservatism of New England men, a conservatism sometimes gently mocked and sometimes bitterly derided, but a conservatism for which this Nation has more than once had cause to bless New England.

Thanks to it our forefathers accumulated in the corner of the world committed to their care a cultural and political heritage well worth conserving. It proved so well worth conserving that all subsequent peoples who came here, however otherwise they may have differed from the original colonists in religion, race, or temperament, speedily acquired, as with the air they breathed, the typical conservatism of this Commonwealth. It is not a static, reactionary mold of mind; it is a dynamic conservatism, the result of enlightened conviction, a conservatism bent on losing nothing of the good which the past has preserved for us and resolved to add to that good in transmitting it to those who, please God, may build a better future.

The conservatism of our forefathers in Massachusetts was not designed to enslave us in the name of the past, but it was calculated to save us from enslavement in the name of the future. It recognized that hard-won liberties can be speedily lost under the seduction of easily promised future advantages, and that the God-given heritage of the past and the sacred liberties of the present can be too readily sacrified in the name of a future which may never be and which perhaps were better not.

The conservatism of the Massachusetts heritage is particularly saving in time of crisis. It reminds us that there will be, when the tumult and the shouting dies, no new Heaven or new earth. It reminds us that the citizens of any brave new world to be will still be men, not gods. It reminds us that any future world can only be built out of whatever good survives from the past. It warns us never to hold lightly the good which our forefathers built so patiently in this Commonwealth, never to gamble with the liberties which are the heart and the soul of that good, never to permit religious faith to grow cold, the faith which taught us those liberties, never to forget the blessings on this Commonwealth by which Almighty God confirmed the wisdom of those who, in building it, honored Him and His chief creature, the human person.

Sometimes in the not so distant future the children whose schools you will visit in accordance with this education plan will begin to take over. They will write our new laws. They will interpret, modify, and amend the old laws. Their mentality will determine how much of the old will survive and what will be the direction of the new. It is well that you speak to them now, eloquently and persuasively, of the things you and I have recalled this evening. Make your voices clear and convincing, for by then other voices will be heard in our land.

These will be the voices of new prophets who spread a teaching forgetful of New England's God and of the reverence which Massachusetts had for the human person. These new teachers will bid our children write their law without reference to God and, ignorant of His Scripture with its warning that we put not our trust in princes, even those of the proletariat, they will propose sooner or later a government of men, of bureaus and commissions, not laws. They will talk little of the family, less of the sovereignty of parents and not at all of the dignity of personality. They will speak of race or class or partisan interests. They will repudiate the religious revelation which is the heart of our traditional faith and they will reject the legal concept of objective natural law which was the heart of our tradition of political freedom. They will have no voice for the phrases which meant so much to our Founding Fathers that they enshrined them in the basic documents of our national life, phrases which spoke of natural law and of God's authority, "the laws of nature and of nature's God."

Alas, it may be that these phrases will have no meaning for many who will seek to write and to construe the law of our land on matters of every kind, even those affecting our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. Already people tell us blandly that our Supreme Court is no longer a natural law court or, concerning certain legislation governing education and partially moral matters, they assert that although citizens may singly reverence God and cherish the moral law, the community is not concerned with sacred values or with our religious heritage.

All this may be. But at least in this month when we commemorate the authentic heritage of Massachusetts, let us remember that it was not always so. The men who founded our courts and who wrote our basic law did not believe it so and that is one of the chief reasons why our courts exist. Our democracy may become amoral or unreligious in days of confusion and indifference. But in the days of its original inspiration and initial strength it talked of the endowments which the human person has from his Creator and of his consequent accountability to

God. It may be that our children will not always discern the blessings of God on the faith of their fathers, but if they doubt the wrath of God on those who forget that faith and desert its social corollaries, then let them advert to the military, economic and political preoccupation which were left behind us at the doors of this hall and to which all too soon we must return. No defense of the Massachusetts heritage and of the values which it taught our forefathers could be more effective than the present straits to which certain new prophets, contemptuous of faith and freedom alike, have reduced the world.

Hence the great importance of the positive work of education to which this month the Massachusetts Bar Association has dedicated itself. I pray that the education campaign in all our schools will have as its result an increased respect on the part of our children for public authority and particularly for the majesty of the courts. In this connection we who preach and who hold public posts have an urgent obligation to give the best possible example by emphasizing the dignity of public office, the sanctity of public authority, and the legitimate title to special respect of those who wield it in the executive, legislative, or the judicial branches.

You and I do not believe in the divine right of kings as did the Absolutists, but there is still a divinity hangs about a king if only because he holds authority which comes from God. We, who prefer democratic traditions pay no tribute to democracy when we strip the wielders of civil authority of a dignity and even a divinity which surrounds them, too, so long as they hold as the designees of the people an authority which still comes from God. We must not forget this simply because they sometimes forget it themselves. Perhaps our public officials will be more mindful of the truly sacred character of their trust when those who elect them have been taught in our schools the divine roots and the sanctity of these trusts and have thus become a little more reverent about public authority and a little more wary, therefore, about those to whom they commit it.

In any case, God's standard requires that even in a democracy we think twice and twice again before we threaten public order by pot shooting at the persons or the policies of those who duly hold public office. It is sound democracy to point out that a President or a justice is perhaps no better a man than any one of us, but it is bad morality and bad democracy to forget what the Presidency is and what the majesty and dignity of the office of a judge. Even democracy punishes contempt of court no matter what the private merits of the man who is the judge.

All these things and much more besides the Massachusetts Heritage Month will teach our children. May they learn the lessons well, among them the lesson of how in the Massachusetts tradition we look to the church to inspire us concerning our divine origins and destiny; we look to the school to transmit the knowledge that our fathers developed from reason and revelation; we look to the courts to preserve and protect us in the exercise of the rights and duties arising from these. It is particularly important that the children learn these things at a time when so many and sometimes necessary impulses direct them to look to the heritage of other peoples to learn new wisdom. It is well that for at least a month each year we should direct their attention to the heritage of their own people to meditate the old sanity. During this month reminding them of the Massachusetts Heritage, teach them that they do not need to journey far afield to learn how to build the good society.

This is a good place that we have here. It has firm, humane, divine foundations. Let them begin to plan their future in the light of the lessons of their own heritage here.

The March of Bigotry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the third and fourth articles entitled "Hate, Inc.," written by Mr. Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. I inserted Mr. Steele's first two articles in the RECORD of May 3, and they appear on pages A2972 and A2973.

These articles deal with the march of bigotry in the United States. They are most interesting and illuminating, and have been appearing in recent issues of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 4, 1955]

HATE, INC.

(By Jack Steele)

A NEW GENERATION OF HATE HAWKERS

Some of the hatemongers who flourished in the 1930's have retired or gone to seed, but new ones have grabbed up their besmirched banners.

Of these newcomers some were lieutenants or disciples of pre-World War II bigots. Others, with curious ease, drifted into the hate business from military service—sometimes after a taste of wartime intelligence work.

Still others turned aside from respected careers as their prejudices suddenly erupted from long-hidden wellsprings.

Here are some of the postwar neophytes in the hate cabal:

Conde McGinley

An oldtime admirer of Father Charles E. Coughlin, Mr. McGinley began his activities in 1946 with a little paper called Think. He soon changed its name to the equally inappropriate Common Sense.

Mr. McGinley and Common Sense—which now boasts it is the most widely circulated paper of its kind in the world—were prime targets of the House Un-American Activities Committee's staff report on neo-Fascist and hate groups issued in December.

The report had this to say about Common Sense: "The most vitriolic hate propaganda ever to come to the attention of the committee."

It described Mr. McGinley as "a modern example of the racketeers who made a business out of un-American hate propaganda during the 1930's."

Common Sense is a fountainhead for anti-Semitic and anti-Negro propaganda. Its abusive articles are widely quoted and reprinted by other hate sheets. Other rabble-rousers, old and new, find it a ready market for their diatribes.

Mr. McGinley last year spread his hate into politics and public affairs.

Issues of Common Sense were trucked into Maine in a futile effort to defeat Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican.

Material put out by Mr. McGinley's Christian Educational Association was used against Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, in the New Jersey campaign.

Special anti-Negro issues of Common Sense were circulated in areas where school strikes were staged against the Supreme Court's antisegregation decision.

Mr. McGinley pulled all stops with a newspaper-size broadside entitled "The Coming Red Dictatorship." It featured pictures of 36 prominent Jews, many of them officials of the Eisenhower administration.

Its headlines screamed: "Asiatic Marxist Jews control entire world as last world war commences—thousands of plotters placed in key positions by invisible government."

Mr. McGinley, in a recent fund appeal, boasted that he had printed and distributed 470,000 copies of this document from his Union, N. J., headquarters. He ended the appeal with the assurance that names of contributors would be kept secret.

The Un-American Activities Committee summed up its report on Mr. McGinley this way: "It is regrettable that any American may have contributed to the perpetuation of such a hate factory."

An all-Christian jury in Newark, N. J., last month awarded Rabbi Joachim Prinz a $30,000 verdict in a libel suit against Mr. McGinley. The award included $25,000 punitive damages. The jury held that Dr. Prinz had been labeled falsely as a "Red" in Common Sense. He headed the Jewish community in Berlin before being driven out by the Nazis.

Robert H. Williams

This California pamphleteer and hate-sheet editor parades his bigotry under the guise of "intelligence." He advertises that his former service as an Air Force counter-intelligence officer makes his publications, vital for governors, mayors, police and "citizens interested in preventing sabotage and revolution."

But the Un-American Activities Committee reported that his intelligence duty consisted of less than a year as administrative officer for a bomber wing—a post where it said he could have received no information about "the Communist conspiracy."

The Air Force canceled his Reserve commission in 1950 for the best interest of the service.

His Williams Intelligence Summary is openly anti-Semitic. It is billed as "a monthly report on political and military developments, especially revealing the Jewish influence in these developments."

His pamphlet Know Your Enemy opens with the declaration: "This publication attacks no man because of his race, but it spares no subverter because of his race."

In it Mr. Williams suggests that all Jews should be interned in New York and strategic areas. Then, he argues, these areas would not be bombed by the Soviet.

Some of his phantasies are even more outrageous. He has charged that Jewish Gen. Curtis LeMay arranged to drop the first 2 atomic bombs on the "only 2 sizable Christian centers in Japan."

Mr. Williams reported in a recent fund-begging letter that he was running in the red and might have to quit.

"Have I failed in giving you the earth-shaking truth?" he asked.

"I can't believe it, for I find not a line in recent newspapers and magazines about the greatest news story of all time; the swift destruction of the Anglo-Nordic West, the Christian civilization, through the trickery and financial power of a handful of Jewish manipulators who have all but made themselves masters of the world."

Frank L. Britton

Also a Californian, Mr. Britton is one of the smoothest of the new hate peddlers.

His sheet, The American Nationalist, is a tabloid, printed on slick paper and splashed with color. Its format easily might be mistaken for the two most widely read publications in the Los Angeles area where he operates—Variety and The Hollywood Reporter.

Mr. Britton also runs a boycott campaign against Jews through a front group called the New Confederates. His color comic strips

feature Uncle Sam in a pose copied from familiar "I Want You" recruiting posters. In Britton's comics, Uncle Sam offers advice like "Buy Gentile" and "Boycott Jew Stores."

John O. Beaty

Mr. Beaty is professor of English at Southern Methodist University in Dallas. As a war-time colonel in Army intelligence, he helped prepare daily G–2 reports for the White House.

But his book The Iron Curtain Over America has been described by a Methodist minister, the Reverend Ralph L. Roy as "the most extensive piece of anti-Semitic literature in the history of America's racist movement."

Issued in 1951, it has gone through 15 printings and sold more than 50,000 copies. Most newspapers failed to review it and bookstores seldom display it, but it is constantly plugged by hate-sheets.

Gerald L. K. Smith called it "the most sensational book of this generation" and paid Mr. Beaty and his publisher $3,767 in 1952 for copies Mr. Smith presumably resold.

Mr. Beaty denies that he is anti-Semitic. In "Iron Curtain" he explains why. Its theme is that most European and American Jews are not Jews but "Khazars."

His theory—also endorsed by some other haters—is that these Jews are descended from a Mongol tribe known as Khazars who adopted Judaism.

(Reputable historians say this is bunk. They agree that the Khazar tribe was scattered or destroyed centuries ago.)

But Mr. Beaty soberly parades the Khazar thesis. After an opening chapter glorifying Prussian militarism, he blames the Khazars for the New Deal, World War II, Communist subversion, and what not. And in footnotes he quotes such authorities as Mr. McGinley's Common Sense.

Charges that he is anti-Semitic are absurd, he maintains, since "the Khazar Jew is himself not a Semite."

Mr. Beaty's attack on Jews—whether Khazars or Semites—are not confined to this book. Hate sheets carried letters from him last fall declaring that Christmas had become a buying orgy in which money passes from Christian into non-Christian hands.

Jack B. Tenney

Former chairman of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Tenney is a recent convert to the hate brigade. He lost his seat in the State senate last year after a campaign in which he attacked Jews.

He once called Gerald L. K. Smith a racial agitator, but in 1952 was the vice presidential nominee of Mr. Smith's Christian Nationalist Party. Mr. Smith contributed to his campaign and Mr. Tenney now writes for Mr. Smith's, The Cross and the Flag.

Mr. Tenney also denies that he is anti-Semitic. But he has written three pamphlets attacking Jews; Zion's Fifth Column, Zionist Network, and Zion's Trojan Horse.

Eustace Mullins

Mr. Mullins is a free lancer of hate. A Virginian in his early thirties, his bigoted articles have appeared since 1951 in Common Sense and other hate sheets.

In 1952 an article entitled "Adolf Hitler: An Appreciation" appeared under his byline in the Bulletin of the National Renaissance Party, since branded by the Un-American Activities Committee as "neo-Fascist."

Mr. Mullins worked briefly for the Library of Congress as a photographic assistant. He was let out in 1952 after Library officials learned of his bias.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 5, 1955]

HATE, INC.

(By Jack Steele)

THE RELIGIOUS BIGOTS SPOUT THE SAME LINE

Prejudice is a disease that infects people of every religion, creed, and race.

There is no common denominator to help classify the sources—any more than the targets—of the voices of bigotry now being raised in the United States.

Individual Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are among those who cook up hate and abuse, just as these groups are among its victims.

A Protestant bigot, Edward James Smythe, is credited with this bit of doggerel which illustrates how the freebooters of scurrility attack every other group and then cloak their hate with some real or imagined menace:

"God bless America.
The Jews own it.
The Catholics run it.
The Negroes enjoy it.
The Protestants founded it."
But the Communists will destroy it.

The hate fanatics use religion as others do patriotism and anticommunism as a cover for their bigotry. One hater, Elizabeth Dilling, even invented the alias of the Reverend Frank Woodruff Johnson as a byline for some of her "literature."

Here are several of the fanatics who are spreading suspicion and loathing today:

Father Leonard A. Feency

An excommunicated Catholic priest, Father Feeney for several years has run noisy hate rallies on the Boston Common with a little band of disciples he calls "slaves of the Immaculate Heart of Mary."

He might be written off as a minor local nuisance except that:

He puts out a vitriolic little sheet The Point which he mails—with or without request—to a growing list of Catholics.

Groups of his followers have sprung up, and have had brushes with the law, in several other eastern cities.

Father Feeney aims his hate at Protestants and the Catholic hierarchy, but mostly at Jews.

A recent issue of The Point denounced the Catholic Church for deserting the "ancient dogma" that all Jews are eternally "cursed" and criticized leading Catholics by name for associating with Jews.

It hailed the Spanish Inquisition as a "glorious institution."

In another issue, Father Feeney—using materials lifted from other hate sheets—sought to label the Jews as "the secret strength of communism." "Jews are behind communism."

Titles of other recent articles in The Point include American Gentile and the Jews, Uncle Sam and the anti-Semites and the Monkeys and the Jews.

The Point often attacks Protestants and protestantism. Last fall it denounced Massachusetts Gov. Christian Herter, Republican, on grounds that he was a Mason. It has suggested that it is an unqualified mortal sin for Catholics to see the movie Martin Luther.

Father Feeney was a gifted author. Once literary editor of the Catholic monthly America he has written pleasant poetry and a widely read little book titled "Fish on Friday."

The Catholic Church has done all in its power to discipline him since he shifted to bigotry.

Archbishop Richard Cushing unfrocked him for preaching the doctrine that there is no salvation for non-Catholics. The Jesuit Order expelled him. The Pope finally excommunicated him.

His headquarters, St. Benedict's Center, once was a study house for Catholic students at Harvard. Now Catholics are forbidden to enter it.

Rev. Gerald B. Winrod

This man ranks close to Gerald L. K. Smith as an old pro. For more than 20 years Winrod has blended bigotry with Protestant evangelism and made it pay handsomely.

He started out attacking Catholics. After a visit to Hitler's Germany in 1935, he took up anti-Semitism. He was linked with most of the prewar hatemongers and was a defendant with them in the sedition mistrial.

In 1940 Reverend Winrod was accused by the House Un-American Activities Committee of joining forces with George Deatherage and others to form a united Fascist movement.

He still operates from Wichita, Kans., an organization he calls The Defenders of the Christian Faith.

During the postwar recession in bigotry, Reverend Winrod soft-pedaled some of his venom. He devoted his monthly Defender magazine—which has an estimated circulation of 100,000—largely to sermons, Sunday school lessons and religious tracts. He went in heavily for plugging alleged cures for cancer and other diseases—cures which some medical authoritics have branded as dubious or worse.

He also began to pay more attention to his Defender Missions, chiefly in Puerto Rico where he operates a seminary and several hundred chapels and puts out a Spanish edition of his magazine called El Defensor Hispanol. He even opened a mission last year in the Near East to evangelize the Arabs.

Reverend Winrod returned to blatant bigotry in the 1952 campaign when he joined the hue and cry of the smearers against President Eisenhower. He charged that Ike was the choice of the international Jewish banking fraternity for President.

Among his fund-raising gimmicks are "prayer-circle letters" mailed to his followers. A recent letter offered to send contributors copies of a brochure by John O. Beaty answering "attacks on him, me, and others calling us members of the Protestant underground."

Rev. Harvey H. Springer

"Cowboy" Springer is another of the flock of Protestant fundamentalists who also preach hate. Since 1935 he has spread evangelism and bigotry from his headquarters, the Baptist Tabernacle at Englewood, Colo., a suburb of Denver.

He is a hellfire and brimstone preacher who often makes evangelical tours of the South. He also is a shrewd businessman who has formed many organizations to foster his activities. They include the Rocky Mountain Evangelistic Association, the Soul Winning Bible Institute, the Protestant Information Bureau, and the American Protestant League.

He operates a 160-acre Christian Youth Roundup Ranch near Denver and has incorporated a $250,000 stock-selling venture for a home for the aged.

Reverend Springer, who is credited with once saying that Catholicism was a worse menace than communism, has developed a split psychosis over Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin.

A recent editorial in his hate sheet The Western Voice developed the theme that a religious controversy was raging over Senator MCCARTHY. One side argued that Senator MCCARTHY is the only barrier against communism, he wrote, and the other that Senator MCCARTHY is a tool of the Pope.

"There is some merit on both sides of the discussion," Reverend Springer wrote, carrying water on two shoulders.

Reverend Springer, constantly has attacked Catholics. For a while he abandoned antisemitism, but recently has been assailing Jews again.

Gerald Smith explained Reverend Springer's change of heart in an article in The Cross and the Flag titled "Prodigal Returns."

He wrote that Reverend Springer, after assuring him years ago he "understood the Jewish problem," later had a resolution adopted in his church condemning antisemitism. Gloating that Reverend Springer

now was "taking swings at Jews again," Mr. Smith added:

"So, God bless you Harvey. Welcome home."

Benjamin H. Freedman

Mr. Freedman is a wealthy, retired cosmetics manufacturer.

His association with hate publicists has been inexplicable and controversial.

He sided with the Arabs in the feud over the creation of the state of Israel.

He has insisted that he is not anti-Semitic but only anti-Zionist, meaning anti-Israel.

He has contributed money and articles to the stridently anti-Semitic hate-sheet Common Sense. And he is widely quoted and praised by some racists—often in an effort to prove they are not anti-Semitic.

Mr. Freedman was the prime mover in the abortive attempt to block confirmation of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg as Assistant Defense Secretary. Active in the same cause were Gerald Smith and Mr. Smith's legislative representative, Wesley Swift.

Mr. Freedman witnessed the statements—alleging that Mrs. Rosenberg once had been a member of a Communist-front group—which induced the Senate Armed Services Committee to reopen hearings on her confirmation. It all turned out to be a flimsy case of mistaken identity.

Under questioning by the committee, Mr. Freedman admitted he had given more than $15,000 to Conde McGinley to finance Common Sense.

He later turned out a longwinded account of his role in the case and, writing in third person, explained his relations with Mr. McGinley as follows:

"In 1948 Freedman met McGinley. They found they had much in common. Freedman became interested in Common Sense as one of the most aggressive organizations fighting Marxism (communism) * * *. Since 1948 Freedman has given unsparingly of his time and effort to increase the circulation of Common Sense and has advanced a small fortune for that purpose."

Mr. McGinley recently returned the compliment in a fund-begging letter in which he lamented that Mr. Freedman was no longer able to help finance Common Sense.

"Mr. Freedman was the pioneer in awakening people to the Zionist conspiracy," Mr. McGinley wrote. "He is one of the few most valuable patriots alive."

Facts Forum Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Facts Forum conducts from month to month a public opinion poll in order to find out what people are thinking about current issues.

From time to time the results of this poll have been published in the Appendix of the RECORD as being of especial interest to the Members of Congress.

I have received the tabulation of the final results of the February poll, which deals with 14 questions, some of which are major issues before the Nation today. All of them, I am sure, will prove stimulating as well as interesting.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that this tabulation be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Percentage Yes
Should we substitute an executive council for the Presidency?	8
Does the United States need constitutional protection from treaty law?	81
Is communism gaining more in cold war than is possible in hot war?	83
Is it really un-American for press, radio, and TV to suppress news?	74
Have we lost control of our Government to unelected officials?	64
Should the public schools accept aid from the Federal Government?	30
Is calling our economic system the free-enterprise system a misnomer?	49
Can America defend itself without allies?	53
Will there be another stock-market crash like 1929?	21
Should we blockade Red China as Senator KNOWLAND recommends?	72
Would one-world government prevent war?	8
Is foreign-aid spending a part of the plan to destroy the United States of America?	67
Did the recent Senate censure hearings change your opinion of Senator MCCARTHY?	7
Are Communists in the United States conniving to promote juvenile delinquency?	83

Price Supports for Basic Commodities

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, regret that the time is limited so that we cannot go into this subject fully and completely. Involved in this amendment is the whole price-support program.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to condemn anyone here. The candy manufacturers want cheap supplies, though they do not promise to pass on to the consumer any savings they might have from reduced peanut prices. It is always quite natural for people to try to secure cheap raw materials or to buy cheap, as they are doing. I suspect it is increased profits they are really interested in. If we here today could have the income, as individuals, that we do have and if the cost of living was like it used to be, we would be well off. It just will not work that way. We are dealing with people when we deal with the farm program. When virtually everything else is protected we cannot leave the farmers' prices or income out without bankrupting him. We left the farmer out until about 20 years ago.

During the period of history of this country when we were leaving agricultural commodities without protection, we were providing minimum wages and protective tariffs for others; and we exhausted one-half of the natural resources of the country. We wore the land out. The farmer's lot was a hard one. The price support program was passed in an effort to assure at least some fair return to the farmer. I think all will agree that only under the farm program have agricultural people been able to live somewhat like others.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, involved here is not peanuts as such. Involved here is a segment of the American people with low incomes, whose livelihood depends upon the growing of peanuts, and a fair return for them. If we do not pass this bill, we make bad matters worse. We would thereby injure the farmer without in any way helping the consumer. The difference to the farmer would be a reduction in his present low income of about 16 percent, but to the purchaser of a bar of candy it would mean only about one mill and there is nothing to show such mill would be passed on to the consumer. You know it would not be.

Farm program opponents are making headway to destroy it. May I say this. Already those farmers, or many of them producing perishable commodities, since section 32 funds are used to support and export their products, believe they have no interest in retaining firm supports on basic commodities. And yet they will later find that agricultural programs even for them will stand or fall with the whole farm program.

If farmers growing peanuts are then separated by this amendment from other farm commodities, then wheat, cotton and the rest will feel the effects, too.

The farm program is essential to the welfare of the Nation. Only by a reasonable income can the farmer put back into the soil a share of what he takes out. His income today is terribly low. The President says we must do something for him. There are only two real ways to help, to increase his acreage and to increase his price. To justify increasing production, we must sell; and the Department of Agriculture won't sell. Then when we try to help even a little bit with price, the administration is here opposing that.

President Eisenhower says we must help the small farmers. These are small farmers with an average of less than $1,500 gross per year income. Now is the time to at least hold what they have.

Life Behind the Iron Curtain—Status of Women in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two columns by May Craig, Washington correspondent for the Guy Gannett newspapers in

Maine, based on her recent trip to Russia, and discussing the status of women in the Soviet Union and the dreary life led by our embassy staff in Moscow, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of May 2, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—BROOD MARES AND BURDEN BEARERS

(By May Craig)

Moscow.—Women do not have equality in Russia, though they tell you so and point to the constitution. Women are the brood mares and the burden bearers. Americans are shocked when they see women doing the heavy work. In the streets middle-aged and old women, bundled in shapeless dirty clothes and big rubber boots with felt tops, do the shoveling of snow, work in the drains, sweep endlessly with the primitive brooms made of twigs tied to a stick.

In the foundry of the Stalin Auto Works, 31 years old, the first plant to make cars in the U. S. S. R., women handled heavy metal forms, at top speed. Piecework (by the group), speedup, lack of safety devices, lack of light, struck me in this plant. Our Marian Martin, who is an expert on industrial safety, would have been appalled to see it. The floor was full of holes, debris stood around, men and women handled forms and even worked with the molten metal without any gloves. I did not see a single pair of heavy-toed shoes. Some few men working with molten metals had goggles, but not the efficient kind we have.

There were a few women with pants, but most wore skirts, though they were short. The clothes were nondescript, though I saw some coveralls in the auto-assembly line that looked alike, including one woman, who wore gloves. The women's clothes were dirty, usually a sweater or jacket underneath, because it was cold, a soiled cotton dress, scanty and short, and some sort of black canvas apron. Their shoes were also nondescript, worn, usually flat slippers, entirely unfit for standing and walking in heavy work on the broken concrete floors, or to support the feet. All wore the kerchiefs on their heads, which are the universal headgear of women here. Seldom does one see a hat; even the few you see, mostly on guides, are not becoming or stylish and are dark, dull colors.

The auto-assembly line and the bicycle line seem efficient. I asked the manager, who had been in the United States, what his annual production is, and got the usual evasive answer. Through the interpreter he said a truck came off the line every 5 minutes and a bicycle every minute. That made 192 trucks a day, the interpreter said, and there were 300 working days a year. They work 6 days a week, 8 hours a day in this "workers' paradise."

They make only commercial trucks here, no military. A bicycle sells for equivalent of $150, but since the rate of exchange is so exorbitant this is not a true selling price. A girl who works on the bicycles would have to work 20 days to buy one, that is a better sample. Most girls on the bicycle assembly line had stools to sit on, but they worked fast. They had compressed air tools to rivet. After the frame of the bicycle was together, of course they worked standing. The manager knew all about the English bicycles displacing the American type in the United States.

There are 35,000 employees in this plant which also makes refrigerators, though we did not see that department. The manager said they had nurseries for working mothers, and schools not only for children but for the workers who wanted to study. Many adults are studying, manager said.

They live in adjacent apartment houses, usually two rooms to a family with a small kitchen and toilet. Buildings are a good many stories high and have elevators. Rents are low and there is free medical services.

They do not either import or export bicycles. As I came away I saw edges of the stone steps broken away, making accident hazards. I did not see a single fluorescent light in the plant, though they had them in the Pravda newspaper plant.

Everywhere there are statues and pictures of Lenin and Stalin. This is often not the grim Stalin in uniform that we are familiar with. There are paintings everywhere, including airports, of a Father Stalin, smiling, in white clothes, standing in a rural scene, or with idealized factory line in the distance. He looks up and away, to the future; sometimes he is with children, benign and gentle.

Everywhere we go, the camera devotees of our party are told what they can take pictures of and what not. There seems no rhyme or reason to what they can take and what not. Since we are strictly supervised everywhere we go I have seen nothing that had any security value, so we might as well have taken all. There are no maps of the city; no maps of Russia. Our tour director was even worried because some of the editors bought ordinary atlas maps before we got into the Soviet. None of the airline maps show Russia in detail. There is no telephone directory—unless you know the number you are out of luck. The operator at this hotel did get the American Embassy for us without our knowing the number. These are little things that surpirse Americans, accustomed to our free and easy life. Overseas telephone messages can get through, with luck, and are fairly clear.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of May 3, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—YANKS IN RUSSIA HAVE A DREARY LIFE

(By May Craig)

Moscow.—Our Embassy staff has a dreary life here. Most of them speak Russian in some degree, some fluently. We are fortunate in having as ambassador, Charles E. Bohlen, a career diplomat, who knows Russia and the satellite area well. The representatives of the free nations have only the most formal contact with the U. S. S. R. officials. They see them when they officially request it; they see them rarely at an official function.

Our Embassy staff is especially isolated because so few Americans come. There are some British businessmen who come hoping for contracts, but since the cancellation of most of the contracts made by Malenkov for consumer goods, this hope has waned. We are the only Americans in Moscow now. One morning when we first came, and two of us were wrestling with how to make the floor matron understand that there was no heat in our bathrooms, two young men came down the stairs and said in oh-how-welcome American: "Can we help you?" They were students from Columbia University who had been studying Russian and had a month's visa to travel in the U. S. S. R.

The ambassador gave a cocktail party for our editors' group at the handsome Embassy, with marble columns and floors—and it was warm. Moment we get to an American place we know it—because it is warm. Naval attaché at the Embassy is Capt. William M. Sweetser, of Portland, who has four sisters living there and in Cape Elizabeth. He will be coming home next year and expects to be stationed in Boston for a tour.

Military and naval attachés are regarded by the Communists with especial suspicion, because the party line is that the United States is a warmonger, plotting the destruction of the peace-loving Communist world. At the party were several American newspapermen—there are only five here—and a few Russians. They are often invited, but the host never knows whether any Russian will show up. Of course, these were not top people, at the cocktail party, only those having to do with protocol and information. The staff were all eager for news from home, real news, not just what is in the papers they get and it is always a battle between them, hungry to talk about home, and us, here to get foreign information.

The Ambassador was very cordial and said he would do anything he could to help us—which isn't much because we are strictly supervised in everything we do and we never did see any official of the U. S. S. R. Government.

The Ambassador chuckled as he added: "If any of you get arrested, I'll see that we write a good stiff note about it." There was an undertone to this, however, because we know, back home, that about all we can do, except go to war, is write notes to this adamant regime when they down our planes, imprison American citizens, or commit other acts of international discourtesy.

With it all, we have fun. This is a very congenial group and being in this hostile country we tend to draw closer together. While we complain about no heat, poor food and service and plumbing, the lumpy beds, the eternal evasions and delays that attend our requests for what we want to see and where we go, we have fun. We chatter and laugh in a way that makes the Russians look at us in surprise. The faces here are all alike—stolid, sober, anxious, enduring. Once, on the subway, I saw a girl talking to a young man and they smile the smile of every young man and maid. Our guides smile, but that is a professional smile.

Our last dinner in Moscow we celebrated and the waiters, whose sketchy English was matter of fun, as our struggles to talk in Russian, German, and French, joined the hilarity. They produced a baked Alaska for the Americans to replace the inevitable vanilla ice cream. Everybody drank toasts in "wodka," as we learned to pronounce vodka—I am not much of a drinker, so the one small glass lasted through all the toasts.

Waiters will accept tips without hesitation, but we were told not to offer money to the help on the floor because that is not good party manners. I left some small toilet articles I did not need, such as nail polish, soap, Kleenex, small tube of shampoo, and the maid was pleased, though I had to tell her in sign language what they were. The embassies where we have visited in our trip have helped us with little things from the commissary when we ran short. Cigarettes, toothpaste, band-aid, and such, for which we paid, of course. One editor from Texas wore high-heeled, pointed-toe Texas boots which made a great hit when he tucked his pants into the tops and wore the astrakhan Russian cap he got from a Russian in return for his 10-gallon Texas sombrero—but the shoes gave him a blistered foot after he had walked a few hundred miles through museums, cathedrals, and palaces, so the band-aid helped. When the Russians wear us out in this sort of thing, it uses the time we might try to spend seeing officials and other places.

Home Economics Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following resolution adopted by the Ohio Home Economics

Association at its annual meeting on April 23, 1955:

The Ohio Home Economics Association with a membership of 1,014 members, in session at its annual meeting in Toledo, April 23, 1955, goes on record as strongly protesting the realinment of home economics research in the USDA as set forth in Administrative Order 101.1 issued by Dr. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator.

This protest is made after long and careful consideration by home economists to Dr. Shaw's directive: "that you (Dr. Steibeling) proceed at once to shift the emphasis in research in human nutrition and home economics so as to strengthen our program in foods and nutrition."

We agree that foods and nutrition need to be strengthened but not at the expense of "discontinuance of research in Home Economics Research Branch relating to operating characteristics and performance requirements of commercially produced household equipment and appliances and the preparation of popular and semipopular publications on the selection, care, and use of such goods", "the discontinuance of research in the Home Economics Research Branch relating to selection, design, construction, maintenance, and household reconditioning of clothing and household textiles articles, and the preparation of popular and semipopular publications on the subject."

Since home economics research is located in the Department of Agriculture, the Department currently carries responsibility for supporting all phases of home economics, not only those directly related to utilization of agriculture products. We therefore request, in the best interest of the public, that the Secretary of Agriculture call upon a group of homemakers and professional home economists to review this surprise action and to make plans to: (1) restore the current aspects of the program being discontinued, (2) review the use of the funds in the best interest of homemakers, (3) formulate a long time plan for expanding the home economics research program.

We want to clarify the Agriculture Research Administrator's statements that there is misunderstanding of the issue on the part of home economists. We understand the problem, and we protest the attempt to confuse the issue and make it appear that the complete elimination of research in certain important aspects of homemaking is "of great importance to home economists and to the Nation's families."

We also respectfully urge that Members of Congress study and consider where an adequate program of this important work of aiding millions of homemakers can and should be carried on in the Federal Government.

MARY ELIZABETH HUCK,
President, the Ohio Fuel Gas Co., Columbus.

DOROTHY ELLEN JONES,
Vice President, the Cleveland Board of Education, Cleveland.

BETTY LOU KOOGLER BRADY,
Secretary, Homemaker, 640 Parknoll Road, Dayton.

LILLIAN NELSON,
Treasurer, Marietta College, Marietta.

Dr. HAZEL PRICE,
News Editor, Homemaker, Westerville.

Dr. DOROTHY SCOTT,
State Councilor, the Ohio State University, Columbus.

Members of the executive committee of the Ohio Home Economics Association.

The Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the postal pay raise bill in this instance has been made an instrumentality to test the average Member of Congress and to determine the mettle of which he is made. Since the beginning of this 84th Congress an effort has been made to reduce the pay raise from the 10 percent across-the-board proposal, with a retroactive provision, as advocated by myself in the House, and by my good friends Senators JOHNSTON and NEELY in the Senate. I have done everything down to the point of compromising with my conscience on certain provisions which I deemed essential to the welfare of postal employees. I believe my original thoughts were even more liberal than the provisions contained in the Johnston-Neely bill, but for the sake of uniformity and acceleration in passage and of collaborating with the distinguished Senators I introduced an identical measure in the House.

Now it was not sufficient for the so-called administration spokesmen and the White House to express disapproval and make known the President's displeasure. Nearly all, if not all, Republican leaders, and I am sorry to say a few, very few, Democrats have used the threat of a Presidential veto to discourage pay raise proponents. They have passed this on to House Members with such absolute assurances as to indicate direct expressions of the adverse attitude of the White House; namely, to the effect that the President would veto any bill above, as I recall, 6.5 percent, and eventually I believe this was raised to 7.6 percent.

At any rate, the Senate had passed a 10-percent raise with a retroactive provision and other features, which it sent to the House for action. The House, without any doubt on the score, declared itself fearlessly and positively by voting upon the three amendments of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and approving them. One bore directly upon the reclassification feature, one was on retroactivity, and the other was to raise the amount of the percentage increase to 8.2 percent. There was no doubt about where the House stood on these questions nor was there any doubt as to where the Democratic and Republican Parties stood on the questions. The Republicans in the House almost to a man and woman, some of whom actually voted for their own 50-percent pay raise, alined themselves with the enemies of the faithful and devoted workers who serve the public so thoroughly and well under circumstances which are frequently not the best. The Democrats, on the other hand, true to form, voted in support of a fair and reasonable increase and stood by the postal workers, as they will by the classified employees of this same Government of ours when that question comes up for disposition a little later. This rankles in my heart and stimulates belligerency to do combat against the determined minority and the White House, and including President Eisenhower, all of whom have stood in the way of a reasonable increase for Government workers, and reaches the point where I am ready to accept the Presidential challenge and the threat of veto by putting it to a test.

Under the circumstances, there was only one thing which the House and Senate conferees could do as regards the amount of the pay increase. They had to take the maximum under the Senate bill and the maximum permitted under the House bill and compromise between the two figures. The figure of 8.8 percent is the total provided for and submitted to both Houses by their conferees as an essential part of the conference report. The House conferees, in fact, had no choice or latitude any more than did the conferees of the Senate. The rule of conference is to compromise between the dictum of both Houses. I have served on too many conferences not to know, and the House conferees of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, too, are familiar with this rule.

I resent wholeheartedly the use of a veto threat by the Executive, and that applies to any President whether of my party or not. I am positive that the veto can and will be overridden, if it occurs, and I would wager that the President will not dare to veto the measure. It is a parliamentary trick and threat which altogether too frequently boomerangs against the White House or presidential spokesman. It is one thing for the President to oppose and to plead, but it is quite another for him to repeatedly threaten the legislative branch which, too, has its responsibility. I take my responsibility as the Representative of the 15th District of Michigan very seriously and I attach great dignity to the course which I pursue in legislating for the benefit of the people.

I have held for years that it was the disposition of Congress to lag behind the needs of the workers, and this is not said in any derogatory sense because the demands altogether too frequently are excessive. The pie is only so big and the number of cuts per pie are limited. It is the responsibility of Congress to try as best it can to be liberal with Federal employees, with its wards, and all others who must come to Congress with their problems be they financial or otherwise, and Congress must cut the cloth according to a reasonable pattern. The budget does not always control. It is not the final word. Thus when we deal with an emergency and it concerns a balanced budget or a balanced ration for the hungry we must provide first against starvation. If it is a matter of the Nation's safety and security the budget again is secondary to survival. In this instance, with the postal and classified employees it is a question of trying to meet a condition and solving the problem and finding a means and a method of overcoming any deficit. I am willing to go to any

extent necessary to balance the budget, whatever the legitimate means may require.

The Presidental action as regards the pay bill which he vetoed after the 83d Congress went home was wanton, premeditated, distasteful, and unjustified, because Congress, too, has its responsibilities. The President could have vetoed the bill before adjournment despite the fact that pay action bills were delayed until the very last. I shall always remember this action and point out that that is not my way of legislating nor arriving at a responsible understanding between the executive and the legislative branches.

Price Supports for Basic Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there are several things that we need to consider in connection with the farm bill. Price supports for farm commodities were written into the law by this Congress only about 20 years ago. The price support program was the result of a bipartisan effort, because all saw the need. It was an effort in this country of ours under dire necessity to give some degree of protection to those engaged in taking care of this country and in growing farm commodities. The Congress realized then and we need to realize now, that by law, we provide bargaining rights and minimum wages for labor. We give to the railroads and to business interests the right to reflect, in the rates that they charge, the costs of operation plus a profit. We protect many other industries. About 20 years ago it was recognized that we had to give some protection to those that were engaged in farming, to see that the high cost of other things that were used in our life, most of them protected by law, did not result in a continuing wasting away of our soil and natural resources and the destruction of our farmers. Price supports are tied to the effort to see that a reasonable share of the national income goes to those engaged in agriculture.

In that same law providing price supports for farm commodities, while we supported these commodities at a certain level and would reflect such price in domestic sales, it was provided that they be sold in the world markets at competitive prices. Our CCC losses and, yes, our reductions in acreage have come largely because we would not sell. I do not know a single case—and this is supported by the testimony of even the Department of Agriculture, including the Secretary—there is not a place in the farm-support program where the major cost has not been storage and carrying charges accumulated during periods when we did not offer the commodities for sale in world trade at truly competitive prices, as authorized and contemplated by law. The Secretary of Agriculture has authority to sell all these commodities in world trade and to make the price right. It is because we would not make our sales prices competitive that we have held American commodities in our own hands and paid this high storage. When offered in world trade most commodities have been offered at a higher price than would move them, all by decision of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation. That shortsighted policy has resulted in the high cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation operation. The Department now recognizes the effect of this policy. The Secretary of Agriculture only recently said that foreign production was increasing under our convenient price umbrella. But Mr. Benson said he would not change his policies prior to July 31.

Assistant Secretary Paalberg in a speech March 18, said the following:

We are competitive pricewise in the world cotton market only intermittently, in a series of unpredictable interludes. There is no better phrase to describe our position than the phrase used by the cotton industry itself—we are the residual supplier.

* * * * *

There is no question but that our pricing policies have given aid and comfort to our competition.

* * * * *

The United States, which now produces only about 40 percent of the world's cotton, cannot, by regulating its own production, satisfactorily determine prices and quantities for the entire world.

2. The three elements needed for effective selling are quality, merchandising, and a price that meets competition. We cannot, by improving quality and increasing our merchandising efforts, fully compensate for our inability to be competitive pricewise.

* * * * *

I might liken the cotton industry to a stool which needs three legs to stand upright—quality, merchandising, and realistic pricing. It can't stand permanently on just two legs, no matter how strong they're built.

These statements clearly show an awerness on your part of what is happening to us under present policy. And yet this policy is being continued by the Department, notwithstanding the provision contained in the CCC charter for sales in world trade on a truy competitive basis.

And yet Mr. Benson and the Department have authority now to make the prices competitive. Acreage, and the amount or volume of farm production, is tied to the movement of commodities. It is tied to the supply on hand and the supply that we sell.

The Department, by its own decision, in effect has agreed to hold what it has and not sell, for if you don't make the price competitive you don't sell. And then they count those commodities and reduce the farmer's acreage down, down, down. I say to you that the report that was issued by the subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee in the Senate quoted by the minority leader is erroneous. It is true as the minority leader says, the senior Senator from my State was chairman of that subcommittee. However, in my judgment he and the majority of his subcommittee are wrong.

There is no justification for calling on the farmers to vote for lower support prices just to get the department to sell for increased acreage must come from sales.

Support levels and acreage are two different things. Acreage depends upon the movement of cotton, the sale of cotton, and the sale of other farm commodities. Only in the sale and movement of these commodities can you increase acreage; and the Department won't sell because it will not use its authority to offer competitively in world trade. But to say to the American farmer that he has to agree to take a lower support price, before the Secretary will sell, is demanding a contribution from the farmer in order to get a change in policy by the Department. Price supports, in turn, are based upon efforts under the law to assure some fair return to the farmer.

Only a few weeks ago it was pointed out that the farmers of America have an annual income of less than one-half the income the rest of the population has in this country. The records show that in the next year farm income will fall by more than $1 billion. The national income in the same period will increase by more than $20 billion.

And yet under those conditions we are asked to have the farmer agree to accept even less of the national income. Why? In order to get the Department of Agriculture to change its policy. Its present policy is to hold and not sell. They have the authority to sell and they admit the ill effects of holding our commodities above world competitive prices, by which we provide an umbrella for the rest of the world; and believe me, our American investors are taking full advantage of such policy. They are expanding their production in foreign countries. Why? Not because of high supports in the United States, because if you supported at 125 percent of parity, the Secretary of Agriculture could sell competitively in world markets. And if you reduced price supports to 50 percent of parity you would be in the same predicament we face now, as long as the policy of not selling competitively which is now in existence, continues.

Mr. Benson says he is not going to change his policy before July 31. He says that it is ruining us, but he says he will not change it. He is not going to offer these commodities competitively. You say perhaps we could not sell them. Well, we got them last year to offer some minor commodities for sale in world trade on a competitive basis. What happened? We sold them for dollars, 453 million American dollars. Foreign countries do have the dollars. They do not buy in our market, because we hold our prices above foreign prices, but not because of your support law. Your support fixes the amount of payment for these commodities that goes to your farmers, but in no way restricts the price at which we can sell in foreign markets.

In trying to help in this pitiful situation, your President pointed out only a week or so ago that many, many farmers have less than a reasonable income on which to live, pointing out that the Congress needed to do something to relieve those small farmers. But here we find his administration, with his approval, reducing their income. It will help little to have more county agents or to lend the farmer more money if he cannot sell for a reasonable price. The pile-up of commodities in the hands of the CCC was and is unnecessary. I will say that I agree with the President as to the deplorable condition of many farmers; however, I differ with the recommendations of our President and of this administration to help the small farmer. I say that to give him a little more credit, if he has some outside income, will not help him much; to give him another county agent and to do some more research is not going to help him too much. You may differ with me on that, but I know you do not help the farmer when you reduce his prices at a time when his income is so pitifully low as to get recognition of his plight by the President of the United States and secures a recommendation for cure, even though such cure will not cure.

I say to you that the farmer's income now is far too low. I say that you should sustain the former law, to give him at least, for that which he grows, 90 percent—of what? Of the average comparative income in the base period 1909–1914. Is that too much at this time when Mr. Benson told me: "Yes, I am for the increase to 90 cents an hour in the minimum wage"?

I am not attacking that here. I say to you that if by law you are going to give protection to labor in its bargaining rights, if by law you are going to give them assurance of a minimum hourly wage, if by law you are going to have protective tariffs and give the right to monopolies and others to include in their prices the costs that go into their production, plus a profit, certainly you must keep something in the law that says that a fair share of the national income shall go to the American farmer. And when this administration and the President recognize that fair share is not going to them today, you do not cure the farmer's problem by reducing his prices so that even less would go to him in this and subsequent years.

May I repeat, you say to the American farmer: "If you want more acreage and more production, if you want your commodities to move in world trade, we are not going to change the policy of this administration and of this Department of Agriculture unless you agree to take less price for what you grow."

The only argument I can see for Mr. Benson's approach, and I give him the right to his opinion, is that somehow, somewhere, he thinks a farmer could live and let his prices go down to where they were competitive worldwide, but we know he cannot do that when his costs are fixed by other things beyond his control.

Let me repeat, more than $4 billion worth of commodities the Commodity Credit Corporation has, have not and are not now offered for sale in world markets for dollars; yet the authority exists. There is no excuse for paying out this money in storage costs when we could sell the commodities for dollars. Do not tell me they do not want to sell them because they would take losses or because they do not want to lose money; because at the same time they would not sell, they are running around over the world trying to give them away and paying $700,000 per day storage. Certainly you lose more by giving something away than if you sell it for dollars in world trade.

The farmers' share of the national income in 1946 was 12 percent. In 1948 it had dropped to 11.6 percent, in 1951 to 9.4 percent, and in 1954 to 7.2 percent of the national income. The outlook is that it will drop even further this year.

During that period profits and dividends of American business have gone from $8.3 billions to $17.8 billions last year, and a probable increase of $19.6 billions this year is in sight.

Mr. Chairman, with the administration recommending legislation to add to the farmers' costs, there are only two ways for the farmer to be helped under present conditions, first, to increase his volume, second, increase his price—for volume times price less cost is the farmer's income.

The administration is recommending increased costs.

Volume is dependent on selling his production, and on that the Secretary of Agriculture would not offer $4 billions worth of commodities on hand for sale competitively, as authorized by law, but counts the commodities to reduce acreage and thereby reduce volume.

All that is left is price and now we find our friend, the majority leader, opposing our efforts to at least help a little on price.

The farmers' plight is becoming serious on the farm. I think it is serious at the White House and at the Department of Agriculture. It looks like it is becoming serious in the Congress.

Remember, a break in farm income has led the way to every depression. Sooner or later the farm situation will be reflected throughout the country.

All farmers and farm groups are interested in the whole farm program, but the businessmen, organized labor, and all the rest have a real stake in his welfare, too. I hope they will realize it before we have another 1929.

The Proposed Austrian Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to the Secretary of State:

Hon. JOHN F. DULLES,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am taking the privilege of including in this letter to you brief remarks made by me on the floor of the House today in connection with the proposed Austrian treaty.

I am concerned, as I am sure you can well imagine, with this country approving language as found in the so-called article XVI, which will permit in any way the bringing about the shocking circumstances which developed in Europe following World War II, when so many thousands of anti-Communist prisoners and escapees were forcibly returned to Russia and torture and death.

I am aware of the appearance of the word "voluntary" in the language of the proposed article XVI, but knowing as we do the long history of the Soviet attitude toward these people the word is a mockery. To disband and penalize committees or groups of men and women in these cantonments, who have expressed anti-Communist beliefs; to open without protection or reservation these cantonments to committees or commissions of Russian "agents," can only produce a repetition of many sad and unsavory events of the past under like or similar agreements.

You are aware, of course, of the current forceful propaganda drive by all-Soviet to induce the return of many of these persons to their homelands, with the resulting propaganda victory to the eastern bloc in the eyes of the world, if these desperate, frustrated, and disillusioned people should return.

In this feeling of desolation which overwhelms these refugees, coupled with anything but proper treatment they have received from the western nations, they are entitled to be protected from inducements and blandishments of Soviet propagandists operating under the cloak of the language originally proposed in article XVI, of the Austrian Treaty.

I trust, with your full awareness of the circumstances, you will see fit to direct the spokesman in the Vienna conferences for the United States, to be alert to the dangers and the subject matter of this communication.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

Tabulation of Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent out a 12-question poll to 28,000 Union County, N. J., citizens requesting their views on issues presently facing the Nation and the Congress. The response to my questionnaire was most gratifying and is, I feel, a graphic demonstration of the vitality of our democracy. I have found the questionnaire to be an invaluable instrument for establishing contact between myself and my constituents and would urge every elected Representative to utilize this means of ascertaining his constituents' views on issues.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the results of this poll be included in the Appendix of the RECORD and would like to point out in particular the re-

sponse to my first question concerning reciprocal-trade legislation. I think it most important to bring to the attention of the Congress that a typically eastern industrial area indicates such an overwhelming interest in and support of continuation of the reciprocal-trade program.

The results of the poll are as follows:

1. Do you favor the continuation of the reciprocal trade program of negotiating with other nations to jointly lower tariffs as a means of expanding world trade? Yes, 83 percent; no, 15 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

2. Do you favor granting statehood to Alaska? Yes, 82 percent; no, 15 percent; undecided, 3 percent. Do you favor granting statehood to Hawaii? Yes, 81 percent; no, 17 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

3. In the light of the present world crisis, as well as our budgetary situation, do you believe the proposed cutback of the Army is warranted? Yes, 38 percent; no, 54 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

4. The last pay raise granted to postal and other Government workers was in 1951. Do you believe their salaries should be increased by: 5 percent, 27 percent; 10 percent, 49 percent; 15 percent, 16 percent; not at all, 6 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

5. Do you believe the present minimum wage should be increased from 75 cents an hour to: 90 cents an hour, 22 percent; $1 an hour, 35 percent; $1.15 an hour, 5 percent; $1.25 an hour, 18 percent; not at all, 17 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

6. The present immigration law operates in favor of immigration from northern European countries and against immigrants from southern Europe and other parts of the world. Do you believe this law should be altered to eliminate this discrimination? Yes, 53 percent; no, 40 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

7. Do you favor the continuance of the "point 4" technical assistance program which extends technical help to underdeveloped areas of the world? Yes, 78 percent; no, 18 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

8. Do you favor the proposal which would establish universal military training? Yes, 70 percent; no, 22 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

9. Do you favor the establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission to insure that discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color is not practiced in employment? Yes, 69 percent; no, 29 percent undecided, 2 percent.

10. Do you favor continued United States support of the various activities of the United Nations? Yes, 78 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

11. Assuming the continuance of the present operations of our Government and the present economic conditions in the Nation, do you favor an across-the-board lowering of the personal income tax? Yes, 42 percent; no, 55 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

Freedom of Association in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, with headquarters in Brussels, Belgium, asking for the release of all imprisoned trade-union officials in Venezuela who have not been accused of criminal acts and permit them to leave that country:

WORKERS' REPRESENTATIVE AT CARACAS CONFERENCE CALLS FOR FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION IN VENEZUELA

A "fervent appeal" to the Government of Venezuela to allow trade unions to operate freely in that country was made by A. Vermeulen, representative of the workers' group of the governing body of the International Labor Organization, at the opening of the session of the ILO Petroleum Committee in Caracas yesterday.

He called, in particular, on the Government of Venezuela to:

1. Release all imprisoned trade union officials not accused of criminal acts and allow them to leave the country if they so wish;

2. Submit without delay the cases of others to legal investigation;

3. Declare that it will promote the development of genuine freedom of association along the lines laid down by the International Labor Organization.

The speaker recalled that the ILO had received many complaints over the last 6 years about the violation of freedom of association in Venezuela and that the situation had been investigated on the spot by missions from the ILO and from the ICFTU, both of which had found the complaints substantially justified. As long ago as 1952 the Venezuelan Government had agreed to release imprisoned trade unionists. Nevertheless, many are still in jail without having been tried, and Mr. Vermeulen cited the following names: P. B. Perez Salinas, president of the Confederation of Labor of Venezuela; R. Quijada, president of the Farm Workers' Federation; L. Hurtado, secretary of the Confederation of Labor; and I. Ordaz, A. Hernandez, and H. Borrome, founders and leaders of the Oilworkers' Federation.

Mr. Vermeulen made it clear that the workers' group of the ILO governing body had been opposed to the holding of the conference in Caracas because of the lack of trade-union freedom in Venezuela, and that the same attitude had been adopted by the ICFTU, the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers, the International Federation of Petroleum Workers, and the democratic oilworkers' trade unions in the principal producing and refining countries, which were boycotting the conference. As a member of the ILO governing body he had considered it his duty to attend the conference, but took the opportunity of voicing the feelings of the free trade-union movement in the manner outlined above.

Heads I Win, Tails You Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, labor leaders—some sincere and patriotic, others self-seeking—who have taken over the Democratic Party, delight in nurturing discord in the Republican Party.

Their main objective is to become and remain the dominant political party of the country, administering their own theories of political economy—the main thought in which seems to be forcing employers to create and maintain a job at adequate pay for all who desire to work, plus unemployment and social-security compensation which will prevent anyone, anywhere, any time, suffering discomfort.

More of every good thing is unquestionably the objective of practically all of us, but some still realize that someone, somewhere, sometime, must work if any of us is to have anything.

But, back to an example of how some writers for labor publications avail themselves of every opportunity to create discord in the Republican Party, which has not yet been taken over by labor leaders, note editorial comment by Willard Shelton in the April 29—current—issue of Labor's Daily:

EISENHOWER AND KNOWLAND

(By Willard Shelton)

There's a legend floating around that it is still unpopular to criticize President Eisenhower, whose individual standing with the people is alleged to remain incredibly high. Would it be too much to suggest that the President, personally and regardless of popularity, faces an inescapable obligation to do something about Senator KNOWLAND, his theoretical floor leader in the Senate?

KNOWLAND issued another blast this week at the Eisenhower-Dulles announcement that we were prepared to do business with Red China, to try to negotiate a cease-fire in the Formosa Strait, with or without the acquiescence of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government-in-exile.

Dulles came to this position belatedly and only after he and the President had been pushed by Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The State Department made itself ridiculous by its sour first response to the soft words of Chou En-lai, Red China's premier.

Dulles had to tell a news conference that he had been out of touch, that our position was being altered, and that our real response was different from what we had originally said.

The unhappy fact is that GEORGE, a Senator, has for practical purposes been the American Secretary of State for the past several months.

It was GEORGE who pushed through the reckless resolution giving Eisenhower advance congressional approval—a blank check—for whatever war he might decide to fight on and close by the mainland of China. "What is the alternative?" GEORGE cried, and because of his great prestige he carried the day.

Now it is GEORGE speaking up for a Big Four conference, and GEORGE who says that we should accept Chou En-lai's offers to negotiate, and because GEORGE has spoken Eisenhower and Dulles find the courage to agree with him.

Something must still be done by the administration about KNOWLAND.

The Senator from California has been raging around for more than a year, threatening to resign his leadership in the Senate and campaign through the country if Eisenhower does thus and so about Far Eastern policy, or if the United Nations does thus and so.

KNOWLAND is barely polite toward the President. He openly doubts the wisdom of drafting Eisenhower for a second GOP nomination. He sarcastically proposes that we split mainland China in two, giving half to the Reds who already hold it all and half back to Chiang, who was chased away once. He spies appeasement in every proposal for negotiation.

KNOWLAND is technically the elected floor leader of Republicans in the Senate, and technically speaks for them rather than the White House. But it is impossible for a

President to get along with a Senate official spokesman who constantly challenges the White House.

Eisenhower and KNOWLAND can't both lead the Republican Party, and Eisenhower and Dulles cannot constantly depend on GEORGE and the Democrats to rescue them from KNOWLAND.

Let's ignore the matter of Eisenhower's popularity and suggest that he act like a President. The next time KNOWLAND blasts him, let him blast back, even at the expense of daring the California Senator to carry out his frequent threat to resign and wage open political war.

American Bases in Iberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article of David Lawrence: United States Has Real Friend in Spain—The Fact of American Bases in Iberia Might Well Forestall World War III:

UNITED STATES HAS REAL FRIEND IN SPAIN—THE FACT OF AMERICAN BASES IN IBERIA MIGHT WELL FORESTALL WORLD WAR III

MADRID, May 4.—If all allies on this side of the Iron Curtain worked as cordially together and as understandingly and as enthusiastically as Spain and the United States do today, the chances of preventing a third world war would be immeasurably improved.

For only after surveying the wonderful strategic setup and the plans for an even bigger build-up in the future does one realize that here in Spain a relatively inconsequential investment of funds by the United States already has brought results far in excess of what the American people may ever get out of the other countries into which billions of Marshall plan aid were poured in the last several years.

To understand the strategic value of American bases in Spain it is necessary to take into account two possibilities. One is that, due to internal political pressure, some day neither Britain nor France will—unless there is a direct attack on their cities—permit American airmen to retaliate with atom bombs flown from bases on their soil even though some American city may have already been destroyed by bombs. The other is that American airplanes starting from Spanish bases can carry on strategic air missions into the heartland of the enemy areas and refuel or come to rest at points in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East.

But what is also important is that Spain is to our bases in England what Texas is to our forward units in Montana and the Canadian defense line. Here in a sunny climate, where all-year-round operations are possible, the big supply and support depots of the future will be available to the American Air Forces operating throughout Europe.

But, in addition to the tremendous value of Spain to the United States Air Force and the Strategic Air Command, there is another advantage, which the ports on the long Spanish coast lines at the western end of the Mediterranean give to the United States Navy, whose aircraft carriers must refuel and take on supplies at convenient locations. The opportunity presents itself for joint tactical operations in the Mediterranean, with the United States Air Force and the Navy working in cooperation.

As American military missions become firmly established here—and they have moved in quietly and efficiently—there is a sense of real security achieved for the American people. The planning began when the late Adm. Forest Sherman, under the Truman administration, came here to lay the groundwork for what has since become perhaps the most successful piece of two-nation cooperation on a military level that the modern world has seen.

Spain, of course, is not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and sometimes one wonders whether fate has not, after all, decided for us that under a two-nation partnership there would be less red tape and less opportunity for the injection of what are sometimes frustrating problems of a political nature than might be the case under the cumbersome setup of a 19-nation group.

Americans can breathe easier because Spain has opened up big areas of land for airfields and has generously bestowed military advantage after advantage to make possible a real defense operation; ready for instant action. It has cost Spain more than has been received here, and this is something that ought to engage the earnest attention of the Washington authorities. Here economic aid, for example, is reckoned in terms of 30 millions—not billions—and the annual amount should really be at least twice that sum, because there is no question that America got far the better of the bargain in the way the military agreements were set up. The Spanish officials are much too proud to make a point of it, but many Americans feel the United States could well afford to pay fully for the many tangible things that have been given here. Thus, for instance, the American military mission occupies a lot of office space rent free. One wonders in what other allied country any such generous gesture has ever been made by a government.

There is little talk of war here, and the newspapers lately have been publishing dispatches from America and elsewhere about the hopes being expressed that world war III is more remote. But it is a fortunate thing that no effort of a defense nature has been relaxed in this enormous base. It is precisely because the Communists know what can be done by America with airpower based in this country that they may never risk provocation to a major war.

The John Day Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here two editorials, one from the Union Bulletin, Walla Walla, Wash., and one from the Capitol Journal published at Salem, Oreg. Both of these editorials concern H. R. 5789, legislation calling for the construction of the multiple-purpose John Day Dam on the Columbia River, and are so excellent that I want all of my colleagues to have the benefit of reading them. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From the Capitol Journal of Salem, Oreg.]

FINALLY—A REAL "GIVEAWAY"

We've heard much here in Oregon about giveaways, most of 'em phoney, such as "giveing" the States the tideland oil rights they'd been acknowledge owners of for nearly a century before Harold Ickes thought up a scheme to transfer title to the Federal Government.

But at last we are confronted with a genuine giveaway, and right here close to home. Three Northwest public utility companies—Portland General Electric, Pacific Power & Light, and Washington Water Power—have announced willingness to put up $273 million of the cost of the proposed $310 million John Day Dam on the Columbia. The Government would advance $37 million for flood control, fish ladders, etc., which is a governmental, not a corporation job.

Where's the giveaway in this? It is in the fact that the Government will own the entire dam. The corporations will take their money back in electric power. They gain the further advantage, which they will have to pass on to their 600,000 customers in the Northwest, of exemption from property tax on this huge investment because it will be in the Government's name. This is presumably why they prefer to let the Government own it.

Why shouldn't they prefer a Government dam such as the public power people constantly demand? We see two reasons: (1) There is no telling when Congres will make that much money available, and (2) under the public power preference clause the current from a straight-out Government Dam might all go to public power agencies, leaving the 600,000 customers of the 3 privately owned companies in the relative position of a Negro down South, as second-class citizens of the Government to which they pay taxes.

If there is anything wrong with this proposal, other than that it is wicked for anyone but the Government to invest money in electric power generation, we'd like to hear it. For this looks like a feasible plan for early construction of a much needed Northwest power facility.

We are not alarmed at the thought of the investors receiving an interest rate on their money, for we know Federal, State, and local tax-levying agencies will promptly capture about two-thirds of whatever return this investment realizes. Industry is two-thirds socialized now as to profits. The question is, Must we go the rest of the way?

[From the Union Bulletin of Walla Walla, Wash., April 22, 1955]

A TRUE PARTNERSHIP PROPOSAL

The bill introduced Thursday by Representative SAM COON, of Oregon, for construction of John Day Dam, represents a challenging attack on the problem of multipurpose dam construction in the Pacific Northwest.

Because it is one of the first proposals which would utilize to the fullest the partnership concept of development which has been stressed by President Eisenhower, the project should receive the full support of the administration. And because it does not appear to violate the comprehensive approach to the region's water-resource program or open up a dispute between public and private power interests, we can see no reason why it should not be given a helping hand by both political parties.

As we have long recognized the primary problem in obtaining construction starts on new major projects has been a simple one of insufficient money. The Federal budget has been under such pressure as to preclude the appropriation of sufficient Federal funds to keep the program moving ahead as rapidly as needed. Yet it has been obvious that at least 1 or 2 new starts must be made within the next year if a serious power shortage is to be averted by 1960.

The Coon proposal appears to meet this problem head-on in realistic fashion. Since power costs will represent nearly 90 percent of the estimated $310 million bill for John Day Dam, the legislation provides that an equivalent share of the construction funds

should be advanced by local public and private utilities in return for 50-year contracts for the dam's power output. This would mean that roughly $273 million would be put up by local interests, with the Federal Government's share being limited to $37 million which would cover costs allocable to navigation and other so-called "nonreimbursable" features.

As Representative COON pointed out in introducing the bill, in effect this plan would provide for advance sale of power, rather than waiting until the generators are on the line before disposing of it. It would relieve the Federal Government of the responsibility for long-range financing of the power construction costs, with large appropriations which would be repaid only over a long period of years.

At the same time, however, the objection can no longer be raised that this would be a "sellout" to private power interests. For one thing, both public as well as private utilities would have an equal right to participate in the project, without reference to State boundary lines. And for another, the local utilities would not own any portion of the project but would merely be paying in advance for the use of power from the dam, which would be fully owned and operated by the Federal Government.

Feasibility of the proposal appears to be insured, as several Pacific Northwest utilities have already indicated their willingness to put up all of the $273 million or as much as would be allocated to them by the Federal Power Commission. The FPC would have final responsibility for deciding the allocation among any responsible utilities interested in participating in the program.

The only possible source of objection that we can anticipate would come from those who feel that complete Federal financing is the only answer. It must be conceded that the Federal Government can obtain a lower interest rate on bonds than can other borrowers, and that private financing of a large portion of the cost will have some unfavorable effect on power rates. But our feeling is that electric power at a slightly higher cost is still preferable to a power shortage, and certainly there are grave doubts that the Federal Government will be in a position to assume the entire $310 million expenditure in the near future.

Considering the region's economy, the completion of John Day is significant not only from the power standpoint but almost equally so in the development of navigation facilities. It is the final dam in the series between Portland and the Tri-cities, and would make possible the long-awaited day when barges can move up and down the river under slack-water conditions.

We hope that the Coon bill will receive speedy approval from Congress. Here is a method of facing up to the continuing financial problem of river development that will be relatively painless to the Federal Government. It is a true partnership plan, and it deserved a try.

Unlike Texas, Ukraine Is a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, in the past 5 years a sufficient amount of knowledge and information has been disseminated in our country with regard to the history, culture, and political aspirations of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union that it seems to be inexcusable, at this stage, for anyone concerned with foreign affairs to misinterpret these important nations. Yet commentators, journalists, and others continue to equate the Soviet Union and "Russia," to falsely characterize Ukraine as Russian Ukraine, in effect, to manifest their ignorance of this obviously significant area of the world.

It was my privilege 2 years ago to serve on a subcommittee which conducted a hearing on a resolution pertaining to Ukraine and Byelorussia. The facts presented then established beyond doubt the historic struggle of these two large non-Russian nations for their genuine independence. This indisputable fact was further fortified by the massive evidence assembled by the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression in the course of its hearings last year. Thus, for anyone to parallel Ukraine and Byelorussia with Texas and Massachusetts runs counter to the nature and meaning of this general fact and indicates an unfortunate misconception of the political context of this area of the world.

Such a misconception still appears to reemerge, this time in connection with the revision of the U. N. Charter. Concerning this subject, an informative letter-memo, written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, appeared in the December 15, 1954, issue of the Ukrainian bulletin under the caption, "Unlike Texas, Ukraine Is a Nation." Because of its marked relevance to the current Senate hearings on U. N. Charter revision, I request that this material be included in the RECORD:

UNLIKE TEXAS, UKRAINE IS A NATION

Below is must reading for all Americans. It is the letter, dated November 23, 1954, which was written to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

The letter was occasioned by the lack of knowledge—still disheartingly present—at high official levels with regard to the submerged nations of the U. S. S. R.

For example, an interview was recently granted to U. S. News & World Report (November 26, 1954) by Henry Cabot Lodge, chief American delegate to the United Nations. In discussing China and the U. N., Mr. Lodge former Senator from Massachusetts, said, "China is there." The interviewer commented, "We should be entitled to have Texas in there, too, then, shouldn't we?" Whereupon Mr. Lodge, our representative to an august international body, responded:

"If they've got the Ukraine and Byelorussia, then we certainly ought to have Texas—I would add Massachusetts."

Senator WILEY shares this gravely erroneous view.—EDITOR.

As far as I know, it appears that on two recent occasions you have publicly declared yourself in favor of a revision of the United Nations Charter that would eliminate the representations of Ukraine and Byelorussia in the U. N. and thereby reduce the total number of votes at the disposal of the Soviet Union, taken as a unit. On the surface, this proposal may seem to bear some merit and easy attraction, but, as I should like to point out below, when careful thought is devoted to the ground upon which you predicate your recommendation and to the likely political consequences of even a favorable official consideration of the idea, one cannot but pause to reconsider seriously its advisability in terms of relative advantage and net political worth of our Nation.

In order that there might not be any possibility of misunderstanding regarding the reasoned analysis presented here, it is observed at the outset that the proposal as advanced by you entails no evident, logical relationship to any general demand or principle aimed at the expulsion of delegates from Communist-dominated areas because of their democratically unrepresentative character. Surely, if this were the case, then we would have little rational cause to restrict the proposal to only two Communist representations. Moreover, I believe it will also be logically admitted that the motivating reason for your proposal is not exclusively the quantitative end of reducing the Communist votes in the United Nations by the mere number of two. For certainly if this were so, the final cause of our action would be, from this quantitative viewpoint, far more impressive by abolishing all of the Communist votes on the basis of the principle alluded to above or some similar one. From a functional viewpoint, it is almost impossible to see how the elimination of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian votes alone would substantially reduce the difficulties that we are forced to encounter in the U. N.

BACKGROUND OF ISSUE

However, from a general political viewpoint, it is not at all difficult to estimate accurately the effects of our official submission of this proposal, no less its dubious acceptance on the part of the U. N. membership. To arrive at such an estimate naturally presupposes an elementary recognition of the fact that this issue can scarcely be considered and properly appraised in a context of thought devoid of essential historical knowledge related to the developmental sequence of events forming the intelligible background of this subject. Indeed, one could hardly with any degree of appreciative understanding begin to treat it otherwise.

In the manner of the basis of your proposal, to view the non-Russian nations of Ukraine and Byelorussia as simple state counterparts of Texas and New Mexico in our federated national structure is a gross misconception of modern East European history which, doubtless to your astonishment, the Russian Communists have circulated at different times and in various dialectical forms to support their unfounded contention that the Soviet Union is a voluntary association and union of states. Perhaps it should also be noted that this spurious parallel is recklessly employed by some anti-Communist Russian emigres who fundamentally share a common ground with Red Moscow by their totalitarian insistence upon a "one and indivisible Russia," which in their lexicon means an empire similar in scope to the present Soviet Union. Needless to say, undoubtedly neither of these disinforming sources is to be associated with the basis of your proposal, but, unfortunately the parallel action of thought results in a common negation of the distinctive national and cultural substances of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples.

Without in any way exaggerating the negative and denialist significance of this erroneous basis, it can be said to encompass, in addition, the indisputable historical events of Ukrainian and Byelorussian national independence prior to the military conquest of the two countries by the Russian Communists in 1920–22 and to their forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union shortly thereafter. Although in real effect the formation of the U. S. S. R. in 1922–24 was tantamount to the reestablishment of the Russian Empire, the Russian Communists were politically astute enough to recognize the historical meaning of the sweeping non-

Russian revolution for national independence in 1917–22. In addition to rendering nominal status to the self-assertive non-Russian nations in the republics of the Moscow-contrived Union, they have skillfully alternated periods of harsh repression with phases of political and cultural concessions in order to canalize the irrepressible patriotic eneries of these captive nations to their own maximum advantage of imperialist control and manipulation. In this they formed a workable pattern of future aggression, as witnessed in the past decade and a half, and successfully shaped methods and techniques for the permanent enslavement of new victims.

Thus in the light of the basis of your proposal, are we now to regard Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as state counterparts of Idaho, Utah, and Arizona? If Poland were nominally included in the Soviet Union, although functionally its position in the real empire is substantially no different from that of the Baltic States or Ukraine or Byelorussia, would it be rationally sound to view it as a counterpart of Nevada or Oregon? The correct answers to these determining questions should be obvious if we maintain in our informed minds that sound historical perspective which proportionately discounts a 20 or more years' difference in the experiences of subjugated nations with Communist imperialism to only a few minutes in historical time. In short, the unfortunate and harmful effect of the premise upon which you found your proposal is the denial of Ukraine and Byelorussia as separate and distinct nations from the Russian; indeed, the unrational denial of the known aspirations, resistance, suffering, and perseverance of their peoples in their continuous struggle against the foreign yoke of Moscow, as much as it would be for those of the Baltic countries. In the framework of concrete, political realities, I think it will be agreed that no amount of legalistic juggling can becloud the crucial fact that these prominent known phenomena do not characterize the inhabitants of Texas and New Mexico who are conscious, integral parts of a single nation.

CONSEQUENCES OF PROPOSAL

Now, within this founded context of thought, it should not be difficult to anticipate the consequences and effects of our official consideration and acceptance of your basically insupportable proposal, especially in view of the most recent developments in the Soviet Union. Sound and factually substantiated reasoning on this subject forces us to the conclusion that by submitting this revisionist recommendation the United States would be providing Moscow with a powerful political weapon in its current efforts of consolidation in Ukraine and Byelorussia. One cannot overlook the essential facts, as confirmed by Senator Vandenberg, Mr. Stettinius, and others, that Stalin's insistence upon the admission of Ukraine and Byelorussia into the U. N. in 1945, was based primarily on the urgent consideration of appeasing the intense patriotic nationalism raging in those countries rather than on the superficial reason of merely gaining two additional votes for the Soviet Union. In another wave of concessions this past year Moscow donated the Crimea to the territory of Ukraine, and in a 6 month's celebration of the Pereyaslav Treaty of 1654 played on the theme of Russo-Ukrainian partnership in realizing the goals of Ukrainian freedom and independence. As quoted from the Theses issued on this occasion, "It was only thanks to this friendship that the Ukrainian people, as all the peoples of the U. S. S. R., upheld their freedom and independence."

When sober thought is given to the outstanding fact that Ukraine, with a population of about 45 million, is the largest non-Russian nation in both the Soviet Union and enslaved Eastern Europe, the importance of Moscow's endeavor to mold a tight Russo-Ukrainian combination becomes manifestly evident and, from our point of view, quite ominous. The highly significant question for us to answer is whether, in the contest for the minds and loyalties of the large Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples, we are content to offer them less than what Moscow has, including a denial of their separate national characters, as your proposal unquestionably signifies.

Following the recent Theses of Moscow, an adept student of this subject can with reasonable certainty envisage the propaganda content that Moscow in its constant appeal to Ukraine would derive from the proposal. It might well sound as follows: "We consolidated your historic territories in 1939–40 (as in Theses, p. 13). We fought to have you as one of the founding members of the U. N. (p. 14). For years we have told you that only with us you can prosper, grow, be strong, free, and independent. Now, surely, here is evidence enough that the imperialist Americans seek to deny you even the status of a world-recognized nation by urging your expulsion from the U. N., etc."

The Fate of Poland's Underground Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the last war the Soviet Union with diabolical calculation set out to destroy all sources of Polish democratic leadership that might arise in the postwar era and thus frustrate Communist objectives of making Poland a satellite state. In Katyn Forest the cream of the Polish officer corps was wantonly massacred by direction of the Soviet Government. In the futile but heroic Warsaw uprising the Soviet Army waited silently and deliberately at the gates of Warsaw while the Polish Underground Army was ruthlessly devoured by the Nazi war machine. And finally in March 1954 the leaders of the Polish underground were misled by acts of Soviet treachery and ultimately were arrested and imprisoned by the Soviet Government.

Prior to the formation of the Polish coalition government in 1945, Moscow agreed to allow 12 underground Polish leaders to consult with the Polish Government in London on the arrangements for the coalition regime. The Polish underground leaders, among whom were Gen. Leopold Okulicki, commander of the Polish Home Army, Jan Stanislaw Jankowski, Stanislaw Jasiukowicz, and Antoni Pajdak, received an invitation through indirect channels to confer with Colonel General Ivanov, of the Red Army. Colonel Pimenov, of the Soviet NKVD, assured the Polish leaders that "as an officer of the Red army who has been entrusted with such a greatly important mission, I guarantee to you, under my word as an officer, your fate will be in my hands and that after your arrival at our quarters you will be absolutely safe."

But on March 27, 1945, when General Okulicki and Vice Premier Jankowski presented themselves at the headquarters of Colonel General Ivanov, in accordance with previous arrangements, and on the following day, when three members of the Home Council of Ministers and 8 representatives of the principal political parties took the same step, they were all arrested. Not until May 5, 1945, was there any statement regarding their whereabouts. Subsequently 3 of the men were acquitted, while the others were given sentences up to 10 years in prison.

This entire proceeding, needless to say, was a flagrant violation of all established principles of international law and of justice. I, therefore, respectfully recommend that the following resolution be acted upon as a demonstration of our desire and the desire of the American people to redress this wanton miscarriage of justice.

Exceptional Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials entitled "Exceptional Children," which appeared in the New Orleans States of Friday, April 29, 1955, and "The Catholic Action of the South:

[From the New Orleans States of April 29, 1955]

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Those who have concerned themselves with the plight of the Nation's mentally retarded, or "exceptional," children ought to take heart from what has been going on in Washington recently.

Several legislative proposals indicate that as far as the lawmakers are concerned these children who formerly were relegated to the social scrap heap are going to lose their unwanted tag as "forgotten children."

Both the House and the Senate have considered bills to give financial relief, in the way of additional income tax exemptions, to parents of such children. Also considered is a plan for the retarded themselves, when unable to earn a living, to continue to qualify for child's benefits under social security regulations even after 18 years of age. And a House appropriations subcommittee is pushing a program for study into the causes of mental retardation, the possibilities of preventing or alleviating it, and methods of training such children to become useful citizens.

More important than the results of such legislative proposals is the fact that debate about them has brought to the Nation's attention a considerable segment of the population about which there has been very little knowledge before now.

Surprising to most people is that there are an estimated 4,800,000 retardates in the United States. Surprising to Orleanians is that there are about 9,000 such children under the age of 25 in New Orleans. And embarrassing to all is the fact that despite these numbers next to nothing has been done for their care and training.

Whatever has been accomplished has been the result of enlightenment of the parents of such children. Formerly they accepted them as a cross, to be borne in silence. Now

realization has come that retardation, resulting from many causes, is no stigma. Now parents know that most such children can be trained to perform useful functions; that they need not be classed as permanent dependents of the parents or the State.

What is surprising is how much attention has been given by the public to other ailments which effect fewer persons. The whole Nation joined the fight against polio, for example, though polio is estimated to be only one-tenth as common as mental retardation.

Locally, the Association of Retarded Children, Inc., of Greater New Orleans has been plugging away at this problem for some 3 years. Its members, who conduct a continuing recruiting campaign, include parents of exceptional children, professional men interested in the problem and civic-minded citizens who want to help. They meet, discuss mutual problems, and reap the benefit of their association.

Next week, for example, the local group will meet to hear a discussion by Dr. Herman Yannet, director of the Southbury, Conn., training school, said to be a model in the training of retardates. Whatever Dr. Yannet's message, we doubt that it will cheer members as much as the news that Congress at last has become aware of the problem and is trying to help find solutions.

[From the Catholic Action of the South of April 17, 1955]

SEEING THINGS: EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

(By M. F. Everett)

A long and thoughtful letter from a reader calls attention to the serious need for assistance to retarded persons, a cause that affects society in general as well as relatives of the retarded, which has in general been pitifully ignored in the past because of society's failure to recognize its moral responsibility as well as the practical returns from rehabilitation.

In contrast to the former hopeless, apathetic attitude a more realistic one is now arising to combat the quagmire of secrecy, do-nothingness, and ignorance that smothered consideration of the problem despite the fact that there are some 4,800,000 mentally retarded in the United States alone and that sociological problems of lesser importance have been met.

With a few exceptions, such as the splendid work of some Catholic institutions, the problem until recently remained one in hiding. Families kept a mentally retarded person isolated in shame. Society accepted a crippling physical illness as unfortunate, deserving of sympathy, but shunned the mentally retarded though many could have been helped to a satisfactory place in society.

Fortunately, modern research has given a better understanding of this and other afflictions that have caused fear throughout the centuries. Any family, no matter what its wealth, educational background, race, color, or religion, may have a mentally retarded child. There are at least 70 known or suspected diseases or mishaps occurring before or during birth or in early childhood that may cause mental retardation.

This is a condition, not a disease, and is not the same as mental illness. It is an impaired and incomplete mental development dating from birth or an early age. Usually it involves, besides slow development, a limited ability to learn, with reduced social aptitudes and vocational capacity. Like normal children, the retarded child may become delinquent if his needs for guidance, training, recreation, and proper social relationships are denied, and the frustrations and emotional disturbances resulting from such denial can subject him to mental illness.

The mentally retarded are 9 times as numerous as victims of cerebral palsy, 10 times as polio sufferers permanently afflicted. About 1 of every 1,000 of our population is severely retarded. Some are totally dependent and must be cared for like babies all their life. Others have responded to training along minimum social lines but must have constant supervision.

About 1 of every 250 persons develops at less than half the rate of the normal child. This class is short on judgment and ability to make important decisions, but many can learn self-care, acceptable social behavior, and useful work under sheltered conditions.

Twenty-five of every 1,000 are sufficiently retarded to need special education for adult living. Most can become self-supporting adults, capable of managing their own affairs under favorable conditions. About five per thousand because of personality or other variations find difficulty in coping with modern living and join the dependent or semi-dependent groups. In all about 1 percent of our population needs care, training, or other special consideration because of mental retardation or similar difficulty.

There are three main needs: The right slant on the problem by parents and the general public, increased research into the causes of retardation, and more facilities for the special training of retarded children. With special training 25 of every 30 can become self-supporting, that is, capable, with counseling, of handling their own affairs.

Public and private home schools exist but are too few and fees are beyond many families. A promising development is the community day school, which gives the child instruction while allowing him to live at home. Public and parochial schools are experimenting with special day classes. State institutions are being improved in care and facilities provided.

More and more dioceses are adopting measures to meet the problem. Bishop Charles P. Greco, of Alexandria, last fall established St. Mary's Training School for Retarded Children at Clarks, which is operated by Sisters of Our Lady of Sorrows.

The problem has been discussed extensively at meetings of principals of Catholic schools in the New Orleans archdiocese. A Dominican sister was sent a few years ago to the Catholic University of America for special work concerning visually handicapped, and the Catholic Daughters of America are making another scholarship available this year for a nun.

Information is being gathered on conditions and on how best to meet the situation. The Right Reverend Monsignor Henry C. Bezou, archdiocesan superintendent of schools, on a recent visit to Philadelphia spent an entire afternoon going through St. Barbara's school there. Though special training is needed for the care of retarded children, he feels there are a number of lay teachers in the archdiocese who would welcome the opportunity to do such work.

The religious approach is highly important, he asserts, for, although some manipulative training can be given retarded children, it is hard for them to learn to read. They understand pictures more readily and delight in religious pictures. Both the charity of Christ that prompts help for these unfortunates and the attitude of the children themselves make training under religious auspices a happy solution.

A serious handicap in this and other dioceses is that officials are hard put to provide facilities and teachers for normal children. Though they are anxious to meet the problem of the retarded, it is hard to obtain sufficient funds and personnel. An extent of the problem may be seen in the estimate that it would cost $7 million yearly to care adequately for handicapped children in Louisiana alone.

The Association for Retarded Children, Inc., a group in the metropolitan area, has headquarters at 314 Balter Building, New Orleans. It was started by parents in Jefferson parish and will be 3 years old in May. There are over 200 paid members and mail is sent to some 400. Dues are $3.50 a year, of which 50 cents is sent to the national association and $1 to the State organization. The State group has more than 1,000 members. The national society, organized in 1950, has 325 affiliated associations numbering 40,000 persons.

Advances have been made in Louisiana and more progress is assured if sufficient support is had. The State Colony and Training School at Pineville, with Dr. William P. Hurder as clinical director and acting superintendent has improved its conditions. The legislature in 1954 appropriated $235,000 for an evaluation center, to be affiliated with a medical school in New Orleans, but to serve the whole State. A medical director for this center now is being sought. A law also was passed licensing private schools for the retarded, which will put them under the State Department of Institutions.

It is hoped to have more classes for the retarded in public schools. There is a 3-week summer course at Louisiana State University for teachers of retarded and a course at Tulane University, New Orleans, that meets one night a week. Teachers in the past had to go elsewhere to obtain credits for such specialized teaching. Another serious need is a center for social and other activities for those over 16. The young adult, incapable of higher education, finds it hard to adjust to ordinary conditions and needs special help in this area.

Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, a leader in work for the retarded, points out that such children are "neither punishments nor pointless." God has an important work to do through "exceptional" children. The best index to the civilization of a community is what is done for "exceptional" children, for they are usually least in so many ways—in years, in endowments, in privileges, in all the things people cover for their children. Christ declared: "For as much as ye have done it to the least of these, ye have done it unto Me."

Fleet Adm. William Daniel Leahy Reaches 80th Milestone on Life's Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today America has another opportunity to honor a most distinguished naval officer, Fleet Adm. William Daniel Leahy, on his 80th birthday. So as to indicate the distinction due this great American, I am going to mention the highlights of his career, which more eloquently than any words of praise reflect his service to his country.

Admiral Leahy was born on May 6, 1875, in Hampton, Iowa, the son of M. A. and Rose Hamilton Leahy. Upon graduation from high school in Ashland, Wis., he entered the Naval Academy in 1893. After completion of the course at the Academy he was assigned to duty aboard the new battleship *Oregon* which was then stationed in the Pacific. It

soon became apparent that war with Spain was imminent. So as to have her available for possible operations against the Spanish Fleet, the *Oregon* was ordered from the west to the east coast. She executed these orders by her famous 14,700-mile voyage around Cape Horn at the then record speed of 11.6 knots. More important, when she arrived in the Carribean, the *Oregon* was in readiness for battle which shortly came with the Spanish Fleet in Santiago Harbor. In the engagement which resulted in the destruction of that fleet, the crew of the *Oregon* distinguished itself and among the ship's officers who were commended in the report of the commanding officer was W. D. Leahy, naval cadet. The distinguished conduct under fire by Naval Cadet Leahy in his first assignment aboard ship became the pattern for his future illustrious career.

During the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion he was assigned to the Asiatic station, where after service in the *Castine* and the *Glacier* he received his first command in the gunboat *Mariveles*.

After several assignments ashore and afloat, his outstanding qualities of leadership and ability to shoulder responsibility were recognized by his appointment in 1911 as fleet ordnance officer of the Pacific Fleet, and the following year by his assignment as chief of staff to the Commander Naval Forces in Nicaragua. Late in 1912 Admiral Leahy was given shore duty in the Navy Department but by 1915 World War I was having its effect on the United States and he took command of the dispatch gunboat *Dolphin* engaged in the hazardous search for German supply vessels. After a short tour in 1917 as executive officer of the battleship *Nevada*, attached to the Atlantic Fleet, he took command of the troop transport the U. S. S. *Princess Matoika*. For his distinguished service as commanding officer of this vessel in transporting troops and supplies to European ports through waters infested with enemy submarines and mines, he was awarded the highest naval decoration, the Navy Cross, and also a special letter of commendation by the War Department.

The end of World War I did not enable Admiral Leahy to rest on his laurels. Instead, even more exacting and important assignments were soon to come his way. In 1921 he had command of the flagship *St. Louis* with responsibility for protecting Americans and American interests in Turkish waters and the Black Sea during the war between Turkey and Greece. After assignments in the Bureau of Navigation and in command of the battleship *New Mexico*, he was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in 1927 with the rank of rear admiral. Although by this time he had completed 30 years of outstanding naval service, it seems that this service was just a practice for that which was yet to come.

After duty in the fleet and on a Navy reorganization board, Admiral Leahy was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. It is a signal honor to serve as chief of one bureau of the Navy but to be honored by an appointment to serve as chief of a second bureau is indeed rare.

However, outstanding performance of duty was to bring more responsibility and higher honor. He again returned to sea, this time as Commander Battleships with the rank of vice admiral and soon to be commander in chief, battle force, with the rank of admiral. I can well imagine that he may have felt that he had reached the pinnacle of a naval career. But by 1937 the dark clouds of World War II were gathering and on January the 2d of that year, Admiral Leahy was appointed Chief of Naval Operations, the only officer in naval history to receive that appointment who had already served as chief of two bureaus of the Navy Department. As was his habit he served with distinction and was responsible for laying the groundwork of the two-ocean Navy which swept the enemy fleets from the seas in World War II, carried troops and supplies to our allies and to which all the allied nations should be thankful for its great contribution to victory.

After completion of his term as Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Leahy retired from naval service. Upon this occasion, the Secretary of the Navy wrote him:

> Your career in the active naval service extending over a period of 46 years has included many activities within the varied scope of the naval profession. You have seen active service in two wars. * * * You have represented the Government on diplomatic commissions, and have served on vessels of the "Old Navy" as well as the latest of the "New Navy." Your sea service terminated as commander, Battle Force United States Fleet, and from that command you were selected for the highest post in the Navy, that of Chief of Naval Operations. Your conduct as Chief of Naval Operations has been marked by sound and original thinking, as well as vigorous action and has greatly contributed to the welfare of the service. These and all the other duties which have been assigned to you have been discharged competently, ably, and to the fullest satisfaction of the Government.

Sixty-four years of age—forty-six years of arduous naval service including two wars—certainly now he could rest. But to those who are dedicated to the service of their country, rest is more often a hope than a reality. Six weeks after his retirement he was named Governor of Puerto Rico and a year later was called from that post to be Ambassador to France which at that time was under the occupation of Nazi Germany. There he laid the groundwork for French collaboration with the United States. To him is due much of the credit for the neutralization of the French Fleet and preventing its addition to the Nazi and Italian navies which were seriously threatening our shipping at that time. His work in this regard was a triumph over an extremely intricate complex of French politics and personal loyalty.

He was recalled to active duty on July 20, 1942 and given the unparalleled appointment as Chief of Staff to the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. In this appointment he served as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff. Here, and as personal adviser to the President he played a large part in formulating the political and military decisions which led to the victory in World War II.

In December 1944, he was honored by appointment to the newly created rank of fleet admiral.

Fleet Admiral Leahy continued to serve as Chief of Staff to the President as Commander in Chief until March 25, 1949, when his resignation was reluctantly accepted. On that occasion the President presented him with a gold star in lieu of a third Distinguished Service Medal. The citation reads in part:

> His supreme loyalty to his country and his appreciation of its place in world affairs, supplemented by his fundamental concern in the welfare of humanity as a whole, transcended his already vast knowledge of military affairs to culminate in statesmanship beyond that required of any naval officer in our history.

Fleet Admiral Leahy's record serves as an inspiration and a challenge to every American. He presents an example of dedication to his country; of inspired service which disregards all personal considerations; and of strong individual character derived from habitual discipline and scrupulous regard for obligation and duty. In a word, he is the personification of the traditional Navy spirit of self-sacrifice in the service of his country. God grant that we shall always have officers like Admiral Leahy to call on in time of need.

Farm Props Versus Wage Floors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

FARM PROPS VERSUS WAGE FLOORS

When the Senate voted last August for the abandonment of high, rigid price supports for the so-called basic commodities it marked the culmination of one of the most courageous and politically difficult legislative battles in which the Eisenhower administration has engaged. It was a fight to dislodge powerful vested interests created under World War II emergency legislation. The legislation had been scheduled to expire 2 years after the fighting ended (which would have been at the end of the crop year 1947), but the farm bloc had succeeded in having the provisions extended every time the date of their expiration approached. After going through the motions of fighting for a return to flexible supports for several years the Truman administration was suddenly blinded, on the eve of the 1952 elections, by the light of a great revelation. This revelation, it seems, had to do with certain unsuspected, and as yet unidentified, virtues, discovered in the 90-percent rigid supports it had been castigating at more or less regular intervals up to that time.

Now there is talk of a deal between labor-minded legislators from urban areas of the North and the agricultural legislators favor-

ing a return to 90-percent supports. With the time approaching for the vote on a proposal by the farm bloc to restore wartime supports, one city Democrat—Representative ANFUSO of Brooklyn—did make an appeal for such a coalition of forces, or, as it is more colloquially referred to, logrolling. Representative ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, has declared that in supporting 90-percent price props the urban Representatives hope to obtain help from southern Members in their efforts to have the minimum wage raised from its present 75 cents an hour to $1.25. (The President has advocated an increase to 90 cents an hour.) Representative COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, and chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, denies the existence of such a coalition. All that has happened, he says, is that some labor leaders have endorsed the pending bill because they are aware that a strong farm economy is part of a national prosperity.

Labor leaders who believe that a strong agriculture is essential to a balanced prosperity are, of course, eminently correct. But any labor leader who believes that high, rigid price supports and a strong agriculture are interchangeable terms for the same thing, or that they are even compatible, is proceeding on a seriously mistaken assumption. And to the extent that they or others have fallen into this error the farm bloc must be charged with a large share of the responsibility. For the farm bloc, as Representative ARENDS has correctly pointed out, has diligently sought to identify declining farm prices, not with the huge surpluses created under rigid supports, but with the recent adoption of flexible supports.

Labor leaders have also been led astray if they have been persuaded that there is any similarity between high-level price supports and the minimum wage. In the first place, farm-price supports have their own built-in provisions for escalators, which is not the case with the wage floor. In the second place, the beneficiaries of the minimum wage are a small segment of labor at or near the subsistence level; the chief beneficiaries of high-level price supports (assuming that anyone benefits from them in the long run) are, on the whole, upper-bracket income farmers who produce what are referred to euphemistically but arbitrarily and erroneously as our basic crops.

American Veteran Leader Calls for Free Trade on Return From World Goodwill Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, upon his return from a recent goodwill world tour, Mr. George Mark, former national commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, issued a plea for the expansion of trade among free nations and the liberalization of American trade policies. Under unanimous consent, I ask that Mr. Mark's statement appearing in the March 31 edition of the Obywatel Amerykanski be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article, I believe, presents a strong and coherent argument for the necessity of American leadership in the direction of freer trade. I heartily endorse Mr. Mark's views on this subject.

The statement follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C. March 22, 1955.—George Mark, former national commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, just returned from a world tour and discussions with leaders of many countries, has issued a plea for the expansion of trade among free nations and the liberalization of American trade policies. Mr. Mark stated that his observations of world conditions have led him to the conclusion that maintenance of our reciprocal-trade program and a lowering of our tariff barriers are imperative if we are to prevent the free nations of Europe and Asia from falling into Communist hands.

During his good-will tour, Mr. Mark met with such leaders as Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, Vatican officials, and United States Ambassadors throughout the world. He visited Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, India, Thailand, Formosa, and Japan. In the statement issued on his return, Mr. Mark said:

"Distrust of America's capacity to lead the world in a global fight against communism is rolling over the skies of Europe and Asia like an atomic cloud. In every country I visited I found government and party leaders suffering from the fall-out of empty promises, broken pledges, and diplomatic double-talk emanating from Washington.

"The effects of this loss of world confidence in the United States are worse than those of radiation disease. They sap the strength of government leaders in dozens of countries where they are fighting a battle against communism in their own front yards, instead of comparative safety of Washington, or the United States State Department.

"The world has no faith in the Republican promises to liberate enslaved nations or to use massive retaliation against Communist aggression. People in Europe and Asia are wondering whether the balance of the Republican Party pledges to restore peace in the world will be forgotten as just campaign promises.

"I believe the entire world is waiting now to see whether the Eisenhower administration has the strength to carry out its last remaining pledge—to safeguard the economies of free nations by unconditionally supporting and promoting world trade.

"President Eisenhower's decision to raise tariffs on Swiss watches was considered throughout Europe as the test case of his foreign trade policy in which he completely failed to live up to his own trade principles.

"One European statesman with a sense of humor told me that he regarded this decision as America's massive retaliation against the Swiss for the crime of being the best cash customer and one of the most loyal supporters of America's tradition of democratic freedom.

"I returned to America to find a wave of pessimism regarding the future of our trade policy. Protectionists, encouraged by Eisenhower's desertion of principle in the watch case, are waging a savage struggle to destroy our positive trade policy and to replace it with a Grover Cleveland type of trade program.

"If we break this final pledge we will forfeit the respect of the world. Europe's leaders, who have been made cynical of American trade promises by the example of our treatment of Switzerland, will turn to more and more trade with Russia as they see the American market withdrawn from them. This will mark the beginning of the greatest Communist triumph. Russia will not hesitate to insidiously penetrate the economies of every nation in the world and to weaken the morale and political fiber of each of these countries by becoming the ruling economy power in trade, because we have abdicated our position."

The McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would completely revise and replace the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. This bill is a codification of all existing immigration, naturalization, and citizenship laws, clarifying and simplifying the present act. This in itself would be an important step toward eliminating the confusion which exists both in our own country and abroad as to the real policy of the United States toward those who seek to enter her boundaries. But above all, this bill would give positive and real meaning to the democratic principles which we, in this country, hold as a shining beacon to those beyond our borders.

It is no secret abroad that the present immigration laws of the United States belie our expression of "Welcome" to those brave enough to flee their oppressors—indeed, every day our radio broadcasts are beaming American ideals of freedom and democracy and opportunity for all to the downtrodden people behind the Iron Curtain. We tell the peoples of Europe and Asia of the real humanitarianism of the United States, and then set legalistic boobytraps for those who take us at our word. This is a shameful manner in which to act, and certainly no thinking American can fail to see the very real consequences of such a policy.

It is time that we, as American citizens and as legislators for the American people, see that this disparity between word and deed is ended. And the only way to do this is to enact a fair and comprehensive law.

Now I realize that such a sweeping law is open to critics who say that all immigrants are a danger to the United States, and that any immigrant may be a Communist wolf parading in the proverbial sheep's clothing. Let me reply to such critics that my bill provides full and comprehensive security against subversive and undesirable aliens; it actually tightens existing laws which permit thousands of unscreened aliens to cross our borders. Certainly what this Nation needs is a law which permits desirable people to come to the United States, and a law which absolutely protects those in the United States from the seditions of subversives, and this bill does both.

My bill would also eliminate all racial and national bias, establish a uniform right of review and appeal from administrative decisions, and remove the distinctions between native-born and naturalized American citizens. Certainly there can be, in this Nation of equality, no "second-class" citizens. My bill would also replace the national origins quota system with a new unified quota system. It would provide for a separate single agency to handle all immigration and naturalization functions,

which are now divided between the Consular Service of the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department. It would also differentiate between aliens seeking permanent residence here and alien visitors coming here for scholarly or scientific purposes, for business or pleasure.

May I remind the spokesmen of both major political parties that the American people have been promised revision of existing immigration laws. Both candidates for the Presidency in 1952 declared that such revision is essential to the good name of the American people, and I believe the American people think so too. President Eisenhower reiterated this declaration in his state of the Union message in 1953, and in April he specifically requested such legislation in letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. We cannot continue to maintain what has been called a "redtape curtain" in our immigration and refugee laws and still in all honest sincerity criticize the Iron Curtain abroad.

May I propose to the Members of Congress, then, that we, each of us, rid our Nation of the hypocritical sham and pretense of democracy contained in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and show the world that the American ideals of freedom and justice are realities both at home and abroad.

Poland's Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this annual occasion, May 3, the date of Poland's Constitution Day and free Poland's national holiday, calls for a renewal of the strong bonds of culture between the American and Polish people. The fate of Poland, the traditional friend of the United States, will always be of primary interest to Americans regardless of ancestry. Freedom has always been the first principle of the Polish political tradition. The Polish struggle to regain her lost freedom through the centuries is a long and familiar story. The world's records know no parallel to the epic resistance of the Pole to efforts of aggressors to enslave, denationalize, and break him. The real appreciation of the value of the individual and of the worth and dignity of the person makes the Pole loathe equally communism and fascism—any denying of the worth and dignity and freedom of the individual. As history amply illustrates, to the Pole the rights of the individual must be duly regarded by the state.

As embodied in the great democratic Polish Constitution, the state exists to protect and facilitate the life and occupations of the individual, not to use him as cannon fodder and the instrument of dictatorship. To be sure, he is glad to die for his country if need be, but that is his desire for a country he loves—not for a dictator he has to obey.

Today, the Polish struggle for freedom is widespread. It is being waged on the national, social, cultural, and moral levels, where human mind and feeling play often a much greater role than that of bayonet, revolver, prison, or concentration camp. The tradition of individualism constitutes an obstacle to the subordination of Poland to the Communist system which disregards the dignity and freedom of man. The Communists have recently put great stress on the elimination of these Polish national characteristics in their determination to snuff out the spirit of Polish independence. Fortunately, for the free world, that spirit still lives and will continue to live.

What hope can we hold out to these brave and courageous, but long-suffering people? Would that we could be more encouraging—more reassuring. But I think we can say that we recognize and appreciate their courage and their desire for freedom. We certainly will never rest easily, never forget their justifiable and burning desire for freedom until the yoke of Soviet enslavement and brutality has been lifted. The struggle is long and arduous, but never too long or too arduous to give up hope. We look to the day when Poland will again emerge as a strong, free, prosperous, and happy nation. We know the people will never give up their hope; we know they will be ready when the day arrives to throw off their suppressors.

With courage, with perseverance, with faith in freedom, this day will come.

Governor Leader's Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my constituents, like a great majority of Philadelphians and Pennsylvanians, view with alarm and great concern the vicious and inequitable tax proposals being urged by Governor Leader and endorsed by Mayor Clark. In this connection, under permission granted, I am quoting a letter to the editor appearing in the May 2 edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer clearly outlining the inequities in Governor Leader's tax plan and an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 4, 1955, entitled "Mayor Sets Stage for Senate Race":

INEQUITIES IN GOVERNOR LEADER'S TAX PLAN

To the EDITOR OF THE INQUIRER:

It is appalling that there should be introduced in the legislature of any State of the Union by the responsibly elected administration of a major political party, such a vicious and inequitable tax program as has been recommended by the Governor of Pennsylvania.

As is well known, the constitution of Pennsylvania prohibits a graduated income tax. Attempts to alter the constitution in this respect have been decisively defeated by the people at the polls. Notwithstanding this definite demonstration of public opinion, and in the face of campaign protestations against an income tax, the administration nevertheless now demands not only a graduated income tax in cheap disguise, but something infinitely worse.

A graduated income tax—onerous as it is when the rates become oppressive, and they are certainly already oppressive under the Federal law—at least makes some attempt to conform to that sacred—and much overdone—principle, ability to pay. The present tax proposals have nothing to do with ability to pay. On the contrary, they lay the burden upon our people according to types of income, not levels.

For example: a businessman, grocer, service station owner, or master plumber, or a professional man, architect, lawyer, or dentist, struggling along on an income of $4,000, is taxed at 2 percent of his net income; while at the same time a person on salary or wages, earning $10,000 a year, is taxed at 1 percent.

For further example, and even more vicious: a widow or retired couple, with their savings invested in mortgages, municipal or corporate bonds, and some stocks, even though their net income might be only $3,000, are taxed at 4 or 5 percent of net income, or 4 and 5 times the $10,000 man in the earlier example.

The certain effect of such legislation is to drive as much business from Pennsylvania as can find it possible to move away. And no industry seeking a site to locate and give employment could conceivably be foolish enough to choose Pennsylvania, where dividends are taxed at 5 percent, and capital gains—the fruits of that initiative and free business enterprise which have made America the greatest of nations—are taxed at 6 percent over and above the already prohibitive Federal rates of 25 percent.

It seems inconceivable that the courts of this commonwealth, sworn to uphold the principles of the Constitution, could ultimately do other than to declare these tax measures unconstitutional. However, the immediate task of all citizens is to impress upon the Members of the legislature, Senate and House, their vigorous opposition, in the hope that the whole program will be quickly scrapped by the representatives of the people.

JOHN F. GOLDSMITH.

PHILADELPHIA, *April 27.*

MAYOR SETS STAGE FOR SENATE RACE

As mayor of Philadelphia, Joseph S. Clark, Jr., should be deeply concerned about Governor Leader's plan to put a third bite on the pay envelopes of Philadelphians in the form of a State wage tax.

But as a potential candidate in next year's election for the United States Senate seat now held by JAMES H. DUFF, Clark is much more interested in securing Governor Leader's support.

Accordingly, the Clark brand of strategy has called for him to come out enthusiastically in favor of the governor's tax program and to inform the people of Pennsylvania that they should be glad to put up the additional $411 million that it requires.

The mayor doubtless believes he is playing smart politics. After all, he needs the governor's backing if he is to be the Democratic nominee for the Senate, doesn't he? Therefore, it is up to him to pat Mr. Leader on the back and tell him what a fine thing he is doing in preparing to take a new tax cut from workers' wages.

But Clark's ardent espousal of the wage tax may not turn out to be such a shrewd maneuver after all. He has every right, of course, to indorse the tax and to argue in its favor. But the taxpayers have the right, also, to pick and choose, when it comes to

voting, between candidates who sought to inflict a burdensome new tax on them and those who opposed that tax.

In coming out for the Leader taxes, Mayor Clark has resorted to an old political dodge: place the blame one someone else.

It is not George Leader's fault, he contends, that all these heavy taxes have to be imposed, but the fault of two other fellows named John Fine and Jim Duff.

He would have us believe that the tax problem now facing the Democratic governor at Harrisburg was left on his doorstep by his two predecessors and that Leader has to clean up the mess.

He hails Leader as a "responsible, mature statesman" and admonishes the people of Pennsylvania that they should be glad to do everything they possibly can to help him "put the State back on a solvent basis."

If this script seems familiar, there is good reason for it. It has been followed faithfully an untold number of times in the past, as those newly taking public office have sought to blame all their problems on the delinquencies of their predecessors.

The trouble with the Clark rendition of this old theme is that it doesn't quite come off.

Even Mayor Clark cannot convince anyone with a grain of intelligence that the whopping budget submitted by Governor Leader wholly represents hang-over commitments made by previous State administrations.

There is more than $100 million in quite new appropriations, for instance, for purposes referred to by the Governor in the vaguest terms. It will take quite a lot of doing to blame these proposed expenditures on preceding administrations.

When it gets down to the heart of the Leader program, which is the tax on wages, Mayor Clark's statement is deftly evasive. He merely asks a question: "What fairer method of raising revenue necessary to balance the State budget can be suggested than that recommended by Governor Leader?"

We suggest that he take a look at his morning mail. He will probably get quite a number of answers to that question.

He may even be called upon to answer this query: "Just what is fair about a State tax on wages, on top of Federal and city taxes on income already in effect?"

The mayor chose to ignore the alternative of a sales tax, following the lead of the Governor, who prefers to tax the pay envelope.

Clark's statement is doubtless appreciated by Governor Leader, who has found his tax plan widely unpopular even in his own party and it may even convince Leader that the mayor is a statesman of a high order who ought to sit in the Senate. But it will be the people of Pennsylvania, not the tax-happy Governor, who will fill the Senate seat next year.

Who Should Run Technical Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned with the problem of how our foreign aid program will be administered when the Foreign Operations Administration goes out of existence. The President proposes to set up an International Cooperation Administration under the State Department. I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the following comments of the Washington Window, a column published by the Public Affairs Institute, on this entire problem:

WHO SHOULD RUN TECHNICAL AID?

For the past 5 years the United States has been tinkering with its technical-aid program designed to help underdeveloped countries to get on their feet.

The tinkering has been notoriously unsuccessful. Since 1950, the organization setup of the program has undergone three major reorganizations and is due for a fourth on June 30, when the Foreign Operations Administration, under Harold Stassen, is scheduled to go out of existence. The program is then supposed to come under the wing of the State Department.

Is this a good idea?

There are a good many people who think not. They feel that the State Department is essentially a diplomatic agency and not an operating agency, a field in which it has failed repeatedly. Others think that the State Department should have general supervision of the program but that the actual work should be carried out by the various Government departments concerned. Still others feel that the best solution is to keep the technical-aid program as a completely independent organization.

The case against turning the whole program over to the State Department is a good one. In 1950, the technical-aid program was set up within the State Department and for the 3 years that it remained there it floundered pretty badly. Not only did the Department keep policy control, but it tried to run the program, too.

The State Department, critics of the new plan say, is not an operating agency, never has been and is not likely to be one in the future. They contend that President Roosevelt understood this thoroughly and it was for that reason that he set up wartime agencies such as the Board of Economic Warfare, Lend-Lease and similar operating groups outside of the State Department despite the frantic protests of Secretary Hull.

Largely as a result of the State Department's bitter resentment of independent agencies in the foreign field, the point 4 program originally was set up inside the State Department. Commenting on this experience, the National Planning Association recently said:

"Those who watched TCA's (point 4) 3 painful years of attempting to administer an operating program from within the Department almost despair that State will ever be able to gear itself to enable a fast-moving action program to operate with speed and decisiveness."

The proper solution, in the opinion of those who don't want the program in the State Department, is that it should be operated by an independent agency working under broad policy agreements with the Department of State so as to keep a consistent foreign policy.

Going beyond this, they feel that if point 4 is to be revived from the lethargy into which it has fallen, it is necessary once again to dramatize the original purpose for which it was established to fight communism on a broad economic level that would give hope to the world's undeveloped areas.

To do this they feel that the cold government-to-government approach has long since proved its inadequacy. They urge wider participation of nongovernment groups in this effort, organized so that the missionary zeal of private citizens can be put to use in this worthy cause; that the one hope is to make the program a people-to-people program that can rearouse both the enthusiasm of the American people for whom point 4 once meant so much and that of the recipient people for whom point 4 once represented a living hope.

Among ideas that have been advanced is creation of citizens' advisory committees, perhaps one in every State, to follow point 4 affairs closely, to press for its extension and to fight for appropriations for it.

Unless this is done and done soon, they fear that point 4 is likely to wither away until it becomes simply a minor bureau within the State Department lost in the shuffle of high diplomacy.

It's Hard To See a Letter to the Editor as Really Immoral Political Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's Hard To See a Letter to the Editor as Really Immoral Political Activity" found on page 12 of the May 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The bill to amend the so-called Hatch Act to make the provisions inapplicable to State officers and employees, is before the House Administration Committee and preliminary hearings have been held. Letters received from three-fourths of the attorneys general of the 48 States unanimously approve this legislation and urge that the proper authority be restored to the States.

The editorial follows:

IT'S HARD TO SEE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR AS REALLY IMMORAL POLITICAL ACTIVITY

When W. Arthur Simpson, a Vermont State employee, sat down to write a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald back in October 1951 he had no idea that this exercise of an ancient and honorable American privilege would eventually land him smack in the middle of a States-right fight to determine how much authority over its own affairs a State must surrender in exchange for Federal aid.

Mr. Simpson, a Republican, is Vermont's Commissioner of Social Welfare, a job that involves administering State funds plus certain grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. In the preconvention discussion of the best possible Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Simpson favored Senator Robert Taft. He wrote a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald saying that while he didn't think Robert Taft was the only alternative, "he at least has the virtue of being honest, forceful, a fighter, and a successful campaigner." Surely Mr. Simpson's views should have no more to do with his fitness to hold his job than if he had come out for Senator KEFAUVER.

However, the United States Civil Service Commission in 1953 issued a letter of charges against the Vermont social-welfare head, charging that he had violated the Hatch Political Activities Act by writing the letter, and by presiding at a session of the Republican State convention in 1950. The Commission did this even though published Federal Security Agency rules and the laws of the State of Vermont seemed to Mr. Simpson to exempt him from the Hatch Act on the ground that he was putting in most of his time for his State, and not for the Federal Government.

The Federal Commission ordered Vermont to fire Arthur Simpson. Vermont refused. The Civil Service Commission then told Vermont that Uncle Sam would hold out from Vermont's share of welfare aid an amount equal to Simpson's salary for 2 years. At this, the Vermonters appealed to the Federal district court in Montpelier, where the case is now pending.

Incidentally, Mr. Simpson has worked for his State quite a while, apparently without trouble. In April 1953, the Vermont Legislature adopted a resolution praising him for distinguished service over more than a third of a century, citing him as a "gracious neighbor and public administrator," and concluding, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Other States are up in arms about what was done to this Vermont Republican, and the expansion of Federal power which it implies. New Hampshire has joined Vermont in the court battle. Indiana, where four State employees have been charged with political activity, seems about to follow suit, with Hoosier Gov. George Craig leading an effort to persuade other States to support a bill by Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, Indiana, Republican, which would make the Hatch Act apply only to Federal employees.

Lawyers for the State of Vermont urge persuasively that the Federal Government's idea that the Hatch Act applies to anybody who works even part time for a State agency receiving Federal funds could logically involve a State employee serving 1 day or members of any State board or commission financed by $1 of Federal funds. Such a person couldn't write a letter to the editor on a political matter, even if he didn't write in his official capacity. (Mr. Simpson signed only his name, didn't use his official title.)

Conceding that the Hatch Act was wisely intended to keep Federal employees out of politics, it is certainly doubtful that Congress intended to extend its prohibitions to every State office that gets a nickel of Federal money or to mere expression of preference for candidates for office. If that is what Congress did intend, a vote on the Beamer resolution provides an opportunity to make the intention plain. In the meantime a vote of thanks is due the Vermont, New Hampshire and Indiana rebels for bringing the whole thing to light.

The Simpson case may go against them, now that the Federal camel has thrust its head legally into so many local tents. If it does, it will be time for a lot of Americans to get into poitics in earnest and reverse the trend by which Federal control of State affairs is assumed as the price of Federal "aid." If the Simpson case causes the citizenry to look these Federal gift horses in the mouth, there's nothing wrong with that.

Sale of General Aniline & Film Corp.'s Assets to American Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following resolutions which have been submitted to me by the General Aniline Supervisors' Association on legislation which would permit sale of the General Aniline & Film Corp.'s assets to private American management:

Whereas the supervisors' association, comprising more than 300 management employees at the Linden, N. J., plant of the General Aniline & Film Corp., has noted with concern the effects of continued Government control, by virtue of the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, over the assets of the corporation; and

Whereas in meeting assembled on the 13th day of April 1955 has unanimously voted to urge passage of Federal legislation to permit the sale of the corporation's assets to private American management; and

Whereas bills S. 1405 and H. R. 3608, introduced by Senator CLEMENTS and Representative O'BRIEN, now before the Senate Judiciary Committee and Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, respectively, embody provisions which would effectively serve the purposes of securing the future welfare of all employees of the corporation and their families, and fulfill the best interests of the corporation and the Nation as well; and

Whereas any further delay in the disposition of the corporation's assets will work to the greatest disadvantage of all concerned: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to take prompt action to effect passage of legislation during this session of Congress, in the sense of the bills introduced by Senator CLEMENTS and Representative O'BRIEN; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be distributed to Members of Congress in whose home district employees of the General Aniline & Film Corp. now reside.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial taken from the March 4, 1955, issue of the Daily Record, St. Paul, Minn.

The editorial points out in a very concise way why H. R. 12 should be defeated. The views expressed in the editorial further support my position as to why I voted against H. R. 12:

USELESS, HARMFUL LEGISLATION

At this writing the House vote on H. R. 12 has not yet been taken, but it is anticipated that it will have been registered by the time this issue of Daily Record reaches its readers.

It is our sincere hope that the bill will have been voted down since, from the standpoint of the dairy industry at least, it is about as useless a piece of legislation as has come before the Congress in a long time. H. R. 12, it will be recalled, is the Cooley bill, which, among other things, proposes to raise the support level of dairy products from the present 75 percent to 80 percent of parity.

Just how useless the bill is to dairymen may be gleaned from a consideration of the fact that on March 15 all milk at wholesale was at 85 percent of parity and manufacturing milk at 82.3 percent, so that the industry would have nothing to gain from the bill but would suffer the stigma of supposedly asking for more money from the Federal Treasury, even though nothing would be forthcoming.

There is the additional objection, of course, that a move designed to raise the price of dairy products (even though it did not do so) might discourage the industry just when it is beginning to see hope of getting out from under the paternal wing of the Federal Government and doing a better job of increasing its return from the market place than it would get as a Government pensioner. This is added reason for leaving well enough alone.

It happens, however, that there are other very good reasons. One is the fact that a higher price derived from Government aids cannot be justified in the face of heavy Government purchases of the past 3 years. A second additional reason is the danger that unjustified demands may bring unfavorable reaction from consumers and their representatives in Congress, which might well imperial the whole support program—even though the industry still needs to have that program as insurance. Last, but by no means least, is the danger that demands for higher support prices will almost certainly bring counter demands for production controls—and we still think that they represent the greatest evil likely to befall the industry.

As a matter of enlightened selfishness, if nothing else, it behooves the dairy farmer to go back to the original concept of the price support program and accept it as a device to safeguard the farmer against bankruptcy, and not as an instrument intended to guarantee his prosperity. That prosperity can be assured only by dint of his own efforts.

American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Item recently published two very timely editorials—one deals with the American merchant marine and points out the essential character of this industry. It also shows the degree of misinformation about the operation of our American merchant marine.

The second editorial deals with the need for a weather ship in the Gulf of Mexico.

Both are timely and of interest to all Members of Congress.

They follow in full:

[From the New Orleans Item of April 15, 1955]

PAYBACK FEATURE LITTLE KNOWN—MERCHANT MARINE SUBSIDIES

It's often said it is easier to be misinformed about the merchant marine than about any other activity subsidized by the Government.

Perhaps this is because the payback clause in operating subsidies to shipping companies is so little known.

It works this way—when the subsidized operator's profits reach 10 percent of his investment, he starts paying back the subsidy money to the Government.

Most other subsidies don't have this insurance feature. The usual idea of a subsidy is an outright, nonrecoverable payment.

The payback subsidy applies to the shipper's operating expenses. The Government pays him the difference between American scales and the much lower worldwide scales on such essentials as wages, insurance, repairs, and supplies. If the Government did not do this, United States shipping would be run off the seas by competition from the

lower-operating-cost vessels of other nations. This would be a national calamity, equivalent to the loss of most of our naval auxiliary vessels.

After he has been brought up to scratch by operating subsidies, the United States shipping operator still must compete for his profits. Nothing in the subsidies guarantees profits.

The guarantees are made by the shipper. He pledges to serve certain trade routes. He must provide the type of ships needed for specific trade areas. And he must replace wornout and obsolete ships (this is covered by a construction differential subsidy).

What makes the operating subsidy good business all around is the fact that the United States is the world's biggest importer. Mountains of the world's raw and finished products pass through our ports constantly.

When American shipping carries its share of these cargoes, several beneficial things happen. The American crewmen make good wages. The shippers make profits. The Government gets back an appreciable share of its operating subsidy payments.

We must not overlook another basic reason for maintaining our merchant marine. In crisis, our ability to handle our own shipping is essential.

Our merchant marine, in time of war, becomes our fourth arm of defense.

[From the New Orleans Item of April 17, 1955]

SHIP SUPPORT GROWING—WEATHER-EYE ON THE GULF

Support for a floating weather station in the Gulf of Mexico is growing in Congress.

In the last session, Representative T. A. THOMPSON, of Ville Platte, asked for the station in a bill which died in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

When THOMPSON resubmitted his bill this year it was 1 of 4 idenical weather station proposals. The others were sponsored by Congressmen from Mississippi, Texas, and Alabama.

Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, has also introduced weather-ship legislation in the Senate.

Where the gulf weather ship lacks support, according to local backers of the project, is in the Federal departments which would have to pay for it—Commerce, Treasury, and Interior.

Representative THOMPSON wrote to one of these backers that "legislation is not really necessary • • • if the departments are willing to proceed under existing authority. In the absence of this, legislation is the only means of attracting attention."

Apparently the "absence of willingness" does not mean that the Department secretaries believe the vast, 716,000 square-mile gulf area has all the weather forecasting facilities it needs. Rather, the economy-minded secretaries favor a less-than-perfect forcast system that would still be an improvement.

Commerce Secretary Weeks stated that present radar and aircraft weather-scouting would be good enough, if it were supplemented by a little trained weather sleuthing by gulf fishermen.

Weather-ship supporters tore into Weeks' statement with glee. The fishing boats he wants to equip with barometers are among the most urgent needers of better weather forecasting, they said. When threatening weather blows up, the fishermen are interested only in hurrying to safety—and rightly so.

The weather-ship backers have their own views about the economy of the project. The Treasury Department estimates it would cost $2.8 million a year to support the three Coast Guard vessels which would alternate on the gulf weather station.

The offshore oil drillers, fishermen, farmers, coastal property owners, and others would save much more than that in storm damage if there was a really adequate warning system, the backers say. They point to other possible economies, like lower storm damage insurance rates.

It is difficult to outline all the benefits of having a gulf weather ship. Doubtless, it would do a better job of forecasting than radar, with its 200-mile range, and aircraft, which can't operate around the clock every day as a ship does.

Some forecasters say that 70 percent of the weather for the whole east coast is formed in the gulf. Reliable early warning against all degrees of storms would pay off not only for the gulf coast but for a much larger area northward.

The job ahead for weather-ship proponents is to hammer away with economy arguments which are strong enough to convince the three governmental Departments concerned. Everyone else seems sold on the idea.

H. R. 2967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following correspondence with regard to H. R. 2967:

MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Lansing, Mich., March 22, 1955.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: We wish to convey to you the representative thinking of the Protestant leadership, both clergy and laity, here in Michigan. The Michigan Council of Churches represents more than 2,600 local churches and most of the major demominations of the State. In the past the churches have very actively opposed universal military training legislation. It appears to us now that bill H. R. 2967 is, as described by Hanson W. Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times—"really universal military training and service by another name."

In the opinion of many church leaders this is UMT because of these 4 features: (1) Its goal is the conscription of all physically fit young men for some type of military training or service. (2) It is envisioned as a permanent or continuing program. (3) It is a compulsory program. (4) It would keep men under military jurisdiction for a period of 8 to 10 years on precisely the same basis as the present system of universal conscription by classes. It is our opinion that H. R. 2967 is not the best solution of the problem of national security. We feel that the possibilities of building a voluntary Reserve rather than a compulsory Reserve have not been fully explored.

We are certain that you will wish to give this measure searching study and that you will not be a party to hasty examination of these issues. We are confident that you are endeavoring to get the real facts and then vote on their merits. That is why we are making available to you the convictions of the substantial constituency represented by the churches in Michigan that have been facing this issue for a number of years. These churches continue to oppose universal military training. Please do not misconstrue this opposition as an indication that we oppose national security. We feel, however, this is not the way in which it can be best achieved.

Most sincerely,
HAROLD C. MCKINNEY, Jr.,
Director of General Operations.
MERRILL R. ABELY,
Chairman, Committee on International Affairs.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF MICHIGAN,
Battle Creek, Mich., April 30, 1955.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am herewith forwarding correspondence received from James R. Wilson, director of the national security commission, and Miles Kennedy, director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, relative to the objections raised by the Michigan Council of Churches relative to national security training.

These I thought would be of interest to you. I would appreciate receiving them back when you are through with them.

Very truly yours,
J. ADDINGTON WAGNER.

APRIL 1, 1955.

MILES KENNEDY'S COMMENTS RELATIVE TO THE FOUR QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO MR. ADD WAGNER

1. The American Legion has advocated national security training for all young men who are physically and mentally qualified to take such training. We submit the only way in which the obligation a young man owes to his country can be equitably carried out is to enact a law calling for universality of service. Selective Service tells us that for every 5 boys who register for military service, only 1 is actually inducted into the Armed Forces. Furthermore, the American Legion feels that, if we are going to have to rely solely upon volunteers, we will never get enough of them to meet the country's needs; that if the United States is faced with another emergency, we would again have to rely upon veterans, over 950,000 of whom were recalled for 2 years' service during the Korean war. The great majority of these men had already served their country from 2 to 5 years during World War II, while hundreds of thousands of our eligible young men sat home and rendered no military service at all.

This situation will never be corrected until we have provided a strong citizen reserve so that we do not have to rely upon veterans to meet each new emergency as it arises. Any young man, physically and mentally fit, does not think much of his country if he is not willing to spend a few months of his time in learning how to protect it.

2. As long as we have wars and international strife, this country is going to have to take the necessary steps to protect itself, or it will become a victim of Communist aggression and perish. Present indications are that this situation is going to obtain during the foreseeable future. The American Legion advocates extending the Selective Service Act for 4 years from July 1, 1955, to the 1st of July 1959. Our bill, H. R. 1630 (sec. 7 thereof), advocates that the authority to induct men for service in the Armed Forces shall cease and be suspended and shall thereafter remain inoperative effective not more than 5 years after the first person is inducted into national security training. This in order to provide an orderly replacement of national security training for the present Selective Service System.

3. This is answered under 1 above. While the American Legion feels that all young men who are physically and mentally fit should spend at least 4 months in national service training, we have no objection to these men volunteering for such service provided they have not been called for active duty through the medium of Selective Service machinery. As above stated, we doubt very much that sufficient numbers will volunteer to meet the country's actual needs.

In addition, why should a boy who is patriotic enough to volunteer have to carry the burden of protecting the country, while his less patriotic neighbor remains home, does no military service at all but reaps the benefits and protection afforded the stay-at-homes by-the more patriotic young men of our country. There is nothing fair or reasonable about such a system at all; it is morally, ethically, and legally wrong. We boast a lot about our democratic systems and policies; let's apply some of them to national security training.

4. It is true that the bill H. R. 2967, advocated by the Pentagon, calls for a 10-year overall obligation. Under the current law (Public Law 51, 82d Cong.), all young men now have an 8-year overall obligation, consisting of 2 years on active duty and 6 additional years in the Reserves. However, under the American Legion's bill H. R. 1630 (sec. 18 (b)), the Reserve obligation could be reduced to 4½ years if the trainee made a reasonable effort to meet his Reserve obligations or duties. Our witnesses so testified before the Brooks subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee on March 2, 1955.

It is respectfully requested that Mr. McKinney and his associates examine the bill H. R. 5297, introduced by Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, chairman of the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, under date of March 29, 1955. Such an examination would reveal that many of the features advocated by the Pentagon in H. R. 2967 have not been accepted by the subcommittee, but, on the other hand, several suggestions advanced by the American Legion in H. R. 1630 have been adopted. Under the provisions of the Brooks bill, about the only compulsory feature therein is that members of the Reserves who fail to live up to their obligations (provided they have not already served at least 2 years on active duty) could be recalled to active duty for a period of not to exceed 2 years. The American Legion subscribes to this provision.

Under the Pentagon's bill, trainees who did not live up to their Reserve obligations could be given a dishonorable discharge. The American Legion does not agree with this thinking.

We respectfully submit that the Brooks subcommittee, during its long and exhaustive hearings, which covered a period of several weeks, has made a thorough and competent study of this problem from all angles, including the possibilities of building a voluntary reserve rather than a compulsory reserve, as advocated by Mr. McKinney. It is to be noted also that Mr. McKinney puts forth no concrete suggestions for our study or consideration. If he and his associates can offer a better plan, I am certain that the proper officials of the American Legion would be more than glad to give it every consideration.

MILES D. KENNEDY.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL SECURITY COMMISSION,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 5, 1955.

Mr. J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
Wagner, Wagner & Wagner,
Battle Creek, Mich.

DEAR ADD: Thank you so much for your letter of March 30 and the attached copy of a letter from Harold C. McKinney, Jr., of the Michigan Council of Churches sent to Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY.

Actually, Add, Mr. McKinney is right in the four points that he sets out in his letter. To briefly review those points:

First. National security training or UMT is designed to give every physically fit young man some type of military training. As proposed by the American Legion, this would be of aproximately 1,000 hours or 4 months duration between the boy's graduation from high school and his entrance into college or embarkation upon a career.

Second. The American Legion has always envisioned national security training as a permanent and continuing program; otherwise we would fall into the same valley of unpreparedness following World Wars I and II.

Third. In order for the program to be effective it would necessarily have to be compulsory for eventually the American Legion hopes that voluntary enlistments would maintain the strength of the Armed Forces while the reserve components would be maintained by national security training graduates.

Fourth. On this point Mr. McKinney is merely talking about existing law because Public Law 51 established the total military liability of every young man at 8 years. National security training would merely mean that the young man would have approximately 7 years, 8 months of Reserve liability following his release from the National Security Training Corps.

On this last point (fourth) it is reasonable to assume that after NST has been in operation for several years the Reserve obligation could be reduced because of the huge number of young men flowing into the reserve components semiannually.

What we are actually faced with in Mr. McKinney's letter, Add, is the tremendous opposition of the clergy to a youth training program, even though it is under civilian control. As a deacon in my own church and one who is in a position to know how our membership feels on this subject, I can violently disagree with Mr. McKinney's contention that he speaks for the laity of the Michigan Council of Churches. As you well know, the group that is opposing national security training today is the same group which in 1940 opposed the Selective Service Act. Today they are praising selective service to high heaven and condemning national security training. It is reasonable in my mind to assume that 10 or 20 years hence these people will be lauding national security training.

In conclusion, Add, I realize that this has been a long letter. Miles has made some points which I think are quite important and I am enclosing a copy for your information. Last week the Brooks subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee took favorable action on a bill which while not 100 percent what the American Legion advocates, is certainly a step in the right direction and contains the majority of points which we advocated. I sincerely trust that this session of Congress will see the accomplishment of this long-standing mandate.

If further material or information is needed, I trust that you will advise me accordingly.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES R. WILSON, Jr.,
Director, National Security Division.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1955.

Manpower and personnel.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Thank you for your letter of March 28 with which you enclosed a copy of a letter from the Michigan Council of Churches expressing their opposition to universal military training and H. R. 2967.

I would like to stress that the national Reserve plan, formerly H. R. 2967 and now known as H. R. 5297, is not related to universal military training. It is true that the 6 months active-duty-for-training feature of the plan gives it a surface resemblance to a form of universal military training, but any similarity to that program ends there.

In the first place, universal military training was proposed as a permanent system. Our plan is for 4 years only and is subject to continuing study during that time on the basis of future requirements. Universal military training is based upon universality of training without regard as to whether the trainees are needed by the Military Establishment. Our plan is based solely upon military requirements. In addition, trainees, under universal military training, would be members of a separate corps which would not be a part of the Military Establishment while under our plan they are members of the Armed Forces for the full period of their military obligation. Perhaps one of the most important differences between the two programs is the matter of compulsion. Universal military training proposes an entirely compulsory system of training; the national Reserve plan offers young men affected thereby four choices as to how they may fulfill their military obligation.

These, then, are the principal differences between the two programs, and I trust this explanation will serve to indicate that our plan represents a new, and we believe a logical, approach to the problem of providing the Active and Reserve Forces necessary for the military security of the United States.

I am enclosing two copies of a booklet which describes the objectives and principal features of the national Reserve plan. In the event you should wish to forward a copy to the Michigan Council of Churches I believe it would be of great value to them in developing a better understanding of our proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER L. BURGESS.

To Increase Refugee Entry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an article from the New York Times of May 3, 1955, entitled "To Increase Refugee Entry":

TO INCREASE REFUGEE ENTRY—LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN ACT, ECONOMY OF OPERATION PROPOSED

(The writer of the following letter was formerly in the United States Foreign Service, his last post as vice consul in Rotterdam.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The taxpaying United States public must be considerably confused over the present controversy being waged over the administration of the Refugee Relief Act. Even State Department consular officers who have been and are engaged in the operation of the refugee program must admit, and do so privately, that the well-intended and humantarian parcel of legislation is a rusty old locker to which no one seems to have the key.

Despite a huge expenditure of public funds and the pooled efforts of State Department, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Public Health Service, Department of Labor, and Counterintelligence Corps personnel assigned to the program, the results to date are pitifully meager. The American taxpayer has reason to ask why.

At the Rotterdam consulate we were prepared, as a result of a costly administrative buildup, to issue the 17,000 special visas allotted by the act to refugees in the Netherlands. It soon became all too clear that the goal set by Congress would never be met.

ISSUANCE OF VISAS

On March 25, after 1 year of active operation under the act, only approximately 400 visas had been issued. About 380 of these were to persons who normally would be entitled to visas under the yearly Netherlands quota. Some 20 visas had been issued to bona fide refugees. Yet our results were not considered poor in comparison with other offices in Europe.

The main hurdle to effective operation we found lies in the wording of the Refugee Relief Act itself. The act requires that every person issued a visa under its provisions be guaranteed by his sponsor in the States a specific set of living quarters and a definite job, approved by the Department of Labor. Prospective sponsors soon discovered that the red tape involved in proving and completing these guaranties involved more effort than they were willing to exert.

Those who did secure housing and promised jobs for prospective immigrants and executed the numerous forms to be forwarded to the consulates, via the Department of Labor, Department of State, and various local offices, learned that this paper battle was only the beginning. Security investigations would require from 2 to 6 months more and by that time the future employers and landlords in America would have grown impatient and canceled their agreements.

Consular officers do not question the importance to national security of thorough field investigations on all visa applicants. It is honestly felt, however, that the normal secure consular investigative procedure used in processing regular quota immigrants is adequate. Also there is no need for a separate, expensive and duplicating investigative staff. The act provides that an independent investigations unit report on each visa case, however, and by law this procedure must be followed, regardless of the waste of money and extra processing time involved.

It had been hoped by our officers abroad that the appointment of a qualified professional migration adviser to the Secretary of State such as Edward Corsi would result in either corrective administrative procedures or in strong recommendations to Congress by the Department for elimination of the bottleneck features of the act. These hopes proved but dreams, however, by recent developments.

REVIEW OF OPERATIONS

The most desirable action would be for responsible Members of Congress who are not involved in the present controversy to take action. They could review the entire operational history of the program with the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Department of Labor, consult directly with consular officers to get their suggestions for necessary administrative and legislative changes and work out a workable, yet secure, and expeditious program of operation.

This would definitely require amendments to the present RRA and administrative economy cuts. It would also save the program from certain failure, effect considerable economy, relieve our missions abroad of diplomatic headaches and foreign criticism, and make possible achievement of the original worthy aims of both our Congress and the President.

The assistance promised by our Government to refugees from the horrors of communism and from the ravages of war constitutes an important part of our foreign policy. Victims of totalitarian aggression and natural disasters must be encouraged to look toward our shores for the shelter of political and economic freedom which has become not only a basic facet of our historic identity but also the stimulant which has enriched and strengthened our national development. To permit this tradition to suffer through indifference, personal ambition, and administrative disagreement is folly.

ROBERT G. SCHUCK.

CORNWALL, N. Y., *April 24, 1955.*

American Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through its Loyalty Day observance on May 1 of each year, desires to help combat anti-American propaganda at home and abroad. This effort, dating back numerous years in the annals of the VFW has grown in scope each year. The Communist demonstrations that have taken place in this country annually on May 1 have been effectively counteracted. Thousands of patriotic Americans take an active part in Loyalty Day parades and celebrations that are sponsored by VFW posts and their auxiliaries in towns and cities throughout the Nation. It has been proved that loyal Americans are more than willing to demonstrate their allegiance to the principles of Americanism. The VFW should be congratulated and profoundly thanked by every loyal American for its use of the weapon of truth.

As far back as 1929 the Veterans of Foreign Wars defined Americanism in the following timeless phrases:

Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enimies; undivided allegiance to the flag, and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity.

This definition follows somewhat the preamble to the Constitution of the United States. Loyalty becomes something more than a theory or a postulate when it is translated into practice.

We Americans are a logical people when it comes to matters pertaining to organization. We have a genius for the creation of the mechanics of civic organizations. There is no country in the world with our multiplicity of civic efforts. Service club follows service club—for both men and women.

The same tendency is obvious in the field of the printed word. Magazine follows magazine in abundant profusion, many dedicated to reforming something. Topics vary all the way from foreign policy to mosquito extermination.

It has been said that America is a slave to resolutions, and that the average citizen feels a thrill of exaltation when he attends the annual dinner of his trade society, and votes aye to numerous resolutions all aiming at reform or regeneration of someone else.

Again we have a very riot of special days: Father's Day, Mother's Day, Army Day, Navy Day, and so forth, all designed to focus attention on some concrete definite policy or group.

Thus, logically, we have an American Loyalty Day to call attention to the needs of such efforts. If we can only get people to think American loyalty just once a year, something at least has been accomplished in the cumulative effort, a habit of mind has been formed. Such a day has numerous implications. The date itself is important—May 1—the famous Red May Day, the day of international protests. This day has always been regarded with apprehension in the capitals of Europe, and, to some degree, in our crowded eastern seaboard cities and the industrial centers of the Nation. May 1, set aside in the minds and hearts of all loyal Americans, can reduce the Red May Day aspects to the dull level of anticlimax.

American Loyalty Day is not merely for native-born citizens of this land, but for all who have chosen this fruitful, democratic way of life. It is not a selfish, personalized observance, but gives opportunity for the individual to examine his American loyalty and decide whether or not he is actively making use of it for the good of all mankind.

Effective loyalty must be inspired and strengthened by a capacity to see beyond the material facts which surround us. Otherwise, it can never survive the inevitable changes which take place daily in material things. "The things which are seen," wrote St. Paul, "are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal."

True American loyalty demands a capacity to look beyond the immediate difficulties. That is the secret of its power. It is an age-old promise. History is filled with apparent miracles achieved by men who, in the face of impossible odds, held loyal to their basic principles of life and looked beyond the immediate present, regardless of current skepticism. Consider the incredible things in which the great inventors have believed, the impossibilities which the scientists have created, the miracles that have occurred upon our own athletic fields.

Loyalty is certainly not a blind devotion; it is ready to transform beliefs into action; it must recognize the responsibilities of American citizenship; it has an appreciation for the perils arising in everyday life but chooses to overcome them.

Loyalty may be difficult to define. It is not something that is bought and paid for. It is not purchasable on an open market. It must be given open heartedly, freely, with the kind hope that the recipient will find happiness and comfort in it. It must be felt as a warmth of welcome, a deep sincerity. It must leave an indelible imprint which is unforgettable and is remembered long after the deed which it accomplished is forgotten. It cannot be demanded or commandered.

The loyalty that these United States expects of us on May 1, 1955, and the other 364 days of the year, is the loyalty it deserves—no more, no less.

Again, may I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their patriotic endeavors and urge each citizen to become active in the demonstration of American loyalty.

Curious Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has designated Mr. John B. Hollister, of Cincinnati, as the head of the new International Cooperation Administration, which is to handle our foreign-aid program when the Foreign Operations Administration goes out of existence. I believe the Congress will want to learn a good deal about Mr. Hollister's thinking on foreign aid and I ask unanimous consent to include two editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald which raise some legitimate questions regarding Mr. Hollister's philosophy and how it may affect his administration of our aid program.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 2, 1955]

CURIOUS CHOICE

John B. Hollister, of Cincinnati, whom President Eisenhower has designated head of the new International Cooperation Administration to be set up in the State Department, is an able lawyer and administrator who has been executive director of the Hoover Commission. In his new capacity, if he is confirmed by the Senate, he will be in charge of all foreign-aid operations, including the technical-assistance programs. The post demands unusual energy and special organizational gifts, both of which Mr. Hollister has. But it may be asked whether he wholeheartedly believes in the program he is picked to administer and whether he will bring to it the zeal which is required if the Asian part of it is to strike fire. If rumors concerning a preliminary Hoover Commission report on foreign aid can be relied on, Mr. Hollister's chief interest would seem to be to liquidate it as soon as possible.

Mr. Hollister is a former law partner of Senator Taft and a member of the Taft wing of the Republican Party. His choice for this significant post may have been influenced in part by a desire to keep the Taft wing of the party under the Eisenhower banner. If such is the case, it may prove to be as unfortunate as the appointment of Clarence B. Manion, former Chairman of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations, whose resignation the White House requested when he criticized many Eisenhower programs. Mr. Hollister would make an excellent director of the General Services Administration or some other agency chiefly concerned with economy and efficiency. But the foreign-aid chief should be concerned with social and economic development programs as well as with economy and efficiency. He must be interested in bold experiments designed to raise living standards in the underdeveloped countries. These require the Government to take risks with its money in the interest of long-term and sometimes intangible returns.

We hope that our misgivings about Mr. Hollister, who is a man of ability, experience, and patriotism, are ill founded. But the Senate ought to satisfy itself on these questions before it approves him for a task that is of such importance in our foreign relations. The vigorous continuance of some form of foreign aid to the underdeveloped areas is an investment in world stability of vital concern to the American people.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 5, 1955]

THE POLITICS OF AID

One reason, seemingly, for the nomination of John B. Hollister to head the foreign aid program is the administration's hope that a man of his conservative reputation will be able to sell the program to Congress. This has some plausibility, provided that first the administration can sell the program to Mr. Hollister. President Eisenhower acknowledged Wednesday that he had not inquired whether Mr. Hollister is in sympathy with the aid concept—surely a strange way to run a railroad. Mr. Hollister is an able and conscientious man, however, and we hope that since he has agreed to take the job he will strive sincerely to carry out the administration's wishes.

Negative comments on Capitol Hill indicate that the task of persuasion will be formidable. There is reason to criticize some past blunders in the administration of economic assistance. Yet never has it been more important to convince the peoples of Asia that this country has a genuine concern for their welfare beyond treaties and guns. If there is any underlying meaning to be read into the Bandung Conference, it is that Communist China is flexible in her bid for leadership. The real rivalry in Asia is between China and India; and the way to resist China's magnetism is to strengthen the independent government's including India. That will require, not a big splash, but technical help and modest capital expenditures tailored to individual needs—to assist the development of resources, improve standards of living and broaden the bases of independence.

The challenge is for Congress to show its understanding that the independence of Asian nations is more important than dotted-line agreement with the United States. It would be little consolation later to investigate "who lost Asia?" The time to help save it is now.

Roosevelt Subcommittee—Small Business Applies Requirements of House Resolution 151 to First Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 7, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for your information, and also the information and guidance of my other distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, the full text of a letter dated May 2, 1955, to me from Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, Los Angeles County, Calif., in answer to my letter to him of April 21, 1955, on the same subject.

I wrote the distinguished California Congressman, in my letter of April 21, the text of which is hereinafter set forth, for two reasons:

First, the hearings of the Roosevelt Subcommittee on Small Business were the first committee investigations, I believe, held following the unanimous approval of House Resolution 151, on March 23, 1955, and as author of said resolution I sought to have the earliest possible benefit and information about any experiences the Roosevelt subcommittee might have had operating under House Resolution 151.

Naturally, as author of the resolution, I did and shall undertake to keep as fully informed as possible as to the operations thereof in connection with House committee investigations.

Second, I was informed that some newspaper comment was made out West claiming that there was a possibility that the prompt functioning of the Roosevelt subcommittee hearings would be limited or hampered by reason of the requirements of House Resolution 151.

I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and all the Members of this great legislative body will note the letter statement by Mr. ROOSEVELT with exceeding interest. And, because during the debate on House Resolution 151, the brief question was raised as to the intent and spirit thereof with reference to when closed committee sessions were required, I wish to say that the statement made by the chairman, Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, of the House Rules Committee, to Congressman ROOSEVELT in describing the type of testimony which was required to be in closed session meets with my hearty approval and I respectfully urge that each and every chairman and subcommittee chairman of House investigative committees carefully note the reasonable and sound explanation made by the distinguished Representative from Virginia, Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH.

In this connection, I will state that during the time Subcommittee Chairman ROOSEVELT was making inquiry I was not available in Washington because I was presiding as subcommittee chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Milwaukee, Wis. I make this explanation in connection with Mr. ROOSEVELT's letter to me for the reason that several Members have asked if I concurred with the interpretation placed upon this section of House Resolution 151 by Rules Committee Chairman SMITH and Subcommittee Chairman ROOSEVELT who was so fine and fair in undertaking to apply the full intent and spirit of House Resolution 151 to his subcommittee hearings.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
1030 New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLYDE: Responding to your letter of April 21 requesting full information as to the application of House Resolution 151, of which you are the sponsor, and which passed the House of Representatives unanimously March 23, 1955, I am happy to send you the following report:

Pursuant to section 2 (m) of House Resolution 151, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5, House Select Committee on Small Business, I consulted with the Parliamentarian of the House concerning anticipated testimony which might conceivably be incriminating to certain large firms in the oil industry. The Parliamentarian advised that it would be wise to hold executive hearings until the nature of the evidence was completely established. The committee, therefore, held its first hearings in executive session. It soon became apparent that the testimony was of a responsible and factual nature, and the committee, therefore, voted to make the testimony public in its entirety as per section 2 (o), and the oil firms were

advised that they would have full opportunity to respond.

As chairman of Subcommittee No. 5, I then consulted with the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, and described to him the type of testimony received by the committee in the previous session. Chairman SMITH advised that in view of the responsible testimony he believed future testimony should be open in character, inasmuch as the spirit of House Resolution 151 indicated that witnesses were not to be held in closed session unless their testimony was expected to be irresponsible and of a harmful nature which could not properly be defended against. Subcommittee No. 5, therefore, in agreement with and in conformity with Chairman SMITH'S suggestion, has held the rest of its hearings in public session, and I believe that they have been generally by all parties considered to have been fair and impartial.

We, therefore, feel that under this interpretation of House Resolution 151 the committee's work has not been hampered and that the rights of all concerned have been respected. In accordance with section 2 (h) the committee has also always had at least 2 out of the 3 of its members present at all hearings.

I trust that this will give you the information you desire, and with appreciation for your good wishes, which I reciprocate most heartily, I am

Very sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

APRIL 21, 1955.

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am communicating to you at this time and asking your cooperation along the lines requested by me herein as an aid to me in connection with the practical application and working out of the Doyle resolution, House Resolution 151, which passed the House of Representatives unanimously on March 23, 1955.

As you and your subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of the House apparently held the first investigative hearings by a subcommittee subsequently to the enactment of House Resolution 151, I am interested in your full advices and information to me of how the aforesaid resolution worked out in connection with the important subcommittee hearings here at the Nation's Capital and then out in California. Did you have any occasion to apply any particular paragraph of House Resolution 151? If so, how did you apply it and what the practical result?

I will also thank you for any comment or suggestions you may have in this connection.

Thanking you in advance and with personal regards, I remain,

Cordially yours,

CLYDE DOYLE.

Rural Doctors Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 31, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is still a definite need for expanded medical facilities to educate young men in the medical profession to alleviate the critical shortage of doctors in our country. This situation is especially acute in our rural communities as most of the young men who have been educated for this profession have settled in the larger cities. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch published a very interesting editorial on this subject and I would like to include this editorial as part of my remarks:

RURAL DOCTORS NEEDED

Securing an adequate number of doctors for the rural areas of Missouri has been a constant problem for many years. Consistently the young physicians choose to start their practice in the city where they served their internship, although their roots may be in the country or in some small town. This means that many elect to stay in St. Louis or in Kansas City, or if not in those two cities in a place where there is ready access to research and hospital facilities. As a result, the doctors are few and far between in many counties where their services are needed.

A serious effort is being made to correct this situation by the University of Missouri School of Medicine according to its dean, Dr. Roscoe L. Pullen, who told a KWK–TV and KWK audience over their Operations Progress program last Sunday that medical internship programs are in the works for Columbia, St. Joseph, Springfield, and possibly Sikeston or Cape Girardeau. The net result should be more doctors for the rural areas.

An interesting point was made that frequently the doctor who is closing out his internship has decided to be married—and to a city girl. Usually she takes a dim view of going to a small town, and the result is that her husband opens an office in the city.

It was facetiously suggested that perhaps one good way to take the doctor to the country would be for medical groups to go into the match-making business. That is, to see to it that the graduating physician meets a girl from the rural precincts—object matromony.

But if the original suggestion was made with tongue in cheek, it was soon developed by the panel that the idea isn't at all bad and that it is well worth exploring. In fact, steps have already been taken in that direction and it may develop into a recognized procedure once the intern is prepared to quit his apprenticeship and strike out on his own.

One of the panelists, Dr. James Tolinger of Jackson, Mo., made the practical observation that along with the marital tie-in, small towns and rural areas should assist the young doctor financially in getting started. Most of them begin their practice with meager funds, if any. They have completed their medical courses at great expense to their parents; they earn a bare subsistence during their internship. But to start practice they will need from $6,000 to $16,000 for equipment alone if they are to do a worthwhile job. If the rural communities where they might practice would supply that assistance, the inducement would be great to take a chance in the country.

This has been tried in several States, one of which is Illinois. Dr. Andy Hall of Mount Vernon, who is still practicing at the age of 90, says a plan has been in effect since 1948, sponsored by the Illinois State Medical Society, by which loans up to $1,250 annually are available for 4 years to medical students. The interest rate is 2 percent if they stay; 7 percent if they do not. In some States the funds are outright gifts, with certain stipulations that the young doctor must continue his practice in the community that has helped him.

One of the potent arguments for the establishing of a State medical school at Columbia a few years ago, instead of in St. Louis or Kansas City, was that more medical school graduates would return to the rural communities from whence they came. A survey shows that at least 1 out of every 4 doctors remains to practice in the city in which they intern.

It is to be hoped that the plan to take medical internship programs to at least 5 or 6 communities outside the 2 large cities of the State, will be given every opportunity to develop. Many counties are woefully lacking in doctors, and those in practice are overworked and cannot provide needed services. Some means must be found to supply them with more men of medicine.

Statement by Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey, on Deepening of Delaware River Channel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to accommodate the growing foreign and domestic commerce that utilizes the Delaware River requires an immedate appropriation of $25 million to commence the 4-year program that such development will require.

I include as part of my remarks the statement I presented to the House Appropriation Committee at the hearing held today in connection with the matter.

It reads as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, REPRESENTING THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, IN SUPPORT OF $25 MILLION APPROPRIATION TO COMMENCE WORK ON DEEPENING OF DELAWARE RIVER CHANNEL PROJECT

Mr. Chairman and members of the Appropriation Committee, we are very appreciative of the opportunity you have given to us to appear before your committee and present the facts and figures that, in our opinion, amply justify the inclusion of a $25 million appropriation at this time for the deepening of the Delaware River Channel.

The deepening of the upper Delaware River Channel has been found economically justified by the business, industrial, maritime, State, and municipal interests of the entire Delaware River area. It has the enthusiastic and aggressive support of each of these.

There is no area in the entire Nation that gives promise of greater expansion than the area within the Delaware River Valley. Industrial, commercial, and maritime interests have made, and are now making, large investments amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars to promote economic expansion of the entire district served by the Delaware River. The importance of this contribution to our national wealth and our national security cannot be disputed.

The Delaware River is the main artery of commerce, foreign and domestic, that serves an industrial and farming area not exceeded by any other river in the entire Nation. At the present time its insufficiency of depth is a great handicap in fulfilling its complete usefulness. The traffic on the Delaware River is seriously hampered by this condition and if it is not speedily corrected the injury wrought upon the commerce of the entire area will be incalculable. Furthermore, we must not overlook the further fact that the Delaware Valley lies in the heart of an area in which there is taking

place a rapid industrial and commercial expansion that will require service of ocean-going vessels of a draft in excess of 35 feet.

The resultant financial gain to the United States Treasury is a further justification for an adequate appropriation to deepen the Delaware River Channel. The following figures show that it is just ordinary good business for the Federal Government to invest in the Delaware River:

(a) Customs receipts alone bring $52 million a year into the United States Treasury. Since 1936, the Federal Government has spent a little over $100 million on our Delaware River Channel—but since 1900, it has collected almost $1.5 billion in customs revenue—or a return of $14 for every $1 invested.

(b) Every day the Delaware River carries 700,000 barrels of crude oil to feed our great petroleum refineries. With an adequate channel, the large modern tanker can deliver crude oil at least 60 cents per ton cheaper than the smaller tanker which our Government built during World War II. The Navy's Military Sea Transport Service is now asking Congress to authorize the building of 20 such large modern tankers because of their defense value. The yearly saving in transportation costs of $20 million—for just this one item of our Delaware commerce—will mean a Federal tax revenue of $10 million.

(c) The Delaware River will handle for the steel industry an estimated 15 million tons of imported iron ores. If we calculate conservatively that the large ore carrier will bring this ore to our dock for 50 cents per ton less than the cost of using smaller ships, the benefit to the Federal Treasury will be almost $4 million in additional taxes.

(d) Prosperity in our three-State Delaware Valley area depends upon an adequate Delaware River channel. With such a channel, we will have greater opportunity for industry to employ our people, and this means more Federal revenue from business and individual taxes. In the last fiscal year, Pennsylvania and New Jersey alone contributed over $7 billion in internal-revenue collections of all kinds—better than 10 percent of all tax revenues.

In conclusion, I wish to make reference to the strange suggestion that comes to us from the Chief of Army Engineers, namely that local interests pay half the cost of increasing the depth of the Delaware River. This contribution has been estimated at $18 million.

The Chief of Army Engineers admits that the deepening of the channel as proposed would unquestionably contribute to the general welfare of the region. But he makes the qualifying observation that the use of channel depths greater than 35 feet will be confined to a single company.

In answer to this suggestion, I reply, Why should an industry be compelled to contribute directly to the cost of a public improvement which benefits not only that industry but a whole region, as the 40-foot channel undeniably would? Even if a private enterprise is willing to shoulder such a charge, should the Government want it to? Would there not be corollary questions of the industry's rights in the improvement it is helping to finance, and of tax deductions? Should an industrial firm whose tax payments help produce public improvements be required also to pay directly for such projects?

If a 40-foot Delaware Channel is in the public interest, as it appears to be, it should be treated as a public improvement, built with public funds—not as part of a corporate investment.

Furthermore, to adopt a policy of required local participation in cost of river and harbor improvements creates a situation that would not only be novel and unique in the Government policy that has heretofore prevailed, but the results could conceivably prove most disastrous by curtailing future expansion of our principal ports and rivers.

Questions immediately arise as to not only the lack of justification for such a policy but also as how such a policy could ever be practically applied in its application. For instance:

1. What is meant by "local interests"? Is this to mean "local industrial interests," "local commercial interests," "local maritime or shipping interests," or "local, State, or municipal interests"?

2. If industrial, commercial, or shipping interests are intended, then would it be applicable to the presently existing interests or would it contemplate also contributions from future interests of a similar character? If so, then how would it be applied as between present and future interests?

It can be readily seen that it would be unfair and unjust to apply it only to existing interests as against future interests that would equally benefit, and most objectionable of all considerations, that would naturally grow out of such a policy would be the tendency of new interests to avoid placing their industries or other interests along the Delaware River. Thus it would have a tendency to stifle future development of the whole Delaware River Valley.

3. Furthermore, if such a policy should be adopted as to the Delaware River, then it would be the application of a policy that runs counter to our river development policy since our beginning as a Nation, and in all fairness, would require the application of the same policy to all our rivers and harbors and thus create a situation that would prove most detrimental to port developments throughout our Nation.

Thus I wish to record my objection to the proposal of the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, that local interests be required to contribute in cash to the United States one-half of the actual additional cost of construction of the recommended improvement of the 40-foot channel in excess of the cost of a 35-foot channel, and I respectfully urge the committee to report favorably legislation for an adequate amount that will enable this great improvement to be started at the earliest possible day.

Pulitzer Board Honors Arthur Krock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Washington Star, of May 4, 1955, reporting the eloquent tribute to Arthur Krock of the New York Times, by the Advisory Board on Pulitzer Prizes, on his retirement from its membership. His many friends will applaud:

PULITZER BOARD HONORS KROCK

NEW YORK, May 4.—The Advisory Board on Pulitzer Prizes has cited, for the second time, Arthur Krock of the New York Times, for distinguished correspondence from Washington.

The citation was contained in a resolution approved by the board on Mr. Krock's retirement from its membership under a rule that he proposed. The new rule limits tenure of board members to 3 terms of 4 years each.

The resolution said the board "accepts with great regret" his decision to retire from membership and "recognizes with deepest gratitude the distinguished services he has given to the Pulitzer prizes." The resolution also said:

"That Mr. Krock, through his exclusive interview with President Harry S. Truman, achieved the extraordinary distinction of being cited by the board for doing the outstanding work of 1950 in the national reporting category, but being denied a Pulitzer prize because he was a member of the board, no national reporting prize being awarded that year;

"That Mr. Krock is hereby cited, both for his unselfish efforts as a member of the board and for his distinguished correspondence from Washington, as a great newspaperman and an example to all newspapermen."

General Pulaski: American Benefactor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, about 2 months ago was the 207th anniversary of the birth of General Pulaski. As a person with dogged determination, General Pulaski has few, if any, equals. His perseverance to accomplish his mission marked him by his enemies as a "must" to be disposed of. Only due to his likewise determination to be free was he able to acomplish so much before death finally overtook him at Savannah.

A review of his background in Europe, his continued fight for freedom and finally his meeting with Benjamin Franklin in Paris, led him to battles in America which should inspire all of us with greater hope. His ability to overcome so-called insurmountable difficulties should inject us with new vigor to accept the challenges thrown before us today.

It is my pleasure to submit for the RECORD on this day commemorating the Polish Constitution of 1791 an admirable piece of research written by Joseph Wytrwal. Mr. Wytrwal is a social-studies teacher at Eastern High School in Detroit. He has written about General Pulaski in a way that should interest every American.

GENERAL PULASKI

One day in September 1775, 28-year-old Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski wrote the following dramatic words in a letter addressed to his close friend Prince Radziwill:

"Education received in earlier days prevents me from raising my own hand against myself; but the prolonged hours of this torture do not bring the deserved end to my life."

Little did Pulaski known that 3 years later he was to become a protege of George Washington and that his fame and glory would be part of American history.

Who was this Polish general, whose monuments cover the American continent and whose name will be repeated in classrooms for generations to come?

Kazimierz Pulaski was born in nobility in the Podole Province of Poland on March 4, 1747. His life on his father's estate passed without any special significance. In com-

parison with the upbringing of other youngsters of that violent era, Pulaski's father had been an able jurist who lived a retired life, devoting his time to the education of his sons in accordance with the tradition of the country. Apart from a military training, horseback riding and political indoctrination his sons received the best education one could get through private tutors. It was at the age of 17 when young Pulaski learned to despise the Czarist regime and all it had stood for, and he had learned to suffer from privation when he and his family were locked up in a castle by the Russians. It was there that young Pulaski learned more, through practice, about the art of open warfare. This experience came in handy later when Pulaski bravely opposed the enemy in the skirmishes at Starokonstantynow and at Chmielnik, which he defended in the name of the Bar Confederation.

His attitude and stand at that time came as a result of the unprecedented arrest by the Russians of four Polish deputies to the Sejm. The Sejm, being paralyzed by the threatening force of 30,000 Russian soldiers, could not do much to defend the arrest of its deputies. Neither did King Stanislaw August Poniatowski take any action. The only answer to the Russian outrage was a firm plan for an uprising, which was drafted by Jozef Pulaski. He found an able and loyal supporter in his own son, Kazimierz. On January 29, 1768, the insurrection was proclaimed at bar and from then on Gen. Kazimierz Pulaski fought uninterruptedly one battle after another. He was in charge of the armed positions at Zwanice and at the Holy Trinity trenches. He crossed the swollen Dniester River, when outnumbered by 4,000 Russians, and unimpressed he led his attachment of 400 horsemen through Bukovina to Karkow. Meanwhile, Jozef Pulaski, the general's father, had died in a Tartar prison, his younger brother was arrested, and he himself was called by the enemy an ambitious opportunist. Pulaski did not lose his courage. He once more started an offensive after having joined remnants of the Confederates at Sanok. After an unsuccessful attack upon Przemysl, he went north to Lithuania in order to start an uprising there. But here again he was defeated, and added to everything else, he lost his brother, Francis, who fell in the battle against General Suvorov's forces. With only a handful of men Kazimierz escaped into Hungary in order to form new forces and to get courage for new battles to come. Kazimierz Pulaski did come back into Poland and in September 1770 he occupied the famous Chestochova Convent, forcing the Russians to retreat. Yet, despite this and many other victories of the Tsarist armies, the Bar Confederacy was growing more and more desperate. In addition General Pulaski was being accused by his own compatriots of having planned the kidnaping of King August Poniatowski, a plan he had rejected when it was secretly offered him. Pulaski defended himself in a proclamation that he had written, but to no avail. He was pronounced a criminal, and from fear of being delivered into Russian hands he began moving from place to place. He would find refuge in Dresden and when the trail after him become hot he moved to Strasbourgh and thence to Paris. Although denounced by the High Court in Poland as a renegade, Pulaski remained loyal to his cause. His only sin was a desire to overthrow the Tsarist regime in Poland and to liberate his beloved country. Once again he made the attempt. At the very moment when Turkey had been defeated after the Turkish-Russian War, Pulaski, with only a few enlisted volunteers, appeared in the Balkans at the camp of the Grand Vizier. He arrived too late. From Rodosto he went to Smyrna and from there to Marseilles. Luck had left him completely. In Marseilles he was robbed of his personal papers and money. He was thrown into jail like a common criminal for his debts. As he was sitting and brooding in jail over his past, the French who had felt responsible for Poland's misfortunes notified Pulaski about the presence in Paris of Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane, who had been recruiting volunteers for America. In the spring of 1777 Pulaski met Franklin in Paris. The latter gave Pulaski a letter of introduction to George Washington saying:

"Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of liberties of his country against the great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into Your Excellency's hands. The court here has encouraged and promoted his voyage, from an opinion that he may be highly useful to our service. Mr. Deane has written so fully concerning him, that I need not enlarge; and I only add my wishes that he may find in our armies under Your Excellency, occasions of distinguishing himself."

A new unexpected chapter in General Pulaski's life had begun. At the end of July, Pulaski landed at Boston. At that time there was fierce fighting on the Hudson River and on the shores of Lake Champlain. Like a firehorse, temporarily disused, Pulaski grew impatient and wrote the following to George Washington himself:

"I wish to receive under my command a detachment of cavalry volunteers, and to hold such a rank as would authorize me to command a whole division if I deserve it. * * * I should like to receive a position in which I would be under orders only from the Commander in Chief. If this is impossible, I would like to share the hardships of war with the Marquis de Lafayette, and to execute the Commander in Chief's orders as the subordinate of the Marquis. The chief thing for which I ask is to be near the enemy, to have the opportunity to earn the name of a good officer. I had under my command in Poland in various battles 18,000 men; attacks and sieges which I commanded allow me to count myself among those who have acquired experience in war. You should not slight such men; I have come from Europe in the hope that I may be accepted in the ranks of those worthy citizens who fight for their country and independence."

On August 28, 1777, the President of Congress received the following letter from George Washington:

"To think of some mode of employing him (Pulaski) in our service there is none occurs to me liable to so few inconveniences and exceptions as the giving him the command of the horse."

Meanwhile, until commissioned by Congress, Pulaski had the opportunity to show craftsmanship in military art at the battle near Warren Tavern. Not only did he check the British but he personally saved General Washington's life, insisting to see the latter when he found out that British forces were mistakenly taken for Americans. As a result of Pulaski's conduct in the Battle of Brandywine, Congress awarded him a commission, and on September 15, 1777, he became a brigadier general in command of the entire cavalry of the American forces.

On Christmas Eve of 1778 British forces, after having captured Savannah, threatened Augusta, Ga., and Charleston. Pulaski, who was serving under the command of General Washington, arrived just in time to push the British back. In this battle he lost his second in command, Colonel Kowacz, a compatriot, and 50 men of his legion. Had it not been for Pulaski's display of bravery and personal combats, Charleston would have been lost to the enemy.

During the summer military operations were suspended and the silence on the front frustrated Pulaski. In consequence on August 19, Pulaski wrote the following letter to Congress:

"Enthusiastic zeal for a noble cause and for life in America, and disregard for death made me enlist in your ranks, and I flattered myself that I should work to your satisfaction and earn your approval. It must be my fate that nothing but honor to which I have ever been faithful, makes me continue in this service; but I am disheartened by ungenerous treatment. * * *

"Be just, gentlemen, and I think as I could not bow before the powers of Europe I came here to sacrifice everything for the independence of America. I wish to live in a free country, and before I settle down I wish to fight for that country's freedom. * * * Maybe I shall have the opportunity to prove that I am a friend to your cause, though I have not been lucky enough to commend myself to some person."

Pulaski's desire to take to arms came sooner than he had expected. In an attack to recapture Savannah, Pulaski led his cavalry under the command of Count d'Estaing. When d'Estaing fell wounded, General Pulaski took over, but he soon fell too, hit by a grapeshot. As a result of infected gangrene the brave fighter for Poland's and America's independence died in agony on board the *Wasp* on October 11 and he was buried in the watery grave. Thus, this great son of Poland never lived to see the finished fruits of his adopted country, whose foundations he so vigorously helped to lay.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish Daily News recently printed an article by Joseph Wytrwal in which he presents Pulaski Proclamations issued by 12 of our State Governors. The survey on General Pulaski which is reported in this article was conducted by students in his American history class at Eastern High School in Detroit. Contributing work to the survey came from Larry Blair, Richard Pastick, Howard Cloutier, Dwight Alison, Patricia Verlinden, Ernestine McNeece, Carlos Broadley, Louis Gaines, Richard Stys, Cynthia Beaudion, Curtis Butler, and Norman Geohring.

The article is as follows:

TWELVE GOVERNORS ISSUED PULASKI PROCLAMATIONS

(By Joseph Wytrwal)

President Eisenhower made the following statement in his General Pulaski Memorial Day proclamation for 1954:

"The story of this Polish patriot's supreme contribution to our independence is a treasured chapter in the annals of a grateful nation."

According to a recent survey, conducted among the governors of the United States, Count Pulaski's deeds of valor on behalf of the American colonists in their fight for freedom have not gone unnoticed or unsung by subsequent generations of Americans.

Last year, to commemorate the 175th anniversary of Pulaski's death at Savannah, Ga., 12 governors issued proclamations.

They were:

Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut; Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts; Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York; Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan; Gov. Hugh Gregg, of New Hampshire; Gov. Lawrence W. Wetherby, of Kentucky; Gov. Robert E. Meyner, of New Jersey; Gov. Robert B. Crosby, of Nebraska; Gov. George N. Craig of Indiana; Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin of Maryland; Gov. C. Elmer Anderson of Minnesota, and Gov. Dennis J. Roberts of Rhode Island.

Gov. Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts, made the following observation in his proclamation:

"After the last partition of Poland, Pulaski was forced into exile to Turkey and later to France, where the news of the American

struggle for freedom reached him. Therefore, at Paris, he at once presented himself to Benjamin Franklin as a volunteer, was readily accepted, and in July 1777, landed, at his own expense in Masachusetts, being immediately invited by George Washington to serve as an officer on his staff.

"Shortly afterwards, as a result of Pulaski's praise-worthy conduct in the Battle of Brandywine, Congress awarded him a commission as brigadier general to form and command the entire cavalry of the American forces. Thus Count Pulaski earned the title of 'Father of American Cavalry,' which units led so effectively at Germantown, at Charleston, and at Savannah. At the latter place, leading his legion to the defense of our French allies, Pulaski was fatally wounded. Two days later, on October 11, 1779, at the age of 31, he had made the supreme sacrifice on the Altar of Liberty."

Gov. Hugh Gregg, of New Hampshire, stated:

"Informed Americans are grateful for the memory of the gallant Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who so bravely aided our people to win their independence in a past generation."

Gov. S. Fine, of Pennsylvania, made the following statement in his proclamation:

"On the honor roll of heroes and patriots who suffered and died that we might enjoy the priceless boon of liberty, the name of Count Casimir Pulaski stands forth with great distinction."

Gov. Lawrence W. Wetherby, of Kentucky, declared:

"In battle, General Pulaski's devotion to the great American cause was demonstrated by his gallant charge into the enemy lines, and his tragic death has served to ennoble him in the eyes of the entire liberty-loving world; and, it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War."

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, stated:

"Casimir Pulaski came from his native Poland to offer, without reservation, his assistance and his fortune in developing the cavalry for the Army of George Washington. Fighting not for personal advantage but the principles and ideals to which he was dedicated, he died, on October 11, 1779, in the battle of Savannah, that the liberty he loved so well might live."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, said:

"Count Pulaski's exploits at Brandywine were such that Congress made him a brigadier general and chief of cavalry. The gallant defense of Charleston by the Pulaski Legion in May 1779, which he organized, is an unforgettable chapter in the military history of our country. General Pulaski literally gave his life for our freedom when he perished October 11 of the same year from wounds he sustained at Savannah."

Gov. Robert B. Crosby, of Nebraska, said:

"A Polish patriot, Casimir Pulaski, was a man who so fervently believed in the principles of freedom that he was willing to fight and die for this cause. He was killed during the American Revolution defending the rights of a people who, like him, wanted above all else to be free. So great a patriot was he that the Nebraska Legislature some years ago saw fit to call the attention of its citizens to this martyr by proclamation each year."

Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, asserted:

"His contribution to our cause, and through that cause to liberty in the world, gives him a permanent place in the history of this Nation which is today's main bulwark of freedom and the hope of oppressed peoples everywhere, including those of Pulaski's beloved Poland."

Gov. Elmer Anderson, of Minnesota, said:

"General Pulaski's dedicated and devoted service to this Nation has provided inspiration not only for the service men and women of this country but also for the freedom-loving people of his native Poland."

Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, of Rhode Island, said:

"He was assiduous in hoping to find opportunities of proving his devotion to the American cause, although he encountered opposition and discouragement in trying to put his ideas into effect. At the age of 32 he was mortally wounded at the Battle of Savannah and did not live to see the victory to which he had contributed."

Gov. John Lodge, of Connecticut, declared:

"For his bravery and splendid leadership at Brandywine less than a month after he had been given his command in America, Pulaski was accorded the rank of brigadier general. His example was an inspiration to all Americans, and especially to the men of the famous Pulaski Legion, who performed signal service in the War for Independence."

Gov. George S. Craig, of Indiana, made the following observation in his proclamation:

"The passage of the years since General Pulaski's death had not dimmed the glory of his sacrifice or the luster of his fame; and his selfless devotion to the cause of freedom stands today as a challenge to all men who work for freedom in all nations."

No; the glory of Pulaski's sacrifice, or the luster of Pulaski's fame has not been dimmed by the passage of the years. With every passing year, the memory of Count Casimir Pulaski is held in ever greater reverence.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski is acclaimed with warmest affection by our entire Nation. This affectionate place his memory holds in the hearts of millions of Americans is well earned—for General Pulaski is truly one of our national glories.

National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two communications which I have just received from Mr. J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., with respect to my resolution, House Joint Resolution 231, which would proclaim a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week:

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 27, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I would like to further add to the letters previously forwarded in support of your resolution, House Joint Resolution 231, a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week the following:

Mr. Edward H. Leighten, editor, Flow magazine, has written, stating: "Thank you for sending the information on the proposed week. This is certainly a fine idea and aside from writing letters to Congress, we will be glad to do anything that may be indicated to further the promotion."

Mr. Carl Harrington, editor, Mill and Factory Magazine writes, stating: "In reply to your letter we will be delighted to help publicize this week. Please keep us advised and we will take an active part in bringing it to the attention of our readers."

Mr. J. Sack, managing editor, South African Mechanized Handling, Johannesburg, South Africa, writes, and I quote: "Many thanks for your kind thought in sending me a copy of the original correspondence with the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr. regarding the proclamation of a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week by the President of the United States.

"Once again, I am moved to sincere admiration of the work of your society specifically, and American enterprise generally, in drawing public attention to important problems. The way you are handling this matter is, in my opinion, an object lesson from which I hope we, in this part of the world, will be able to profit."

Assuming there are no objections I am going to feature it prominently in South African Mechanized Handling.

Mr. Richard M. Oliver, industry planning service, Aircraft Industries Association, writes, stating: "We are pleased to know of the effort and shall be glad to assist in whatever way we can.

"The Aircraft Industries Association does not have any particular group working wholly on material handling problems, but there are interested personnel among the membership of material, manufacturing methods, and preservation and packaging committees. We shall be glad to publicize the National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week to our interested personnel."

Mr. Richard Malkin, executive editor, Air Transportation Magazine, writes: "Congratulations on your fine effort. Air Transportation will be happy to cooperate in the job of getting the idea across."

Mr. A. Lawrence Young, secretary, International Air Transport Association of Montreal, Canada, writes, and I quote: "As an international association I do not think we can at this stage, participate formally in your program. However, we appreciate fully the importance of your objectives. I have shown your letter to Mr. Groenwegge who handles cargo matters in our traffic section. We should be most appreciative if you could see your way to keep him advised of developments."

Mr. R. N. Redmayne, general manage, Air Industries & Transport Association of Canada, has written, stating: "May I acknowledge your letter to Mr. T. P. Fox, president of our association, and in reply advise that we wish to commend the steps taken to focus attention on material handling problems."

I would request that this information be included into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of benefit to the effort to establish a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

AMERICA MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, April 27, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am in receipt of a letter and other information from Mr. Harold F. Hess, executive vice president of the Construction Industry Manufacturers Association, Inc. who writes: "I have read with interest your letter to Congressman RODINO on the subject of a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week. Attached is information on use of construction machinery and allied equipment in many segments of industry."

Construction machines and allied equipment are the basis of all human welfare and physical progress. They make modern construction possible, and from construction springs the fundamentals of all civilized man's existence—his food, water and shelter, clothing, transportation, defense against his enemies, and even his recreation. Everything man uses in peace or war starts with construction of facilities for production and distribution.

Without construction there would be no civilization. Without proper tools, materials and machinery there would be no construction.

Construction equipment is special equipment, designed, developed and constantly improved through the years to let us build better, faster and more efficiently. Yet, because, of its high capacity, ruggedness, efficiency and versatility, construction machinery is becoming indispensable to production operations in other basic industries. It is found in the mines, producing, hauling, and processing vital minerals. It is found in the woods, handling and hauling logs for timber production. It is found in the oil fields, digging slush pits, building and handling pipelines, erecting derricks and other production equipment. And it is found in many large industries handling heavy materials.

This industry, invaluable in peacetime, is in wartime called upon to furnish the equipment to generate the electric power for Signal Corps, build the airports on foreign battlegrounds, repair bomb-wrecked bridges, assemble big cannon in the field, build the roads for advancing troops, unload supplies (or evacuate them in rough going), drill wells, and build the docks for supplies to be unloaded.

This equipment is also used by the Armed Forces to build pontoon bridges, lay cables for telephone communications, and travel with the combat engineers and the Navy "Sea Bees" as an integral part of the operations, for without it a nation could not survive in modern-day warfare.

In time of mobilization and in war, construction machinery assumes the importance of planes, guns, and tanks. It makes possible the rapid expansion of plants for producing war materiel. It makes possible the fast building of vital air bases, ports, camps, and other military establishments, helps in production of critical materials needed for a military program. And, in combat, construction equipment carries the building of roads, airfields, and other facilities right up to the front lines.

In the interests of the effort to establish a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week through your House Joint Resolution 231, I would request that this be included in the record as of benefit to the program.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary, AMHS, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

Resolution of School Committee of Dover, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted by the school committee of the city of Dover, N. H., and transmitted to me by Mr. Maurice A. Blais, chairman of the Dover School Committee:

Resolved by the School Committee of the City of Dover, That our Representatives in Congress be and hereby are requested to work for the enactment and passage of Federal legislation to aid education which will contain direct grants to cities and towns for the construction of school buildings. Solely guaranteeing bonds as provided in some of the proposed legislation will not benefit cities and towns to any appreciable extent nor permit them to start new contruction as the real-estate taxpayer cannot carry this extra burden. The chairman is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to our Representatives in Congress.

Floyd J. Pemberton Named "Driver of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride today that I point to a high honor which has recently been conferred upon a Detroit citizen and resident of my district.

He is Floyd J. Pemberton, a driver for Commercial Carriers, Inc., of Detroit. Mr. Pemberton has just been named the trucking industry "driver of the year," the highest award given by the industry in recognition of safe driving habits and personal heroism. One driver is selected each year from among the 6 million on the highways.

Not only does driver Pemberton have an excellent safety record—over a half million miles with only a minor mishap in which an automobile bumped the rear of his truck—but last December he risked his life to save two women, helpless in a burning car. They are Miss Dorothy Powell and Miss Eleen Cooper, both of Ypsilanti, Mich.

It was Christmas Eve and Floyd was heading toward Detroit, and home. He had safely delivered a load of new cars to Cincinnati.

Suddenly, about 300 feet in front of him, 2 cars collided head-on. The driver of one was thrown out and killed instantly. The other car burst into flames.

Mr. Pemberton pulled to a stop and risked an explosion of the gasoline tank to use the fire extinguisher he carried in his cab to put out the flames. He placed flares on the highway to prevent other motorists from crashing into the two wrecked cars.

He then removed Miss Powell from the wreckage and applied a tourniquet to her leg, which had been nearly severed at the knee. He did not remove Miss Cooper because as he explained afterward, "she was bleeding too badly at the throat to risk being moved." However, he did place cloth padding under her chin to check, as far as possible, the bleeding.

A physician who cared for Miss Cooper later said "her survival could have been termed a miracle" and was due largely to Mr. Pemberton's quick action at the scene of the accident.

Michigan is proud of Floyd Pemberton. But the pride goes much deeper than mere respect for his new honor.

Floyd has an honorable discharge from the Marines and was wounded at Saipan and Okinawa. He and his lovely wife, Bonnie, live with their 3 sons in their own home in Redford Township, just outside Detroit.

With no time for the usual scoutmaster's schedule, Floyd makes up for it by taking his boys and fellow members of Troop 227 on special fishing and bowling outings.

The Pembertons are a typical, happy American family group.

And it is for this that Michigan primarily honors Floyd. It is respect for the solid American citizen, who did not hesitate to plunge himself unselfishly into the midst of a dangerous situation to aid his fellow beings.

His kind are the citizens of whom we all are proud.

Effect of Automation on Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced a resolution which was referred to the Rules Committee. It provides for the creation of a select committee of seven Members of this House to study the effects of automation on our economy.

I humbly ask the support of the Members of the House for the early establishment of this committee. I believe the urgent need for the study envisaged in my resolution, House Resolution 221, is clear. The resolution would authorize the creation of a select committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the growing use of automatic machines to make decisions previously requiring the exercise of human judgment, and to perform functions previously requiring human participation or supervision. I feel an analysis now is necessary with regard to the effect of automation on the American economy.

That definition, in the vernacular, is a mouthful. I tried to find a simpler definition and turned to the dictionary in my office. We have a 1951 edition of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary; and, do you know, the word "automation" is not in there. I then asked the Library of Congress for a definition of the word. They report it is not contained in any dictionary they have. Despite this, we have all, however, heard a great deal about automation recently. Just a day or so ago, a certain great American industrial company sent out

its employee relations newsletter, "for circulation among management." It is entitled "Automation—Friend or Foe?" On page 5 of that newsletter this concern said that today the employer must automate to stay alive, and to automate, he must get his costs down appropriately and "remove from his payroll any substantial surplus of employees not needed." The company continues, saying:

The point is that there is no royal road to technological progress and if we want to continue to see our level of living go up, some risks by all are inescapable. Since it is no longer a question of whether industry in general will automate, but only whether a given company will be a leader or fall behind, anybody who is temporarily displaced by improvements in that company would lose his job anyhow—along with all the other employees in that company losing their jobs—if it should fall back in the parade.

What that company is really saying is this: There is no longer any question about industry adopting automation. Companies which do automate will have to fire substantial numbers of employees and those who do not automate—and reduce their payrolls to remain competitive—will be unable to remain in business, and all their employees will be put out of work. That is what this concern told its management.

Certainly no one here wants to put a damper on the increased expansion and growth of American industry. One of the marvelous results of the genius of the people of the United States is an economic machine capable of building our Nation into a true paradise. I say—full speed ahead. There can be no turning back, no halt to progress. If we falter, we plant the seed of our own downfall. However, we must proceed carefully and not foolishly; intelligently and not wastefully; forcefully and not destructively. This same wonderful economic machine which we have built can very easily turn upon us, devour our workingmen, eliminate our consumers, and like the Frankenstein monster, destroy its creator.

There can be no doubt that economic planning is an absolute necessity today. Recognizing this, the Federal Reserve Board has raised the margin requirements for stock purchases twice in the last 4 months and has taken other steps to help guide our economy and our well-being. We must not neglect the labor and industrial situation and the helpless condition of the millions of American employees.

You may be sure if we do, the Communists may be counted upon to seize upon every dislocation and resultant period of unrest and unemployment to further their own plans.

And please, let us not deceive ourselves: automation has arrived and will continue to expand with ever-increasing rapidity. The labor supply is, according to all predictions, scheduled for great increases. With the simultaneous increase in automation, what will these prospective employees do. I do not know and I do not believe any one person knows the answer. According to governmental reports, industrial employment decreased again in March, reaching the lowest level since last September.

The best available data shows that the packing industry is being seriously affected today by automation. Due to automation in that industry, more job rates were "bargained out" of the new contract with one packer this year than in all the last 15 years put together.

The electronics industry, in the well-chosen phrase of Robert Bendiner, of the Reporter magazine, "the fountainhead of automation," which should be employing many new people in producing the new mechanical wonders, shows that employment just is not keeping pace with production. "Electronics output in 1952 was 275 percent higher than in 1947, but was produced by only 40 percent more workers," according to Bendiner.

The telephone industry furnishes a daily example of the effects of automation. Many of the calls which once were toll calls needing a special operator are now dial calls and can be completed by the individual placing it. Fifty thousand telephone operators have been replaced so far by this new dial system.

Life magazine, with calm aplomb, says:

With a total of 2.7 million not working, we have been able to turn out and consume virtually as much goods as at the record heights of the boom. What this indicates—

And this is the point—

is that the United States may be able to produce and consume at boom-time levels, yet still have a "permanent reserve" of unemployment, which may increase.

That is a fine way to describe a worker with a family to feed: "Permanent reserve of unemployment." We cannot just set aside these men and women and call them trained reservists like the National Guard or Reserve.

The Factory Management and Maintenance industrial editor had this to say, according to Bendiner's excellent article, which I highly commend as "must" reading—the Reporter, April 7, 1955:

The jobs that are "duck soup" for elimination by automatic production are mainly the semiskilled ones, such as machine operating and materials handling. Some observers believe the factory of the future will go so far as to wipe out this great "middle class" of industry.

The effects of automation will first be felt in the areas of the country most heavily populated and industrialized. These areas, my own New York, New England, Ohio, Michigan, and other industrial States, are all in the path of catastrophic dislocations. As automation accelerates, the obsolescence of present plant facilities mounts, thus causing mass exodus of industry from these areas having skilled, trained labor pools.

While the effects of automation have not as yet been completely recognized, automation today is like a slow, creeping paralysis. The employee who is being replaced by a machine is in many cases rehired for merely temporary work, while the millions now unemployed cannot find new work. It is this employee who is not hired who is the most seriously affected at the moment.

Certainly in the long run automation, like all progress and industrial advancement, will prove highly beneficial to all. More jobs will be created. More goods will be produced. More leisure and more pay will be available to everyone. Walter Reuther, of the CIO, recognized this when he said that we will achieve an "abundance in terms undreamed of before," with "vast improvements in the living conditions of the American people."

Before we reach this pleasant state, however, we must face the problem which automation is now creating. Newsweek reported:

Ford's automatic engine plant turns out twice as many engines as before with one-tenth the manpower. A radio assembly line producing 1,000 radios a day uses only 2 workers where 200 were used before. An average refinery which employed 800 people without instrumentation, now uses 12.

The man put out on the street today or tomorrow is not in the least concerned with the land of plenty we will achieve in 1975. He needs help now. Life's vast "unemployed reserve" must have help now.

Obviously the State and local governments cannot assume this immense task alone. Federal guidance and planning are essential. What is needed, how much help, and what kind of help the Federal Government should supply is unknown and should be explored.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY has made the point most forcefully when he said that we must "find out how automation may be made to pay its way in terms of human welfare."

It is clearly the human problem with which we are concerned. The material values we have in ever-growing abundance, but the individual must not be lost and buried in a mound of statistics.

This Congress can establish itself as one of the wisest and best America has known. We have the golden opportunity now to evaluate and assess, in advance, the benefits, problems, and difficulties which automation will create. If we seize this chance we can truly help mold a greater and healthier society.

We must act now. We cannot allow an era of "technological unemployment" to come upon us, for if it does, international communism will seize the opportunity to feed upon this disaster. It is our duty to avert this calamity.

I implore your support and prompt approval of this study of automation.

The Time Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a timely editorial on the subject of civil defense which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger of May 4, 1955:

THE TIME IS NOW

United States Civil Defense Boss Val Peterson delivered a real whoop-and-holler speech the other day to the governors of our States about the need for pepping up State

civil-defense work, but the governors are throwing the question right back at Mr. Peterson.

They want to know what Uncle Sam is doing first.

They say it's primarily a Federal job and the United States isn't showing them what to do.

This hassle has been going on for over a year now. We're no further along the line toward adequate civil defense than we were in 1950. We're probably worse off, because lots of new weapons have been developed, lots of new warnings have been thrown out, but no new instructions.

There's no sense in teaching the population what to do about civil defense after a bomb has fallen. The time is now, before the fatal event. And there's no sense in each agency exhorting the other to get going. It's obvious by now that somebody has to take the lead and the Federal Government is the logical choice.

We need a set of rules and regulations. We need clear and precise instructions on what kind of shelters to build, where, and how. We need to know what supplies to store in public places, how to control our roads and our airports and railroad terminals. We need to know what burdens we in New Jersey are expected to carry for our less fortunate brethren across the river, who won't find it so easy to escape into the hinterlands.

When is the Federal Government going to answer the questions?

H. R. 5986

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5986 to provide for Federal employees who are injured in the line of duty the right to ultimate review by the courts of their claims for workmens' compensation—a right which they do not now possess.

A Federal employee, who is injured on the job, is entitled to compensation upon application and approval of his claim by the Bureau of Employees Compensation in the Department of Labor. Should the Bureau deny his application, the worker is privileged to request the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board to review his case. Under the present statute, this is the court of last resort.

The procedures for making such claim and the right of appeal from an adverse decision from the Bureau of Employees Compensation are described in the Federal Employees Compensation Act of 1949—Public Law 357, 81st Congress.

In most States there is an analogy between the Federal Bureau of Employees Compensation and the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board and the machinery established by the States for presenting and reviewing compensation claims of private-industry workers. In one important respect, however, the comparison is not valid. Under the law covering Federal employees, the claimant exhausts all rights after appealing to the administrative tribunal, the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board. An employee in private industry in 47 States is permitted to appeal to the courts following use of all procedural machinery established under the various State laws. Attached is a list showing the type of judicial review accorded by the States. Hence, Federal workers are not granted the same rights as their fellow employees under State laws.

Review of proceedings before the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board will reveal that approximately 70 percent of Federal employee appeals are decided adversely to the employee. Ignoring appeals which are completely without foundation in law or fact, there remains a substantial number of cases where the worker has no further recourse.

The bill I have proposed is an effort to remedy this defect by extending to Federal workers the right to secure judicial review of compensation claims after use of all administrative procedures. I am hopeful that the appropriate committee of the House will consider this legislation at an early date.

The list showing the type of review accorded by the States follows:

STATE AND TYPE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW

Alabama: Supreme court within 30 days.
Alaska: United States district court in 30 days.
Arizona: Supreme court within 30 days.
Arkansas: Circuit court within 30 days; further appeal to supreme court.
California: Supreme court or district court of appeals within 30 days.
Colorado: District court within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Connecticut: Superior court within 10 days.
Delaware: Superior court within 10 days.
District of Columbia: Federal district court within 30 days.
Florida: Certiorari to supreme court in 30 days.
Georgia: Superior court within 30 days; further appeal to court of appeals.
Hawaii: Circuit court in 20 days.
Idaho: Supreme court within 30 days; 6 percent interest from date of acicdent.
Illinois: Circuit court or city court, in cities over 25,000 population, within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court in 60 days.
Indiana: Appellate court within 30 days.
Iowa: District court within 30 days.
Kansas: District court within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Kentucky: Circuit court within 20 days; further appeal to court of appeals if amount involved is sufficient.
Louisiana: Proper appellate court; further appeal to supreme court.
Maine: Law courts within 20 days.
Maryland: Circuit court or Baltimore common law courts in 30 days; further appeal to court of appeals.
Massachusetts: Supreme court within 10 day.
Michigan: Supreme court within 10 days.
Minnesota: Supreme court within 30 days.
Mississippi: Circuit court within 30 days and further appeal to supreme court.
Missouri: Circuit court within 30 days then to appellate court.
Montana: District court within 30 days after decision; further appeal to supreme court.
Nebraska: District court within 14 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Nevada: No provision.
New Hampshire: May be taken to supreme court.
New Jersey: County court within 30 days; further appeal to appellate division of superior court.
New Mexico: Supreme court as in other cases.
New York: Appellate division of supreme court in 30 days; further appeal to court of appeals.
North Carolina: Superior court within 30 days.
North Dakota: District court within 30 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Ohio: Common pleas court within 60 days after rehearing; further appeal to supreme court.
Oklahoma: Supreme court within 20 days.
Oregon: Circuit court within 30 days; further appeal as in other cases.
Pennsylvania: Common pleas court (county court in Allegheny County) within 20 days; further appeal to superior court. To the circuit of county of which applicant was a resident.
Rhode Island: Superior court within 10 days; further appeal to supreme court.
South Carolina: Common pleas court within 30 days.
South Dakota: Circuit court within 20 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Tennessee: Circuit court within 10 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Texas: Court of county where injury occurred; within 20 days.
Utah: Supreme court within 30 days.
Vermont: County court within 15 days, questions of law and fact; or to supreme court within 15 days, law only.
Virginia: Supreme court of appeals within 30 days.
Washington: Superior court within 30 days.
West Virginia: Supreme court of appeals within 30 days.
Wisconsin: Circuit court for Dane County within 30 days; further appeal to supreme court.
Wyoming: Supreme court within 70 days.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington News today, May 5, 1955, entitled "A Reasonable Request":

A REASONABLE REQUEST

When the House of Representatives takes up the Alaska-Hawaii statehood bill Monday it will have a rare opportunity to make history. It has been more than 40 years since an American Territory was made a State of the Union, and these two are the only Territories remaining.

The case for Alaska and Hawaii is compelling—legally, economically, and morally.

There is no other way under our Constitution to give these people full citizenship and self-government.

A Territory by the very nature of things is under the Federal Government's thumb in important matters. It is prevented by bureaucracy from making any solid plans for its future. Its people cannot even vote on the men who govern them.

Alaska has the land the resources to support millions. But they first must be developed, and a steady flow of immigration and capital is necessary to bring that about. Fast as Alaska has grown, it would attract many more people from the States if it controlled its land and other natural riches

and could offer people a chance to come and develop them.

While the Government has encouraged settlement and exploration as a paper policy, it virtually has stopped there. A government of Alaskans is the only kind that understands Alaska's problems, the only kind that will do anything substantial to solve them.

Morally, colonialism is indefensible when its victims are capable of governing themselves. And while independence for Alaska and Hawaii is a theoretical alternative, they do not want it for the good reason that they are as American as any of us—and we could not do without them, from the military standpoint.

They ask no more than most of us have possessed and taken for granted all our lives—full and free citizenship in our country, and the right to choose those who govern us.

We should be big enough to share it with them.

Naval Veterans of 1898

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of a letter I have sent to the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Spanish War of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, concerning House Joint Resolution 151.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1955.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Spanish War, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am pleased to endorse House Joint Resolution 151, introduced by Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, which was the subject of recent hearings by your subcommittee. A good friend and constituent of mine, Capt. Laurence H. Parker, of Fiskdale, Mass., treasurer-in-chief, Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, has brought to my attention the provisions of this measure and I am hopeful that the subcommittee can take favorable action.

House Joint Resolution 151 seeks to correct an injustice to the naval veterans of the Spanish-American War by placing them on the same basis as those veterans who served in the Army insofar as pension benefits are concerned. With the passage of the years, only some 20 or so surviving naval veterans and widows would benefit from the passage of this legislation.

The naval veterans of 1898 and their dependents are not being accorded the same treatment granted through law to the Army veterans. At present, no pension is allowed the widow of a naval veteran of the combat area, who had as much as 89 days of actual service, whereas a widow of an Army volunteer, with no duty in the combat zone and only 60 days of actual service, receives a full pension. This discrepancy apparently results from the fact that furlough time can be included by Army veterans in the computation of service time while this particular provision of the pension laws has not been extended to the naval veterans.

House Joint Resolution 151 will correct this inequity and I will be thankful for your help in bringing this legislation before the full membership of the House. It would also be a favor to me if you would include this letter in the RECORD when House Joint Resolution 151 is before the full committee for consideration.

With thanks and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

What Has Happened to the United States of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Lt. Gen. George Stratemeyer, retired, is worthy of consideration by all of us in dealing with the Formosa situation. General Stratemeyer spent many years in this area of the world and is very familiar with the problems of the Far East:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?

The old spirit of 1776 seems to have nearly disappeared from our leaders and many of our people. The American guts of our forefathers have evaporated. Even the Golden Rule here at home seems to have gone. Also conspicuous by their absence are the Flag, the Constitution, and our Bill of Rights. I do not understand the strange times we are encountering.

Our airmen, soldiers, and civilians still remain in Red Chinese dungeons or have been tortured to death. Our country doesn't seem seem to be bothered about this as word came out yesterday that we would confer with the Chinese Communist murderers and apparently double cross our great World War II ally, Chiang Kai-shek. This from America is beyond my comprehension.

Our flag symbolizes God, the Constitution, love of native land, patriotism, Americanism, fearlessness, loathing of cowardice, pride, integrity, dignity, and truth.

The Constitution was the foundation for many years for the very life of the United States of America, but it seems to have died. It must arise from the dead by a new birth. God demands of us morality, a Constitution of one Union of 48 States. Human rights are now desperately longed for by the people when they are not taxed to death and they again can have a gold standard dollar. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has stated in the American magazine that our Nation can start operating in the black "right now," without impairing essential government functions.

It takes great leaders to live up to the Golden Rule, and it will take a great nation to do the same—America once had this so why not again? God demands morality. Our fathers had to start from stratch with their accumulated experiences and knowledge of governments and human nature—so must we again have this realism, standing on their shoulders of wisdom, plus our newly acquired realisms. We are told that we can't turn the clock back. I say we can turn the clock back. We can dignify our flag; we can stand up for the Constitution and our Bill of Rights (including every word in both); we can have a solid and sound gold standard dollar; and we can "In God We Trust," with fight.

The flag demands that it no longer be a pair of pretty pajamas for those pleading the fifth amendment. God demands morality. Liars must be punished as criminals when they evade the Constitution or try and make a dirty rule of the Golden Rule. The American eagle will scream with approval if we will just turn the clock back to "In God We Trust," with fight. Then every home will be a sanctuary, a church, a cathedral, a place of reverence for God and a respect for God's laws. Fear must be gotten rid of and be replaced by courage, integrity, Americanism, patriotism, and truth.

If the United States of America forces the surrender of Quemoy and Matsu to the Chinese Communists, it will be a great disaster for our country. Remember the Red Chinese have no effective north-south communications except shipping. Nationalist guns on Matsu and Quemoy force this shipping far out to sea where Chiang Kai-shek's naval vessels destroy or intercept it. With Matsu and Quemoy abandoned to the Red murderers, their shipping can hug the coast and the Communist domination of southeast Asia and the Communist seizure of supplies we propose to send to Indochina can be made certain.

This abandonment of Quemoy and Matsu would surely immobilize Chiang permanently on Formosa, and in a few years, as his army grows old, the Communists would take without opposition that great strategic island so essential to the security of the United States of America. That island is the key to the free world's Pacific defense. Moreover, President Chiang Kai-shek is our faithful ally, not as the chieftain of Formosa, but as the rightful dignified head of the Government of China.

In view of China's great mountain ranges and west-east rivers, there is no chance of the Soviet or the Red Chinese Government sending decisive military aid to South China. In fact, it appears that if Chiang were allowed to land on the Chinese mainland in South China, he could establish there an anti-Communist government friendly to the United States. And besides, the Chinese Communists couldn't do a thing about it. This is especially true now, because of the desolation of the Yangtze due to the worst flood in modern times. Moreover, there are hundreds of thousands of anti-Communist guerrillas in China proper and particularly in South China who are friendly to Chiang Kai-shek and the United States who are just waiting for leadership and supplies to rise into deadly action against the Chinese Reds and to liberate their country.

In my opinion, there is reason to believe that the Soviet would welcome a South China government hostile to North China. This would prevent North Red China from getting too strong—something which the Soviet hierarchy probably fears because of their restive satellites, their internal problems, and their long thin supply line to the North China-Korea area.

God demands morality, so let's be honest for once and keep our word to the Chinese Nationalists, our fighting ally, and get our boys out of Red Chinese dungeons.

Minimum Wage of $1.25 an Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass.:

Whereas the President of the United States has proposed, and Congress is now considering, legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage above the present inadequate figure of 75 cents an hour; and

Whereas a fair and reasonable minimum wage would raise the living standards of underpaid workers, increase the national income, stimulate business activity, minimize unfair industrial competition based upon sweatshop wages, and help to solve the problem of runaway shops; and

Whereas the city of Lynn, Mass., has suffered serious competition because of the inadequacy of the present minimum wage and is threatened with further difficulties unless action is taken quickly; and

Whereas the President's proposal of a 90-cent minimum falls far short of meeting the needs of underpaid workers or of the population as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lynn, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, and urge our Senators and Representatives to support such legislation in the interests of both our own community and the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That an attested copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Massachusetts Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following statement by Mr. L. S. Buckmaster, general president of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, CIO, points out the need for immediate action on the part of Congress to increase the minimum wage. Mr. Buckmaster's statement follows:

As the duly elected president of our organization, consisting of approximately 200,000 men and women working in large and small manufacturing plants throughout the United States, it is my privilege to submit this statement to the Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is now considering proposed changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Our organization was formed 20 years ago and has steadily grown to its present size. We represent workers engaged in the manufacture of rubber products, cork products, linoleum and other hard-surface floor coverings, and a wide variety of plastic items. Our union negotiates with some of the major industrial concerns in the United States, including the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., United States Rubber Co., the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and the B. F. Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., as well as with smaller concerns employing as few as 25 employees.

Average straight-time hourly earnings for persons working in the rubber industry are approximately $1.95 and the industry ranks 7th among the 21 manufacturing industries in the United States in this regard. There are few members of our union who are currently earning less than $1.25 per hour.

Nevertheless, I urgently recommend that this subcommittee approve an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 throughout the United States, and the broadening of coverage, as proposed in Senator LEHMAN's bill, S. 662. The general economic and social justifications for such an increase have been presented in great detail to the subcommittee in both oral and written testimony by other spokesmen for the CIO and, therefore, do not need repeating here. I would like to add to that testimony, however, 1 or 2 general comments and some specific information about situations in industries which we represent, which further point up the need for this increase.

There are perhaps many desirable social changes which cannot be achieved by legislation. Increasing the minimum wage and extending its coverage, however, will provide a means, which the country can well afford, by which depressed living standards in sections of our population may be raised toward a national level of decency. In a sense, a low minimum wage such as now exists, condones the existence of certain factories or operations, at least partially, because they are able to exploit labor.

Fair competition is certainly a healthy characteristic of our American economy. We would suggest, however, that one aspect of "fair" competition would be that it should not thrive, or even partially exist, by virtue of substandard wages. Competition is not "fair" when it exists in whole or part by depriving people of opportunities toward a humane fullness of life.

THE RUBBER INDUSTRY

There are a few specific cases, however, in which our membership has some direct interest in increasing the minimum wage to $1.25.

Within the rubber industry almost 50 percent of the employees are engaged in the manufacture of tires and tubes. Earnings in this segment of the industry are higher than the average, namely about $2.24 per hour on a straight-time basis.

There are no tire and tube plants at which employees are paid less than $1.25 per hour. However, these plants also manufacture tire retreading material known as "camelback" and, in the production of this item, the plants face competition from small, low-paying establishments. Following is a list of the well-known rubber companies manufacturing camelback: Armstrong Rubber Co., Cooper Tire & Rubber Co., Dayton Rubber Co., Denman Cord Tire & Rubber Co., Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Gates Rubber Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Kelly-Springfield Tire Co., Lee Tire & Rubber Co., Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co., Mohawk Rubber Co., Pacific Rubber Co., Polson Rubber Co., Seiberling Rubber Co., Southeastern Rubber Products, U. S. Rubber Co.

These companies are all paying their employees more than $1.25 per hour, in most cases substantially more than $1.25. In contrast to this, the Continental Tire & Rubber Co. in Guntersville, Ala., is paying its skilled employees 80 cents per hour, and other employees 75 cents per hour.

The key operation in the manufacture of camelback is the tubing process, in which the rubber is forced through a die to make a continuous strip of camelback. In preparation for this, it is necessary to have a warm-up operator work the rubber to the proper consistency for tubing. These are the two skilled jobs in the process; other workers are neded to perform unskilled work.

An analysis of the rates that are paid for producing camelback at various URCLPWA plants will show that even a minimum wage of $1.25 will not completely eliminate the wage differential between established plants and the low-paying camelback companies. For example, at the Seiberling Rubber Co. in Barberton, Ohio the warm-up mill operator is earning $2.15 per hour and the tread tuber $2.55. At the Mohawk Rubber Co. in Akron, Ohio these two key jobs pay $2.66 and $2.86 per hour respectively. At the new plant of the Mohawk Rubber Co. in Littleton, Colo. (constructed for the sole purpose of producing camelback) these two operations pay $1.85 and $2.05 respectively. At the plant of the Polson Rubber Co. in Garrettsville, Ohio employees receive $1.91 for these operations.

These wage differentials of over 100 percent are important enough under conditions of normal economic competition, but they become particularly important when Government contracts are involved. It is our understanding that the Continental Rubber Co. with hourly wage rates approximately half as high as at established plants manufacturing camelback, has been the successful bidder on numerous Government contracts for the production of camelback, some to be used within the continental limits of the United States and some to be used at overseas installations.

It is not claimed that competition between companies is solely in the field of hourly wage rates. Certainly, manufacturing efficiency and output per man-hour both affect unit costs. But, nevertheless, a wage differential of over 100 percent is so extreme as to present unfair competition to even the most efficient plant.

Substandard wages in the rubber industry are not entirely confined to specific operations or individual companies. I should like to call the subcommittee's attention to the fact that in Ohio even in the high-paying rubber-products industry, where nationwide average straight-time hourly earnings in 1953 were $1.87, 3,686 persons were receiving less than $1.25 per hour. This condition may have altered somewhat since 1953 as a result of collective bargaining, but it certainly still exists.

In conclusion, may I again say that my statements herein should be considered by the subcommittee as supplementary to testimony offered by others in the CIO. I have not repeated them here, as a convenience to the subcommittee, but our organization fully supports the position advanced before the subcommittee by CIO President Walter Reuther.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following resolution from the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oreg., in approval of the reciprocal trade agreement program, without crippling amendments:

Whereas

1. The value of exports and imports of the Oregon customs district amount to approximately $200 million (sea borne commerce directly in and out of local ports only);

2. The exports of this area are almost six times the value of imports and this area would likely gain considerably from a higher level of foreign trade;

3. A higher level of foreign trade can best be achieved by: (a) A two-way flow of goods, (b) international free enterprise, (c) and gradual reduction of artificial barriers to trade; and

4. The reciprocal trade agreements have been in successful operation for 21 years without damage to the United States economy: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Portland, Oreg. supports expanding the foreign commerce of the United States by approval of the Trade Agreements Act principle. It further supports H. R. 1 without crippling amendments as it now appears before the Senate Finance Committee, which will extend our reciprocal trade agreement program for 3 years.

Poland's Constitution Day, May 3, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland have the right to know that we of America, who owe so much to those of Polish birth, cherish the thought that a free and sovereign Poland will rise again.

On this day when liberty-loving Poles celebrate their national holiday and the anniversary of their constitution, they should be plainly given the encouragement that may reside in the simple fact that we have not forgotten them.

We of the Western World, who share a common, humane, and democratic tradition with the Polish people, are temporarily separated from direct access to many of them. Violations of solemn agreements by the Soviet Union, whose word we hoped could be trusted, have closed the Poles in the mother country behind the Iron Curtain.

It is impossible that this situation shall forever exist, that the patriotic citizens in Poland proper can be ground into dust, that they can be forced to forget their heritage, to abandon their proud culture.

The national spirit of a brave, free people cannot be destroyed by the tyrant's yoke and the foreign oppressor, even when he uses puppets and quislings from within to execute his will. A wise writer pointed out that after the several partitions of the past "Poland survived as a national entity" although held for a century in a "state of emulsion."

The Polish people today are not less devout in their religion and their national faith, not less courageous and determined, than those who went before them and who recovered Poland's sovereignty and liberty after the First World War.

We of America must have a special consideration, in all truth, for the oppressed in Poland. In our own time of struggle, in the days of our revolution, the Polish people sent Thaddeus Kosciusko, soldier and patriot, whose devotion to liberty and military skill were equally serviceable to General Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of Poland's people and the slavery in which they are held by the Soviet Union's violations of faith are not a new theme to me.

More than 8 years ago, on February 12, 1947, I took the floor to warn that in contempt of her own pledged word the U. S. S. R. was attempting to sovietize the Polish people and territory. I stated then, and I repeat today, that this attempt was foredoomed to fail.

I stated then, and I repeat today, that America should never recognize a Soviet-dominated, fraudulent election that purports to reflect the people's will but actually reflects only the demands of the foreign overlords.

I said in 1947, and I most solemnly repeat today, that the leaders of the Soviet Union must recognize there is no hope for lasting peace when they lightly and contemptuously break agreements entered freely in conference.

America must never cease to make this clear to the men of the Kremlin. America must never cease to express, on every occasion, her desire and faith that Poland will once again be free.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include the remarks I made to the House on February 12, 1947:

UNITED STATES MUST PROTECT POLAND AGAINST COMMUNISM

(Speech of Hon. MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, February 12, 1947)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, America today pays tribute to two great men, Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko.

Others will review the achievements of Lincoln in addresses throughout our great Nation. I take the floor this afternoon in tribute to Kosciusko, Polish soldier and patriot, who became an officer in America's first Army and aided our Founding Fathers in their struggle to make the Colonies an an independent nation.

Two hundred years have failed to dim the luster of Kosciusko's glory, achieved in the cause of freedom. He brought from his native land of Poland a military skill which he placed at the disposal of General Washington for 6 long years. He contributed so much to the success of the American Revolution that when his work was done he returned to Poland carrying with him a vote of thanks of Congress.

Kosciusko's name will live forever—symbolic of the struggle of man against the forces of oppression. His name means to the world emancipation from human bondage. It is fitting that on this anniversary of his birth we should think of him—honor the memory of a valiant hero and stanch defender of the ideals of liberty and justice, not only for Poland but for all mankind.

Others came from Poland in those days of trial for the colonists—indicating that over 200 years ago there burned in the hearts of the Polish people that same love for freedom that remains alive today.

The Polish people know oppression—have known it for many centuries. On this anniversary of the birth of one of their great men whose friendship for America helped to relieve her from oppression, it is fitting today to give some thought to the plight of Poland.

America has always befriended the small nations of the world. To Poland we owe a lasting debt of gratitude; first, because it is the land of some of our earliest benefactors; second, because it was brave Poland that first accepted the challenge of Hitler. For her heroism shall Poland be partitioned; shall her Government be made the puppet of a stronger nation whose ideologies are so foreign to the Christian beliefs of the Polish people?

We should have some concern for Poland's welfare, just as Kosciusko and other Polish patriots had concern for America. We cannot follow the happenings in Poland today without coming to the very definite realization that the U. S. S. R. is doing some very questionable things. Russia has taken over the economies of all Central Europe and America must face the ugly fact that the U. S. S. R. in violation of agreements made with her wartime allies, is spreading the tentacles of sovietism over unprotected and unwilling people.

A great Christian people like the Poles will never accept the Godless political or social philosophy of the Soviet. There can be no peace in Europe, or in the world when one people try to force upon another ideologies in which they have no faith.

Our Government cannot ignore and, of course, it has not ignored the attempts to perpetuate a puppet government in Poland. President Truman only a few days ago delivered to the new Polish Ambassador a scathing denunciation of the manner in which the recent Polish elections were held and made it clear that America does not feel that provisions of the agreement between the war Allies has been followed.

America should be unyielding in its protest against the Soviet-influenced election in Poland.

Liberty is slowly bleeding to death in prostrate Poland. Countless thousands of Poles have been victims of political murders or exiled. Through former Secretary of State Byrnes, America has voiced its disapproval of these persecutions.

The fraudulent Polish elections are a warning of eventual Soviet annexation of all Europe by employment of similar methods unless stern and effective measures are adopted by the United Nations.

The flagrant violation of even the meager obligation of holding free elections in Poland, as guaranteed by the Yalta agreement, raises doubt in the United States concerning the sanctity of Russian pledges. These dishonest elections are aimed at the complete enslavement of the Polish Nation.

I have repeatedly stated that the future holds no hope for a lasting peace unless the nations of the world can arrive at mutual understanding. How are we to expect such if one of the great powers holds so lightly agreements made in conference? However, it is done, the Soviets must be brought to realize that their attempted domination of Europe must be curbed if a way to lasting peace is ever to be found.

Sacred pledges were made by the victorious United Nations at Yalta and at Potsdam guaranteeing freedom and personal security in life and property to all peoples in all lands. Russia was a participant in these conferences. She assumed obligations by agreements concurred in by the United Nations. If the Soviets do not choose to honor these agreements, they leave the world with serious doubt as to their future course.

As a Nation dedicated to freedom—recognizing the blessings of liberty as we do—America should continue to exhibit the liveliest concern in the welfare of Poland and all small nations who were given such hope by the Atlantic Charter. America's great weight must be thrown behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

Loyalty Day, Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the consideration of the membership an outstanding address

made by Capt. Benjamin B. Lipsner, representing Irving Breakstone, commander of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, at the Loyalty Day celebration held at Gary, Ind., May 1, 1955:

LOYALTY DAY CELEBRATION MAY 1, 1955, AT GARY, IND., SPEECH BY CAPT. BENJAMIN B. LIPSNER, REPRESENTING IRVING BREAKSTONE, COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS

Mayor Mandich, distinguished guests, citizens of Gary, fellow Americans, as the duly authorized representative of the American Legion Department of Illinois and the personal representative of the distinguished State commander, Irving Breakstone, I consider this a personal honor and privilege to be here and to receive this fine heart-warming reception at your hands.

It seems fitting and proper that this fine city of yours was chosen in which to open our national campaign "education for freedom." Your city is particularly dear to my heart because it was here that the world's greatest pioneer in gliding which was the forerunner to successful flight that the great Octave Chanute commenced, experimented, and developed his great gliding techniques, using your great sand dunes from 1891 to 1896. The Wright brothers, one of them Wilbur Wright, was born in Millville, Ind., they were disciples of Chanute, and it was his friendship and great encouragement that brought ultimate success to the Wrights, who made their first powered controlled flights at Kill Devil Hills, near Kitty Hawk, N. C., on December 17, 1903. The Wrights learned from Chanute the art of construction as well as gliding and he went to the scene of their great triumphs in North Carolina. There is a glacial boulder marker in Marquette Park which was dedicated to this great pioneer, "The Father of Aviation." I was present and took part in those ceremonies on July 11, 1936.

We have a great deal in common with our neighbors of Gary and the State of Indiana. You gave the American Legion two great national commanders, the late lamented Gov. Paul Vorhees McNutt and your present distinguished Governor Craig. We of Illinois also contributed several great national commanders, Gen. Milton J. Foreman, Edward Hayes, and former Gov. John Steele, all of whom were my dear friends. General Foreman and Edward Hayes have passed on, but ex-Governor Steele is still very active in the American Legion.

"Education for freedom" is the only positive approach to a true understanding of our rights and prerogatives as Americans, under our precious Constitution and our Bill of Rights. There is nothing difficult or mysterious about our Constitution or Bill of Rights. Our mission is to openly discuss among ourselves in Legion posts, churches, clubs, and schools, the great virtues of these important instruments of freedom. We should know our history incident to the creation of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. It is a glorious history which fills one's heart with inspiration, gratitude, and pride, whether you are a college graduate or only attended public school. Every American should readily understand the great heritage which is ours by virtue of our patriotic forefathers whose wisdom created a great Nation dedicated to God and His children of every class, creed, color, or religion, into one great family, where right, not might, determines all questions that affect our children, ourselves, and our posterity. Our great and dynamic State commander, Irving Breakstone has thus far succeeded in establishing throughout our State, discussion groups in every part of Illinois, all of whom are revitalizing and influencing our citizens to take a positive, rather than a negative view of our rights and privileges which our forefathers designed for us to follow.

The American Heritage Council, an organization composed of public spirited and patriotic men and women who are fostering a campaign to bring to the American public a patriotic program as well as aiding the American Legion in its education for freedom movement. We in the American Legion owe a great debt of gratitude to this great patriotic organization that is doing such a splendid job of promoting patriotic discussion groups so as to familiarize in a simple and earnest manner just why our Constitution and Bill of Rights is an American heritage and is responsible for making America the greatest Nation in the world.

In short, under the leadership of our distinguished State commander, Irving Breakstone, of the Illinois Department of the American Legion, this splendid program is being sponsored to educate its members about American history and the fundamentals of justice, freedom, and democracy.

The cracker barrel roundtable method is an interesting and valuable method of teaching adults. Here's the way it works: Groups of 8 or 10 persons are set up. They read important American documents and then meet and discuss them. Under the guidance of a moderator they match their ideas and opinions. Discussions that start off with, say, the Declaration of Independence, often wind up in a discussion of today's headline news.

The participants quickly learn, many of them for the first time, the wide variety of opinion that exists on many subjects they believed were not debatable. Americans are not conformists and thrive on controversy. Group meetings teach the liberals to respect the opinions of the conservatives and vice versa.

Meetings of this character help make the Legion post of a community the center of being well informed. They help Legionnaires understand why we and others have been concerned about the tendency toward a Gestapo-type of activity circulated by some uninformed members of so-called service organizations.

These zealots have the mistaken notion that anyone who disagrees with their own particular brand of patriotism is un-American. They do not understand that a basic American right is the right to disagree with the majority. The new positive approach to Americanism inaugurated by Breakstone is a better way of fighting communism and protecting Americanism, because for the first time, it will teach many Americans exactly what Americanism really is.

In conclusion, I want to thank Mayor Mandich, Col. Harry Rothman, Commander Richard S. Kaplan, your fine patriotic leader of the American Legion, and all the citizens of this great community for their cooperation in making this affair possible.

American Forefathers of Italian Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, people of many national origins have made valuable contributions toward the founding and development of our great country, its culture and civilization, and its way of life.

Recently, there has come to my attention a very fine address which is a piece of excellent research in the field of American history. It deals with the subject Our American Forefathers of Italian Origin, and it was made by my good friend, the Honorable Luke A. Mercadante, before the Nassau County Chapter of the American Committee on Italian Migration on April 27, 1955.

Mr. Mercadante is one of our very prominent citizens in New York. He is a former mayor of Glen Cove, N. Y., where he now resides and is in private law practice. In 1950, he was the Democratic candidate for attorney general on the State ticket. He is active in political, civic, and philanthropic affairs, an able leader and administrator, and a fine speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many of our colleagues and the public at large will find Mr. Mercadante's address most interesting. For this reason, I am placing it in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

OUR AMERICAN FOREFATHERS OF ITALIAN ORIGIN

The treasury of our country's heritage is replete with contributions of Americans of Italian origin. Their tremendous value is appreciated by the persons knowing the facts. Unfortunately, the scholastic history books have failed to recite most of these incidents. For that reason many people are not aware of the leading role played by the citizens of Italian origin in the creation of practically every American tradition.

The discovery of America by Christopher Columbus stands as the most important event of modern world history. Almost as important were the feats of his contemporaries and countrymen, Giovanni Caboto and his son, Sebastian. Their discoveries served as a basis of England's claim to Newfoundland, Greenland, Labrador, and most of the eastern coast of North America.

Giovanni Verrazano sailed to the coast of New Jersey, discovered New York Harbor and the mouth of the Hudson River almost a hundred years before Henry Hudson.

Amerigo Vespucci, after whom America has been named, made some exploratory trips to the Gulf of Venezuela.

The feats of these men stimulated and inspired other men to come to America to meet the problem of civilization. The interior of this vast new country had to be exploited. Physical hardships brought by the elements had to be overcome. Hostile Indians abounded everywhere.

A young Neopolitan daredevil by the name of Tonti came with La Salle in the latter part of the 1600's to explore the Mississippi Valley. Together they founded the first settlement of the Mississippi Valley, and great cities like Detroit, and so forth, owe their existence to them. Tonti was La Salle's lieutenant. He had lost his right hand in the explosion of a grenade and wore a hook in its place. Nevertheless, he was such a fierce fighter that the Indians were terrified of him. He and La Salle were the first to sail down the Mississippi.

As the Thirteen Original American Colonies were beginning to take shape, Virginia, the first to be colonized, was making progress. One of its leading citizens, Philip Mazzei (Poggia) introduced the culture of grapes for the first time in America. He was a close friend of Patrick Henry, governor of Virginia, who sent him on an expedition to Europe as a representative of Virginia. He was also an intimate friend of Presidents Madison, Jefferson, and Adams. During the Revolutionary War, he was captured by the British and imprisoned on Long Island. He published the most accurate history of America. His letters had a tremendous influence on the great Jeffersonian political philosophy.

The most outstanding member of the colony of Maryland at that time was William Paca, the third governor of Maryland. Paca was involved in all of the important politi-

cal movements in Maryland from his entrance into politics until his death. He was elected to the First and Second Continental Congresses. He also served as chief justice of the court of appeals in admiralty and as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention. His signature can be found on the Declaration of Independence. In addition to public service, William Paca contributed much of his own money to outfit troops during the Revolutionary War.

Young Virginia was full of ambitious and restless men seeking new horizons. One of them, George Rogers Clark, was anxious to conquer the Northwest but was sadly in need of funds. A Piedmont soldier merchant, Joseph Vigo, who made a fortune fur trading in New Orleans threw in his wealth. Without his help Clark could not have conquered the Northwest. This territory now includes many States. When Virginia, later, ceded all of its territory to the Confederation of American States, she made the condition that the United States should assume its debt to Vigo. Vigo was not paid in his lifetime. He died almost penniless after generously giving his time and money to the American cause. Nearly 100 years passed before the Federal Supreme Court ordered his claims to be paid and his heirs received about $50,000. Indiana has named a county and a township for him and great tribute was paid to him at the dedication of the memorial to George Rogers Clark.

President James Madison and President James Monroe made frequent trips to Philadelphia to visit a mutual friend. He was the Venetian musician and composer, Philip Tragetta. Tragetta established the American Conservatorio in Philadelphia and thereby set aflame a torch of culture in this new country.

Elsewhere, Americans of Italian origin were spreading a refined civilization. In the hills of northern Idaho a Jesuit missionary worked among the Indians. Father Antonio Ravalli built with his own hands a church in the wilderness. He carved the altar and statues. With the same hands that perform the sacrifice of the mass, he built a sawmill and small flour mill. Then came the days of the gold rush, of roaring, shooting Virginia City, Last Chance, Silver City, Crook Creek, and Hell Gate. Father Ravalli won fame in these Montana towns as a priest and physician to Indians and white alike.

In Missouri, a Neapolitan missioner, Joseph Rosati, aided in the creation of St. Mary's Seminary in Perryville which provided many pioneer Catholic missionaries. He built numerous churches, the greatest of which is the Cathedral of St. Louis.

The first collegiate institutions on the Pacific coast, the College of Santa Clara, was molded by the hands of Father Greg Mengarini, a Roman missioner and educator. After performing fruitful labor among the Blackfeet and Flathead Indians, Father Mengarini devoted his later years to the college.

Father Benedict Sistini pioneered the teaching of algebra, geometry, and trigonometry in this country with his outstanding treatises on the subjects. He also started a periodical which had the widest circulation of any Catholic magazine in the United States, The Messenger of the Sacred Heart.

Nowadays we talk about splitting the atom and molecular activity. A Jesuit priest, Joseph Bayma, wrote a book around 1850 entitled "Elements of Molecular Mechanics" which was considered by famous mathematicians as a most extraordinary advanced work. Right after that he was transferred to California as president of St. Ignatius College in San Francisco. There he wrote many elementary textbooks in mathematics.

Father Samuel Mazzuchelli (Milanese) after working with the Indians, established a congregation of teaching sisters, the Dominican Congregation of the Most Holy Rosary. He was also chaplain of the first territorial legislature of Wisconsin, and the designer of the first capitol building of Iowa.

The Jewish Theological Seminary in New York was founded in 1886 by an Italian Rabbi (Leghorn) Sabato Morais. He was an ardent abolitionist as were other famous Italian-Americans of the day. Vincenza Botto, during the Civil War, advanced the cause of the North in the Italian press. Botto, a professor of Italian and literature at the University of the City of New York entertained Horace Greeley, William Cullen Bryant, and Edgar Allen Poe. Establishing the first important salon in the history of American letters was his greatest contribution.

Just about this time (1880) the first Italian daily newspaper Il Progresso was established by Charles Barsotti. He is responsible for the erecting of statues to famous Italians, Verrazona at Battery Park, Garibaldi in Washington Square, Columbus in Columbus Circle, Dante at Broadway and 63d Street, Verdi on Broadway.

It may seem that the Italian-Americans were contributing only to the cultural growth of Americans. They were distinguishing themselves in battle, too. Bancroft Gherardi, while commanding the *Port Royal* in Farragut's fleet, routed three enemy gunboats in the battle of Mobile Bay. He was highly commended for his cool and courageous conduct. During the Civil War he commanded several ships in the west gulf blockade. He fought in the Mexican War and also secured the settlement of Haitian Revolution. His highest title was commander in chief of the North Atlantic Squadron.

When the Civil War broke out Luigi Cesnola founded a military school for officers. Later he served as a major in the 11th New York Cavalry. He was with Sheridan all through the Shenandoah Valley campaign. He had been wounded and taken prisoner. He received the Congressional Medal of Honor. Later President Abraham Lincoln made him a consul.

An early contributor to American industrial know-how was Giuseppe Tagliabue. He invented the apparatus for determining proof in spirits which was officially adopted by the United States Revenue Bureau. He also invented a mercurial barometer, an apparatus for testing iron and coal, an instrument to determine the amount of water in a barrel of oil. His thermometer is very famous. Tagliabue made delicate instruments used in the refining of sugar, condensing of milk, and for collective weather data.

Beautiful Meridian Hill Park in Washington, D. C., was designed by a Florentine, Ferruccio Vitale. He was also founder of the Foundation for Architecture and Landscape Architecture.

In the New National Museum Building in Washington there has been on exhibition a pair of bronze doors for the west entrance of the Capitol made by sculptor Louis Amateis—Turin. His monuments can be found in Galveston, Houston, Washington, Connecticut, and in many other places. His better known portrait busts are those of President Arthur, James G. Blaine, General Hancock, and Andrew Carnegie.

Recently, Congress has taken time to honor probably the greatest painter of American history, Constantino Brumidi—Roman. He worked in the Capitol Building for over 30 years, much of the time in the rotunda. He was a 70-year-old man, with silvery hair and beard. He performed the dizzy climb to the heights of the rotunda in a slow-moving cage by manipulating ropes. He worked 3 years on the rotunda and received $30,000. In the corridors you will recognize his Washington at Valley Forge, the Battle of Lexington, the Death of General Wooster, the Storming of Stony Point, and the Boston Massacre. In the Agricultural Committee room he painted figures symbolizing history, geography, arts, science, mechanics, commerce, and war. Also portraits of Robert Fulton, Franklin Morse, and John Fitch. When he first went to work in the Capitol he was paid $8 a day. Later, Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, had this increased to $10 per day. Brumidi can truly be called the Michaelangelo of America.

While Brumidi was beautifying the Capitol physically another American of Italian origin was trying to beautify it spiritually. This man, Father Charles Pise, was the only Catholic Chaplain of the United States Senate. He had been nominated by Henry Clay and, of course, duly elected.

Edward Marzo gave the United States the American Guild of Organists and 50 years of inspired musical activity.

These are only a few of the early Americans of Italian extraction that have helped to make our country great. They serve to illustrate that Italian endowment to the American heritage has been long, constant, and enduring.

Starting with the discovery of America by Columbus and shortly after the discoveries of the Cabot's Verrazano and Amerigo Vespucci, the glorious pagent features the exploration of the Mississippi Valley by Tonti, the inspiring letters of Mazzei which gave Thomas Jefferson much of the substance of the Declaration of Independence, the political genius of William Paca helping to mold the new Republic, the sacrificing of Vigo's personal fortune to finance Clark's great expedition, the seed of culture germinated by Tragetta's American Conservatorio, the civilizing of the wilderness by Father Ravalli and the missionaries of Father Rosati, the founding of the first college on the Pacific coast by Father Mengarini, the scholarly treatise of Father Sistini and his Messenger of the Sacred Heart, the mathematical genius of Bayma, the tremendous contribution to education by Father Mazzuchelli's teaching sisters of the Dominican Congregation of the Most Holy Rosary, the founding of the Jewish theological seminary by Rabbi Moris, the establishment of the first important salon of American literature by Professor Botto, the culture of Charles Barsotti and his Il Progresso, the naval strategy of Bancroft Gherarardi in winning important victories in the Civil War, the military genius of Cesnola in training officers for the Union Army and his own heroic participation in battles, the great inventions of Tagliabue which advanced American industry, Vitale's Foundation for Architecture, the great sculptures of Amateis which have immortalized many great Americans, the beautification of the Capitol Building by America's greatest painter, Constantino Brumidi, and finally, the musical culture of Marzo's American Guild of Organists.

In reviewing this parade, every American of Italian extraction should feel a justifiable pride and should resolve to make the utmost effort to contribute to our glorious American heritage.

Port Report No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Houston Post of Monday, April 11, 1955:

PORT REPORT NO. 2—TO NEW ORLEANS FREIGHTER WHISTLE SWEETER THAN JAZZ

(By Jim Mathis)

The city that care forgot.

This is the New Orleans that Texans know. The grand old lady of the yellow, surging Mississippi River.

A city of quaintness, fervent piety, strange sins, joyous laughter, and hep jazz. It has ancient trolley cars, Pat O'Brien's, Gypsy Lou, street peddlers, and Pirate's Alley. A playful place of surface charms.

Don't you believe it.

The New Orleans of today is a rejuvenated giant with one aim—regaining its No. 1 place in the gulf coast sun. Beneath that wrought iron and magnolia front are steel sinews of commerce and dollars.

For its resurgence, wise Orleanians chose the city's greatest asset and Houston's greatest current weakness—its port and foreign trade, respectively.

While brash young Houston rests for a time on its turbulent, half-century laurels, New Orleans is quietly and delicately plucking the leaves from the wreath.

In 1954, as in the past 5 years, New Orleans is second only to New York City in the dollar value of water-borne commerce through its miles of docks.

New Orleans is willing to concede that Houston is No. 2 behind New York in tonnage through its port, but officials ask a pointed question:

Which is more desirable, tonnage or dollars?

It's obvious they'll take the cash.

With Houston dropping in tonnage since 1952, even the margin of annual tonnage is now narrow. Houston's 1954 estimated figure is 40,647,159 tons; for New Orleans about 39.5 million tons.

New Orleans is still the only port outside of New York City which operates on the billion dollar level in foreign trade. It has no intention of letting anyone else slip up on it in that field.

From a wartime peak of $700 million annually in foreign trade, the city has zoomed to $2 billion. Nothing is likely to halt that climb except a general decline in foreign trade.

A combination of geographical and community spirit, a spirit unmatched in postwar years—have formed the basis for New Orleans' resurgence.

When Jean Baptiste Le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville, chose the site of New Orleans in 1718, he chose as wisely as did the Allen brothers, who promoted Houston.

New Orleans lies 110 river-miles from the sea, inside a crescent bend of the Mississippi, which seldom drops below 150 feet in midstream.

In effect, the city lies squarely at the small end of a mighty funnel through which drains half the Nation's export goods.

When port agents send publicity maps into the hinterlands to promote commerce, the maps do not only lay claim to the natural Mississippi Valley business, however.

The western line of their "territory" starts at El Paso, runs northward through New Mexico, Colorado, western Wyoming, and into northwestern Montana.

The eastern boundary begins at Savannah, Ga., on the Atlantic Ocean, runs northwestward through South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Chicago, Ill., and Wisconsin.

A network of tributaries, and the Mississippi itself, touch 31 States from Minnesota to Louisiana.

Texas, of course, is only a minute portion of this commercially fertile field, somewhat larger than even the Louisiana purchase. (Oddly, freight rates from many West and mid-Texas cities on the Texas and Pacific Railroad are less to New Orleans than to Houston.)

The essence of New Orleans' advantages in location, however, is in the tremendous barge traffic plowing down the Mississippi. Tons of bulk commodities such as ore and grain pour into New Orleans by this route for transshipment to foreign destinations.

These unwieldly barges serve a secondary purpose, also. The cheapest transportation known, they force competing railroad lines to keep rates into New Orleans at a minimum.

With all these advantages, New Orleans became the first port of the Nation, even ahead of New York, 100 years ago. At that time the port was already 150 years old; Houston was an infant.

But time was to bring reverses to the city, and the postwar years of World War I found it in 16th position in value of cargo. It became a pawn of political regimes, and at one time 2,000 persons drew checks from the Port Commission, although few ever reported for work. Docks rotted.

A reform movement ended this "deadheading," and a constitutional amendment took the State-owned port out of politics. Now board members serve 5 years, with staggered terms. Candidates are named by the presidents of trade and civic organizations, narrowed down to a list of three, from which the governor must choose one member.

World War II meant a boom to the port, and New Orleans became a major port of embarkation for the armed services. It performed well enough to get the warm praise of Army officials. A survey showed New Orleans could handle cargo cheaper and faster than even New York. The city prospered along with its port.

The years of peace, however, were just ahead, and with them the specter of another lean era. This time merchants and businessmen knew what to expect, however, and they weren't having any of it.

A survey disclosed what most suspected—70 cents of every dollar in the city came directly or indirectly from port activity. Businessmen pondered the future, cast about for possibilities.

William G. Zetzmann, a soft-drink bottler, acted first. He sent letters to 55 businessmen, asking them to a luncheon to discuss ways to promote foreign trade.

"Don't bother to come unless you have a lot of money to invest in the future of your city," Mr. Zetzmann wrote.

Of those invited, 53 came—to pledge $250,000 at that first meeting. This grew to $600,000 within 1 year, and by 1945, the organization—formally labeled International House—had purchased a 10-story building in the center of the city. Three stories were converted into a club, and International House was ready to go.

It began as an organization of 500 members. Each had to furnish bank references, and dedicate a goodly part of his time to the task of making foreigners feel at home in a strange land.

Today, International House has 2,400 members, and more are clamoring for admittance.

It works something like this:

A businessman from Brazil arrives in the city on a definite mission. He is brought immediately to the International House. He gets a membership card, an office and a bilingual secretary within 10 minutes.

Then the World Trade Development Department gets busy, finds out whether the businessman wants to buy or sell. Appointments are made for him, and business contacts furnished. He gets a list of all the suppliers or merchants who sell or buy the merchandise or service he wants.

If he wants to conduct his own research, a fully staffed, fully equipped business library, in many languages, covers one part of the building floor.

An international relations department moves in then, to make reservations for plane or train visits to other cities, to round up social entertainment, a bilingual assistant to help the visitor's wife shop, or even a multilingual babysitter.

All these services are absolutely free. The visitor pays only for his food and drinks, perhaps not even these.

Its services are not confined to the foreign visitor, however. The same help is offered to the American businessman, with special emphasis on assistance to the small manufacturer to whom foreign trade is an unknown field.

The development department's files bulge with records of contacts made and the results.

A manufacturer in an Illinois city who had never exported his farm machinery before is now routing a major part of his business through New Orleans to ports of South American nations.

A Tampa, Fla., baby stroller builder sold 452 of his strollers within 6 months to Latin American buyers there.

Some $30,000 in leaf tobacco from Kentucky went out to Africa and the Canary Islands through International House contacts.

Not all contacts are small. One multimillion-dollar flour deal began from a single contact furnished a Kansas City, Mo., firm.

What New Orleans expects of this service—and is certainly getting—is at least a portion of the shipping generated by the connections it furnishes. In most instances New Orleans gets all of it.

But New Orleans, wisely, has decided that one-way traffic is not the sole answer to foreign trade. Representatives promote imports as avidly as exports.

A direct growth of this effort is the International Trade Mart, a sleek, 5-story building a block away from International House.

Here, foreign nations and manufacturers may rent space and display their products. Buyers from New York City or Chicago may come directly to New Orleans, look over items ranging from Belgian handmade shotguns or African patio mats, to Indian embroidery.

Organized in 1945, with 66 percent of its space rented when it opened, the Trade Mart now operates at capacity. It has always been in the black, and is retiring its bonds ahead of schedule.

Its offices now exhibit over 600 items, from all over the world.

Clay Shaw, director of the mart, estimates that $50 million in business is done annually through the mart.

To keep pace with the growing use, the interlocking boards of the 2 institutions are already negotiating for construction of a new international building—one at least 12 stories and with more space. They ex-

pect to have it in operation within 30 months.

Indicative of the long-range approach to foreign trade taken by the city is the International House's devotion to its cultural program—interchange of Latin American and American students.

In 1945, the International Relations Department organized 13 Louisiana and Mississippi colleges into an exchange group, and even pulled scholarships from many of Latin or South American students.

In the last 10 years, over 10,000 Latin or South American youngsters have moved through New Orleans to these colleges. The program became so effective that the Cordell Hull International Foundation asked that the International House take over direction of its exchange efforts.

Today, approximately 6 percent of Louisiana State University's enrollment is Latin American. In New Orleans, there are 25 Latin American interns and nurses doing advanced work in hospitals.

These youngsters, of course, will grow up as the leaders in their country. When someone says United States they will think New Orleans. As their influence spreads, the direct benefit to New Orleans will become incalculable.

In postwar years, New Orleans has also renewed, through the International House, its Trade and Travel Missions. There have been 21 big plane flights, and countless smaller and individual missions. Writers, newsmen and businessmen from all over the Mississippi Valley have made these forays.

Mayor de Lesseps Morrison, the city's energetic young mayor, has made 12 of these flights.

The mayor is also on call to entertain the visiting Latin American officials, as are other officials and businessmen. It's no trouble at all in New Orleans to whip up a 300-man luncheon or dinner for an important visitor.

Rounding out the port's extra-curricular promotional efforts is a free trade zone—a 12-acre area set off in the port in which foreign goods may be kept without custom charges.

Inside this zone, a foreign manufacturer or a New Orleans importer may store and process goods which may be sold in the United States or transshipped to other nations.

If the goods are sold here, the customs levy is made. If they go out again to other nations, no charge is levied.

Since the zone was established, the giant Sears and Roebuck firm has moved all its imports through New Orleans. Sears maintains a huge warehouse, filled with items like Japanese dishes and Italian motor scooters destined for its South American retail outlets.

Importers of Brazil nuts bring shipments into the zone, clean them and dry them before importation to reduce customs cost.

LOSS LEADER PAYS OFF ON ITS OWN

Another importer cleans and processes coffee beans. A $75,000 wool and cotton fumigator has been established by the Port Commission in the zone.

While importers pay no customs in the zone, they do hire New Orleans labor, drayage, and pay warehouse fees. And the zone generates considerable traffic for the port, like a grocer's loss leader.

Despite all these outside community efforts, the visions of developing foreign trade would have been impossible of fulfillment had not the port proper kept abreast with facilities and service.

Shut off from new construction along its 52 miles of waterfront during the war years, the port faced a big overhaul task as restrictions lifted. Luckily, wartime commerce had built up a backlog of funds for changes.

About $16 million has been poured into the reconstruction and replacement of old wooden wharves, some over 50 years old. A number of modern facilities have been built. Over $7 million went into doubling the capacity of the port's grain elevator, which now holds over 5 million bushels.

Present plans call for expenditure of $10.5 million for 1955, and an overall total of $44 million. Port officials publicly say the face-lifting can be done in 10 years, port engineers say privately it will take 20 years.

Whatever the time, the money is being plowed into the port. And solely from revenues. The port hasn't issued bonds since 1939.

With the exception of approximately $400,000, all the revenue from a Louisiana gasoline tax goes into servicing bonds issued prior to 1939. The time may come, and soon, when the port must finance part of that $44 million expansion with bonds.

Currently, the Port Commission has jurisdiction over 77 berths, along 7½ miles of riverside, in the New Orleans port. Of these, 63 are for general cargo and 14 for special purposes. Two are banana terminals which give New Orleans the edge over all other ports in importation of this fruit.

There are scattered over 5½ miles, 27 private berths in the port, varying from 450 to 500 feet in length. Many of these are for special purposes or are for the United States Navy.

By this November, Port Director W. J. Amoss says, the dredging of the present 5½-mile Industrial Canal linking the river with Lake Pontchartrain to a depth of 30 feet will be completed. This will bring the port some 55 miles nearer to the Gulf of Mexico, at least for the smaller freighters. It will be that much more advantage for the port, even at 30 feet.

Port figures show that 6,342 vessels entered the harbor in 1954. Of these, 3,878 were deep-sea craft and 2,464 inland craft.

Many Orleanians, while fascinated by the continued boom in foreign trade, are happier over the influx of industry in the area. Tremendous strides have been made in recent years.

Some estimate that over $1 billion in permanent industry has moved onto the Mississippi, or the Industrial Canal, since 1950.

The largest single new plant is the Kaiser Aluminum Works, a $145 million plant for production of pig aluminum. Chrysler Corp. converted an unused plane factory into a tank engine installation worth $70 million. The American Cyanamid and Chemical Corp. invested $47.7 million into the production of fertilizer, and Lion Oil put $31 million into an anhydrous ammonia factory.

Shell Oil, an oldtimer at New Orleans, expanded its facilities by $30 million, as did other major plants in the area.

An index of the industrial growth may be seen in the booming annual expansion of the local power companies, Louisiana Power & Light and the New Orleans Public Service Co. Both spend over $10 million annually.

The whole of New Orleans has felt this new blood pumped into old veins, and responds accordingly.

Port Director Amoss calls this response, from the International House to the cabbie who is exceptionally pleasant to a foreign visitor, "a state of mind that we enjoy in New Orleans."

"To put it in a word, we are 'simpatico'," Mr. Amoss continued.

That is a Spanish word which, liberally translated, means "in sympathy with."

"We feel here that Latin Americans and other foreigners, no matter from where, aren't rascals just because they are foreigners," Mr. Amoss said. "It's an outgrowth of long experience in New Orleans and understanding through our mixture of peoples for centuries.

"It trickles down from the top to the clerks, the police, and all levels.

"Perhaps our efforts are part necessity, and certainly a great many interests aren't unselfish. But I don't think we have to apologize for such unselfishness."

Mr. Amoss credits the International House with crystallizing the "simpatico" feeling already present, and channeling it into a productive force.

But he feels that the credit should be more widespread—all over the community.

He and other port officials point to the long happy relationship with labor in New Orleans; there hasn't been a strike in decades.

"You can't develop this feeling overnight," Mr. Amoss ended.

So while other gulf coast ports hang on grimly to what business they have, or let it slip gradually, New Orleans holds more promise for the future, and cash for the present.

Right now, 53 percent of the city's total foreign trade is with South or Central American cities, and 10 percent of the European commerce has been directed to gulf ports through its International Mart, with New Orleans getting the big chunk.

You can still hear the best in jazz on Bourbon Street, sip soup at Antoine's if you want to stand in line, or pay exorbitant prices for antiques, all the modern pleasures of a tourist are still to be found in New Orleans.

But the solid heart and the real color of the city lie in the hoot of steamship whistles and the smudge of factory smoke.

The Milk Program: What It Has Meant to Schoolchildren Across the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is always refreshing to me to get a report direct from the people about some of the programs for which the Congress is responsible. I have in mind the milk program which has meant a great deal to schoolchildren all over the Nation.

Recently, when I was reading the April 28 issue of the Southern Democrat, one of Alabama's fine weekly newspapers, published in Oneonta, Ala., in the Seventh Congressional District, I noted this article written by Sudie Cowden Hicks, of the Remlap School. I think that its reading will give each Member of the House a good insight into the milk program.

The article follows:

When I first heard about the subsidized milk program for the schoolchildren I said, "Well, that is one thing we won't have to fool with. Our children get plenty of milk at home. We don't have a lunchroom and it would be too much trouble for us." As I thought about it more I knew that this was a decision for the parents and not for me. I talked to the children and found to my surprise that almost none were drinking what is considered the minimum essential to good health.

I then got out a letter to the parents asking how many would be interested. About two-thirds said they would, so we began the program. We drink the milk at morning recess and find that it helps to fill that big empty spot that develops in our stomachs between an early breakfast and 11:30 lunch. After a few weeks other benefits developed that were completely astounding to us teachers.

Now, of course, I had read and heard most of my life of what proper food can do for people but I never dreamed that one glass of whole milk a day could make the change it has. One beginner who had not learned to

read at all is now reading and is learning some number work and looks like a different child. Another overage, retarded boy whose disposition and conduct were so bad that I had considered having him taken out of school has become pink cheeked, usually pleasant in manner and attitude, eager to do the chores of a country school and he is improving in his schoolwork.

Now when I see the pleasure of the children as they drink the milk and as I note the improved appearance of most of them I am glad that Mrs. Cline and I trusted the judgment of our parents and helped Uncle Sam make a good investment in his future citizens.

Imports of Tuna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the critical predicament of the American tuna-fishing fleet is dramatized by two messages I have received from fishermen's groups in the past few days. The situation results from an increasing flood of frozen tuna imported into this country absolutely duty-free.

Preparation of tuna by freezing, in order to import it, is a comparatively new technological method. In the past, frozen tuna has never been included in tariff schedules which covered canned tuna. This has resulted in a loophole through which most of the woes of the tuna industry have emerged.

Consideration by our Government is currently being given to the binding of the present duty-free status of frozen tuna into permanent trade agreements with foreign nations. If this is allowed to happen, the American tuna fleet is doomed, and tuna production and control of tuna prices will be lost to the Nation. This must not occur. The best interests of the consumer and the thousands of workers in the tuna industry and allied fields will be served by reasonable controls on imports of tuna.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following communications as a portion of my remarks:

SAN PEDRO, CALIF., *April 30, 1955.*
Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have just adjourned meeting composed of boat owners, labor, local government representatives, and members of allied fishing interests that have been and are being seriously hurt by the crush of imported fish. We are most unhappy and certainly not proud to report to you that the majority of tuna canned by United States packers so far this year is imported fish. At the same time there is and has been tuna on American vessels waiting at the dock to be unloaded. We have been delayed constantly in this unloading of American tuna boats and have just learned that our future sailings might be on a restricted basis. Unless our Government recognizes our plight immediately and cooperates in some manner to perpetuate our fishing fleets, this committee feels that date of complete collapse of the American fleet is imminent. We ask your advice and cooperation in this matter.

MASON CASE FISHERMAN'S COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION OF SAN PEDRO.

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., April 21, 1955.
Hon. BOB WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I am enclosing herewith a copy of the San Diego Labor Market Bulletin which reached my desk this morning. You have recently received material from the chamber of commerce, which is a report of a committee on the tuna situation, and in it reference is made to the labor situation in San Diego. This particular bulletin amply bears out that situation. You will observe that San Diego has now been classified as in group IV–A area for the first quarter of 1955. In the second paragraph it speaks of the employment dropping to a new 3-year low and speaks there of losses in fishing and food processing.

You will observe that they forecast some increase in employment in the canning of fish, and, inasmuch as we haven't been doing any, this will be true, and we hope to get that on such a basis as it will continue. You will observe, however, declines in shipbuilding, which has a reference to the tuna business also, inasmuch as our activity has a great effect upon shipbuilding.

All in all, the situation is not good. We are fighting hard in the tuna business to reestablish ourselves. We hope that the Department of State does not see fit to consign us to the ash heap through some foolish negotiation with Japan, particularly as it regards frozen tuna. I know we have written to you many times and I feel almost apologetic bringing up the subject again, but there seems to be no other way we can proceed than to keep reminding the people in Washington that we have a difficult situation. I know that you have done a very fine job in keeping the people in the executive departments aware of this situation. I trust that you will be able to do that again and for that purpose am enclosing some additional copies of the San Diego Labor Market Bulletin.

Yours very truly,
AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
H. F. CARY, *General Manager.*

Opportunity Provides Success: Tribute to the First Lady of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is always acknowledged that success follows opportunity in life. We acknowledge the contributions from a successful individual which has meant so much to the welfare of our Nation. Every State in this great Nation of ours has many citizens who have contributed to the welfare of America.

We acknowledge the contributions of so many of the citizens from our own State of Arkansas. Recently, in a special program in Little Rock, Ark., an appropriate tribute was given to the outstanding men and women of our State.

On this special occasion, sponsored by the Arkansas Democrat, one of our outstanding newspapers covering the State, an award was made to the first lady of our State, the wife of our esteemed Governor, the Honorable Orval Faubus, at which time she was designated as the outstanding lady for 1955. On this special occasion, Col. J. Carroll Cone, native of Arkansas, and of my congressional district, delivered a very fine and appropriate address, paying tribute to not only our first lady but to other outstanding and successful men and women of our great State. I commend this special message to you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of Congress, and, by unanimous consent, include it with these remarks in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY J. CARROLL CONE, APRIL 23, 1955, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

I am highly honored to have your invitation through my good friend, Mr. Rex Hayes, of the Arkansas Private Flyers Association, to appear on the program today—wherein you are paying honor to four of the outstanding men and women of Arkansas. Your invitation gives me an opportunity to renew acquaintances with many old friends of my native State, and to meet, for the first time, several of your outstanding citizens whom it has not been my good fortune to meet heretofore. I am glad to have this opportunity to meet, for the first time, the first lady of our State, Mrs. Faubus, and her husband, the Governor.

I wish to congratulate the Arkansas Democrat for sponsoring on an annual basis, awards of this kind to outstanding Arkansan men and women, and I congratulate your Arkansas Private Flyers Association on having been permitted to participate in the awards being given today.

I am proud to be a native son of Arkansas, particularly when, in my travels throughout the United States and in many foreign countries, I frequently have called to my attention Arkansans who have made outstanding records in this and in other countries. I am reminded of a great man, Mr. Samuel W. Rayburn, many years ago president of the Union Trust Co. of Little Rock, who went to New York about 20 years ago as president of Lord & Taylor—later becoming president of the Associated Dry Goods Corp.—and who has now retired and is making his home in Florida. Also, there is Arthur McCain, until recently president of the Chase National Bank, and Charley McCain, former president, and still a member of the board of Dillon Read & Co. of New York; Van B. Sims, formerly comptroller of the State of Arkansas, and now vice president of Lord & Taylor; and Miss Dorothy Shaver, a native daughter, now president of Lord & Taylor.

The city of Washington is filled with outstanding men and women, born and reared in Arkansas—men and women who are making great records for themselves, and reflecting great credit upon our native State.

I am particularly proud of the daily comments I hear in Washington and around the country—highly commendatory of the Arkansas delegation in Congress. We have two outstanding Senators, JOHN M. MCCLELLAN and WILLIAM FULBRIGHT (by the way, I know you will be interested in knowing that, since Senator MCCLELLAN has become such a national figure in the Democratic Party, there is a growing sentiment in favor of his nomination for President of the United States at the next Democratic Convention), and our entire delegation in the House of Representative is equal, if not superior, to the delegation of any other State. Another great Arkansan, and a national leader in the Democratic Party, is Leslie Biffle, of Piggott, Ark. Leslie, as you know, was for many years Secretary of the United States Senate and is one of the most highly respected leaders of the Democratic Party.

The longer I live outside of the State, though I retain a legal residence here, the more anxious I become to again make my permanent home here—which I fully expect to do in the next few years.

I am proud of the record Arkansas men and women have made in their contribution to the development of American aviation

both in war and in peace. I remember that Field Kindley, of Gravette, Ark., was the second ace of aces among the American flyers in World War I. I remember that many Arkansan men who learned the rudiments of aviation in Arkansas have become pilots or important officials in the great airlines of the country, and many others have attained high rank in military aviation. I remember that I taught senior State senator, Ellis Fagan, to fly back in the early days of aviation in Arkansas and, not only did he become an excellent pilot, but he was the first man to own and operate in airline in Arkansas which ran from Oklahoma through Fayetteville, through Little Rock, to Memphis. I remember Johnny Howe, whom I started as a second lieutenant in my old 154th Aero Squadron, who is now a general in the Air Force. Another young man whom I encouraged to start flying and who became a major general in the Air Force, and whose death was a great loss not only to the State but to the Air Force, was our good friend, Earl Ricks, of Hot Springs. In the early days in the development of civil aviation, there were many young men of our State who led the way in the development of civil and military aviation not only in Arkansas but throughout the Nation. There was Felix Smart, of Pine Bluff; Adrian Williamson and Russell Lambert, of Monticello; Charles Taylor, of Little Rock; and many others too numerous to mention in the short time allotted to me at this moment. I am humbly proud that it was my good fortune to have had a part in all of these activities.

The State of Arkansas and its fine citizenship has been good to me, and I am truly deeply grateful for the friendship of the fine people of this great community. You helped me in many ways in my early struggles for an education and a livelihood.

It was my good fortune to serve you for 2 years as assistant secretary of State, and to be elected twice as your State auditor—in which campaign I made the first statewide political campaign by airplane that was ever made. You gave me the honor of serving you for 2 years as your State Director of Aeronautics and, finally, you accorded me the privilege of being candidate for Governor of Arkansas—and you kindly defeated me by a fairly substantial majority. My defeat as a candidate for governor was really a favor because it is a fact that if I had any particular qualifications, they were in the aviation line—and I remember quite well that within a few weeks after my defeat, and at a time when I felt my life had been ruined, I received an entirely unexpected long distance telephone call from the president of an aircraft company in Kansas City, who asked if he could see me in Little Rock the next day. The result of that visit was my election as vice president and sales manager of a Kansas City aircraft factory, at a salary of more than twice the salary of the Governor of Arkansas.

In 1932, due to some of my great Arkansas friends, particularly Senator Joe T. Robinson and Senator Thaddeus Carraway, President Roosevelt appointed me Director of Civil Aeronautics in the old Bureau of Air Commerce—which led to a later appointment as adviser to the United States on European aviation, with particular reference to the European technique in airline operation. During my work in this capacity I was based in London and Paris, and it was while on this work that the president of Pan American World Airways, Mr. Juan T. Trippe, called me by trans-atlantic telephone from New York to Paris and prevailed upon me to quit Government service and join Pan American for the purpose of organizing and operating the Atlantic division of Pan American Airways, which operation had just been decided upon by the Pan American Airways board of directors.

After establishing the Atlantic division of Pan American, I was promoted to my present position in connection with Pan American Airways System public relations.

I am in my 18th year with the greatest airline in the world, which, incidentally, employs scores of native sons of Arkansas. An old Little Rock boy, whom you all know, is one of our most valued officers—I have reference to Charles Shoemaker, Jr., who has been with us for many years and who is in charge of the passenger service department of our Latin American division, and is based at Miami, Fla.

During the years I have been with my company my work has caused me to travel through over 40 foreign countries and colonies—which has been an education in itself—and during which travels I have run into numerous former Arkansans who are doing important work for our country or for private companies in various sections of the world.

All of the opportunities I have had in my life, and any accomplishments I may have been able to make, have been due, directly or indirectly, to the friendship, encouragement, inspiration, and aid that has been given to me in the past by my wonderful Arkansas friends, and I am grateful to you all.

In conclusion, I want to thank you again for the honor you have conferred upon me by inviting me to participate in this event today.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

The Compulsory Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concerned with the proposed compulsory Reserve bill:

BRONXVILLE, N. Y., *May 2, 1955.*

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: You probably are as concerned as I am about the pending compulsory Reserve bill. As you know, 8 years is a long time for Americans to be under military control.

When General Smuts said: "Conscription is the taproot of militarism," I believe he meant that you can't train the boys of the Nation physically for war without also training their minds for war.

The European experience with such a program was so disastrous that I am sure we ought to think twice before adopting, in the atomic age, a program that may gradually make our people rely primarily on military solutions to world problems.

Is it not true that Reserve groups have testified in the public hearings in favor of the voluntary system, and that the Navy and Air Force were especially vocal against this compulsory plan? They are apparently confident that they can meet required goals without this bill.

Why then should we tamper with our precious freedom to impose an 8-year draft on every boy?

Very sincerely,

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1955.

The Honorable EDITH GREEN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Will you oppose the 6-month military training portion of H. R. 5297?

The high-school principals of this country who are genuinely interested in the defense of their country and also in the welfare of all school youth opposed, by resolution at their recent convention, any military program that would induce youth to leave secondary school before graduation.

The present 6-month military-training portion of H. R. 5297 will offer a special plan to youth to evade the present selective-service provisions, or any extension of it, by enlisting for military service between ages 17–19. This the youth will be induced to do and to leave high school before graduation so they can be included in this limited quota of 100,000–250,000 youth every year. Such a program will tend to violate the present stay-in-school-until-graduation policy of all branches of the Armed Forces, which we believe you wish to maintain.

We are authorized by the high-school principals of our country to urge all Members of Congress to preserve and continue the present selective-service provisions in any military program before the Congress.

Youth should not be permitted or induced by a 6-month option to enter the military-training program before graduation from high school or until ages 18½–20 if still in attendance in high school. Consider this a personal letter expressing the prevailing attitude of high-school principals toward the 6-month portion of H. R. 5297.

LELAND N. DRAKE,
President; Chairman, Legislative Committee.

PAUL E. ELICKER,
Executive Secretary; Secretary, Legislative Committee.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jenninge, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Buchanan, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Davidson, Bell, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, ———, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Fine, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Machrowicz, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Machrowicz, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Dingell, Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Harold M. Stephens, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 4-6420
	Circuit Judges	
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6207
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee, 3550 Springland Lane.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, 1500 Massachusetts Ave.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, Woodley Park Towers.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 4912 Brookway Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Paul W. Brosman
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*—1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, P. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*.—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.—The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*.
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*.—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*.—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Granahan, William T., *Pa*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*—125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.—1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*.—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—The Coronet

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*.
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*.
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Long, George S., *La*.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*.—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa*.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*.—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*.—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*.
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*.—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.—3130 Wisconsin Ave.
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.—3250 T St. SE.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*.
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*.—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
Meader, George, *Mich*.—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*.
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*.
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va*.
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*.
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.
Morrison, James H., *La*.—4420 Dexter St.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*.
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*.
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*.
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.
Natcher, William H., *Ky*.—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*.
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*.
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*.—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass*.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*.
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*.—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*.
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*.
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.
Phillips, John, *Calif*.
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*.
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*.
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*.—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.
Quigley, James M., *Pa*.
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*.
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill*.—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.
Richards, James P., *S. C*.
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*.—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*.
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*.—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*.
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*.—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*.
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*.
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*.—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*.—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*.
Short, Dewey, *Mo*.
Shuford, George A., *N. C*.—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*.
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*.—The Dorchester
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*.
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*.
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*.
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*.—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*.
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*.
Thompson, T. A., *La*.—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*.
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*.
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*.
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.
Tuck, William M., *Va*.
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*.
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.
Utt, James B., *Calif*.
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*.
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*.—The Senate Courts
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*.—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.
Watts, John C., *Ky*.
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*.
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*.—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*.
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*.—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J*.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*.—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*.—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*.
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*.—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*.—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*.—3202 So. Stafford St., Arlington, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*.
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska*.—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii*.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Foreign Policy in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on April 13 my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] delivered a very interesting address concerning our foreign policy in the Pacific at the Democratic fund-raising dinner at San Mateo, Calif. Because this subject is of such extreme interest to all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DULLES DILEMMA

I have come to you this evening to make a brief report on foreign policy in the Pacific—a policy which summed up is the Dulles dilemma. It is a dilemma vitally—maybe mortally—important to us on the Pacific coast. It is also, like any dilemma, frighteningly confused—in this case more than usual because of a last-minute discovery by Mr. Dulles of a paper tiger—a tiger which he claims to be this country but which many feel is merely this country's Secretary of State.

In a consideration of foreign policy of the United States, there is one all-important point to remember. We are told of the administration-Republican foreign policy—of the Democratic foreign policy and of the bipartisan foreign policy. The administration-Republican foreign policy can only be defined if you name the day and define it.

Of the Democratic foreign policy we have a clear idea indelibly written in history of which we are inordinately proud; of the bipartisan foreign policy we have no idea whatsoever. You first must decide which fraction of the Republican Party you will bipartisan with. However, none of these policies are the American foreign policy. The American foreign policy can only be decided by the American people themselves—people such as you who I am addressing tonight. It is you who must and shall set policies of the United States—domestic or foreign. To do this, you must be appraised of the facts—of the choices before us and their dangers.

I have come tonight to tell you as many of these as I have time for so that you can help dissipate both the Dulles dilemma and the paper tiger.

To begin with—to you as Democrats—as one of your Democratic Senators, I want to say that there was never anything wrong with the basic Democratic foreign policy set down by Truman and Acheson. It was the policy of containment—the policy of implacable opposition to aggression. The Communists understood it that way and respected it. Today the Republican Party is trying its best to get back to it as quickly as possible. In fact, the heart of the Dulles dilemma is how they can get back without having the Democrats say, "I told you so"—without the Communists putting us behind an iron curtain instead of us keeping them behind one.

For campaign purposes purely, the Republican Party today is making a terrific ado about two things. First, they are claiming that the Yalta agreement was the original sin so far as the Orient is concerned. From it they claim stem all the problems of China, Korea, Indochina, Matsu and Quemoy, and Formosa. Second, they say that the only way we can possibly extract ourselves from our present dilemma is to trust implicitly in the clear judgment of our military leaders—the foremost of whom is our President.

With this we must take emphatic exception. Our present situation has been caused to a large extent by too great dependence upon the judgment of our military leaders. After the Second World War we found, as did the old tiger of France Clemenceau after the First, that "War is too serious a matter to be left entirely to the generals."

Regardless of it merits, the Yalta Agreement was signed by President Roosevelt at the insistence of the military leaders of the Republican leaders in the United States Senate in order to shorten the war and to save 500,000 American lives.

That the military leaders were dead wrong, that they miscalculated our strength, the devastating effectiveness of the atomic bomb and the capacity of our scientists and industry to make bombs, is the tragedy of Yalta—if tragedy there is.

You have heard of the insistence of our Joint Chiefs of Staff that we must get Russia to take an active part in the Pacific in order to save our boys. What you probably have not heard is what the Republican party itself was saying at the time. I have in my hand a speech given on the Senate floor at this time by Senator WILEY of Wisconsin, one of the ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Here is what he had to say:

"Why then should we pussyfoot with our Russian ally and not declare only that we want them to make common cause in the Pacific? Why then should we not strengthen President Truman's hand by making known this desire from here at home in no uncertain terms? * * *

"Why should we act like helpless milktoasts when we have vast financial and other bargaining power to use as pressure on Russia? Why should we follow the lead of the 'nice Nellies' of our State Department who have been more concerned with diplomatic niceties than with the preservation of American interests and lives? * * *

"Thus America has everything to gain and thousands of her boys' lives to lose unless Russia joins in the Pacific struggle. * * *

"I would be remiss in my obligations as a United States Senator if I did not voice, in all humility but with all the force at my command, the feeling of millions of Americans that Russia do her part in the Pacific."

Our second great example of military judgment occurred in Korea. We undertook Korea with the complete support of the Congress of the United States. We undertook our responsibilities instantly. I know because it happened that I was at Blair House, the White House at the time, the evening we took that action. Republicans, Democrats, Military staffs all agreed that this action was imperative and confirmed it next day.

In Korea we fought a confined, highly successful and—to begin with—not an excessively costly war, up to the great error in military judgment. We had rolled the North Koreans back to their own borders when the military decided they would push on to the Yalu. You remember that incident. The Chinese said: "If you do, we will get into this ourselves." The military leaders said, "We don't believe you. You can't and you won't." So they crossed over into North Korea. They pushed to the Yalu and they were wrong. Not only did the Chinese Communist armies get into the fight, they pushed us clear down to the southernmost tip of Korea and cost us the long and bloody war that followed.

This is the war that the Republican Party promised to end if they were reelected and they did. They ended it in a way President Truman could have ended it at any time—by surrendering.

You will remember when your San Francisco newspapermen interviewed a dejected Gen. Mark Clark when he came home from that surrender. They asked him why we gave up airfields and island that were strategic. He answered, "I guess because they wanted them." The Washigton papers characterized it was the "voice of the mouse" and the first surrender in American history.

After Korea comes the third great example of military judgment—Indochina. Mr. Dulles and every expert on Asia said that once the Communits armies were freed in northern China they would move down to southern China and attack Indochina. They reported that these armies were moving in that direction—that they were building up for an invasion. Finally they did invade.

No preparations were made by our Government to meet this invasion. We closed our eyes and hoped it wouldn't happen. We refused to pour in arms and assistance to our allies as we had in previous wars. We left them helpless quarry of the red snake. But we did trust in the military appraisal of the situation. This was that the defenses of the French could stand without us—that the strategy of Dien Bien Phu would be successful. Well, it wasn't.

Mr. Dulles said that Indochina was absolutely necessary to the defense of the whole of Southern Asia. You remember the statement that all Southern Asia would fall—like a house of cards.

He went to Geneva to say that we were going to be tough. We made promises to the French and moved our aircraft carriers into the gulf to back him up. But he held a news conference just the night before the Geneva meeting and said, "Well, of course. He didn't mean it." That was the time they cartooned him as rushing to Geneva but leaving his head behind.

You can see what Clemenceau meant when he said that war is too serious a matter to be left entirely to the generals.

Today we must make another fateful decision. Whether to defend Quemoy, whether to use atomic bombs. The military tell us that the Chinese cannot withstand our first assault—that Russia will not back up China. But don't forget that if they are once again wrong and Russia does keep her treaties and back up China, we are in for a major war.

In digging up Yalta as a campaign issue, the Republicans are hoping to attract our attention from their two surrenders and their bumbling foreign policies.

In passing we might also point out that if Yalta is the original sin in the Pacific—the refusal to follow Prime Minister Churchill's advice and enter Europe through the Ljubljana Gap into the Balkans gave eastern Europe to the Communists—and in that the President cannot say he had no part.

The first step toward our present dilemma in the Pacific was taken on February 2, 1953, by President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message. In the Republican campaign for votes, regardless of truth or national safety, that party turned its back upon the policy of containment for one they described as broad and daring. It was not the containment but the liberation of Communist China. In line with it, the President unleashed Chiang Kai-shek. Said the President:

"There is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that required the United States Navy to assume defensive responsibilities on behalf of the Chinese Communists. I am, therefore, issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China. This order implies no aggressive intent on our part, but we certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea."

It sounded comforting, but it was the first roar of the paper tiger. I knew—I had been in Formosa. The military knew and the Communists knew that Chiang Kai-shek had no army worth unleashing. It was like unleashing me in the ring with Marciano next month. The operations of our 7th Fleet did not change; they flew and sailed the same patrols.

But it certainly gave Communist China something to think about. They looked upon Chiang's 50,000 men on Quemoy and his increasing fortifications, not as far from their mainland as Oakland is from San Francisco and decided they should do something about it. They announced they were going to drive the Nationalists out of these islands and out of Formosa too, by the way.

As for the defense of Formosa, we are all firmly, unanimously, and wholeheartedly committed to that adventure. Last January—lest China or the world have any doubt as to our determination and provoke a war by accident—we made it brilliantly clear by passing the Formosa resolution in the Senate. We gave the President no new powers, but we did confirm our unhesitating support of his constitutional powers.

We made it clear that the American people would make war against China or any other nation if such a course was thought essential to national safety; that we did not favor waiting supinely until attacked but were drawing a line—a distant line—which we would not permit to be crossed by a hostile force.

There is a fraction of the Republican Party—and your Senator KNOWLAND is among them—that do not think this goes far enough. They believe that China must be liberated, that the Communists must be utterly crushed—atomic bombed to surrender, and that such a bloody course is essential not only to world peace but our own survival. In this they have the ears of the administration—the support of the generals. Their demands for preventative war furnishes the only reason for the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus. We must realize this and take our part in this debate. If these two inconsequential islands, as some Senators claim, are invaluable as a springboard to launch a full-scale war to liberate China, then the American people should know that this is their value. They should know the cost. It is no matter for secret deliberation and decision.

What devilish, ghastly irony it would be for all of us here on the Pacific, if after so emphatically eliminating the chance that China accidentally set off a world war because she did not clearly know our intentions, we ourselves set off one because we did not believe the Chinese and Russians.

I have been to Formosa several times. I have listened to the debates and I believe it is clear beyond a reasonable argument that these offshore islands are in no sense essential to the defense of Formosa. Arguments to the contrary are almost frivolous. As the New York Times says, "It is almost like arguing that the loss of Staten Island—a ferry boat ride from Manhattan, would jeopardize the defense of Bermuda."

Two reasons are given for our defending these islands to the bitter end. The first is that if we don't we will be considered a paper tiger. The second that if we lose them, Chiang's troops will lose their morale and might even defect.

As to the paper tiger, he was discovered by Mr. Dulles himself and described to the Nation in a speech upon his return from the Bankok conference on March 8. He said we must not make any further concessions that would lend support to the Communist charge that the United States is such a flimsy animal.

It is useless for us to protest now that Mr. Dulles should have thought of this eventuality before the administration unleashed the noneffective Nationalist armies, before he declared "massive retaliation."

There is no use of my pointing to the speeches I have made on the floor of the Senate—and Senators LONG, JACKSON, etc., have made protesting Mr. Dulles' policy and predicting its inevitable outcome. He has most certainly brought it on himself. All I can insist upon is that the paper tiger is not the United States—but the Secretary himself and an administration that has put political expediency before wise and courageous action.

As to the humor of Chiangs' troops—to this end we can scarcely risk atomic war—justify the millions of inevitable casualties and back up an army that can get no fresh recruits or reenforcements except from ourselves.

If we defend Quemoy, it will mean the use of small atomic bombs. It will mean that we will fight with only two allies—Chiang and Sigmund Rhee. Even Canada has said it will refuse to come along. If the Russians keep the mutual defense treaty with China it will mean submarines, planes, and even small atomic bombs to resist us. Only one hydrogen bomb on Formosa would end all of this dilemma for eternity. It is just the right size for such a bomb.

It is my opinion that it is high time we end this dilemma. Let us with protests, votes, and every means at hand, make it crystal clear to the White House that we want no part of these offshore islands. That we want no part in experiments with atomic warfare that is cheap in money but astronomically costly in human life.

Let us also demand an end to the bumblings of our State Department—to the putting of politics before wise policy and money before national defense.

We must, as the administration said it would do 3 months ago, introduce clarity and certainty into our relations with the Chinese Communists and the whole world. We must let America be America—have an American foreign policy which is a fearless Christian foreign policy.

As to this in conclusion, I would like to point out that world events are showing us that even our democratic policy of containment may not be enough. We live in a day when the underprivileged of the world are on the march demanding equality of opportunity, freedom from economic exploitation, and the enjoyment of a better life. The Communists are capitalizing on this to the ultimate enslavement of nations. Until we can capitalize upon it too, and bring hope to these people of a new and fresh day, we will really have no effective American foreign policy.

If only they had a faint ray of hope that they might enjoy a pitiful little of what we enjoy they would never become Communists. Every one of us here wants them to have not only the hope, but to actually have what we have. For that we would gladly fight in the American tradition—to make them feel it, know it, and to realize the benefits of it, must be your American foreign policy.

Loyalty Means Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Merton B. Tice, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, over the American Broadcasting Co. facilities, the address being entitled "Loyalty Means Liberty." Mr. Tice is a citizen of South Dakota. I commend to all American citizens a careful reading of his address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY MEANS LIBERTY

"The most shameful and sordid period in the relatively short history of our great country is the more than 30 years during which Soviet espionage has been allowed to spread its tentacles over the United States," so reported the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives, on December 30, 1951. We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars also noted, particularly during World War II and afterward, that the United States was fast becoming "the promised land" for Communists. Why? Because many of our industrial and military secrets were not protected; and secondly, disloyal Americans enjoyed the greatest individual freedom ever known by man.

Think of it—men of dishonest purpose, enjoying all the blessings of liberty, engaged in a conspiracy to destroy the Government that provided their very own protection. And, as of this month, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reported that the known Communist Party members in the United States still numbers about 24,000.

As a veterans' organization of well over a million members, we learned something about this that caused us years ago to stage parades in the East to counter the Red May Day demonstrations in that area. As you know, as far back as 1926 we requested Congress to outlaw the Communist Party. And, thank heavens, this mandate was fulfilled last year by our Congress. But as we learned more and more of the astounding number of Soviet spies and traitors in our midst, we decided, as our country's oldest veterans' organization, to do something to smash the Commies, and at the same time strengthen America. It was time to stand up and be counted. So, on May 1 in 1950, Loyalty Day, on a national scale, was launched by the VFW.

Loyalty Day gives an ideal opportunity for every patriotic organization to show the world their dedication and allegiance to the

Government of the United States of America, and to restate their vow to preserve and defend the United States from all enemies, whomsoever.

As commander in chief of the VFW, I want to thank warmly the veteran, civic, fraternal, labor, religious, women's, and youth groups which have participated. In particular, our thanks go to the school children who have taken part in patriotic programs during Loyalty Week.

This year, our theme is: Loyalty means liberty. That is true, of course, only if the present and succeeding generations appreciate and understand the benefits and are willing to defend liberty from all her enemies. Edmund Burke, a noted writer, wisely said: "For evil to triumph it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Apropos of Loyalty Day, and in paraphrase, one might say: For Communist slavery to triumph it is only necessary that free men do nothing.

We are gratified, as an organization, by the successful results of our efforts to do something. For example, nothing has given more impetus to State celebrations than the unanimous gubernatorial endorsements. And the awards for the last 5 years from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge have spurred us on. Publicity media have been extremely outstanding in this nonpartisan, nonsectarian, cooperative patriotic program. And Congress has now designated May 1 of each year as a national observance. We of the VFW are grateful.

We, as Americans, have much to be proud of. However, we have avoided anything that might be called selfish nationalism. And although the United States has the tremendous responsibility of leadership in the free world, we stress our international obligations rather than our international standing, and our desire to help our allies rather than our national material strength.

However, we do reflect in these programs our never ceasing resistance to totalitarianism; and, we continually stress, that for us the Constitution is revered as the symbol of national unity and American liberty. Let me point out that just to hate communism is not of much help. That is just water off a duck's back. We have to do something in a positive and constructive way if we are to accomplish anything.

Let us now—you and I—examine a definite area wherein much may be done to further Americanism. Consider the field of education. I believe all will agree that human dignity and freedom is the high trust of education. In fact, upon this base depends the maintenance of our representative government. Accordingly, we believe it mandatory that educators teach that the principles upon which this Government was founded deserve the devoted loyalty of every true citizen. I sincerely believe that few duties for parents are more important in the rearing of children than vigilance as to what our beloved future citizens are studying, and how their teachers feel about this great land of ours.

It is certain that youth must be prepared to live in our present day world and able to face the grave problems of the hydrogen age. Yes, a fundamental knowledge of his precious, national birthright should be an essential element in the education of an American. It conditions his patriotic content wherein lies his respect for law and constituted authority; his deference to the conscience and dignity of man; and his love for his land and its people. If the young American understands all this, he will know, as did Kipling, that:

"All we have of freedom—all we use or know—
This our fathers bought for us, long and long ago."

One also learns through a study of American history, that the stability of our Government rests on loyalty to the constitutional leader after final decisions are made and laws passed. Disagree, yes—the absolute right to disagree. Always, public opinion must be permitted full opportunity to be heard, but when laws are declared constitutional, then to them the good citizen must ever be faithful. And because of that quality of loyalty, we have enjoyed the most successful self-government the troubled world has yet known.

In the matter of patriotic education, I ask you: How can we produce outstanding American citizens without an adequate knowledge of realistic American history, exposure to the theory and practice of democratic government, and a heart-searching examination of the spiritual needs and history of man? Could there be a finer course of study for American citizenship?

We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have for some years strongly advocated that Americanism should be taught as it once was: A way of life charted according to the humanitarian ideals and democratic principles which our forefathers wrote into the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. What better patriotic inspiration is there for youth, or for any American, than that contained in the exciting story of the creation of the American Nation? And today, as we negotiate on an international scale, if we expect to win the hearts and minds of men—and that is the struggle—at a time when free governments are falling on distant fronts, we must show a unity in social faith and unquestionable proof of our devotion to the ideals that have made us great.

There is nothing dry or dull in this social faith as expressed by Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Eisenhower. In fact, when we review our history since our founding, we can safely say that no three centuries were ever crowded with so many moments of drama and adventure, of tragedy and glory, than found in the colorful history that shaped our destiny in the New World.

And never should we forget, whether we are of the first generation or the tenth, that we are all co-sharers of that proud heritage. We are grateful that on Loyalty Day so many foreign-born march with us in large parades—Americans all. We should remember also that the casualty lists of all our wars bear witness that these newcomers through the years who fought and died for their foster mother—America—were of the conviction that:

"Each generation of free men
Its share of liberty
Must win again and yet again
That men shall be free."

Sometimes, though, we wonder exactly how far, as a Nation, we will go to defend the freedom and dignity of the individual. For example, how far will we go to effect the release of our young men held by the Reds—the 11 airmen illegally held by Communist China? There are also reportedly some 800 other Americans in Communist jails, many confined in dungeons, some in leg irons and arm chains for months. It seems high time that this country did everything possible for the release of these men. We simply cannot afford to do less.

Of course, these questions are complicated and involved, but that is all the more reason that something should be done, and done now. We do not believe our people should be held for ransom—the price admission to the United Nations. Red China should never be permitted to shoot her way into the United Nations, and we beg of Congress to take a firm stand. Furthermore, we are firmly convinced that if the Communist world continues "nibbling" on any front, force should be met with force. The only proviso is that all concerned be informed in advance exactly what to expect. We should know by this time that appeasement is a sure road to defeat.

Challenges and problems confront our generation as we come to the crossroads of civilization in our redezvous with destiny. There are no simple answers. Only with a deep-seated belief in God and a full arsenal of atomic bombs may we hope for survival. We must accept the fact there is no cheap way to bring about worthwhile results or to achieve an adequate military defense. We know that liberty will survive only if men and women defend it. And as we give thanks to Almighty God for our rights and privileges, we should also ponder how better to discharge our duties and responsibilities as Americans.

To deserve a title, one should earn it. And I submit, that to deserve the world's greatest title—"I Am An American"—one must be willing to defend the Nation at any cost, to fight for the noble concepts of the free way of life, and to die if need be that freedom may live. Let us always remember that cowards did not found this country and cowards will never preserve it.

The Future of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, among Americans best informed regarding transportation problems, especially as they relate to the merchant marine, is Gen. John M. Franklin, whose patriotic service as Chief of the Water Division of the Transportation Corps of the United States Army, and as Assistant Chief of Transportation during World War II, represented a major contribution to the welfare of this Nation. General Franklin delivered a forceful address before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association on April 14, and because of the factual information it contains I consider it worthy of the reading of the American public and ask that excerpts from the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It will be my endeavor to show how essential was the role of the merchant ships in World War II and the necessity of equalizing construction and operating costs between foreign-flag ships and American ships, if we are to have an American merchant marine at all, and, finally, what the real cost to the taxpayer actually is.

The 1936 Merchant Marine Act is the act under which the Government equalizes the cost of constructing and operating American-flag vessels with competitive foreign-flag vessels. The soul of the act is parity. It has nothing to do with profit.

* * * * *

The first question is, Why is it necessary to subsidize American shipyards and the American merchant marine?

1. The answer is simple: Because of the higher scale of wages and the higher cost of materials in the United States as com-

pared to foreign countries. The cost of building ships in foreign yards is between 40 and 50 percent lower than in the United States. This cost must be equalized, or there will be no building of commercial ships for foreign operation in this country. The shipowner gets the same ship he could buy abroad for half the money he would otherwise pay here. A large number of Americans do build their ships abroad and operate them under foreign flags.

This construction equalization is in reality a subsidy to American shipyards and American labor.

If no ships are built in the United States in peacetime, there will be a serious lack of shipyard facilities and personnel with the developed skills for the tremendous expansion of shipbuilding which experience has taught us will be vital in wartime. This is inviting disaster.

2. Now, as to operation: The average monthly wage cost of operating a 10,000-ton American-flag cargo vessel in 1953 was $24,500; British, the next highest, was $6,500 per month; German, $5,100 per month; Japanese, $4,100 per month. It is obvious that unless these costs are equalized there will be fewer and fewer American-flag ships operating foreign in peacetime. I do not think these wage differentials are far out of line with those in other industries. As an example, the wages of a coal miner in the United States are about four times the wages of a British coal miner.

* * * * *

Just prior to World War I 90 percent of Amercian trade was being carried in foreign vessels. When the war broke out and foreign ships were withdrawn from commercial service, the American economy was for a time almost completely shut off from needed foreign raw materials. Our export trade was left high and dry.

These experiences, combined with the recent lessons of Korea, are more persuasive than words. As a world power, we cannot depend on foreign nations to transport the sinews of war to our troops and vital raw materials to our production plants.

* * * * *

Now let us look at the cost of the American merchant marine to the taxpayer and what it contributes to our National economy and security.

First, as to the real cost. I welcome a chance to discuss this, because the cost to the taxpayer is somewhat misleading and very often misunderstood.

An American-flag steamship line operating under a contract with the Government must meet certain Government requirements as to operations and equipment:

1. Its ships must be constructed in American shipyards;

2. All of its ships must be registered under the American flag;

3. Safety requirements imposed by Congress, which are the highest in the world, must be met. Foreign standards are much lower.

4. Regularly scheduled service over specific essential trade routes must be maintained;

5. All the officers and 90 percent of the crewmen it employs must be American citizens;

6. All of the equipment, food, supplies, and other materials used on its ships must be of American origin.

If these qualifications, among others, are met, the steamship company is entitled to what is called an operating-differential subsidy as provided in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Operating-differential subsidies represent the difference in cost of operating under American registry—with an American crew, using American stores and equipment, and maintaining the higher standards of marine safety—as against operating under a foreign flag, using lower salaried foreign seamen, cheaper stores and supplies, and lower safety standards.

Moreover, under the act, 50 percent of all profits, earned by a steamship company holding an operating-differential subsidy, in excess of 10 percent of its capital necessarily employed, are recaptured by the Government.

In the 14-year period, 1938 to 1951, inclusive, the subsidized lines have received or accrued operating-differential subsidy totaling $258,550,362, of which $111,392,038 has been recaptured or accrued for recapture by the Government, leaving the net operating subsidy paid by the Government during this period of $147,158,324.

During the same 14-year period, 1938 to 1951, inclusive, the subsidized lines paid to the Government Federal income and excess profits taxes amounting to $130,503,000. Therefore, the net cost to the Government for operating-differential subsidy for the period 1938 to 1951, inclusive, after considering taxes paid by the subsidized lines, was only $16,655,000.

Foreign Aid Forever?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Forever?" written by Mr. Henry Hazlitt and published in Newsweek, May 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID FOREVER?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Once a government bureaucracy has been set up to do any job whatever, it will find endless excuses for expanding, prolonging, or perpetuating that job. This is the sad history of our postwar foreign aid.

Originally urged by Secretary Marshall in 1947, to meet what was then regarded as a temporary emergency situation, foreign aid has gone on and on, from year to year, constantly changing its stated purposes, constantly changing its name, but showing not the slightest tendency to terminate or even taper off. It may come as a jolt to some readers to discover that the President is actually recommending an increase in the amount to be spent in the next fiscal year even over the amount being spent in the current fiscal year. He wants foreign aid to rise from $4.3 billion in 1955 to $4.7 billion in 1956. Worse than this, far from even suggesting a tapering off, the President in his letter to Secretary Dulles of April 16 made it clear that he thought foreign giveaway should be a continuing program under a permanent government establishment.

The President's April 20 message to Congress on foreign aid gives the perfunctory and mainly rhetorical arguments for it that we have been hearing for the last 9 years. The message raises a hundred doubts about details. I can mention only 1 or 2.

It is a program for scattering the taxpayers' money over nearly the whole world—practically to every country outside of the Iron Curtain. To a few countries, in the world as it is today, continuance of military aid is unavoidable. This now applies most notably to Formosa and Korea. The President's message makes out a less obvious but still persuasive case for aid to Iran, Greece, and Turkey. But having mentioned these specific countries, he suddenly plunges into the wholesale and unsupported generality that it is the duty of the American taxpayer to promote welfare and growth for the peoples of Africa. Next we find that it has become somehow our duty to shower money all over Latin America. Where a critical situation exists, as in Guatemala or Bolivia, we must toss in still more. Then we must continue to give to Yugoslavia and India, though there is not the slighest assurance that these countries will be on our side when the chips are down.

This is dangerous business. To scatter aid all around the globe is not only inexcusably wasteful, but its effect must be to reduce the aid we can give, for example, to Formosa, where it is urgently needed. The argument for such indiscriminate largess seems to be that having given aid to countries A, B, and C, we must give it to D, E, and F to prevent resentment.

The President's foreign-aid program still allots substantial funds for "economic" aid, Truman's point 4, and all the rest. We are told that "three out of every four dollars" in our foreign giveaway program "will be immediately spent within the United States." This is like trying to appeal to the self-interest of an automobile dealer by telling him that if he makes you a gift of $4,000, you will use $3,000 of it to buy one of his cars. Yet an economic argument that would be rejected as ridiculous if made to a private business firm can be solemnly made to a Nation.

Again the President tells us that we cannot be secure in our freedom unless, elsewhere in the world, we destroy "the conditions under which totalitarianism grows—poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and disease." Are these really the reasons for communism—or any other form of totalitarianism? Germany went Nazi with less poverty, illiteracy, hunger, or disease than any country outside the United States.

It is ironic, in the light of our foreign-aid program, to compare the budgets of the United States and Great Britain. In its last fiscal year Britain had a surplus of $1.2 billion; the United States will have a deficit of more than $4 billion. In the fiscal year ahead Britain plans a surplus of $414 million; we plan a deficit of $2.4 billion. Yet the country that had the surplus got $120 million of aid last year from the country that had the deficit. And we think it was Alice who lived in Wonderland?

University of Wisconsin To Honor Three Distinguished Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to know that at the commencement ceremonies of the University of Wisconsin on June 17 next, three distinguished Americans will be honored.

There are a noted labor leader, Jacob F. Friedrick; a famous architect, Wisconsin's world-renowed Frank Lloyd Wright; and a great women leader, Mrs. Lillian Gilbreth.

Each of these outstanding Americans well deserves the plaudits which will be given them.

In the April 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as appears on page 4136, I personally paid tribute to Frank Lloyd Wright at the time I had reprinted an NBC radio interview and a Diplomat magazine interview with him.

Mrs. Gilbreth, a famous wife of a famous husband, has been part and parcel of the whole new science of industrial engineering which she and the late Frank Gilbreth pioneered in this country.

I should also like to say just a word about Jacob Friedrick, not only is he an universally respected leader in the ranks of labor, but he is held in greatest admiration in the community, as well, and throughout all segments of Wisconsin life.

The honor which will be accorded to Mr. Friedrick at the University symbolizes the honored new role of American labor. Time was when labor, in its legitimate efforts to organize, in order to achieve a higher standard of living, was smeared and denounced. Labor leaders of the highest patriotism were treated as if they were "Red revolutionaries," simply because they sought the right of the workingman to bargain collectively.

But now, fortunately, that unhappy day has passed. Labor has come into its own. There is no field of community or patriotic endeavor in which the leaders of organized labor do not contribute alongside the leaders of every other section of society. So I am delighted that this fine AFL spokesman is to receive honor at the hands of my alma mater.

I send to the desk an article published in the Saturday, May 7, Milwaukee Journal, announcing the intention to award the three honorary degress. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN TO HONOR LABOR LEADER—FRIEDRICK NAMED WITH FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT AND MRS. GILBRETH

A Milwaukee labor leader, a world famous Wisconsin architect, and a noted woman author and industrial consultant will be awarded honorary degrees by the University of Wisconsin at commencement ceremonies in Camp Randall stadium, Madison, at 5 p. m., June 17.

University regents Saturday confirmed degrees for:

Jacob F. Friedrick, general secretary-treasurer of the AFL Milwaukee Federated Trades Council. Doctor of laws.

Architect Frank Lloyd Wright, of Spring Green, Wis. Doctor of fine arts.

Mrs. Lillian Moller Gilbreth, of Montclair, N. J., president of Gilbreth, Inc., construction engineers in management and currently Knapp visiting professor of mechanical engineering at the University of Madison. Doctor of science.

Friedrick, 63, is one of the most highly respected labor leaders in Wisconsin. He has been cited as the model of the self-educated man who has worked selflessly to enable others to benefit by education. He has been called the man most responsible for the strong support given the University of Wisconsin by the Wisconsin labor movement. Friedrick came to America from his native Hungary when he was 13. His formal schooling was limited to an eighth grade education plus a year and a half at what is now Boys' Technical High School. He joined the AFL International Association of Machinists in Milwaukee in 1913, almost immediately became an active unionist and rapidly moved up in the local IAM organization.

WAS REGIONAL DIRECTOR

From 1935 to 1945, Friedrick was general organizer of the Federated Trades Council. For the next 6 years he was AFL regional director here. He then became general secretary of the trades council, the county central AFL body, and last Wednesday became general secretary-treasurer of the council with the formal abolition of the separate treasurer's post.

Friedrick is chairman of the city sewerage commission and has been a member of the advisory committee of the University of Wisconsin's school for workers since its inception and a member of the State industrial commission's advisory committee on unemployment compensation since 1932.

LEAVES MARK AROUND WORLD

Wright, 85, has been widely recognized as one of the great creative artists of the century. After more than a half century of architectural pioneering, he has left his unique mark on landscapes around the world. Born at Richland Center, Wis., Wright studied civil engineering at the University of Wisconsin in the middle 1880's and in 1887 went to Chicago where he became an apprentice of the late Louis Sullivan, one of the architects in American history.

The Imperial Hotel in Tokyo was only the first of the daringly original buildings that brought Wright world recognition. Some 500 buildings around the world, each representing a new facet of Wright's genius, are testimony to his pioneering.

Wright in 1911 built Taliesin ("radiant brow" in Welsh) at Spring Green, Wis. Wright since 1932 has trained young men in his architectural methods at Taliesin East, which he has, thrice rebuilt after fires, at Spring Green.

Only last year, Wright said he would leave Wisconsin after the State supreme court ruled that the foundation that runs Taliesin was not tax exempt. Wright later relented.

During his long career, Wright has been accorded numerous honors. Among them are honorary degrees from Wesleyan, Princeton, Temple and Yale universities, Florida Southern college, and an award from the University of Venice.

Mrs. Gilbreth's fame has been spread in two books, "Cheaper by the Dozen" and "Belles on Their Toes," written by 2 of the 12 Gilbreth children. Mrs. Gilbreth, 76, was born in Oakland, Calif. She married Frank B. Gilbreth, a pioner industrial efficiency engineer, in 1904. After her husband died in 1924, Mrs. Gilbreth turned her attention to science and engineering in order to take up her husband's work where he left off.

She earned a master's degree in engineering at the University of Michigan in 1928 and a doctorate in engineering at Rutgers in 1929. From 1935 to 1948, Mrs. Gilbreth was director of courses in motion study and utilization of technological progress and professor of management at Purdue university.

During World War II, Mrs. Gilbreth was a member of advisory committees to the office of war information and the war manpower commission.

Mrs. Gilbreth is the author of many articles in the field of education, management, psychology and time-motion study. She has received many awards, among them two in 1954 never before won by a woman—the Washington award conferred by 5 major United States enginering societies and the gold medal of the International Committee of Scientific Management.

Tribute to Robert A. Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at the Taft memorial dinner, before the Suffolk County Republican Club, in Boston, Mass., on last Friday, May 6, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, I am pleased once again to be in the city of Boston and the State of Massachusetts.

For many years I have known your distinguished Governor, Chris Herter, who has made such an outstanding record as your Chief Executive. This is also the home State of my good friend and colleague, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, who serves as Senate Republican whip.

I am also happy to be here tonight with Lloyd Taft, the son of the man whose memory we are to honor.

Robert A. Taft was generally known as "Mr. Republican." In a larger sense, however, he was "Mr. American" as well. His death was not only a great loss to his family, his friends, and his colleagues in the Senate, but to the Nation as well.

In the course of events someone had to be selected to succeed to his position as Republican leader of the Senate. However, in the broader sense, no one could ever replace Bob Taft, the great leader that he was.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee while he was Republican leader of the Senate. As a result, my association with him was a pleasant and cordial one and we worked very closely together in developing the legislative proposals of the first Republican administration in 20 years.

From the earliest meetings at the White House with the Republican leaders of the House and Senate, President Eisenhower had made it clear that he recognized, under the Constitution, that Congress was and is a coequal branch of the Federal Government. He requested a full and frank discussion of the various problems brought up for consideration at these gatherings.

During the 20 years of the New Deal a misconception had developed in some quarters as to the place of Congress in our constitutional system.

We will not find President Eisenhower seeking to seize American industry, large or small, without authority of law and under the vague doctrine of inherent powers in the Presidency.

On the doctrine that Congress was not intended to be and should not be a rubberstamp or a subordinate body to the Executive, Bob Taft and President Eisenhower were in full agreement. Needless to say, I completely concur in this viewpoint.

The first section of article I of our Constitution states: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

As can be readily seen, this is not a partial grant of legislative power, it is total in character. The Congress is where "all" legislative power was intended to be and where it will continue to remain if our

constitutional Government is to survive. The American public has an intuitive understanding of what is at stake. They understand the importance of maintaining the coequal and coordinate status of the three great branches of our Government.

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt attempted to subordinate the Supreme Court by his Court-packing legislation public opinion rose to support the opposition to that legislation in the Congress.

When the same President attempted to purge members of his own party who were exercising their independent judgment and following their convictions, that purge attempt badly failed. The Nation does not want nor in the end will it tolerate either the Supreme Court or the Congress abdicating their responsibilities or becoming subordinate to the will of the Executive.

Fortunately for the Nation we have in President Eisenhower a man who recognizes this fact and the constitutional limitations of Presidential power under the American Constitution.

The Republican convention recognizing the sound principle that we should be the government of laws and not of men and having great faith in our Constitution wanted to make certain that there would be no shortcut method of depriving Americans of their constitutional rights. In this regard the 1952 platform states: "We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution."

From time to time, however, it has to be pointed out to some of the columnists and to the New Deal opposition that the party leader in the Senate has a dual responsibility. It is not only to help interpret the views of the administration to his colleagues, but it is also to help convey the views of the Members of the Senate to the executive department.

He is not and, in my judgment, should not be like a Cabinet officer who can be dismissed at will or a military officer who can be disciplined. For the Senate leader of either party to be placed in that position would, in fact, help to establish the doctrine that the Congress was a subordinate rather than a coequal branch of Government. The party leaders in the Senate and the House, along with the President, also have the responsibility of carrying out the pledges of the party platform during the period between the meetings of the national nominating conventions.

In the past, Republicans have been properly critical of Democratic platforms that have not been carried out during the term for which their candidates received their mandate from the people. We must be alert to the fact that if we ourselves do not have a good batting average in this regard our derelictions would be pointed out by the opposition.

Personally, I believe that the party platform adopted in 1952 in Chicago is as sound today as it was on July 10, 1952, when it was adopted.

A section of the platform reads as follows: "Our goal is a balanced budget, a reduced national debt, an economical administration, and a cut in taxes. We believe in combating inflation by encouraging full production of goods and food, and not through a program of restrictions."

Part of this platform pledge has been met and we have less than 2 years left to comply with the balance.

The Republican Party as a basic matter of principle has stood for a balanced economy, a solvent Government, and a sound dollar.

I believe that before the next Republican National Convention meets in San Francisco in 1956, the Republican Party will have carried out a substantial majority of its pledges. Such an accomplishment will require a continuous devotion to this objective by all Republicans in the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

For we have been faced with the unusual situation that after 20 years under the New Deal, the Republicans were given a mandate and control of the executive branch, and a narrow control of the legislative branch, of the Government for a period of the first 2 years. This year the opposition party gained control of the House and Senate.

I want to remind this audience and the country of several key paragraphs in that party platform:

"The Government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings such as those of Yalta which aid Communist enslavements. It will be made clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy, as one of its peaceful purposes, looks happily forward to the genuine independence of those captive peoples."

The publication of the Yalta papers was a necessary step in giving to the Congress and to the Nation the full facts relative to the Yalta Conference. It is equally important that there be a prompt publication of the papers of the Teheran, Cairo, and Potsdam Conferences.

It was not until the publication of the Yalta papers that the Congress and the country had the information that the then Secretary of State Stettinius in January of 1945 ordered that all the papers being prepared for consideration of the President at the February Yalta Conference of the Big Three should be forwarded to the President through Alger Hiss.

This placed Hiss in a position to know in advance the various recommendations on policy being recommended to the President by the various executive agencies.

In view of the fact that it was some years earlier on September 2, 1939, information was first taken to the executive branch of the Government relative to the Hiss activities with espionage groups it places a heavy responsibility upon the then administration for permitting him to hold such a key position on the eve of the Yalta Conference and to attend the sessions.

On page 91 of the recently released Yalta papers it states:

"At the Secretary's staff committee meeting of January 10, the Secretary asked that all memoranda for the President on topics to be discussed at the meeting of the Big Three should be in the hands of Mr. Alger Hiss not later than Monday, January 15."

It was also quite clear that the party platform pledged the administration to enter into no deal or understanding with the Soviet Union that would destroy the hope of the enslaved people of the world, be they in Europe or Asia, that some day they might be free. In this regard the platform reads:

"We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. That program will give the Voice of America a real function. It will mark the end of the negative, futile and immoral policy of 'containment' which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and Godless terrorism, which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction."

* * * * *

"The policies we espouse will revive the contageous, liberating influences which are inherent in freedom. They will inevitably set up strains and stresses within the captive world which will make the rulers impotent to continue in their monstrous ways and mark the beginning of their end."

In the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Our policy is and should be, "peace with honor," not peace at any price.

The world should have learned at Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of freemen largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact and mutual defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last 2 treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate during this session of Congress.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals, and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the Formosa Resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our Allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

In violation of the terms of the Korean armistice, the Chinese Communists still hold 15 American prisoners of war. Eleven of them have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years.

I believe that the position taken by the State Department on Saturday, April 23, was sound when they stated our policy would be to have the Communists show their good faith by the forthwith release of the American prisoners they now hold.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory in Asia and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communist of the

Soviet Union and of Eastern Germany, because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to the take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks, we broke the 1948 blockade of Berlin by the air lift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of the island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad which have indicated that we must placate communism when they get aggravated for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is no.

At Munich, Chamberlain and Deladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have "no further territorial demands in Europe".

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience, Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian state.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression. But the guaranty given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia for by then they had lost their will to fight, largely because they had lost their faith in the Western Allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory and they are not today.

That these outposts have a military value, no man can deny, for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assault out of Amoy and Foochow as long as the Free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to Free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan and elsewhere where people understand the brutal and aggressive nature of communism.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as steppingstones toward Formosa and the Pescadores.

When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts? If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and their reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reenforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross your heart and hope to die assurance?"

In the light of the bald-faced violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

This Nation was nor born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

I want to share with this audience tonight a letter I recently received from an American pilot now stationed on the island of Formosa. He wrote me as follows:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years I'm sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any Americans. The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I'm quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcefully represent.

"I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

The March of Bigotry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fifth and sixth articles, entitled "Hate, Inc.," written by Mr. Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. I have inserted Mr. Steele's previous four articles in the RECORD of May 3 and 5, and they appear on pages A2972, A2973, A3037, A3038, and A3039.

These articles deal with the march of bigotry in the United States. They are most interesting and illuminating, and have been appearing in recent issues of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 6, 1955]

HATE, INC.

(By Jack Steele)

A NAAWP, THE KLAN AND A NEGRO CULT

The ink was hardly dry on the Supreme Court's decision last year outlawing school segregation before the bigots and racists got busy.

Hatemongers seized upon the decision—a milestone in the evolution of civil rights—as potentially the most explosive and exploitable issue that had come their way since they discovered the Communist menace.

Typically, they "exposed" the Supreme Court decision as being Communist-inspired, ignoring the fact that attacks on segregation in the United States long have been a favorite weapon in Moscow's propaganda arsenal.

Hate sheets from coast to coast flamed with vicious attacks on the Supreme Court and what they called its "mongrelization" policy. Some are still at it.

Old Ku Klux Klan elements hastily tried to regroup in the South, and new little racist groups sprang up here and there to fan prejudices.

Haters first moved to stir up trouble here and in border States where integration was put into effect in some schools last fall without waiting for the Supreme Court's follow-up order.

Strikes

Anti-Negro groups encouraged "strikes" of parents and pupils here, in Baltimore, and in small towns in West Virginia and Delaware. But firm-handed city and school officials—backed by responsible community groups and public opinion—soon quelled most of these demonstrations.

For the hatemongers this was only a trial run.

Some hope to start far more serious troubles when the Supreme Court lays down its plan for enforcing public-school integration in the South, possibly starting next fall.

These are some of the individuals and groups engaged in fomenting disorder:

The NAAWP

The first hate group to cash in on the school disruption was the National Association for the Advancement of White People. Its not-very-clever play on the name of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) apparently had an initial appeal to prejudice.

Its leader, Bryant Bowles, a 34-year-old ex-Marine and Florida "cracker," had a record of arrests for passing worthless checks.

Mr. Bowles first formed the NAAWP here late in 1953 in response to the Supreme Court's decision outlawing racial covenants on real estate. He quickly reactivated it last year and in a few weeks claimed to have enrolled 50,000 members.

The law moved in fast on Mr. Bowles. He vacated his offices here after a fracas with a Negro mailman and, last December, moved to Milford, Del., the scene of his only minor success. He now lives on the outskirts of Milford and is trying to organize a battle with its school board. A few days ago he was fined $600 for helping stir up the Milford school strike.

Mr. Bowles is discredited and unimportant except as a sample of the bigots who are trying to capitalize on the segregation issue.

His speeches soon revealed that he hated Jews as well as Negroes. He started a newsletter called the National Forum. Its first issue featured a story picked up from Frank L. Britton's hate sheet under this headline: "South Indignant as Jew-Led NAACP Wins School Segregation Case."

Conde McGinley threw the support of his anti-Semitic paper Common Sense behind Mr. Bowles. He put out a special issue in July which carried the headings: "Communism Hits South With Nonsegregation" and "Jewish Marxists Threaten Negro Revolt in America." A lead article by Eustace Mullins "traced" the Supreme Court's decision to a 1921 resolution by the Communist International.

Mr. McGinley put out a second anti-Negro edition of Common Sense headed: "NAACP Communist Front Splits U. S." Both issues were mailed and shipped by the thousands into Delaware to help Mr. Bowles.

Mr. McGinley in recent weeks has appealed to his followers for money to distribute these throwaways to "every resident in many States." He wound up a fund-appeal letter with these words: "We will be glad to talk confidentially with any real patriot who

wants to help awaken millions to this Satanic conspiracy."

Gerald L. K. Smith devoted a section of the January issue of the Cross and the Flag to the segregation decision. Included were a picture of Mr. Bowles and a highly laudatory article. Mr. Smith also reported a $50 contribution to Mr. Bowles.

The White Brotherhood

Several new organizations are trying to rally old Klan elements in the South. One being watched closely is the so-called White Brotherhood, formed last fall in Tallahassee, Fla.

Its big wheel is Bill Hendrix, one-time adjutant of the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. He was convicted in 1952 of sending defamatory postcards through the mail and given a 3-year suspended sentence.

The White Brotherhood appears to be an undercover offshoot of the American Confederate Army, an ineffective Klan-like group. At least, ACA "colonels" are given cut-rate membership in the brotherhood.

CITIZENS' COUNCILS

The Citizens' Council move began in Mississippi and spread to Alabama and other States in the deep South. Its avowed aim was to bring economic pressures to bear on Negroes who insist on enforcement of the Supreme Court's antisegregation decision.

Many southern newspapers attacked this movement, one referring to it as a "refined descendant of the Ku Klux Klan."

However, citizens' councils have been set up in many deep South communities. They haven't done much yet, but they are ready to go into action when the first efforts are made to enforce school integration.

Other groups

The National Citizens Protective Association, which started out to stir up racial troubles in St. Louis, is trying to expand into a nationwide group. The power behind it is John W. Hamilton, a one-time aide of Gerald Smith. He turned to anti-Negro activities when, he said, he got tired of Mr. Smith's "Jew, Jew, Jew stuff." Mr. Hendrix is one of the group's directors.

Other anti-Negro groups which have sprung up or gained a new lease on life in the South include: The National Association for the Preservation of the White Race; the National Association for the Advancement and Protection of a Majority of the White Race; the National Patrick Henry Organization; the Southerners; the Pro-Southerners; the Moonlighters; the Grass Roots League; the American States Rights Association.

The Islam cult

Negro organizations like the NAACP have fought bigotry in all its forms. But a few Negroes have formed little hate groups of their own. One is known variously as the Nation of Islam, the Allah Temple of Islam, and the Muslim Cult of Islam.

Some members of this secret all-Negro cult preach militant hate of whites. The cult has a military arm known as the FOL. Some authorities say this stands for "fruit of Islam."

Cult followers chant Arabic litanies and dress in Arab garb. But they are not adherents of the Moslem faith. They use the Bible for their religious rites.

Its members often refuse to register or report for the draft contending that they are citizens of Asia even though born in the United States. Some evaded military service during the Korean war on grounds that they would not fight other Asians.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 7, 1955]

HATE, INC.

THE FIFTH COLUMNISTS OF HATE AND PREJUDICE

(By Jack Steele)

New right-wing and isolationist groups now springing to life are providing a happy hunting ground for peddlers of prejudice.

Bigots of varying kind and degree are trying to infiltrate and take over these organizations set up to give voice to ultraconservative or neonationalist sentiments.

Such groups are legitimate enough and have an unchallengeable role to play in the formation of American public opinion, just as do those of the non-Communist left.

But haters hope to use these groups for their own ends—either as covers for trouble-making or as paths to the pocketbooks of wealthy and unsuspecting "angels."

In efforts to infiltrate right-wing groups, the forces of bigotry have adopted the fifth-column tactics of the Communists.

They readily take over and preach the doctrines of the particular group they want to penetrate. Often they cover their operations with an aura of intrigue and conspiracy.

Some operators try to conceal or explain away their own unsavory pasts. Others hide their prejudices behind euphemisms designed to fool the unwary and confuse their critics.

These tactics make such infiltration hard to tag, as these recent case histories will indicate:

Joseph P. Kamp

He has been one of the Nation's most prolific pamphleteers. He turns out brochures loaded with distortions and appeals to fear and prejudice. Then he sells batches of them to businessmen and others to distribute "where they will do the most good."

Who supplies the money to keep Joe Kamp going? He won't say.

He went to jail for 4 months for contempt rather than disclose the sources of his revenue to a House Campaign Expenditures Committee in 1944. He was convicted on similar charges in 1950, but won a retrial and acquittal.

Kamp, who refers to anti-Semitism as a "dirty little Communist swear word," vehemently denies that he is anti-Semitic.

But dislike of Jews crept into much of his literature. That was the case with anti-Eisenhower propaganda he turned out before the 1952 convention.

He devoted two 16-page issues of his publication Headlines to candidate Eisenhower. The first was headed "Who's Promoting and What's Behind 'We Want Ike'?" and the second "More About What's Behind Ike."

Kamp's answer was obvious—Communists and Jews.

These editions were widely distributed to supporters of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio. Senator Taft repudiated them and the volunteers for Taft denounced them as "scurrilous, un-American, and defamatory."

But hate sheets copied freely from them.

More recently Kamp has cashed in on Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S fame. He formed a front called the Committee for McCarthyism and put out a "miniature library" of pamphlets on Senator MCCARTHY.

He also took it upon himself last year to answer the "MCCARTHY Balance Sheet"—a series of articles by Scripps-Howard reporter Frederick Woltman, who won a Pulitzer Prize for exposing Communists. Kamp's pamphlet was entitled: "The Red-Addled Brain Behind the Scripps-Howard Smear of Senator MCCARTHY."

Hatemongers Conde McGinley, Gerald L. K. Smith, and Gerald Winrod praised and quoted from it. Mr. Smith wrote: "We are indebted to the brilliant commentator Joseph P. Kamp for a very special article on Frederick Woltman who was called out of Roy Howard's journalistic brothel to do a job on the great MCCARTHY."

Kamp's most recent pamphlets have attacked tax-exempt foundations—and suggested boycotts of the products of companies which finance them.

Allan A. Zoll

He is another pamphleteer and promoter whose most successful venture was the National Council for American Education. This outfit, with a name easily confused with the respected American Council on Education, fomented a wave of troubles in the public schools.

Here's how it worked.

Mr. Zoll's council put out pamphlets which served as blueprints for exposing school administrators, teachers, and textbooks as being Red-tinged and for attacking so-called educational frills.

These were sold to taxpayer groups interested in cutting school costs and to patriotic groups aroused by Mr. Zoll's extravagant Red charges. Use of the pamphlets touched off a rash of battles in public-school systems across the Nation.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun first disclosed that Mr. Zoll was behind all this and told who he was.

Mr. Zoll in 1937 founded and became national commander of the American Patriots, Inc. Attorney General Francis Biddle in 1940 listed it as "fascist." Mr. Zoll called this a New Deal smear, but the now-defunct group is still carried on the Attorney General's list for the Eisenhower administration's security program.

In 1939 Mr. Zoll appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee and opposed confirmation of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter on the grounds that he was a Jew. Yet Mr. Zoll claims he "hates anti-Semitism."

He also organized the picketing of radio station WMCA in New York when it took Father Charles E. Coughlin off the air. He was indicted on charges of taking a bribe to call off the pickets, but the case was dismissed without being brought to trial.

Mr. Zoll has been inactive since he married the elderly widow of an oil millionaire late in 1953. She sued for divorce last December.

Mr. Zoll is now back in his New York haunts—presumably ready for a new venture.

The United Nations

The U. N. is one of the major targets of blantant bigots. Gerald L. K. Smith and his fellow hatemongers rarely miss a chance to charge that the U. N. is part of a Jewish-Communist plot to destroy the sovereignty of the United States.

Neoisolationists who are forming new groups patterned after the old America First Committee likewise center their attacks on the U. N.—without, of course, combining them with appeals to prejudice and bigotry.

But these parallel attacks on the U. N. and one-worldism can and do create a good deal of confusion.

Take the case of W. Henry MacFarland, Jr.

Mr. MacFarland now runs the American Flag Committee from his home in Philadelphia.

Attacks on the U. N. issued under its imprint have been widely circulated in the last few years—and widely reprinted by hate sheets.

But many people who have read and perhaps been influenced by the publications of the American Flag Committee know little about Mr. MacFarland's background.

A one-time admirer and supporter of Gerald Smith, Mr. MacFarland once ran from the same address in Philadelphia an outfit called the Nationalist Action League.

The Attorney General cited the Nationalist Action League as Fascist on April 27, 1949, and its name still appears on the Justice Department's list.

A few weeks after it was so listed, Mr. MacFarland sought to unite the Nationalist Action League with a group of supporters of hate-monger Conde McGinley. For a short time, Mr. McGinley's Common Sense was the official organ of the league.

The House Un-American Activities Committee charged in its report in December on hate groups that Mr. MacFarland had also been active in the National Renaissance

Party, a group branded by the committee as neo-Fascist.

Mr. MacFarland's union with Mr. McGinley did not last long. Soon after it broke up he formed the American Flag Committee as a vehicle for his attacks on the U. N.

Mr. MacFarland now assures his supporters that the American Flag Committee is an avowed enemy of fascism.

In one of his publications he offered this explanation of attacks on his own background:

"Neither the (American Flag) Committee nor its chairman has ever been cited as a Fascist by the United States Attorney General, nor by any other Federal or congressional body."

Technically Mr. MacFarland is correct.

The Attorney General cites only organizations—and not the individuals who run them—on his list, which is used as the basis for the Government's loyalty-security program.

And the American Flag Committee has never been cited by anyone.

Banning of Commercial Dealing in Minor Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill (S. 1123) to make unlawful certain commercial dealing in minor children. The bill was prepared after Federal grand jury investigations in Minnesota uncovered a situation involving this traffic between Minnesota and Illinois. Federal legislation on this subject should be enacted, I believe. In connection with this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two recent articles from the Duluth Herald.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Duluth (Minn.) Herald of May 3, 1955]

BABY ADOPTIONS UNDER INVESTIGATION IN DULUTH—AUTHORITIES QUESTION TWO IN CITY—PROBE BRINGS TIGHTENING UP IN STATE LAWS

(By Paul Lawson)

Attention of local and Federal authorities has been focused on Duluth which they term the northern terminus of an interstate baby selling operation. As a result of their investigations, a Duluth physician has been severely disciplined by the St. Louis County Medical Society.

State adoption laws were strengthened at the recent session of the legislature, and a measure is now before the Congress of the United States to tighten laws dealing with transportation of children between States to avoid State adoption laws.

Among those questioned in Duluth by county and Federal authorities was the physician who was disciplined after a thorough, separate investigation by the medical society. Another is a Duluth attorney said to be involved in the adoptive placement of illegitimate children.

St. Louis County and Federal authorities up to the present time have been unable to bring charges because of the inadequacies of State and Federal laws. Cases investigated took place before new State laws were adopted.

The activity of arranging for adoption of illegitimate children by persons, not Minnesota residents, who are thought to pay handsomely and quietly, has been called a great moral wrong.

No definite sums have been mentioned as returns from the human traffic. Official speculation places the cost to the adoptive couples between $4,000 and $6,000 for each baby. Evidence does exist that the outlay in hospital bills, transportation and other expenses, met by the operators, runs up to $1,000 for each completed transaction.

The practice, which authorities says violates the spirit of the Nation's laws against slavery, operates because of the weakness of two groups involved. Mothers of illegitimate children make up one segment. Couples who either cannot or will not seek adoption of children through authorized agencies make up the other. The persons who get them together by skirting the law for fees they may receive are in the middle but untouched by law or possible future tragedy. However, since the close of the recent State legislative session they face prosecution on any new case.

Four separate cases have come to the attention of the Duluth Herald and News-Tribune. Circumstances in each vary regarding final disposition of the children involved. Duluthians are known to have had a part in three of the incidents and, possibly, in the fourth. Illegitimate birth was a factor in all.

According to official information, the general method of operation in the area cases was to persuade the mother of an illegitimate child to give up her baby by consenting to the infant's adoption. In making arrangements, the operators avoided organized public channels as much as possible.

They played on the emotional distress of the woman prior her child's birth. They convinced her that the child would be placed in a good adoptive home where he or she would have advantages the mother never could provide. Finally, they arranged to pay all the mother's bills, including hospital charges and transportation costs. In one instance, a woman also was given money for new clothes.

It appears that the operators favored making the separation of mother and child in Chicago. They also apparently preferred that the woman have her baby in Chicago, but the place of birth was not a vital concern.

One mother was driven by auto from Duluth to Chicago following her delivery in a hospital here. Another visited the Illinois city prior to her baby's birth in Duluth. She was examined and instructed by a Chicago doctor and lawyer but returned to the head of the lakes before her child was born.

Whether the activity is confined to Duluth and Chicago is not certain. Staff members of the United States district attorney's office in St. Paul refused to talk extensively about it. But the results of their investigations were sent to Washington, D. C., on request of Senator EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, member of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Senator announced his sponsorship of a bill to outlaw the practice. He marked Chicago as a baby-selling reception center and said other cities besides Duluth are supply points. Investigators of his committee received reports from the St. Paul Federal attorney and the St. Louis County attorney's staff.

Meanwhile, the Minnesota Legislature moved more rapidly than Congress. It unanimously passed a bill, which was signed into law by Gov. Orville Freeman shortly before the close of the session, to strengthen State adoption laws.

Two Duluth men testified at hearings on baby selling during the preliminary stages of the new law's formulation. Donald C. Odden, assistant county attorney, and Ove M. Wangensteen, executive director, county welfare board, related their knowledge of local activities. These men, with Sheriff Sam Owens, led investigations in St. Louis County.

A Federal grand jury which met in St. Paul in January and February also studied the situation. United States Judge Dennis F. Donovan, Duluth, presided. His insistence and help caused Federal authorities to present information and witnesses before the jury. But it failed to produce the required true bill which would empower the Government to prosecute the suspects.

The strongest evidence held by the county attorney concerns a young mother whose twins were born last fall in a Duluth hospital. The mother and babies were taken to Chicago shortly after the births. There, the infants were taken from the mother who signed several documents presumed to be adoption consent waivers. She has neither seen nor heard of her children since.

The woman's voluntary statement brought a third Duluth resident into the inquiry. This was a woman at whose home the expectant mother stayed prior to the birth of the twins. Accommodations at the home were arranged by the Duluth lawyer with the knowledge of the local doctor, the mother said. She also declared that her hostess accompanied her and the twins to Chicago.

In excerpt, the mother claims her experience was as follows:

About 3 months after discovering her pregnancy, she came to Duluth and entered the home of the local woman. Friends in the expectant mother's home community gave her the Duluth woman's name.

Why did she seek out the Duluth woman? The mother said she learned that the Duluthian would arrange for a home for her child. At the time, the pregnant woman did not know she would bear twins.

Soon after her guest's arrival, the Duluth householder telephoned the Duluth and Chicago lawyers. A visit from the Duluth man followed at once. He tried to persuade the pregnant woman to go to Chicago to have her baby. He told her he would pay all bills and make arrangements necessary for adoption.

The Chicago lawyer came to Duluth and also visited the young woman in company with the Duluth lawyer. Both men urged her to go to Chicago, where, they said, she might stay in what apparently is a maternity home. They repeatedly assured her they would pay all expenses.

The expectant mother returned home shortly after the visit of the lawyers but came back to the Duluth residence about one week before her children were born. She went from the house to the hospital the day before her delivery. The Duluth lawyer brought her cigarets and magazines the following day.

The twins were born prematurely and were placed in incubators according to standard hospital practice. Meanwhile, their mother returned to the Duluth woman's home, leaving the babies at the hospital. The Duluth lawyer, visited her several times during her convalescence, she said.

A county welfare department case worker of the children's division traced the mother to her temporary residence. This woman learned of the case through the hospital's social service director. A tip was given the latter, by one of the obstetrical floor nurses who suspected the mother was not married.

In an interview with the welfare worker, the mother said she intended taking her children home to make private arrangements for their adoption. The case worker failed to win the subject's confidence so that county authorities could help her.

At this point, the Duluth lawyer told the mother it was time to remove the children. He obtained authorization from the doctor who delivered them. The night before

the case worker was to return for another interview, the mother and her hostess went to the hospital to get the babies. They were driven by a man allegedly in the employ of the Duluth woman.

The party was met at the hospital by the lawyer. Upon release of the babies, he paid what the mother said was a bill of $200. Then the two women, infants and driver left by car for Chicago, leaving the lawyer in Duluth.

Meanwhile, the county attorney had arranged for warning of the departure. A hospital nurse learned the babies were being taken and telephoned the alarm which alerted the county attorney. He went immediately to the hospital with two sheriff's deputies. They missed the Chicago-bound group by minutes.

In Chicago, the mother said she and her children were given a room in a good hotel. They waited about a week before the babies were taken away. During that time, the mother was visited daily by the Chicago lawyer. He told her the adoptive parents were wealthy residents of a nearby State who would have a special nurse for the children. But the mother did not see the couple at any time. Her only assurance that they exist was given by the Chicago lawyer and her Duluth woman companion.

The mother told the county attorney that a judge came to the Chicago lawyer's office where the adoption papers were signed. She remembers signing about a half dozen documents, but had only a vague knowledge of what they contained. After this incident, she discovered her children had been taken away. She returned to Minnesota by train a short time later.

All her hotel bills and other expenses were paid for the mother. She said she was given $200 for clothes, transportation, and food. Upon her return to Duluth, she stayed at the home of her hostess for about 2 weeks. She said she saw the Duluth lawyer there on at least one occasion.

The mother then moved into the Superior home of a woman friend. She cared for this woman's children and assisted with housework. Her funds came from personal savings and money sent by her mother. She said she received nothing from the Duluth attorney.

There is a right way and a wrong way to go about adopting children.

If you are foolish enough to choose the wrong way—the hazards are many and the end result may be disastrous to all concerned.

If you take the right road the chances are that you will have a long wait, answer a lot of questions, but your interests and the interests of the child will be fully protected.

All this will be fully explained in a story in Sunday's Duluth News-Tribune when this series of stories is completed.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune of May 3, 1955]

DULUTH MOTHER LOSES PLEA FOR RETURN OF ADOPTED BABY

A Duluth mother's request for the return of her illegitimate child through a court order, after she had consented to its adoption, was denied in a ruling by a district court judge, it was revealed yesterday.

The judge's action was termed rare by county legal and welfare authorities. They said the decision was unique in Minnesota.

In his memorandum, the judge said the decision was no reflection on the mother's character of fitness to care for the child. Children have been taken from mothers in cases where neglect or unfitness were determined.

The judge said his ruling was based on what he considered best for the child's welfare. He explained that this was a fundamental rule in Minnesota and other jurisdictions.

The child was born last fall. The mother had agreed to placing it for adoption and a couple received custody after filing an adoption petition. Later, the mother sought legal help to revoke the consent agreement. She brought suit charging that the child was held illegally by the married couple.

The judge noted that the father of the child was unknown to the court. The mother is divorced.

In her suit, the mother charged that she was coerced to give up her baby. She said the arrangement was made on condition that her prenatal, hospitalization, and medical services costs were paid. The infant was surrendered shortly after birth.

The judge said there was no illegal imprisonment of the baby. He ordered a 30-day stay of execution of the ruling.

The judge declared he was satisfied that the mother had been frightened into believing that she would lose the child if she did not consent to its surrender. He criticized the action of a physician who delivered the baby.

The doctor's action, the judge said, created in the mother's mind the impression that organized welfare agencies were unsympathetic and to be avoided.

Also criticized were the prospective adoptive parents. The judge said their failure to proceed through normal channels resulted in chaos for all parties concerned.

The Northeast Mississippi Hospital, Booneville, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent column by Mr. Paul Flowers in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, regarding the Northeast Mississippi Hospital at Booneville, Miss. Mr. Paul Flowers is a gifted writer, as well as a great humanitarian, and gives here a grassroots report on the work of a busy small-town hospital under the Hill-Burton Act.

Booneville and the surrounding area, with its fine public-spirited citizens and many activities, give an excellent illustration of an expanding community and the part that the Hill-Burton hospital program plays therein.

I commend to the Membership of the Congress the reading of this fine report.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL FLOWERS' GREENHOUSE

NORTHEAST MISSISSIPPI HOSPITAL, BOONEVILLE, April 3.—They've broken out in a rash of pardonable pride in this homey little hospital where a new idea of rural medicine came to the Mid-South 5 years ago.

First of all, only last week came formal notification from the Joint Committee on Accreditation of Hospitals that this one has been given top rating by the organization that inspects and ranks hospitals all over the United States.

Next, word got out that the contract for a new unit, increasing the hospital's capacity by 30 beds, will be let in May, a $200,000 improvement here where the Hill-Burton rural hospital program was pioneered.

Finally, with these heartening tidings came the reminder that Northeast Mississippi Hospital is operating "in the black" that is, paying its own way, and has paid its own way since December, 1949.

Only recently, Dr. W. R. Albus, field representative of the commission, completed an inspection; it was Saturday that his report came announcing that this is the ninth out of 182 Mississippi hospitals to receive such rating.

But there probably won't be any formal celebrating. They're too busy here running a hospital to take time off even for acknowledgment of plaudits for work well done. After all, this modern institution which maintains an old-fashioned warm family style hand in hand with modern efficiency, processes about 55 patients a week (bed patients, that is) and the routines have to be steady to run about 16 percent over rated capacity. When overload periods come, the staff rustles up more bed space * * * in the nurses' lounge maybe, or additional space in the solarium. Thus with an average of 55 patients a week, this hospital has served more than 15,000 ailing people, a generous share of them persons unable to pay for hospitalization; it has accomplished this without any income save fees paid by patients, and it has burst out at the seams.

When they build the new addition, completion of which is planned for early winter, they will put it on a foundation heavy and deep enough to permit extra stories later. This new wing will occupy most of the available land, so the only way to grow will be upward. The present buildings stand on foundations laid for 1-story structures, and so any vertical expansion will have to be over the new part. Patients come here from Prentiss and adjoining counties, a few from other States.

A Saturday afternoon and night here has many elements of the old-fashioned get-together, a fifth Sunday meeting, or a sacred harp singing, without the noise.

Little things seem big here. The small boy hastened in a pick-up truck for treatment, his face torn by a dog. That took some sewing, and of course precautionary measures against rabies. Happily, thanks to years of preaching by Dr. W. H. 'Wick' Anderson and others, the dog was put under observation instead of being killed instantly by indignant parents and neighbors; Dr. 'Wick' says that is a better course than to send the dog's head to a laboratory for study. In any case, the threat of rabies always is a horrendous one; even while doctors are sewing up wounds they urge vaccination of pets, and commend parents for hastening bitten persons to the hospital for immediate treatment.

There has been little rabies reported in this area lately, but there's always the chance that a migrant rabid fox, or skunk, will bite a dog, and that the dog will bite a child or grown person.

That's just one of the things the staff at this hospital has done.

These doctors report also that the wearing diseases of winter are brought under control so much more quickly than once upon a time—often a persistent case of walking flu goes into retreat after 2 or 3 days in a hospital, after the patient had tried for weeks to walk it off. However, most folks keep going until they collapse, which is the hard way. At that, pneumonia isn't the grim spectre it used to be.

No wonder these people are proud of their accrediation by the national rating body, for most of these staff members have made this a way of life in these 5 years.

I have never seen such morale, such a spirit of teamwork and unity. Pride they display, like the spirit behind an athletic team or even a family accomplishment. When notification of the hospital's accreditation came in, you'd have though one of the

girls in the front office had a new engagement ring.

But it didn't throw anybody off stride, they hung up the laurel and went on to make things even better. After all, this will be an 80-bed hospital instead of a 50-bed hospital; but that will mean more work for Administrator E. L. King, for Mrs. Nina Faye Holder, housekeeper, for Roy Coons, di-director of linen rehabilitation. All right then, laundry superintendent.

Daily J. A. Cunningham, Sr., of the board of trustees stolls through the place to see what goes on. He's 81 now, but he convinces you of that only by sworn testimony. Seth Pounds, T. A. Cook, Sr., and Fred Houston watch this place as if it were something precious.

But Mr. Cunningham isn't the only octogenarian on these grounds. There's Dr. W. H. Sutherland, who could have been the model for pictures so dear to the American way, kindly, benign, his 81-year-old eyes sparkling with the zest for living and the satisfaction of service. His wife is a patient in this hospital now; this tireless man of medicine spends what time he can with her, and devotes the rest to those who have put themselves in his care.

Here also you will find Doctors S. C. Galloway, R. B. Cunningham, Paul Elizey, Joe R. Hurst, W. W. Strange, and P. A. Watson.

But most of all here you find a community spirit, a determination to go the Hill-Burton sponsors one better by making this thing promote better health in general, by making it grow for greater service, and for keeping it fiscally solvent. You could even get Mayor Marion Smith to make a speech about it.

The Communist Attitude Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "The Illusion of Futility," appearing in the Wall Street Journal on April 29, 1955, which in my judgment reflects the opinions of many clear-thinking Americans at this crucial crossroad in history.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ILLUSION OF FUTILITY

Expressing his disapproval of the administration's willingness to negotiate with Peipin, Senator KNOWLAND said: "I, for one, do not believe the Communist leopard has changed its spots."

Neither, as far as we are aware, does anyone else concerned in the matter. We are sure President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles and Senator GEORGE would agree with Mr. KNOWLAND that the Communists' objective has been, is, and will continue to be, the destruction of human freedom.

But we thought it was equally well understood that in pursuit of that ultimate objective the Communists are capable of violent shifts of tactics. It is, at any rate, a fact. At times it suits the Communists to be belligerent. At other times, depending on internal and external pressures and other reasons best known to themselves, it suits them to be more pacific specific issues.

When they are in the latter mood, negotiations become possible and can prove very useful indeed. We negotiated, for example, the end of the Korean War with the Chinese Communists. The fact that they agreed to conclude it did not mean they had repented of their aggressive sins against South Korea. What's more, neither the American negotiators nor the American people entertained any such illusion. Nor do they with regard to the possibility of a cease-fire in Formosa Strait.

It is important to remember, in any negotiations, the unchanging nature of the Communists' ultimate objective and to realize that because of it the negotiations may prove futile. But to reject all negotiations on that account would be to doom to futility any foreign policy aimed at peace.

The Case of Mrs. Lucille Affolter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Have the Facts," appearing in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of Wednesday, May 4, 1955.

This editorial deals with the case of Mrs. Lucille Affolter, an employee of the Internal Revenue Service.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE THE FACTS

A mean and ugly issue has developed in the Internal Revenue Service—the Federal income-tax collecting agency—over the case of Mrs. Lucille Affolter, a civil-service employee until June 1953. Republican Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, told the story Tuesday substantially as follows to his colleagues on the Senate floor:

Mrs. Affolter was an employee of the Internal Revenue Service who cooperated with Senator WILLIAMS in his collection of information for his one-man inquiry into income-tax scandals, begun in the Truman administration.

At no time did Mrs. Affolter give Senator WILLIAMS any information protected by law. The data she gave him included such things as appointment books, office diaries, and notes. When intelligence agents of the Service asked to see her appointment books and diaries she said they were in Senator WILLIAMS' office and they could see them there.

Eight days after Mrs. Affolter conferred with the crusading Republican Senator she was fired. She appealed to the Senator who arranged a conference with Internal Revenue Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews, an Eisenhower appointee.

The grievance against Mrs. Affolter, in the Revenue Service, was that she gave data to Senator WILLIAMS instead of the Service's inspectors. As a consequence the dismissal was rescinded, but her civil-service file has been flagged so as to practically prohibit her from ever being reemployed in any agency of the Government.

These are the basic facts as set forth in his Senate speech by the Delaware Republican, who added that the only interpretation he knew to put on the treatment of Mrs. Affolter was that it was to be "an indirect warning to all employees as to what they can expect if in the future they are caught furnishing me with any information."

The real question here is: Why did this civil servant feel she needed to go to Senator WILLIAMS? It is no more desirable that Senator WILLIAMS get information from employees in the service than that Senator MCCARTHY have informants in the Defense Department. In any properly administered Government department, it should be necessary only to report a bad situation to a superior official.

Is the Internal Revenue Service under Commissioner Andrews such a Service? Or is it taking on some of the bad color that disfigured it in the Truman administration?

Senator WILLIAMS performed a notable public service when he went after the disgraceful conditions in the Federal revenue-collecting agency under the Treasury secretaryship of John W. Snyder. In the last year of the Truman administration he received notable cooperation with the result that James P. Finnegan and many others were indicted, convicted, and sent to prison.

Surely the Delaware crusader deserves as much cooperation and more from the Eisenhower administration in Washington. Yet he found it necessary to take the Senate floor and make his extraordinary speech about reprisals in the Service.

Why? Commissioner Andrews is the man to answer.

Calumet-Sag I: An Authoritative Statement by Congressman Thomas J. O'Brien in Behalf of All Members From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the statement on May 6, 1955, of the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, speaking by bipartisan designation and for the entire delegation from Illinois, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM ILLINOIS, SIXTH DISTRICT, CHICAGO, BEFORE THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, PANEL NO. 1

At this time I find it most encouraging, gratifying, and hopeful to realize that the Calumet-Sag Channel project has finally reached this stage of discussion. Actually, this approach to constructive action has been long overdue. For in this project we have one that is of paramount importance, not only to the citizens of Illinois, but to the whole vast and vital midcontinent area of the United States.

It is perhaps unfortunate that the subject of Cal-Sag did not reach this stage of discussion years earlier. For Cal-Sag has been the No. 1 bottleneck on our system of inland waterways for more than 30 years. The responsibility for the neglect of Cal-Sag must rest with those agencies and organizations which failed to impress upon Congress and the public the vital nature of the Cal-Sag project.

For my own part, I must admit that I knew little about this project even though it lies in the Chicago area in which I reside. Probably I would have continued in my lack of knowledge had it not been for the magnifi-

cent educational and publicity program staged by the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee and through the personal contacts and discussions which grew out of the information broadcast in this campaign.

For too many years the Cal-Sag project was admittedly ignored and rejected. Then, about 2 years ago, the long-overdue campaign on behalf of the project was staged. The campaign was a magnificent one, bringing home to all of us the importance of Cal-Sag and the manner in which it was holding back an estimated $3 billion industrial expansion and an estimated 500,000 new job opportunities in the area while at the same time it strangled the whole of our development of our inland-waterways system.

CREDIT DUE KILLIAN AND ALLISON

Too much credit cannot be given to those individuals responsible for this campaign. By this I mean specifically Mr. John L. Killian, legislative vice president of the committee, as well as Anthony G. Allison, its executive vice president.

The campaign organized and carried through dynamically under the leadership of these men put Cal-Sag squarely into the limelight for Congress and the public. Through the educational program of this committee, I and my fellow Congressmen from Illinois were made aware of the true facts concerning Cal-Sag and the necessity for vigorous action on its behalf.

It is for this reason that I have decided to limit my remarks to a general outline of the project and potentialities and to leave the more detailed presentation of the project to the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee whose spokesman will follow me as a witness before this committee.

It was an awareness of the critical importance of the Cal-Sag Channel project, as brought to me by the Cal-Sag committee, that last year motivated me and my colleagues of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives to sign a resolution petitioning the President and the Director of the Budget to place this worthy and necessary project on the budget. Now that this has been done and the project is being given proper consideration I feel that it is highly important that all concerned should be made aware of the economic importance of this long neglected though vital key in our otherwise magnificent system of inland waterways.

HOLDS A VITAL KEY POSITION

To anyone not conversant with the critical importance of the Cal-Sag Channel I suggest a study of the location of this waterway on a map of the Mid-Continent area. A glance is sufficient to force appreciation of its vital key position. It lies, as a mere glance shows, squarely at the crossroads on one of the world's greatest inland waterways system. To the north lies the Great Lakes where a huge fleet of ore carriers move the mountains of iron ore which feed our basic industry—steel. Because of this, we have had the tremendous development and expansion of the steel industry, particularly in the Chicago area, which has during the past few years, risen to the position of the leading steel producer of the Nation.

To the south lies the inland waterway system formed by the Mississippi and its tributaries. This system veins the whole vast and productively rich Mid-Continent area that now contains over half the wealth and population of the United States.

Squarely between these two independent systems lies the Cal-Sag Channel. Let me stress this interdependence of these two waterway systems. For, as the fleet of Great Lakes carriers feeds industry with iron ore and other raw materials, so the Mississippi system of inland waterways carry an equally critical burden of other raw materials to industries such as petroleum, chemicals, grain and others.

Of this great national system of primary production located in the heartland of America, Chicago is the economic capital city and nerve center. By the same token, the Cal-Sag Channel is the connecting link that allows Chicago to function in its role of economic capital and ties the two waterway systems into one unified and efficient whole.

INDUSTRIAL CENTER OF NATION

This has been the position of the Cal-Sag Channel throughout the years that the Mid-Continent area developed into the No. 1 industrial area of the Nation. However, during all that time the Cal-Sag Channel was practically ignored, its critical position disregarded, its tremendous potentials never developed or realized in terms of material economy and industrial efficiency.

That the Cal-Sag Channel exists, even in its present inadequate form, is a tribute to the energy and foresight of the people of Illinois. A Cal-Sag Channel was an absolute necessity since Chicago began to develop as a great commercial and industrial center. Because of this local agencies constructed the present channel and have paid for its operation and maintenance for over 50 years of its existence.

The replacement cost of work done by the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago on this link of our inland waterway system would be over $350 million.

Realizing the key importance of Cal-Sag, Congress acted in 1930 to make Cal-Sag a Federal waterway. Because of its key position and its obvious indaquacy, Congress acted again in 1946 to declare Cal-Sag a Federal Public Works project. But at that time no further action was taken. No funds were allocated. So Cal-Sag remained a neglected, though still a critically important, job to be tackled.

DEVELOPING A MODERN WATERWAY

During this time the economic importance of our inland waterway system drew attention and attendant action. A great system of modern transportation developed along the Mississippi and its tributaries. New locks and dams were constructed. The Illinois River, to cite an instance, was developed as a modern waterway.

However, while this constructive action on our inland waterway added greatly to our industrial efficiency and aided in the growth of prosperity in the midcontinent area, it actually threw a greater and greater burden upon the obsolete and inadequate Cal-Sag Channel. For, as these waterways leading north were improved, a constantly growing volume of waterborn traffice pressed upon the Cal-Sag Channel which, year by year, became a more serious bottleneck and an impediment to the movement of freight and the expansion of industry.

Thus, the position of Cal-Sag became more and more impossible. Now, this position has been made even more intolerable. For, just as the development of the waterways to the south have credited stalemate at Cal-Sag, so, now, plans for further development to the north make action on Cal-Sag absolutely imperative. I refer to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. As everyone knows, this project will open the Great Lakes, not only to Atlantic shipping, but to the newly discovered and developed rich ore bodies of Labrador. As this invaluable flow of ore reaches the ports of the Great Lakes, no city will feel greater effects than Chicago. And, if the beneficial effects of this new ore body is to be felt in increased prosperity throughout the midcontinent area, the avenue through which the benefits must flow will be the Cal-Sag Channel.

IMMEDIATE ACTION IMPERATIVE

It becomes obvious, therefore, that immediate action must be taken to break the bottleneck of Cal-Sag and allow general prosperity and industrial expansion to flow through the one channel that nature has designated as the only available avenue.

In all discussion of Cal-Sag we should note that Chicago is now in process of an ambitious program of port development. With the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway, it is believed Chicago will become the greatest inland port in the world. But, again, Cal-Sag is a key piece in all plans. For, Chicago cannot realize its port potentials, nor can it serve the huge and rich area of which it is the economic capital unless Cal-Sag is modernized. Such modernization would make Cal-Sag what it should be, the efficient key channel linking Atlantic sealanes and the ores of Labrador to the Mississippi Valley, the Gulf of Mexico, and the seas beyond.

In the Chicago area alone, it is conservatively estimated, completion of Cal-Sag would spark an industrial development involving billions of dollars in new and expanded industries, thus creating many thousands of new jobs while at the same time it would stabilize and make more secure those industries already operating in the area and maintain the established high level of prosperity enjoyed by all workers in this area.

WOULD BENEFIT ENTIRE NATION

In appealing to this committee for the most sober and thoughtful consideration of this project, I would point out that no single project in years has such wide possibilities of benefit to so many people. For there can be no calculating the wide, even all-embracing character of this project. It is physically located in Illinois, but the benefits deriving from its completion would be felt from the Appalachian Range to the Rockies, and from the northern ports of Duluth and Superior to New Orleans and the whole gulf coast.

Therefore I urge this committee to approve the appropriations on the budget for the Cal-Sag project so that construction can get underway immediately.

In conclusion, I should like to express my deep appreciation to this committee for the opportunity afforded me to present my views on this vital project.

Calumet-Sag II: Background History of Vitally Necessary Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following statement on the history of the Calumet-Sag project submitted by Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN at the conclusion of and supplementing his argument on May 6, 1955, before panel No. 1 of the Committee on Appropriations:

BACKGROUND HISTORY OF CALUMET-SAG

Construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel was begun in 1911 and the channel was completed in 1922. This period of construction was much longer than it should have been, due to the delay occasioned by World War I.

The use of the Calumet-Sag Channel for navigational purposes came about through necessity, because this channel bisects the ridge of land that lies as the major barrier between navigation on the Great Lakes and the great inland waterway system that leads to the Gulf of Mexico. A channel through this ridge of land has been a prime necessity

ever since Chicago began its rise as a great national industrial and transportation center. While the Calumet-Sag Channel never proved adequate for navigational purposes, the demands of the waterways forced its use as a barge canal.

Recognition of this fact by the Federal Government was evidenced in 1930, when the Calumet-Sag Channel was made a Federal waterway by act of Congress. At this time, the inadequacy of the Calumet-Sag Channel was also recognized locally, and modernization of the channel was requested by various groups at sundry times.

APPROVED BY ARMY ENGINEERS

Such demands resulted in further action by the Federal Government in 1946, when the projected work on Calumet-Sag was approved by the United States Army Engineers and was authorized as a Federal works project by act of Congress.

However, nothing was ever successfully done about Federal appropriations for the construction of the Calumet-Sag, even though barge traffic on this waterway rose from a few thousand tons carried in 1930 to an estimated 4 million tons which will be carried on the canal this year. Naturally, public demands for modernization of the Calumet-Sag Channel have grown in exact proportion to the rising burden of freight borne by the waterway.

The United States Army Engineers, as a result of studies carried on for years on the Calumet-Sag and the area it serves, have conservatively estimated that the potential tonnage to be carried on a modernized Calumet-Sag should amount to some 18 million tons annually.

UNITED SUPPORT OF RESOLUTION

It is against this background that the following resolution is presented:

"Whereas because of its critical position as a link between the water-borne traffic of the Great Lakes and the vast inland waterway system leading to the Gulf of Mexico, the Calumet-Sag Channel, with its present inadequate width and its obsolete locks and installations, seriously hampers the normal flow of trade and commerce on a national scale; and

"Whereas the Calumet-Sag Channel is vital to all industry and commerce in the entire midcontinent area from the headwaters of the Mississippi waterway system at Duluth-Superior and St. Paul-Minneapolis, and in the area served by the Ohio and Monogahela Rivers to the Gulf ports of New Orleans, Pensacola, and Mobile, as well as to Houston and other ports on the intercoastal canal; and

"Whereas this channel is absolutely essential to the needs of national defense, as was so clearly proven during World War II; and with the growing threat of atomic warfare, the Calumet-Sag Channel becomes of even greater importance to the future of our national defense; and

"Whereas there has developed a critical and intolerable traffic congestion at the foot of Lake Michigan, in which this channel is the key factor in a situation affecting railroads, highways, and other forms of transportation, and which cannot be corrected without the modernization of Calumet-Sag Channel; and

"Whereas all planning for Chicago port development, road and bridge building, and other such attempts to break this traffic congestion hampering the movement of trade and commerce in the area, is dependent upon the decision to start construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel; and

"Whereas practically all costs connected with the channel up to the present time—an estimated total of over $400 million at current values—has been borne by local authorities and agencies; and

"Whereas all of these agencies have indicated agreement to make all necessary concessions, turn over needed property, and to cooperate in every practicable manner with the Federal Government, thus reducing the probable cost of construction to a fraction of what it would be without this very substantial local participation; and

"Whereas the United States Army engineers have reported that the Calumet-Sag Channel project offers a ratio of benefits to be derived against costs incurred of about 3 to 1 (2.55 to 1), and this is reported to be the most economical with the highest ratio, of any major large-scale Federal works project in the country; and

"Whereas this project can be carried through to completion without any stoppage of navigation or the flow of traffic on any other form of transportation, and, at the same time, will not hamper the operations of any industry already producing in the area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the undersigned, do hereby unanimously petition the Bureau of the Budget to include an adequate amount of funds to start construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel in its budget for the fiscal year of 1956; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Calumet-Sag Channel, as authorized by act of Congress in 1946 as a Federal works project, be specifically eliminated from any ceiling criteria.

"John C. Kluczynski, Thomas J. O'Brien, Thomas S. Gordon, William L. Dawson, Melvin Price, Sidney B. Yates, Peter Mack, Jr., Barratt O'Hara, James B. Bowler, Harold H. Velde, Chauncey W. Reed, N. M. Mason, Leo E. Allen, Charles W. Vursell, Marguerite Stitt Church, Sid Simpson, R. B. Chiperfield, Edgar A. Jonas, Richard W. Hoffman, Fred E. Busbey, William E. McVey, Timothy P. Meehan, William L. Springer, L. C. Arends, C. W. Bishop.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 7, 1954*."

Calumet-Sag III: Congress Rarely Has Heard Such Impressive Testimony, Says Chicago Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 1955, the morning following the presentment of the case of Calumet-Sag to the panel of the Appropriations Committee by Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, as spokesman for the entire Illinois delegation, Democrats and Republicans alike, and by other distinguished witnesses, the Chicago Tribune carried the following editorial:

CAL-SAG, AN INVESTMENT

Congress has rarely heard such impressive testimony for a domestic improvement project as that presented yesterday before the House Public Works Subcommittee in behalf of the Calumet-Sag development. The committee is considering a $4 million appropriation designated for this purpose in the Federal budget.

Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Chicago, spoke for all the Members of the Illinois congressional delegation—both Republicans and Democrats. Henry E. Seyfarth testified for the Cal-Sag waterways development committee, representing business interests, labor unions, and civic leaders. Mr. Seyfarth presented a comprehensive report on the project, prepared under the direction of Dr. Harold M. Mayer, a University of Chicago economic geographer who is a specialist in transportation and in the development of cities and regions.

A simple explanation of the importance of Cal-Sag was given by Mr. Seyfarth. He likened the situation to two superhighways, each serving a large part of the North American Continent. These superhighways approach within about 20 miles of each other, but to get from one to the other a choice must be made between two roads, each narrow, winding, and obviously unable to handle the superhighway traffic.

One of the super-highways is the Great Lakes waterway system, soon to be improved by the St. Lawrence seaway. The other is the Mississippi River and its tributaries. These waterway systems were connected at Chicago by the building of the old Illinois-Michigan canal, no longer in service, and later by the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. A second link is the Calumet-Sag Channel, which traverses the southern part of Cook County and joins the sanitary canal near the Cook-Du Page County line.

The first of the two connecting routes is unsatisfactory because it leads to downtown Chicago, an area which no longer accommodes much heavy industry and which has no more vacant areas for industrial development. The second route, the Cal-Sag, serves the great Calumet industrial district of Illinoise and Indiana, where 15,000 acres are available for new industries. Dr. Mayer's report estimates that, with proper development of the Cal-Sag Channel and the port facilities at Lake Calumet, the area will support an additional population of 2 million persons.

The report carefully examines the probable effects of the Cal-Sag improvement on competing forms of transportation, chiefly the railroads. It points out that the railroads have not suffered from the Mississippi waterway, because it raised the general level of industrial activity, and the prediction is made that elimination of the Sal-Sag bottleneck will benefit the railroads for the same reason. New freight traffic growing out of new industries and additional population is expected to add $95 million a year to railroad revenue.

The report notes that the Federal Government is not being asked to begin a project for the benefit of a community which is carrying no share of the cost. Improvements already made at the expense of local taxpayers would cost $403 million to reproduce on the basis of 1954 price levels.

If there were no connecting channel between Lake Erie and Lake Huron, or if the channel were inadequate, Congress would have no hesitation in voting funds for such an improvement. It is no exaggeration to say that Cal-Sag is equally important. It will be a good investment, not a drain, on the taxpayers of the Nation.

A Conservation Acreage Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to transfer farmland not needed for commercial production each year into a "conservation acreage reserve" to store soil fertility until time of need. Designed to apply to all farmers, rent would be paid for such acreage to maintain "take-home pay" for the farm family while reducing the cost of the support program.

This legislation would protect the purchasing power of our rural families and prevent shifting from one crop to overproduction in another. The plan, horizontal in direction, would cover all farmers with special incentive to use wisely our soil resources. It would be made consistent with approved watershed development to improve fertility and to keep our farms ready to meet any demands imposed upon them in time of need. National interest demands that we, as a Nation, take care of our soil. One generation from now, the demands of our people must meet a sore test. We will need a reserve production of food to meet "head-on" the needs of a growing population. Seven thousand babies are born every day. When the growth cycle of present day children completes itself, will that generation have an adequate supply of food? Tragic as answers to this question can be, we have the power to prepare now to prevent food hardships. Farmers need adequate income if they are to build soil and not only mine their fertility. Under this bill, the farmer would be paid the landlord's share.

The bill makes provision for farmers to place acreage under this program if another farmer does not wish to use his quota. Where soil tests show fertility on a farm severely depleted, provision is made if the farmer wishes for this whole farm to come under this program. National policy dictates the necessity of such a conservation program. The act states, "It is the policy of Congress that farmers shall be encouraged to make the fullest and best economic use and conservation of the Nation's soil and water resources through coordinated watershed development." I feel it extremely necessary that we continually expand our outlook to bring the maximum number of farm families under programs such as this for our economic welfare and for the benefit of our country.

Problems of a Republican President and Democratic Congress in Working Together—Talk by Congressman William T. Granahan Before Sentry Club, Wednesday, May 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a copy of a talk which I delivered Wednesday night, May 4, to the members of the Sentry Club, an organization of outstanding Philadelphia women. In it I discussed on an objective level the problems which arise with divided responsibilities in Government—that is, divided between a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, or vice versa. As I tried to point out in that talk, it is natural in a two-party system, such as we have, for partisan politics to become injected in many policy decisions, but at the same time the strength of our American system lies in the fact that we can and do work together whenever the safety of this country and the basic freedoms of Americans are concerned.

PROBLEMS OF A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT AND DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS IN WORKING TOGETHER

Beginning back in the election campaign last fall, the question of how a Republican President and a Democratic Congress can work together in harmony and in good faith has been worrying a great many people.

To some students of political science, this sort of situation of divided responsibility in Government between two political parties is considered extremely unfortunate. It seldom happens in other democracies for the reason that the executive head of the government is usually the leader of the majority party in the parliament. To some people, then, the fact that it can happen and does happen periodically in the United States is supposed to be one of the big faults with our constitutional system of elections.

As a matter of fact, we can remember back to 1946 when an able, outstanding Democrat, Senator FULBRIGHT, seriously suggested that President Truman appoint a prominent Republican as his Secretary of State and then resign, so that the Republican could then succeed him as President. That was, of course, before the passage of the new succession act which provides that in the absence of a Vice President, the Speaker of the House and then the President pro tempore of the Senate should be in line for the Presidency before any Cabinet member.

When Senator FULBRIGHT made that suggestion, he was fearful that the divided Government created by the election of a Republican Congress during a Democratic President's term of office would bring us chaos. As a one-time Rhodes scholar, Senator FULBRIGHT was very familiar with the English system in which the Prime Minister always represents the majority party.

As it turned out, Senator FULBRIGHT's fears in 1946 were overly pessimistic. And so were President Eisenhower's last fall when he predicted in Republican campaign speeches that if the Democrats won Congress the country would have two drivers and go in the ditch. It is significant this time, I think, that no one has suggested that both Eisenhower and NIXON resign so that Speaker RAYBURN could be President. And Mr. Eisenhower himself has acknowledged that his talk about the country going into the ditch was mostly campaign exaggeration.

So it looks as if we can get through the next 2 years with a Republican President and a Democratic Congress without any breakdown of the American political system. We learned in 1947–48 during the 80th Congress that most Members of Congress are patriotic enough to suppress bitter partisan obstructionism in time of national danger.

On the other hand, there are problems—a great many problems—in this kind of situation. It would be silly to shut our eyes to them or to pretend that they don't exist. The best policy is to face up to these problems and do what we can to iron them out.

In talking to you this evening, I want to try to bring into focus the two sides of this troublesome problem of divided political responsibility in government—the President's problems in dealing with a Democratic Congress, and the problems of the majority party in Congress itself. For there are problems on both sides.

But in no case are they insurmountable, if there is good will and good faith on both sides. And I hope we can achieve that.

But let me point out one very important fact before we go into this any deeper. It is this:

Under no circumstances should we expect to see President Eisenhower stop being a Republican or those of us in the majority party in Congress stop being democrats just because we've got to work together. We choose up our political sides on the basis of certain principles of government in which we believe. It would be a sad thing indeed for American democracy—based on a two-party system—if those political beliefs were just superficial—if we had to throw them overboard as the only means of achieving harmony and progress in a period such as this.

I want to emphasize that point, for I think it is very important. The Democrats in Congress do not have to run out on everything they believe in just in order to cooperate with Eisenhower. And the President does not have to turn into a Democrat in order to cooperate with us. So please, in the coming 2 years, don't be either surprised or disappointed that these changes in basic principles and views have not occurred.

If the President holds stubbornly to some position and the Congress holds stubbornly to another—and this may happen from time to time—then the question is not whether the Democrats should give in because the President is Republican, or whether the President should give in because the Congress is Democratic. The only question will be. Which side is right? Or, if that can't honestly be determined in the circumstances, then the question is: How do we find a middle ground?

For when you come down to it, nearly all legislation passed by Congress and signed into law by the President is a compromise This is fundamental in American government.

You may be surprised to hear, in fact, that most of the bills which pass Congress and become law are passed by unanimous consent. That doesn't mean everybody agrees wholeheartedly about everything in each of those bills. What it does mean is that in order to get those bills through, so many compromises have to be made between strong views on both sides that finally a middle ground is reached and the less-than-perfect compromise is accepted.

This happens whether the Congress is Republican or Democratic; it happens, too, whether the Congress and the President belong to the same party or to different parties. That's because within the two parties there are strong differences of opinion on many issues; and also because party lines often cut across geographical or sectional or economic issues. Therefore, eastern Republicans and Democrats are often joined on one side against western or southwestern Democrats and Republicans, on the other.

So there is much precedent for a Republican President and a Democratic Congress finding a common ground for a middle course on many of the big issues to come up in these next 2 years.

But behind this cooperation and harmony, there will always be partisan political considerations, too—so don't be surprised when you see them crop up.

Now let's look at some of the problems involved in this cooperative effort to provide effective government leadership with divided political responsibility in Washington. First of all, let's look at it from the President's viewpoint; President Eisenhower—and this would be true of any President in the same situation—wants to make his administration succeed. He certainly would not want to climax a distinguished military career with a failure in the greatest and most responsible job in the world, as President of the United States.

Every President develops a sense of history—and of his place in it. But, while

looking at the long-range evaluation of his place in the history books, he must also be acutely conscious of his place in current history—in the newspapers and magazines and in the minds and hearts of the people. He knows he can accomplish more, both within his own administration and in dealing with Congress, if he is popular with the public generally. But sometimes he has to run the risk that some policies which he feels are very important to the Nation might be unpopular with the people.

If the program is very unpopular, he has a tough time, indeed, getting Congress to accept it, for, after all, every Member of the House of Representatives has to run for reelection every 2 years or else quit and get out. If he gets out voluntarily or is defeated, he loses his seniority automatically; therefore, if he comes back to Congress later, he comes back as a freshman all over again and has to start again from the bottom of the ladder. So in the House, and to a certain extent in the Senate, too, even though they have 6-year terms over there, an unpopular program has tough sledding; many Members feel they vote their own political suicide if they approve an unpopular measure.

But they will do it—and they have done it often—if the President convinces them of his sincerity, of his good faith, and of the underlying vital nature for the whole country of the policy he has recommended.

Now, when the President and the congressional majority are of the same party, the President can get further on this kind of approach. The Congress knows the President would not deliberately cut the ground out from his own party members in the House and Senate.

But when a Republican President tries to sell a Democratic Congress on an unpopular course of action—or the other way around in the case of Truman and the 80th Congress—many Members might feel the President isn't really a bit interested in whether they are reelected or defeated; some might even suspect the proposal of being deliberately calculated to hurt the opposition in the forthcoming election.

Does this sound overly suspicious? Perhaps so. I am only reporting on how Members sometimes feel in a situation like this, and many will continue to remember that the President's party leaders in effect called Democrats pro-Communist in 1954 in order to try to defeat them. That rankles deeply as one of the worst things that could be charged to any patriotic American.

So the President is under a handicap in selling Congress on unpopular legislation, even though, as President, he may have to try his best to do so.

Now, suppose he were to go to the extreme length of praising individual Democrats to the skies as great Americans, honoring them and flattering them in various ways to prove his friendship and good faith in seeking their help on a very unpopular course of action. The President's own party would then scream to high heaven, particularly in the States and districts represented by the Democrats he praised so highly. This might cause him a loss of support from his own party in the Congress, since many Republicans of the rgiht wing have never really accepted Eisenhower as a true Republican anyway.

Therefore, he must call his shots as he sees them; he must sometimes break with his own party leaders when they insist on going after the Democrats as a party of treason; his Vice President, whose campaigning was considered below the belt by many Democrats, cannot help him very much in dealing with those same Democrats in leadership positions in the Congress.

So the President has got to work hard and constantly at maintaining the confidence of the opposition party in the Congress, particularly where he and we agree on objectives. This is particularly true in the foreign-policy field; most of the President's difficulties on this have come, in fact, from within his own party, so he must depend largely on Democrats to get these measures through. Therefore, you see him by and large soft-pedaling the political attacks where this issue is concerned.

Yet, right after the reciprocal trade-agreements bill went through the House successfully only because of the magnificent work of Speaker RAYBURN, you had the situation of the President unleashing a terrific attack on the Democrats and even including the Speaker for alleged irresponsibility on the tax-reduction proposal. This was apparently his way of backing up and bucking up the Republicans to get them to unite solidly behind him on that proposal and keep them happy with his leadership.

So that is often how it goes. One day the opposition party is hailed by the President as patriotic, and the next day as irresponsible. He plays down the political battles where the issue is vital to the country's foreign policy but gets his partisanship into it in some other way on domestic issues. It is a difficult role for the President to play, and we often think he overdoes quite a bit in letting some of his friends inject partisanship and animosity against the opposition party in every possible way. Of course, these same administration officials probably think we overdo the attacks—so you see it's a question of which side of the fence you're on coloring your view of this problem.

Now let's look at some of the practical problems on the other side of it—for the Democrats in the Congress. Year in and year out, both parties are always anxious to capture the presidency and the administrative machinery. Patronage is one aspect of that, but certainly not a major one. The real stakes are the decisions on national policy. Again, I repeat, we have pretty deep-seated views about government and we want to see our views prevail for what we sincerely believe are the best interests of the whole country. This is true of both parties. Democrats believe a Democratic administration is better for the country; Republicans believe their party can do more good for the country. I say that is fine; that's the way things should be. We should have strong views on issues and policies.

Thus, when a Democratic Congress supports a Republican President, because we think he is right on a particular issue, we know we may be making him and his party look better politically than they would otherwise. Nevertheless, we have got to do the same thing the President must do in this situation: We've got to bury party considerations time after time in order to serve national interests. Even while doing this, we know that the President in 1956 will be out to beat us, no matter how well we might have cooperated with him on the really vital issues If he weren't out to beat us, then he wouldn't be much of a Republican Party leader, would he?

Another thing; we may be buttered up by the administration from time to time to get us to vote for something the President wants, but then, as the opposition party, we see these policies administered, frequently, by officials who are completely out of sympathy with us. The Republican administration is composed largely of active Republican partisans—many of them much more partisan than the President. And they use the machinery of Government to try to beat Democrats and elect Republicans.. This is not a complaint; it is a fact. The Republicans said the same thing about the Truman administration during the 80th Congress.

On the other hand, the Democrats had been in power so long during the Roosevelt and Truman years that the newness of power had worn off and frequently the goal was to get a particular job done regardless of whether Democrats or Republicans did it and got the credit. Many Republicans had very high positions in the Democratic administrations—some even as Cabinet officers. So far as I know, however, there is only one really high Democrat in this whole administration, Ambassador Bruce who is almost irreplaceable.

So we feel left out of the day-to-day decisions on policy. We get no credit for supporting the administration when we do; we get all kinds of criticism for opposing it.

All this means is that under our 2-party system, there are problems on both sides; there are frustrations and headaches for both the President and the Congress when they belong to opposing parties.

But these are not the really serious, insurmountable problems of Government. We can work things out in an atmosphere of good faith—for the simple reason that we have to, for the good of this country. Both sides will play politics when it is safe to do so—safe for the country, that is. They will both have their eyes constantly on 1956. But not to the extent of blinding themselves to the needs of 1955 or of the future, either, in those instances in which American safety, American prosperity, and American decency and justice are at stake.

Mrs. Lulu Hall Pratt, Pennsylvania Mother for 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to join with a great group of my constituents on April 28, last, in honoring Mrs. Lulu Hall Pratt, of Coatesville, Pa., who has been selected as Pennsylvania Mother of the Year.

The outpouring of her friends and neighbors was a heart-warming testimonial in itself, and when they proceeded with appropriate words and beautiful gifts to show their appreciation of this dedicated woman it was brought home to all present that the bedrock upon which this Nation rests is that spirit of motherhood so beautifully symbolized by the self-sacrificing love of Mrs. Pratt.

The testimonial banquet was honored by the presence of the beautiful and talented wife of Gov. George M. Leader, an honored Pennsylvania mother in her own right, who in her gracious manner paid fitting tribute to the guest of honor and presented her with the scroll bearing the Governor's proclamation designating the Pennsylvania Mother for 1955.

The Governor's proclamation is made a part of these remarks, and reads as follows:

IN THE NAME AND BY AUTHORITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, HARRISBURG—PROCLAMATION

PENNSYLVANIA MOTHER FOR 1955—PENNSYLVANIA STATE MOTHER'S WEEK BEGINNING APRIL 24, 1955

Whereas the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania annually, during Pennsylvania State Mother's Week, express an official

tribute of respectful admiration to the women of our State's families through selecting one among their number as a most fitting embodiment of the spirit of unselfish devotion and service to community betterment that is a living tradition in our Commonwealth; and

Whereas this tribute is symbolized by the designation of "Pennsylvania Mother for the Year" upon a mother of our State whose qualities of sensitive concern and personal consideration for her fellow citizens in all aspects of human relations reflect the distinctions of her continuous accomplishments in charitable and civic enterprises; and

Whereas Mrs. Lulu Hall Pratt, Coatesville, Chester County, Pa., has been designated recipient of this statewide distinction as the choice of the Pennsylvania State Mother Committee for her superlative record of devotion to the common welfare of her Commonwealth and community.

Now, therefore, I, George M. Leader, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby designate Mrs. Lulu Hall Pratt as Pennsylvania Mother for 1955 in honor of her unequaled record of devotion to the best interests of her fellow Pennsylvanians in all aspects of civic endeavor that engaged her throughout a constructive career of community activity. I am privileged to extend to Mrs. Pratt the sincere esteem and congratulations of the government and the citizens of the Commonwealth who consider her life a sterling exemplification of the best that can be undertaken by the good citizen working for the attainment of the good society. We are confident Mrs. Pratt is worthy of representing the glowing traditions of our Commonwealth in the national conference of all State mothers as Pennsylvania's candidate for the illustrious accolade of American Mother for 1955.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State, at the city of Harrisburg, this 28th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 179th.

GEORGE M. LEADER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HENRY E. HARNER,
Deputy Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Protecting Our Friends in Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it was with gratification that I learned over the weekend that our negotiators had succeeded in striking from the proposed Soviet-Austrian Treaty the provisions of article 16 for forcible repatriation—at least it would have amounted to that—of 30,000 Soviet escapees in Austria.

The significance of this proposed language is explained in a recent editorial in the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis. We can be grateful that our negotiators had been alerted to this blueprint for tragedy.

The editorial follows:

DEATH WARRANT FOR 30,000 FRIENDS

If the United States approves the Soviet-Austrian Treaty in its present form, this country will be signing death warrants for 30,000 of its best friends and allies * * * and dealing itself serious damage in the cold war.

For this bloodcurdling discovery we are indebted to two University of Wisconsin faculty experts, Edmund Zawacki and Dimitri Pronin, who unearthed it in their careful scrutiny of the text of the treaty just concluded between the Russians and Austrians.

Some 30,000 escapees from the Soviet Union are still in Austria, where they fled toward the end of World War II. None of them in the past 10 years has indicated any desire to return to the Soviet Union.

Now article 16 of the Soviet-Austrian Treaty deals with the repatriation of these people and paragraph 5 of this article obligates Austria to deny any relief or help to persons who refuse to return to their native land.

"This," Zawacki and Pronin point out, "is the slippery Soviet terminology, for what is intended to be and certainly will become forcible repatriation. If the United States does not cause these provisions to be stricken from any treaty we approve (the treaty still requires approval of the United States, Britain, and France), we will have signed death warrants for 30,000 of our best friends and allies in the cold war.

"No amount of talk over the Voice of America ever will explain it away."

There is history and precedent, both terrible and triumphant.

Zawacki and Pronin recall that "however great were the political errors committed by the Western Allies at Yalta, the published documents that describe these negotiations made no mention at all of forcible repatriation of former Soviet citizens.

"It must be assumed, therefore, that hundreds of thousands of unwilling but helpless people were turned over to the Soviet authorities in 1945. For they were turned over.

"The officials responsible for this inhuman political blunder have so far managed to conceal their identity."

On the other hand, despite Communist pressures at Panmunjom, American negotiators there stood firm against forcible repatriation of unwilling North Koreans and Chinese, and no Korean or Chinese was delivered into Communist hands against his will.

The American position on this issue thus was dramatically, and it is to be hoped, everlastingly clear.

"In the cold war," Zawacki and Pronin plead, "firmness, clarity, and devotion to principle is as important politically as it is morally—both in Asia now with regard to Formosa, and in Europe with regard to Austria."

The Crop Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 13, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, crop insurance has been stopped in 9 severely hit drought counties in the high plains area.

Colorado counties are Baca, Prowers, and Kiowa.

New Mexico counties are Quay and Curry.

Texas counties are Ochiltree, Deaf Smith, Hansford, and Childress.

Seven more counties will probably lose crop insurance in the near future.

Crop-insurance officials will not extend withdrawal date unless they have additional funds to cover expected losses.

For those farmers using crop insurance, it affords the best, most practical way to handle the land during this extreme drought emergency because it permits the farmers to obtain adequate financing from local sources to carry on proper and good farming practices.

The crop-insurance program is a good boost for the entire economy in the area and an excellent program for leveling off years of high production with low or no production. The soundness of the program should not be judged by losses taken during extreme drought years.

The program has been withdrawn from some of the historically best wheat-producing counties in the Nation.

Immediate reinstatement is necessary because many families cannot operate or obtain financing to get their land farmed this year.

Before the program can be reinstated, crop-insurance officials want assurance that losses, if taken, will not be charged to capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and have suggested either special funds come from legislation—this is time-consuming—or that the President authorize use of emergency funds and allot funds from the President's emergency fund for such purposes.

The withdrawal of the crop-insurance program had the effect of withdrawing on a 24-hour notice since many farmers had pledged this year's crop insurance to plant winter wheat last fall.

Address of Hon. A. Boyd Campbell, President, United States Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the election of a Mississippi small-business man to the presidency of the United States Chamber of Commerce is something to which we, as Mississippians, point with pride.

Mr. Boyd Campbell, the new president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, is a man of unusual qualities and accomplishments. Recently, by virtue of his election to this high position, he has been the recipient of numerous honors and encomiums, all of which he deserves. In the face of this, however, he has proven his right to greatness by retaining his modesty and humility. This is evidenced by the brief and sincere message which he delivered to the annual meeting of the United States Chamber of Commerce at the Statler Hotel last week. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. Campbell's speech:

A distinguished fellow Mississippian, in commenting upon his appointment to a position of great responsibility, said, "A man of much less ability than I have could fill this job, but they couldn't find a man of less ability than I have."

If that remark is appropriate to this occasion, my only reason for not using it is that I did not think of it first.

Five times under circumstances similar to this I have heard my illustrious predecessors emphasize the power and the influence of the national chamber.

One can never be fully impressed with the truth of such statements without having had an experience that drives those facts home in one's own mind. I have recently had such an experience and I desire to share it with you.

An amazing cascade of letters has flowed across my desk during the past 6 weeks. They could well be an opinion poll about the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

From all over America these missives came. They came from Canada and Mexico, from Hawaii, from a ship at sea, and from six countries of Western Europe.

They came from friends and from strangers. They came from people high in government, in finance and in industry, and from men and women in humble walks of life. They came from those who represent organizations that are new and strange to me. Many sent brochures, tracts, and books, and there was a flood of clippings.

In my first, and rather terrifying press conference, I said that security was not to be had by statute or by contract: that it was of the spirit and that it was within you.

That statement was picked up across the continent by editors who had never heard of me, but who approved of what the president-elect of the national chamber had said. They wrote editorials about it and copies were sent by readers who added their own commendation.

Many of my correspondents said they would be remembering me in their prayers. A surprising number said that. Many expressed pleasure that a small-business man had been chosen—and many, frankly, expressed surprise.

But out of the mass of messages, this pattern of thought evolved:

Ours is a great country. We must keep it so by preserving the principles that made it great and by perfecting the practices with which we implement these principles. In striving for that objective, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States will not only be enhancing the great American tradition, it will be contributing vastly to our national well-being.

Yes, in their own language, that is what my correspondents said, but they said more—much more.

The president-elect of the national chamber had been quoted—and correctly so—as saying that the American system of enterprise was a stewardship; that management had a moral accountability; that the most important factor in industry was the human factor, and that only in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and good will could men and management work together and thrive and prosper.

He had been quoted as saying that he believed with all his heart that education was an economic good, a moral obligation and a spiritual trust, and that business and education comprised an imperative partnership.

My correspondents approved of these statements. In doing so, the words they most frequently used were "cooperation" and "faith." They said they wanted to help. They said it with hope and understanding. They said it with simplicity.

It is my desire and my purpose to be numbered among those who have so clearly pointed the way. And so, I dedicate myself anew to the principles upon which this great organization was founded and to the policies for which it stands.

With cooperation, with faith that "we shall not walk in darkness," and with the help of God we will go forward to a better tomorrow.

The strength and the power of this faith has been movingly expressed in the simple but beautiful words and melody of a song: "Walk on, walk on, with hope in your heart, and you'll never walk alone."

Play to the Gallery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on farm price supports appearing in the Washington Post entitled "Play to the Gallery":

The 206–201 House vote to peg basic farm price supports at 90 percent of parity was a tawdry political gesture. Some House Members, no doubt, voted to upset the flexible support program out of sincere conviction that a 90-percent formula offers the best way to stabilize and augment farm income. But plenty of others voted for the rigid supports, one may suspect, in the hope and expectation that the Senate would leave the flexible law unchanged. That, of course, was a cheap way for legislators to get on the record as champions of the farmer's "interest" while leaving the hard responsibility to someone else. The partisan nature of the vote was underscored by the horse trading with certain labor leaders over the minimum wage.

In a narrow sense this sort of sham may seem to be smart politics. There is a great deal of justifiable concern through the country about the decline in farm income; and a gesture, even an empty gesture, in the direction of permanent 90-percent price supports, could produce political dividends. We wonder, however, whether in the long run this is even smart politics. The flexible support law—which provides supports on basic crops at from 82½ to 90 percent of parity this year and next year broadens the range to 75-90 percent—has never had a chance to operate. If the flexible-support principle is an iniquitous as some of the House critics seem to think, one would suppose that the best way to demonstrate this would be to give it a fair trial.

The probability is that at this stage no price-support formula will have a very immediate effect either in increasing farm income or in reducing the accumulation of surpluses. A $7 billion stock of surpluses hangs over the heads of farmers and acts as a price depressant. New trouble is in the offing in the tremendous production of feed grains anticipated this year. Substantial acreage diverted from other surplus crops is being devoted to grains at the very time that grain sorghums are beginning to vie with corn as feed.

If there is no easy solution to the problem of overproduction, the one thing that stands out is that the answer does not lie in a reversion to the type of rigid support formula that aggravated the problem in the first place. Even though the House vote was predominantly Democratic, the issue is not really one of a Republican formula versus a Democratic formula. The antecedent of the present flexible law which the House voted to upset was the Anderson law—a very similar measure which, although Congress never actually permitted it to take effect, was sponsored by a Democratic Senator and passed by a Democratic Congress. The flexible support system is at least an attempt to bring production more nearly into balance with demand, to encourage farmers to produce for the market rather than for the Government. Surely the Senate will understand that the only way to test its worth is to try it.

Housing Needs of the Aged Are Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 21, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a most significant article entitled "Housing Needs of the Aged Are Neglected," by Edith Johnson, appearing in a recent issue of the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla.:

If ever you should try to find a home other than the county farm for an elderly man or woman and you met frustration at every turn, you would realize that one of the major needs of a society in which an aging population is steadily increasing is a far larger number of comfortable, well-operated establishments where otherwise homeless men and women could live out their days with dignity.

Dreary places there are where the inmates wait nervously and anxiously for death, many of them suspecting that life's greatest tragedy is to be unable to die when life no longer is worth living. Places so cheerless and so lacking in privacy and decent comforts that the angel of death would be welcomed as a kind friend.

More than once this column has endeavored to find a home for an octogenarian who is keenly aware of the difference between ugliness and beauty, comfort and discomfort, good food and miserable provender. And usually without avail. Every home fit for a person having some cultural background to live in was full and had a waiting list.

Countless churches in this country have built, are building or planning to erect a fine youth center, a place where the young can foregather, enjoy a wholesome type of social life and the recreation all boys and girls naturally crave. And this is all to the good.

Millions were invested a few years ago in "teen towns" most of them having had but a brief existence. Other millions have been spent in the establishment and maintenance of parks and playgrounds for the Nation's children and youth.

But how little time, thought, money, and effort have been invested in creating tolerable living conditions for the elderly.

What a need there is for homes to shelter aging men and women where they would have light and beauty and comfort and be domiciled for modest sums; men and women quite alone in the world or the parents of children neither able nor willing to care for them. And there are so many belonging to one group or another.

Why are so many elderly men and women ignored and neglected? Is it because they are coming ever nearer to the end of their days and the world no longer expects much of a contribution from them?

Is it due to the fact that they are consumers rather than producers? Does society forget all too readily what they have given to it in their day and time?

In that agricultural civilization which prevailed in this country before the exodus

from the farm and the trek to the towns began there were jobs for elderly people capable of some effort and there were places among relatives where they were supplied with bed and board.

An elderly father could help his son with the farm chores and a grandmother's aid was priceless. She made the best of baby-sitters and she took full charge of the domestic affairs when a new baby was born into the family circle. As most of the food consumed by the family was produced on the farm the cost of elderly people's living was nearly nil.

But how different is the situation of millions of elderly men and women today. In our highly industrialized society many are unwanted. Jobs for them are few and far between. Families living in small cottages or apartments have no room for them—they would be in the way.

For entirely too many it is "over the hill to the poorhouse" to an existence as somber and bleak as Will Carleton described in his long poem.

Some live on in overcrowded rest homes, visited now and then, it may be, by relatives or forgotten by their own sons and daughters. What a reward, if one dared call it that, for having lived bravely, decently, industriously, and fruitfully.

This need, and a pressing one it is for many homes where aged men and women could live comfortably, safely, and happily, should make a profound and stirring appeal to the Christian conscience.

Help for Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak out in behalf of the families of the more than 5,800,000 mentally retarded and handicapped children in the United States, and to point out the urgent need for assistance to these burdened folk that would in part be provided by enactment of my bill, H. R. 2205, now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

The present Social Security Act provides for the payment of benefits to surviving children until they reach the age of 18 years, and for the vast proportion of our people this is a sound provision. We want our mothers to be able, insofar as it is possible to make it so, to remain at home with their children even though they have lost their husbands and fathers, so that our children may have the immeasurable benefit of a normal home and proper care. And for most of our families, it is safe to assume that the children will become self-supporting when they reach 18.

For the families of many, however, this is not true. Can the child who is permanently and severely mentally retarded or crippled be expected to earn a living and to free his widowed mother to do likewise? The answer is, of course, an emphatic no. If anything, the need for special care of the abnormal child above age 18 creates a demand upon the widowed mother far greater than that experienced in caring for normal children under 18 years.

This principle has been recognized in almost every major insurance and retirement plan of the Federal Government. H. R. 2205 would give long overdue recognition to it by amending the Social Security Act to provide benefits to surviving children above the age of 18 who are so mentally or physically disabled that they are unable to earn an independent livelihood, and to continue to widow's benefits for their mothers who must remain at home and care for their handicapped children. By specifying that the child's disability must be a longstanding one, originating before age 18, H. R. 2205 provides a safeguard against any possible abuse of the benefits and at the same time facilitates determination of eligibility for the benefits.

In moving to expand the social-security system, we must always consider whether the additional benefits, however justified on moral ground, are actuarially sound. I have studied this aspect of my bill carefully, and I am convinced that no argument against these benefits can be made on actuarial grounds. Even though enactment of H. R. 2205 will provide benefits to approximately 10,000 handicapped children and their widowed mothers, the estimated additional cost to the fund would not require an increase in the payroll tax, according to computations of social-security experts I have consulted with. Since there are now about 1 million children on the rolls, if current ratios continue, the number of children on the rolls would only be increased by about 1/110 if H. R. 2205 were enacted into law. This expansion of the program, from a cost standpoint, is indeed minute.

Small in cost, yes; but the aid this legislation would give to widows with handicapped children would be of tremendous value in easing their burden of misfortune by providing them with a minimum income for independent existence, and by easing the poverty which so many of them suffer in addition to the permanent sorrow of having an abnormal child. The husbands and fathers earned these benefits, and it is only just that their widows and children should at last receive them.

Hon. John Taber

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous birthday greetings given by Members of the House to our beloved colleague, JOHN TABER, the gentleman from New York, where well deserved and I am glad to have this opportunity to record my personal greetings to him on his 75th birthday.

Mr. TABER has devoted the greater part of his life to the service of his country and has never wavered from the high standards and the principles which have always guided him in his actions. He believes in honesty, he believes in efficiency, he believes in loyalty to one's country and, in the responsible position which he has held on the Committee on Appropriations, these qualities are always present in the decisions which he has made. Perhaps Members of the House are sometimes provoked because of his opposition to plans which they may have in mind for their districts but no one ever doubted the sincerity of the man and the honesty of his thinking.

It is a priceless pleasure and joy to know him and to serve with him in the House of Representatives. He has enhanced the standards of our Government and added luster to the fair name of the Congress. I trust that he will continue in active service and I know the years to come will bring him joy in the realization of the affection in which his many friends hold him and the knowledge of work well done.

Soil Conservation Report, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as I have done in recent years, I want to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the annual report of M. F. Schweers, Wisconsin State conservationist, to district supervisors of the soil conservation service in Wisconsin.

Only four counties in our entire State have not been established as soil-conservation districts. Wisconsin has 39 locally organized watershed associations, and legislation has been introduced in our State legislature to permit wide utilization of the provisions of Public Law 566, the Watershed protection and Flood Prevention Act. One contract already has been let for construction of two floodwater detention structures in the Kickapoo Valley, with a third dam under consideration.

Mr. Schweers' report for 1954 follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Madison, Wis., May 2, 1955.

To: Soil-conservation district supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State conservationist.
Subject: Acknowledgment of your 1954 soil-conservation district annual reports.

"Accuse not nature,
She has done her part.
Do thou but thine."
—*Milton.*

The above bit of poetic philosophy appears in the 1954 report for the Door County Soil Conservation District. In very simple language it portrays a situation and tenders a challenge. When all farm families "use each acre of land within its capabilities and treat it according to its needs for protection and improvement," then we will have done our part.

THE 1954 REPORTS RATE EXCELLENT

We are adhering to our custom of past years by issuing a single letter to acknowl-

edge the fine annual statements received from your and the other 66 soil-conservation districts of Wisconsin. Each year they get better.

We derived a great deal of satisfaction in reading your interesting and informative reports. It was gratifying to note the large number that were mimeographed. We sincerely hope that everyone who received a copy of your annual message enjoyed and got as much out of it as we did.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During 1954 much was said and a lot was written about the drought-stricken areas of the Nation. Wisconsin, fortunately, had above average rainfall which created soil conditions that were not conducive to effective layout of some soil-conservation practices.

Construction of waterways, terraces, diversions, and open ditches, normally built with heavy and farm-owned equipment, was virtually at a standstill for weeks at a time. In many soil-conservation districts 20 to 30 miles of lines were surveyed and staked in hopeful anticipation of good construction weather. Unfortunately, it never materialized. However, amounts of other established practices not requiring equipment were generally up to or above par. This latter appraisal also applies to other activities such as providing assistance to farm families in planning, servicing, etc.

In the final analysis, we, too, are well pleased with overall production in Wisconsin's 67 soil-conservation districts in 1954. The following table shows some of last year's accomplishments, total attainments to December 31, and the percent the past year's work is of the total.

Activity	Unit	1954 accomplishment	Total accomplished to Dec. 31, 1954	1954 accomplishment as percent of total
SCD cooperators	Number	4,193	33,592	12.4
Soil surveys	Acre	527,079	10,951,698	4.8
Tree planting	do	2,681	26,657	10.0
Improvement cutting	do	4,069	74,932	5.4
Reforestation, natural	do	12,942	199,453	6.4
Wildlife area improvement	do	844	11,749	7.1
Pasture renovation	do	11,950	122,038	9.7
Contour farming	do	5,987	132,444	4.5
Contour stripcropping	do	63,263	738,097	8.5
Wind stripcropping	do	3,215	5,535	58.0
Waterways	do	565	5,666	10.0
Terracing	Mile	228	2,773	8.2
Diversions	do	163	1,072	15.2
Drainage	Acre	10,236	98,365	10.4
Closed drains	Mile	158	1,168	13.5
Open drains	do	384	2,805	13.6
Spoilbank leveling	Cubic yard	244,327	1,621,430	15.1
Ponds	Number	37	164	22.5
Concrete structures	do	18	257	7.0

The Service does not maintain detailed records on such items as desirable land-use conversions; increased farmer purchases of needed liming and fertilizing materials; improved rotations, etc. However, these basic factors are considered while assisting farm families in developing and carrying out their conservation plans. To do this job in 1954 Service personnel made nearly 22,900 personal calls on soil-conservation district cooperators.

The Service also assisted district governing bodies and collaborated with the Agricultural Extension Service and the State soil-conservation committee in planning for and carrying out educational and informational programs. We do not have data on the extent of these activities for the year.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Generally speaking, comments contained in your reports indicate that the ACP was a contributing factor to increasing interest in the adoption of soil and water conservation practices.

County agricultural stabilization and conservation committees transferred more than $107,000 to the Soil Conservation Service under the SCS–ACP 5-percent program. Of this amount the Service earned just under $97,000. These funds were utilized by us in employing additional part-time aids during the spring and fall layout seasons and in determining need and practicability for and certification of ACP practices.

More than 25,000 referrals were turned over to the SCS by county ASC committees. Nearly 24,000 were given service. Over 5,700 of the approved practices were satisfactorily completed. The accomplishments made under this joint program are included in the table appearing in the previous section of this letter. About 12,000 of the referrals involved farms of soil conservation district cooperators. According to what you say many of the other farmers have since indicated an interest in farm conservation plans and will ultimately become district cooperators.

WATERSHED ACTIVITIES

Many of your reports made reference to active watershed associations. Records show that there are now 39 such groups in the State, varying in age from 0 to 9 years.

Brevity will not permit quoting many of the favorable comments made about these organizations. "Local planning," "local leadership," "whole family participation," "social and economic advantages," etc., are among the remarks included in your reports or conveyed to us in contacts with enthusiastic association members. A statement appearing in the LaCrosse County Soil Conservation District report presents an interesting and somewhat different type of story, and it is repeated, as follows:

"This Bohemian Valley Watershed Association was organized in the fall of 1952. Its present membership is over 90. In 1954 the members voted to construct a new clubhouse to be used jointly by the association and the local 4–H Club as a meeting place and picnic grounds. Members furnished all the lumber and labor for construction. The Wisconsin Conservation Department is preparing to launch a full-scale stream improvement demonstration in the valley this spring."

The Sauk County Soil Conservation District still leads the State in the number of associations with seven. The officers of all the organizations have formed a districtwide council. This body meets periodically to exchange ideas and experiences. Its members will also develop proposals for presentation and consideration by local associations for improving programs and expanding activities in each of the organizations.

Many groups visited the Kickapoo River pilot watershed protection project during 1954. Weather was bad for construction during the past fall and only about 13 percent of the work on the two water detention structures has been completed. It is hoped that these dams will be finished by midsummer.

All soil conservation district governing bodies received copies of Public Law 566. This is the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act passed by the 1954 Congress. We understand that 2 or 3 watershed organizations are in the process of preparing applications for planning assistance under this program.

In carrying out the cooperative program provided for in Public Law 566 there are a number of responsibilities that must be assumed by local people. In order to fulfill these obligations some questions have been raised as to whether adequate powers are authorized under current State laws. Your State soil conservation committee has taken steps to secure interpretations of pertinent existing statutes. The committee is continuing to study needs for new legislation and will make judicious recommendations thereon.

COOPERATION

Every one of your annual reports contain complimentary references to friendly and effective relationships among all people interested in agriculture in your respective soil conservation districts.

You commended the Extension Service and the State soil conservation committee for their leadership in carrying out the educational program of your districts. Special references were made to the successful air tours conducted in 10 of the districts in 1954. These were carried out under the able leadership of Extension Soil Conservationist O. R. Zeasman and the Wisconsin Aeronautical Commission. According to Mr. Zeasman, 571 people participated in last year's flights. The Extension soil conservationist highly recommends this method of selling the need for soil conservation.

According to your reports a number of Extension Service home agents are acquainting the womenfolk with the seriousness of erosion and what can be gained by following a sound soil- and water-conservation program. One of the most interesting remarks along this line appeared in the Rusk County report, as follows:

"Former Home Agent Marion Wagner was an ardent advocate of soil conservation. Realizing that the attitudes of the farm wife often influences farm plans and farm action, she did her utmost in the course of her demonstrations to bring in the wise use of soil. Since the efficiency and comfort of the farm home depend on farm income, the home agent was interested in a program that would increase and maintain farm production."

You expressed appreciation to the State committee for planning and holding the 1954 State meeting for supervisors. You say these annual conferences are very much worth while.

According to your reports the Farmers' Home Administration is encouraging its clients to become SCD cooperators. The Grant County supervisors' report mentions that the first FHA soil- and water-conservation loan in Wisconsin was made in their district.

You compliment the Wisconsin Conservation Department for their contribution to the forestry aspects of your district's programs. Most reports indicate a great need for additional planting stock.

Many vocational agriculture teachers and veteran on-the-farm trainers consider soil conservation as basic in their education and training activities. And they are evidently doing something about it.

A previous reference has been made to County ASC committees. They have participated in your planning deliberations and provided funds to complement your SCS staff.

We greatly appreciate your very fine remarks concerning contributions made by SCS field personnel. You credit the Service with

assisting farm families in the development and application of farm conservation plans and in carrying out other assigned functions in a satisfactory manner.

County highway committees and commissioners are cited for their fine cooperation in making motor patrols and other heavy equipment available to district cooperators at reasonable rates. Many township motor patrols are being rented out on the same basis. Cooperation has been so fine that in one northeastern Wisconsin district eight motor patrols were in operation on a single day.

Newspapers, radio, and TV are evidently giving excellent support to your soil conservation district activities.

Quite a number of county bankers' associations are doing outstanding jobs in supporting the soil- and water-conservation movement. Many banks have purchased tree planters. One has bought a land leveler. All of these units are made available to farmers in the districts at very nominal rental rates.

One of the outstanding events of the year was staged by the Waupaca County Bankers' Association. A dinner was served and certificates presented to the outstanding soil conservation farm couple from each of the 22 townships. Selection of these farm couples was made by local farmers who inspected the farms of nominees in townships other than their own. The judges received no remuneration, but as one of them said, "I put in quite a bit of time for which I was well repaid by learning about new things I could put to use on my own farm."

YOUTH EDUCATION

Youth education in soil- and water-conservation has a high rating in most district work plans. We still believe Wisconsin ranks second to none in the field of youth training. In most soil-conservation districts, county superintendents of schools have done an outstanding job in having courses on conservation included in the rural-school curriculum. We too commend these important members of soil-conservation district-governing bodies on the fine program they are carrying out.

Civic groups of Wausau, Wisconsin Rapids-Marshfield, and Monroe collaborated with district supervisors, agency representatives, and county superintendent of schools in sponsoring Rural Youth Conservation Days. Fifth to eighth grade rural-school students take over the towns for a day. They compete in essay, speaking, and judging contests. They have a parade, hear talks, and are provided with ice cream and milk by the civic groups. These days are really fun for everyone and they're educational too.

Under the capable leadership of I. O. Hembre, executive secretary for the State soil conservation committee, advances are continually being made in emphasizing and improving conservation courses for teachers, both in secondary schools and on the job. Properly informed teachers are essential to putting over the conservation story as well as any other subject.

Each year more and more of your reports point to increased 4-H Club enrollment in conservation projects. Vocational agriculture teachers have done an outstanding job in their land-judging program. FFA clubs have participated in various activities.

According to a number of your reports the 1954 Boy Scout soil conservation program was quite successful. Extension Service and SCS personnel worked with scout leaders in improving camp sites, conducting field trips and presenting talks to Boy Scout troops.

GOVERNING BODY ACTIVITIES

Your remarks concerning activities being carried out by you supervisors are very interesting. Most governing bodies meet monthly and plan their programs in advance. Evidently your field trips have been quite profitable in guiding your activities. Your sponsorship of plowing matches, demonstrations and meetings have been very fruitful. Quite a number of governing bodies held highly successful recognition banquets for SCD cooperators.

A number of county boards have appropriated funds to district governing bodies. Amounts varied from one up to several hundred dollars. This permits you to do some of the things requiring financing that you would be unable to do otherwise.

According to your reports the semiannual area meetings of supervisors are very much worthwhile. We attended some. We too believe that the exchange of ideas and experiences has been conducive to improving district administration.

The Buffalo County Soil Conservation District Governing Body won first place in the 1953–54 Goodyear soil conservation awards program. The Marathon County SCD was runner-up. We understand that about 35 governing bodies have entered the 1954–55 contest.

The Vernon County district governing body is featured in the Allis Chalmers' movie, Return to Eden. This film pays tribute to the "unheralded achievements of SCD supervisors." The Midwest premiere showing of this film took place at Viroqua on March 25 of this year.

THE FUTURE

The future of conservation in Wisconsin looks good. Your work plans for 1955 are ambitious and commendable. It is inspiring to read them. You are apparently using your SCS men to maximum advantage.

Like Ol' Man River, interest in soil conservation keeps rollin' along. As more and more district cooperators put essential practices to work on their farms, more and more farmers observe their favorable effects on both conservation and incomes. The success of the program is directly dependent upon farmer understanding, enthusiasm, and action. And, as we all appreciate, major credit for soil and water conservation gains goes to the people who till the soil.

In mentioning increased interest we support the above statement with some evidence. According to your estimated workload analyses, it would take over 240 man-years of time to adequately handle the anticipated requests for SCS–SCD farm planning and application assistance during 1955.

On the basis of our current budget we shall be able to make available about 147 man-years. This will mean that the Service will satisfy about 61 percent of your indicated requirements. According to your remarks, a very high percentage of the requests for layout will be satisfied. Planning will suffer, so you say.

We can only deduce from your reports, then, that the program in Wisconsin can be nothing but a success if we all continue to work together harmoniously and effectively as we have done in past years.

THANK YOU

Extending personal regards and thanking you for the many courtesies and fine cooperation you have extended to all of us in the Soil Conservation Service, I am

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

Price Supports for Basic Commodities

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this great debate is now about to be ended. Soon the last word will be spoken, and the vote will be taken. We are coming to the "showdown." All of us must soon stand up and be counted. As chairman of the committee, I think it only appropriate that I should say to you now that when we go back into the House I shall demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman GREEN. In this debate the amendment has been referred to as the peanut amendment. I have cherished the friendship of my colleague, BILL GREEN, for many years. I do not doubt for one moment his great sincerity, but I believe that even he now realizes that the friends he had on yesterday will leave him and desert him today, and will vote to recommit the bill when the roll is called on the motion to recommit. The Republican leadership voted for the Green amendment, and many Members voted for the amendment, knowing at the very time they cast their votes that they intended, even if the amendment were adopted, to vote to recommit the bill. This was the ultimate objective sought to be accomplished by the Republican leadership. It was a smart political maneuver to prevent an outright vote on the real proposition which is now presented to the House. The Republican leadership outsmarted us a year ago when they pulled a "rabbit out of the hat," and offered the 82½ percent price-support amendment. That was clearly a compromise, but even that amendment was an outright repudiation of their own Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. This time the Republican leadership is trying desperately to prevent a true vote on the real issue.

Today we have witnessed demonstrations of real statesmanship. Yesterday the Republican leadership sought to divide us. Yesterday we were divided, but today we know the truth, and we understand the ulterior purposes which influenced the vote which was taken in this House yesterday afternoon. I want to compliment Congressman ABE MULTER, of New York, who in great sincerity supported and spoke for and urged the adoption of the Green amendment when it was presented to us yesterday. When Congressman MULTER realized just what had happened, and when he understood the ultimate objective sought to be accomplished, he took the floor today for the purpose of testing the sincerity of Members who had voted for the Green amendment in which he was interested. Congressman MULTER looked the Republican leadership straight in the eye, and put Members to the test of real sincerity. Congressman MULTER said:

How many of you who voted for the Green amendment will now stand up and say that you will vote for the passage of the bill as amended?

Not a single Republican stood, nor did a single Republican indicate that he would vote for the passage of the bill, even after the Green amendment had been adopted. Perhaps Congressman MULTER was slightly out of order in subjecting the Republican Members to this test of sincerity. He had no right to demand Members of the House to respond to his suggestion, but certainly no one would deny him the right to invite Members of the minority to indicate their views on the important proposition he was discussing. After Congressman MULTER realized that an effort would be made to recommit the bill, even after the Green amendment had been adopted, he had the courage and the statesmanship to stand on the floor of this House, and to urge the defeat of the amendment, because he was unwilling to be used as an instrumentality to bring about the destruction and the repeal of the farm program which has meant so much to the welfare and the happiness of all the people of this great country.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to compliment and pay brief tribute to our able and distinguished colleague, CARL ANDERSEN of Minnesota. CARL ANDERSEN stood like the rock of Gibraltar. He could not be moved, nor could he be shaken, nor did he bow down under the lash of the whip of partisan politics. He stood here like a man, and he spoke his own mind, and he reflected the views of his honest heart, and he labored in behalf of the people whom he has had the honor to represent. CARL ANDERSEN is a man of conviction and courage, and a great champion of the farmers of America. His constitutents have a just right to take great pride in the man that they have sent here to represent them in this the greatest lawmaking body of the world.

As I said when this great debate started, this is the time for facts and figure and not for fraud, fallacy, or fancy. This is the time when the people of America should know the truth. This is the time for forthright and fearless action.

To lead the end users of peanuts—the manufacturers of candy—to believe that great relief was about to be afforded them was nothing more nor less than fiction and fancy—and now the cruel truth they must know.

If the peanut amendment remains in the bill, obviously the bill will be recommitted. If the bill is recommitted, the end users of peanuts will find themselves just exactly where they were before this great fight and effort in their behalf was undertaken. Yes; they will be right back where they were night before last. You have won only a temporary victory. As my colleague from Mississippi, TOM ABERNETHY, has said to me, the Republican leadership gave you a lollipop yesterday, but they will take it away from you today.

Let us be realistic. Let us all be fearless and fair, and face this issue. By the adoption of the peanut amendment, you Republicans have repudiated the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, neither of whom have advocated the abandonment of the program which provides acreage allotments and marketing quotas and price supports for the producers of peanuts. The vote on the peanut amendment is just as vital as its adoption was vicious. The peanut amendment must be defeated. This bill must not be recommitted. Let us come to the final test and to the showdown, and let us here and now say to the country we are either for the mandatory 90 percent of parity price support program, or we are in favor of the slideaway, hideaway, giveaway program, which is the only program of the present administration.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot permit this great debate to come to an end until I have paid at least a brief tribute to CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, the Democratic whip. I have served in Congress for 21 years, and for about 15 years of that time I was an assistant Democratic whip. I have served under many whips, and I want to say to this House, and especially to the Democratic Members, that CARL ALBERT is one of the very best whips the Democratic Party has ever had. No man could have worked more diligently, more faithfully, more constantly than CARL ALBERT has in trying to present to the Members of this House the views of the party of which he is a very vital part. CARL ALBERT is a great American—a great citizen and a great champion of the farmers of his district, his State, and his Nation. He is courageous, he is fearless, he is honest, and he is worthy of every confidence that the people of his district could ever entrust into his care. His heart and his soul are devoted to the welfare of farmers and ultimately to the happiness of the people of this great Nation.

The showdown is at hand—the chips are down—and I am ready for the rollcall.

Eisenhower Administration Promotes Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently advocated that the Federal Government get out of competition with private industry in order to preserve and promote free enterprise. It is unfair to private industry and too costly to the American taxpayer for the Government to produce anything that private industry can produce. The cumbersome and complex redtape and tax-free privilege of the Federal Government make the competition unfair to private industry.

The Eisenhower administration has taken the lead and made great progress in getting the Federal Government out of competitive business with private industry.

The following article from the U. S. News & World Report reveals some of the progress that has been made up to date:

UNITED STATES VERSUS PRIVATE INDUSTRY: THE GOVERNMENT IS GETTING OUT OF BUSINESS

As part of his campaign platform, Dwight Eisenhower promised to take the Government out of competition with private enterprise wherever possible. Since the Federal Government was running some 100 types of business, in which it had sunk $40 billion (Time, July 13, 1953), keeping this promise has turned out to be a big order. Nevertheless, the administration has chalked up notable progress. Last week, in its biggest single step to eliminate competition with private business, the Government sold 24 of its synthetic-rubber facilities. Thus, with a pen stroke, it turned over to 15 companies virtually all of a $310 million industry, and netted a $39 million profit.

The administration has also revived last year's plan to get the Government out of the business of running two atom cities—Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash. At the request of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Democratic heads of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy last week introduced bills to end Government ownership and operation of Oak Ridge and Richland. The responsibility for schools, streets, etc., would be handed over to local residents, eventually saving the Federal Government upwards of $1,500,000 yearly.

In scores of other nooks and crannies of Government, less dramatic ways have been found to eliminate competition with private business. The Defense Department has shut down 24 scrap-metal operations, 7 bakeries, 9 laundries, a chain factory, a caustic-soda plant, 4 cement-mixing plants, a tire-retreading plant, 2 garden nurseries, and 4 ice plants. The Navy, which has been manufacturing uniforms for years, has closed its clothing factory. It is bringing in more private yards to overhaul its ships, has boosted such contracts from $34 million in 1953 to $82 million in fiscal 1955.

Some time this year the Navy will close the coffee-roasting plants it started in 1858 because it was not satisfied with the quality or cost of commercial coffee. It will put on a standby basis the Boston Ropewalk, a cordage factory it opened in 1834 because good rope was not available commercially. The Air Force is now contracting with private businessmen for 50 percent of all maintenance of engines, radios, etc., versus 21 percent in 1952. Government motor pools are being dried up; in San Antonio the Fourth Army has started using public taxis and buses for most official business trips.

The General Services Administration has found new ways to handle its chores with the aid of private-business men. Suppliers now deliver fuel oil and coal directly to users instead of to Government dumps, thereby eliminating extra freight and handling charges. GSA also hired commercial truckers to distribute supplies from central depots to scattered Federal agencies; found it worked so well that it is now using them in more than half the Nation. To help the Government sell a $90-million chunk of its surplus real estate, GSA called in private brokers to find clients and to close sales. Elsewhere the Government has gotten rid of a whole grab bag of business activities it got into because nobody else could or would. It liquidated the Island Trading Company, a copra and trading firm (1954 sales, $3 million), set up by United States occupation officials in the Southwest Pacific, at a net profit to the United States of $1,100,000. In the Virgin Islands the Government sold its rum distillery (Government House brand) and its famed resort hotel, Bluebeard's Castle.

Despite this progress, the get-out-of-business program still has far to go, against plenty of opposition. Government agencies, the Hoover Commission recently found, are almost impossible to kill. "REA is an example. * * * Although more than 90 percent

of the Nation's farms are electrified, the sponsors of the REA program foresee no end to the need for ever-increasing amounts of Government loans for rural electrification." Many another agency is dragging its feet. Probably the worst offenders are in the Defense Department, where empire builders try to justify their activities by crying "national security."

Actually, many "defense" operations bear little or no relation to national security; for example, the Federal Government still owns and operates about 168 ice-cream plants in 36 States; 23 in California alone. Such nonessential activities drain off men and money that could better be used for the defense of the Nation. But cutting back almost any Government activity brings protests from Capitol Hill. For example, Massachusetts' Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has already protested to the Navy against shutting down the Ropewalk on the grounds that it is necessary to the "national interest."

In the huge, amorphous layers of Government not even the experts can calculate how much money has been saved to date by the get-out-of-business campaign. But the most encouraging thing to businessmen is less the money savings than the fact that the long-time trend to get the Government into business has finally been reversed.

Statement of George J. Burger on the Subject of Tires, Batteries, and Accessories Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 24, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of independent filling-station operators everywhere in the United States will be interested in the statement of Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the Small Business Committee. Mr. Burger discussed the distribution of tires, batteries, and accessories. His complete statement follows:

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

For the information of the committee, we have in the field approximately 200 or more sales representatives who are in personal daily contact with small business nationwide. Through this we are able to get the factual information from the grassroots.

In their daily visits it goes without question that they must be in contact with all independent factors in the automotive servicing field.

Further, I have been an independent member of the automotive industry for close to 50 years, and through this it gives me the full knowledge of the basic serious problems facing independent factors in that industry.

It will be noted in a report issued by the Senate Small Business Committee in 1941, Senate Committee Print No. 3 Small Business Problems of the Tire and Rubber Manufacturers and Retailers, from which report I am quoting a section which applies to the subject matter before this committee, namely, the control exercised by the major oil and rubber companies over the independent trade. Such report, at the suggestion of the committee, originated with the writer as a result of a national survey. I quote:

"MAJOR RUBBER MANUFACTURER-MAJOR OIL COMPANY TIE-UPS

"Despite the fact that the major petroleum marketers proclaim their stations are largely operated by independent businessmen it is not difficult to discover that so far as having the right to select a brand of tires is concerned this independence is in reality nonexistent. Dealers admit that the oil companies do not go so far as to send out any letter or written order demanding that the leased stations refrain from handling any specific line of tires. But, as one dealer wrote: 'Here is what happens to those leased stations. If they want a man badly enough, if he is a good boy, stands on his hind legs, jumps through the hoop, and rolls over, they charge him, for example, from $50 to $100 a month for his lease. But Lord help him if he attempts to display his independence.' In that event they say, 'All right, you handle any lines of tires, batteries, or tubes you want, but from now on your rent will be $350 per month. So take your choice'." Other dealers report that in certain instances they had definite proof of threats to cancel leases unless unwanted brands of tires are removed immediately. The means of keeping the leased-station operators in line seems chiefly to be threats to jump rents or cancel leases.

Additional evidence of the widespread control exercised by the four major tire manufacturers through their major oil company connections over the tire-through-oil-station distributor setup, is derived from the following: There was an average of 274 filling stations selling tires and tubes in each dealer's locality as reported in a recent survey conducted by the writer. Of this number, on the average, only 60, or about 22 percent, were said to be free to buy their tire and tube requirements where they wanted, while 214, or approximately 78 percent, were not free.

Further proof of the extensive control which the 4 major tire companies wield over the filling-station field through their exclusive supplying contracts is found in a compilation of the relationships reported. Of the 15 tire-oil company hook-ups the major tire manufacturers control 13, and 2 smaller companies, 1 each.

The following are the reported distributor relationships existing between the major tire and major oil companies: Goodrich—Texas, Gulf, Magnolia; Firestone—Union, Texas, Magnolia; Goodyear—Richfield, Shell, Gulf, Sinclair and Magnolia; and United States—General Petroleum, American, Magnolia, Sun Oil, and Socony Vacuum. Of course it must not be forgotten that the last named of these tire companies is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, private brand-for-oil company manufacturer in the industry, producing Atlas tires for Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Humble Oil Co., as well as Acme tires for the Cities Service Stations.

Special arrangements exist: When asked whether or not they believe there were any special arrangements that the major petroleum companies had with the major tire manufacturers in the matter of deferred payments on tires and tubes sold to the consumer through leased or owned filling stations, dealers cited the credit cards which are accepted only on approved brands of tires. Whether or not the oil company carried the burden of the credit assumed on these sales or whether the tire manufacturers did was not made clear. However, these cards have a double edged effect; in the first place they tend to discourage consumers from buying any other than the approved brand of tires from stations they may patronize and, in the second place, they make it most attractive for leased station operators to handle the line of tires specified, thereby discouraging buying of other makes of tires. In some sections it was reported that certain rubber manufacturers had set up full budget departments on some of their leased station premises.

"The Federal Trade Commission, in a report prepared for the temporary National Economic Committee, stated that 'investigations and complaints brought by the Federal Trade Commission have gone a long way toward eliminating the practice of tire companies of granting over-riding commissions to the oil companies for permission to sell their stations tires and tubes, dealers feel that the major oil producers must still be receiving a quid pro quo for their efforts to induce their stations to handle only acceptable lines.'

"One dealer says he has actual knowledge that one major tire manufacturer had, until 6 months ago, a petroleum company connection and allowed that oil concern a 10-percent cutback for the privilege of selling its retail outlets. Other dealers report that mutual agreements exist whereby the tire companies are able to purchase their oil and gasoline requirements at prices lower than those accorded oil station operators. Still others report, as proof of the existence of overriding arrangements, that where the rubber company sells direct to leased gas stations the billing is done on industry program, but where the oil company bills its station lessors it receives dealer prices, and the rubber company pays its dealers the delivery commissions."

Our observation is that the situation has not improved, but on the other hand, the condition is even more serious today than it was at the time of that report in 1941.

It is interesting to note that during the period from 1941 to the present time the findings in the overall report have never been challenged as being incorrect.

It is my belief that at the very moment the Federal Trade Commission must be cognizant of this control exercised by major rubber-oil companies in what appears to be a definite violation of the antitrust laws.

Finally, there is only one correction which should be made, and such recommendation should emanate from this committee, namely, the complete divorcement of producers and manufacturers operating their own establishments in the retail field. In no other way can there be a future, or an incentive for independents to carry on their rightful business in the automotive servicing field. (This would definitely apply to the oil producers and the rubber-tire manufacturers.)

Contracts Between Rural Electric Cooperatives and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions adopted on May 2, 1955, by the Rural Electrification Committee of the Missouri House of Representatives, and the Agriculture Committee of the Missouri State Senate.

I voice my strongest support of these resolutions and respectfully urge that the existing contracts between the rural electric cooperatives and the United States Government, acting through the

Southwestern Power Admiinstration, be made operative on a permanent basis.

The resolutions follow:

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Jefferson City, May 2, 1955.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned members of the rural electrification committee of the Missouri House of Representatives, do hereby approve the following resolution:

Whereas low-cost electric power rates are most vital to all farm families in Missouri and the Nation, and

Whereas there exists contracts between the rural electric cooperatives in Missouri and the United States Government, acting through the Southwestern Power Administration, that will provide the means for making available to the rural people of Missouri the lowest electric power rates possible, and

Whereas, the United States Congress can make these contracts operative on a permanent basis without appropriating any funds whatsoever, as these contracts are completely self-sustaining: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned members of the Rural Electrification Committee of the Missouri State Legislature support activation of the existing contracts between the rural electric cooperatives and the Government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of the United States Congress so that the wishes of this Committee will be made known.

Charles W. Foley, Chairman; C. D. Hamilton, I. W. Henson, Wesley McMurry, Claude E. Duckett, M. D., Gordon S. Summers, J. H. Kramer, Ralph Wigfield, Shandy Stewart, Roger E. Kirchner, Wm. R. Sherman, G. H. Simmons, Frank X. Siebert, Ralph J. Ayers, D. M. Overstreet, Lee Aaron Bachler, Members.

MISSOURI SENATE,
Jefferson City, May 2, 1955.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned members of the agriculture committee of the Missouri State Senate, do hereby approve the following resolution:

Whereas low cost electric power rates are absolutely necessary and essential to the farmers of Missouri; and

Whereas the rural electric cooperatives, with the help and assistance of the Federal Government, have developed plans for the coordinated use of hydroelectric power generated at Government-built dams that will provide the means for making available to the rural people of Missouri the lowest electric power rates possible, without the appropriation of any funds whatsoever; and

Whereas in June 1953 the District Court, Washington, D. C., ruled that the hydroelectric contracts executed in 1950 between the rural electric cooperatives and the United States Government, acting through the Southwestern Power Administration, were legal and binding in every way; and

Whereas on April 28, 1955, the United States Court of Appeals, when considering the foregoing case, issued the following statement when ordering that "the case be remanded to the District Court with directions to dismiss the complaint":

"It is indisputable that the essence of plaintiffs' complaint is the competition which they will suffer if the Government's contracts are carried out. They can claim no other interest or injury. The defendants have not undertaken to regulate them in any way. They have not been ordered to abandon any of their activities or to forego the expansion programs planned by them. They have not been subjected to any obligation or duty. Their sole interest and objective is to eliminate the competition which they fear. Controlling decisions of the Supreme Court, dealing with other electric power contracts of the Federal Government, establish that an interest of this kind is not sufficient to enable them to sue to enjoin execution of the power contracts and program of the Government." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned members of the agriculture committee of the Missouri State Senate wholeheartedly support restoration of the existing contracts between the rural electric cooperatives and the Government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of the United States Congress.

George A. Spencer, Chairman; William M. Quinn, Leo J. Rozier, Charles A. Witte, J. F. Patterson, John W. Noble, Jack C. Jones, Noel Cox, James P. Kelly, Clayton W. Allen, Members.

Rockefeller Tells Industrialists of Arkansas' Potential Qualities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Arkansas is actively engaged in adding new industries to its economy, and with the building of additional sources of power in the great Mid-south this program of industrialization will accelerate.

In this connection, Mr. Winthrop Rockefeller, chairman of Arkansas' new Industrial Development Commission, visited New York City where he gave the story of industrial Arkansas to leading financial circles and manufacturing organizations. The news story of this action which appeared in the columns of the Forrest City, Ark., Times Herald is especially interesting to all who desire a sound economy in our Nation, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article as it appeared in the April 29 issue of this fine eastern Arkansas newspaper:

ROCKEFELLER TELLS INDUSTRIALISTS OF ARKANSAS POTENTIAL QUALITIES

NEW YORK, April 28.—Winthrop Rockefeller told a group of eastern industrialists and investment bankers here today that Arkansas soon was going to move ahead economically and industrially in a remarkable and interesting manner.

Rockefeller, chairman of the new Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, declared that his adopted State's labor resources had highly attractive qualities that "are too darned hard to find in other places."

"Our people in Arkansas," he said, "have a pride of craftsmanship and they know the meaning of a day's work, too."

He said he had met Arkansas workmen who were willing to travel 40 miles on the off chance that they could get a day's labor, rather than walk across the street to the courthouse for a handout.

Rockefeller flew here from Little Rock to pinch-hit for Governor Faubus as the principal speaker at a luncheon tendered by Rockefeller's younger brother David and former Arkansan Rolland Irvine, vice presidents of the Chase-Manhattan Bank.

Mr. Faubus, who was to have been guest of honor, failed to make it. He sent his regrets from Las Vegas, Nev., where he went to view an atomic-bomb test.

Rockefeller, whose family name and connections make even the most cold-blooded man in the New York money market run a temperature, told his brother and his brother's Wall Street associates that "we need some capital in Arkansas."

He disclosed that David Rockefeller and another brother, Lawrence, had visited Arkansas and were impressed with what they had seen.

Winthrop Rockefeller migrated to Arkansas 2 years ago and has taken up residence atop Petit Jean Mountain where he maintains a model cattle breeding farm.

The speaker, introduced by his younger brother as a farmer, cited Booneville as an example of Arkansas' native enterprise and determination to lift the State out of industrial doldrums. He related that when the Ace Comb Co. examined the community as a site for its new plant it was found that there wasn't enough water.

"The people of that community of about 600 families raised $92,000 to build a pipeline to supply that water," he said. "You'll find that all over Arkansas."

"It is a great tragedy," he said, "that more people who haven't come to Arkansas and seen it, don't come down and see it. The hospitality there is real. It also is infectious. I'm going to have 2,500 people visit me at my place tomorrow."

The audience for his remarks included the financial writers of New York newspapers and press services, 9 executives of the Chase-Manhattan Bank, and 20 other manufacturing or investment executives.

Other Arkansans at the luncheon were Mr. Faubus' executive secretary, James L. Bland; Jack Pickens, chairman of the Arkansas Geological and Conservation Commission; Dabbs Sullivan, Little Rock investment dealer; W. E. Darby and Tom F. Taylor, Jr., of Little Rock, president and chairman of the board respectively of the National Old Line Life Insurance Co.; State Banking Commissioner Dick Simpson; and State Senator Jack Clark of Texarkana and Roy Riales of Mena. Another guest was John D. McCall, of Dallas, an investment banker who made the trip especially for the luncheon.

Mr. Faubus, whose staff has arranged a series of conferences for him with business and political figures in this area, is due in here tomorrow. He is to go to Washington Saturday night.

Kansas Common Sense Conquers Mental Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, as tragic as polio may be—as deadly as is cancer and heart ailments—mental illness is one of the costly human ailments that requires attention.

This fact has been recognized and talked about for years—but little or nothing done about it.

Kansas quit talking about these human tragedies and has done something about it—using their own money and common sense.

The following editorial in the Kansas City Star of May 6, 1955, tells part of the story:

RESTORING SICK MINDS

Statisticians tend to overwhelm us with figures on the growing national need for treating the mentally ill. Half the hospital beds are occupied by mental cases and more buildings, more beds, and huge appropriations will be necessary to meet this problem, the reports insist. These reports are, indeed, true, and constitute one of the Nation's more acute challenges.

A somewhat different picture emerges from Kansas, where dramatic results are capturing attention. Many, many times more patients are being admitted, but mental hospital populations are beginning to decline. The ratio of successful treatments is rising until officials now contend that nearly 4 out of 5 patients admitted in any 1 year can reasonably expect to go home within 12 months. Many return sooner. The State may have all the beds it needs. There is a mounting conviction that Kansas is doing one of the best jobs, if not the most successful job in the country, in this field.

What is this secret weapon for restoring sick minds? Experts agree that it is a combination of many things. Kansas placed its emphasis on staff rather than on buildings and beds. The program has wide popular support and adequate appropriations, but money alone will not do the job.

There is a national shortage of psychiatrists. With the counsel of Dr. Karl Menninger, Kansas set up a training hospital in Topeka to teach its own in 1952. That is now paying dividends. Eight psychiatrists now are serving under this program, gaining experience in Kansas hospitals, and the number soon will grow to fifteen. In addition, the University of Kansas School of Medicine is supplying senior students and residents to the State institutions. There is the closest cooperation between the State board of social welfare, the university, and the county welfare departments.

One thing more, and perhaps the most important, is apparent. Mental patients respond quickly to kindness and consideration. There is an abounding enthusiasm in all the institutions, from nurses and aids to top officials. It is pride in a job well done that radiates to the patients. Perhaps that is the real secret of the State's success.

In the near future further factual information will be given Congress about this program—a program that can well be followed by the Veterans Administration in lessening their load of neuropsychiatric cases—and the hundreds of millions of cost thereof.

Mining Claims on the Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, there have recently been introduced in the House a number of bills that correct abuses of the mining laws on public lands. A proposal which has the strong support of the Interior and Agriculture Departments, the mining industry, and a number of conservationist groups has been introduced by four Members of the House, including myself.

This measure would—

First. Ban the location of mining claims for common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and make them subject to disposal by the United States under terms of the Materials Disposal Act. This provision is similar to the Regan bill in the 82d and 83rd Congresses, which had the endorsement of the Forest Service.

Second. As to mining claims hereafter located, it would, prior to patent—

(a) Prohibit use of the mining claims for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities.

(b) Authorize the Federal Government to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage the other surface resources—except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws—and to use the surface of the claim for these purposes or for access to adjacent land, without endangering or materially interfering with mining operations or related activities.

(c) Bar the mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources except to the extent required for mining or related activities. Any timber cutting by the mining claimant, other than that to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

Third. Provide an in rem procedure, similar to a quiet-title action, under which the Federal Government could expeditiously resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment of this measure, in any given area. This procedure calls for adequate notice to mining claimants in the area involved, and a local hearing to determine any rights to surface resources that may be asserted by claim holders. If a mining claimant fails to assert rights to surface resources, or if the rights he asserts are not upheld, or if he voluntarily waives such rights, the claim would thereafter have the same status as claims hereafter located, with the Government having the right to manage and dispose of the timber and forage and to manage other surface resources in accordance with sound principles of good management.

In the May issue of the Mining Congress Journal, there appears the following editorial pertaining to this measure which I would like to call to the attention of the House:

NOW WE'RE GETTING SOMEWHERE

(By John C. Fox, editor)

Recent introduction in the House and Senate of measures designed to curb abuses of the mining laws without disturbing their basic principles has the support of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and many users of the public domain.

For many years a continuous barrage of adverse publicity has been leveled at abuses of existing mining laws. The general mining laws have been called archaic and outmoded. Actually, where the mining laws have been abused, the fault has largely lain in lax administration and not in the laws themselves.

Myopic critics have completely overlooked the part our mining laws played and are continuing to play in the development of the West, and in assuring a supply of vital raw materials for our growing civilian economy and the defense needs of our Nation, needs that are likely to continue high for the foreseeable future.

It is a basic principle of our mining laws that every American may enter on the public lands to search out mineral deposits. It is also a basic principle that every American having found evidence of mineralization has the right to locate a mining claim and furthermore, when he has invested time and money in the development of such claim to the point where it justifies the granting of a patent, he is entitled to a full "fee simple" title, with the security of tenure and the sound basis for future financing of mining operations which such a title provides.

Our Nation depends on mining for its supply of metals, minerals, and fuels. Mining, in turn, needs encouragement to explore for and develop mineral deposits. The principles upon which our mining laws were built supply the kind of incentive needed. The industry has never condoned the abuses that have provoked such floods of criticism. Instead it has sought means of curbing those abuses without abandoning the fundamental principles of existing law.

The proposed legislation is the product of intensive work by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and conferences between representatives of those departments and of the mining industry. Its enactment would remove the primary causes of abuse of the mining laws and provide for multiple use of the surface of mining claims hereafter located, prior to patent. It would provide the Federal Government a means of clearing up title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims, while protecting the claim-holder's basic rights. It would guarantee to the miner full rights for prospecting, development, and related activities and preserve his right, upon patent, to the same full title to his claim as under the existing mining law.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would solve a problem that has been before the Congress and the public for two decades. It should have the support of every mining man and every user of the public lands.

S. 106

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following resolutions adopted by the Hellenic Post, No. 440, of the American Legion, Newark, N. J., with respect to S. 106. I trust that prompt attention will be given this measure which has been heartily endorsed by this and many other groups of patriotic citizens:

To the Congress and Senate of the United States of America:

At a regular meeting of the Hellenic Post, No. 440, of the American Legion, held Monday, May 2, 1955, at its headquarters situated at the Greek Community Center, 204-210 Clinton Avenue, Newark, N. J., it was

"*Resolved*, That—

"Whereas there are thousands of persons in the Armed Forces of the United States whose religion is of the Eastern Orthodox faith; and

"Whereas at the present time said Eastern Orthodox faith is not recognized by the Armed Forces and said persons are unable to avail themselves of the teachings of said faith while in active service; and

"Whereas there is legislation presently pending, in the United States Congress for the recognition of the Eastern Orthodox Church by the Armed Forces, said legislation being known as bill S. 106; and

"Whereas we, the members of this American Legion post, having heretofore served in the Armed Forces, knowing the need for such legislation, most urgently request the Congress, to favorably act on the aforesaid bill."

In witness whereof, said resolution is hereby signed by its duly authorized officers.

HELLENIC POST, NO. 440, AMERICAN LEGION,
DR. CHARLES CONIARIS,
Commander.
SPIRO P. POULOS, *Adjutant.*
Adjutant.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. W. B. Jones, adjutant of East Atlanta Post, No. 159, the American Legion, enclosing a copy of a resolution which was adopted on April 12 by East Atlanta Post of the American Legion and unanimously adopted by the fifth district executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, on April 18.

Mr. Jones has for many years devoted his efforts actively and consistently to the welfare of the veterans of all wars and to the interests of widows and orphans of our veterans.

I have previously discussed the subject matter of this resolution with Adjutant Jones and with Comdr. J. H. Drumm, of East Atlanta Post. This resolution deserves the attention and action of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and of the Congress. I have referred this resolution to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE. He has advised me that the resolution and its subject matter come within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension, and that at an appropriate time hearings will probably be held on House bill 644, to which the resolution refers, and related bills.

The resolution above referred to is as follows:

Whereas under Public Law 141, as amended, in gratitude for service rendered, the United States Congress adopted legislation authorizing payment of pension of $75 at the age of 65 years for any veteran serving the Armed Forces during war and after discharge becoming disabled; and

Whereas under Public Law 6956, 75th Congress, the United States Congress adopted legislation known as Retirement Act where an employee by having deducted from their salary each month sufficient tax to pay retirement when retirement age is reached, which amount of pension would be based on salary earned, during the time of employment which in some instances might pay $1,600 annually; and

Whereas under Public Law 357, the 82d Congress, legislation was adopted restricting to $1,400 per year for any single veteran and $2,700 for veteran with family; and

Whereas because of the high cost of living the $1,400 and $2,700, respectively, will scarcely pay for the absolute necessities of life and is imposing a burden on veterans now disabled: Therefore

Resolved, That members of East Atlanta Post, 159, through the 5th District Department of Georgia executive committee memorialize the George and national executive committees to petition the Veterans' Affairs Committee to release H. R. 644, which provides no payment if income exceeds $2,700 for single veterans and $4,000 for married veterans allowing the veteran to enjoy the benefit of his pension for service during war, and retirement which he has paid for through insurance as an investment; further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished our Representative in Washington, to the department and national committees, and to the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, Congressman from Texas, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Unanimously adopted this 12th day of April 1955.

J. H. DRUMM,
Commander.
W. B. JONES,
Adjutant.

Unanimously adopted by the fifth district executive committee, American Legion, Department of Georgia, in regular session this 18th day of April 1955, representing 13,000 upward members.

JAMES H. PORTER,
District Commander.
CLAUDE W. PEEK,
District Adjutant.
Mrs. EMOLYN C. WALDREP,
District Secretary.

Refugees in Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a very interesting and informative letter written by Hon. Juraj Slavik, formerly Czechoslovak Ambassador to the United States, and now chairman of the Information Committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, and appearing in the New York Times of May 8, 1955.

The views of Mr. Juraj are worthy of deep consideration, not only because of his knowledge of but because of his experience with the Communist mind.

The letter follows:

REFUGEES IN AUSTRIA—ELIMINATION OF CLAUSE IN TREATY STIPULATING REPARATION URGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Czechoslovak democratic political refugees, and all refugees from behind the Iron Curtain, are undoubtedly very grateful to the great American newspapers for unanimously challenging the Soviet attempt to liquidate in Austria the displaced persons and refugees who escaped Bolshevik persecution from their countries of origin.

We are confident that the western democratic powers cannot agree to such an inhuman procedure as is envisaged in article 16 of the Austrian state treaty. It is true, as you wrote, that there are no more than 4,500 to 6,000 political refugees from behind the Iron Curtain in Austria, the others being ethnic Germans to whom the Austrians say article 16 does not apply.

Even if there were only a few hundred political refugees enjoying asylum in Austria, and free Europe were to acquiesce in their delivery to Soviet and Communist vengeance, it would be a black spot on the conscience of the free and democratic countries.

PROPAGANDA VALUE

Why are the Soviets so interested in the return of a few hundred anti-Communist refugees? Would they help alleviate the manpower shortage? Certainly not. It would, however, be a great victory for Soviet propaganda. In recent weeks you have been writing very revealing articles about the so-called amnesty propaganda, showing how the Iron Curtain countries are trying to induce the refugees to return home. They have even sent stool pigeons to the West who are to return at a given moment to increase the number of those who, in their misery, succumbed to Communist temptations.

Article 16 would be a much surer way of gaining a decisive victory over the West in the cold war. Should this article be accepted by western diplomacy, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, BBC, and all the other means of spreading truth behind the Iron Curtain should close down, because the democrats would feel betrayed and too disillusioned to keep on fighting?

On May 5 it was reported that there was progress made on Austria and that the Russian delegation is prepared to rewrite article 16 to provide that there shall be no forcible repatriation of Iron Curtain refugees, Soviet repatriation commissions visiting camps of the fugitives in Austria shall be limited in size, and activities of such commissions shall be strictly limited to prevent any undue pressure being exerted on the inhabitants of the camps.

SOVIET INTERPRETATION

I wonder whether western correspondents, reporting such progress, are aware that the Russian meaning of forcible repatriation and undue pressure is quite different from the western meaning. And as to giving ground on the refugees issue by restricting the number, does it make any difference whether the Soviet commission numbers 100 or 10 persons?

The main task of such a commission is to ascertain the names and whereabouts of the refugees. After that, pressure is exercised on the unfortunate relatives of the refugees, who are terrorized into writing letters to the escapees asking them to return. The refugees know only too well what happens to relatives back home if they refuse to obey the orders of the Communist executioners.

This is precisely what is happening every day. Outwardly, the Communists are staging a large-scale amnesty and have established an organization which is enticing escapees to return with promises of employment and no recriminations.

From the western point of view there is only one way: to eliminate article 16 entirely. The fact that the Communists are proposing a mere change of words and phrases is very suspicious. I cannot believe that western diplomacy is not aware of the far-reaching significance of the impending decision, and I am sure that the Soviets' infamous aim will be thwarted. The diplomats of the United States, Great Britain, and France cannot deliver a single soul to the Bolshevik henchmen.

JURAJ SLAVIK.

WASHINGTON, *May 5, 1955.*

The Oil Import Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during the last few months, a larger part of the Nation's oil supply came from foreign oil than ever before in our history. It follows, of course, that domestic oil supplied its smallest part of the national oil supply in history.

Yet, domestic capacity to produce oil is at an extremely high level, nearly 2 million barrels per day more than is now being absorbed by the market.

The conclusion is obvious. Domestic oil is being displaced by foreign oil in United States markets. A little more of it is being displaced each day, with the result that the domestic oil industry is being slowly squeezed out of existence.

These are facts fraught with danger. They reflect a situation which is unwise and unhealthy not only for Louisiana, but for the entire Nation.

Unless something is done soon to prevent this displacement of domestic oil in United States markets, the domestic oil producers' incentive to search for new sources of oil will be severely impaired, and the Nation's oil productive capacity will fall far short of our expanding economic and security needs.

The ultimate result of such a policy could well be disaster.

The American consumer has not, and will not, enjoy economic advantages, as a result of the increasing entry, into their country, of foreign oil. As a matter of fact, due to the concentration of foreign oil holdings in the hands of a few companies, the consumer runs a very great risk of being put at a severe long-range economic disadvantage by increased oil imports. Far more important, however, is the detrimental effect that increasing imports are having on our national security. Without accessible oil, our machines of defense would be helpless. It has been amply demonstrated that there is no easy access to foreign oil in wartime. American blood was spilled at sea in World War II to prove this point. I hope that we take whatever steps necessary to prevent this from happening again.

Excessive dependence on foreign oil goes hand in hand with inadequate confidence in the ability of the domestic oil industry. Yet the domestic oil industry has proved itself capable of fueling the Nation's armies to victories in two global wars. It will continue to justify confidence in any future emergency.

Another tremendously important phase of this problem relates to potentially disastrous effect of excessive oil imports on the Nation's economy. All but 18 of our States produce oil. In 1954, more than $6,300,000,000 worth of natural but unused wealth was transformed into actual wealth in the form of crude oil production. Nearly 300,000 people were employed in this country in the production of oil. About 29,000 people were employed in Louisiana. More than $700,000,000 worth of this oil was produced in my State, which ranks third among all States in the production of oil. The loss of this revenue, of this employment, of this wealth, would not be balanced by any practical or foreseeable advantages to the American consumer. It would be both pointless and tragic.

At the earliest opportunity, positive and immeditae legislative steps should be taken to limit oil imports to a reasonable level. It is my opinion that this level should allow the domestic oil industry the opportunity for normal expansion in accordance with demand for oil.

I regret that the importing companies have failed to exhibit the business statesmanship which would have prevented the necessity for taking the legislative route. Their failure to act, however, cannot excuse a similar failure on the part of the Congress.

Now that Congress is studying this problem, I am working for the passage of legislation aimed at solution of the oil imports problem. I believe that such a solution is essential to the welfare of my State and my Nation.

Democrats Lack a Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, appearing in the Washington Star of May 8, 1955, entitled "Democrats Lack a Real Issue":

DEMOCRATS LACK A REAL ISSUE

(By Frank R. Kent)

An interesting development in presidential politics which is being played all over the place here is the situation in which the Democrats opposed to Mr. Eisenhower (which is by no means all of them) find themselves. Here within less than 15 months before their national convention they are not only without a real issue calculated to appeal to the people, but face the possibility that they may supply the other side with one of the most appealing possible—to wit, "He kept us out of war."

In every speech he makes, the President emphasizes that to do that, with honor and without appeasement, is the thing closest to his mind and heart. While he has opposition to his foreign policy, both in his own party and in the other, and while he undoubtedly has made some mistakes and contradictions, no one in either group has yet suggested that his policy is inspired by political ambition or lacks complete sincerity. Nevertheless, his bitterest political opponents concede that if he succeeds he will be literally invulnerable as a candidate. Add to his already great popular strength the asset of keeping us out of war, and the last chance of defeating him would vanish. At least that is the way most of the better-grade Democratic leaders look at it now. This seems to account for the fact that most of them are uncritical of the President on both foreign and domestic affairs—leaving the criticism to a few of the more voluble left-wing Senators, such as HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; NEELY, of West Virginia; MORSE, of Oregon; the Democratic National Committee paid publicists, and the violent CIO attacks, which are a mere repetition of what they were in 1952.

TIRADES ON TRIVIALITIES

As a result of all this, the Democratic attack upon the President is reduced to violent assaults by a few third-rate Senators and to the tirade from the national committee upon trivial matters such as his golf-playing exercise and the normal internal difficulties in the State and other departments. Some and these come direct from the committee publicity agents but others are in the form of rumors and reports. One of these has been the rumor that Mrs. Eisenhower's health was such that the President could not run again. That was abandoned after specific evidence that Mrs. Eisenhower, after a short bout with flu and a rest at the Gettysburg farm, had returned in good health and spirits. The latest rumor is that the influence of Mrs. Doud, the President's mother-in-law, would prevent him from running again. While his wife's health conceivably might force the President to eliminate himself, it is inconceivable that the influence of his mother-in-law would outweigh the claims of his party and the country. Yet that is typical of the sort of anti-Eisenhower propaganda that is more or less rampant in Washington today. It is not effective and it is not well done, but it serves to demonstrate the level to which the present Democratic campaign activities have sunk. Small-bore sharpshooting is the order of the hour. Anything calculated to disparage or embarrass the President is made use of.

Concededly, this is not a pleasant position for a great party to occupy, but it none the less seems inescapable if politics as usual is going to be pursued by the opposition party in the face of the critical condition in which the Nation finds itself as a result of world developments and the inevitable world leadership which has been forced upon us. Few, indeed, will deny the critical condition and fewer still the heaviness of the burden upon the President to preserve the peace and at the same time prepare to meet the most dreadful war in history. Yet, clearly that is what Mr. Eisenhower is trying to do.

NO EASY VICTORY

The reason it is so hard for the politicians of the opposition to accept this is that most of them suspect that there is no way in which they can win. If the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy in Formosa and the Far East is successful in avoiding war, which is its declared and obvious object, then hardly anyone thinks General Ike's renomination and reelection can reasonably be doubted. On the other hand, should it fail and war come, it does seem reasonable to believe (at least the polls and reports appear to show) that the American people would rather have Mr. Eisenhower at the helm than any Democrat available, including the witty Mr. Stevenson. Considering these things, plus the very obvious fact that they have not been able to make a convincing case against either his domestic program or management of domestic affairs, and in the absence of any such scandals as characterized the preceding administrations, it is not surprising that the Democratic professionals find themselves reduced to magnifying unimportant things and personal heckling and disparagement of the President. This ought not to bother him very much and there is reason to believe it does not. Looked at calmly, it is part of his job and to be expected. Also, in a way, it seems complimentary.

Seventh Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, April 27 marked the seventh anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel, a beacon light of freedom in the troubled Middle East.

I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial commemorating this historic occasion. The editorial was published April 29, 1955, by the Jewish News of Detroit, Mich.:

THE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

When the Detroit Jewish community celebrates Israel's seventh anniversary, on Saturday evening, at the annual Yom Atzmaut to Medinat Israel, it will be a signal for all of us to reaffirm our admiration for the builders of Zion who have defied all obstacles in establishing a state that is now an accomplished fact in the council of the nations of the world. It also will be a time for reasserting that our kinship with the people of Israel calls for continued efforts in defense of the young state's economic position.

While it has been left to Israel alone to fight for her political rights, within the United Nations, and to defend her borders against numerous onslaughts, Yom Atzmaut challenges all liberty-loving people also to come to Israel's defense whenever powerful countries indicate a desire to pour ammunition into the countries that threaten Israel's existence. That is why we must be on the alert against unfriendly acts against Israel and on guard that our fellow citizens of all faiths should not be mislead into supporting a war on Israel.

Israel's population of 1,717,834—as of December 31, 1954—included 89 percent Jews—1,526,016; and 11 percent non-Jews, of whom 131,500 were Moslems, 42,800 Christians and 17,500 Druzes. These people are ruled by democratic processes. There is religious freedom, although many issues involving internal Jewish religious controversies are yet to be resolved; but the Moslems and the Christians are worshipping under rules of complete religious freedom, comparable to the liberties that are enjoyed by us in this great land.

Israel's trade, agriculture, industry, and projects for the development of natural resources have made many gains. They are indicative of the alertness of a people that has established a state with a determined desire and will to bring the most advanced western ideas into the country.

International relations have been conducted with dignity. Recognized by 62 countries, in 48 of which she is represented and 37 of which maintain diplomatic missions there, Israel, having drawn into her diplomatic corps her ablest sons and daughters, is conducting her affairs with courage and with a high sense of responsibility.

The young state's compulsory, universal educational system, with free school facilities for all children 5 to 14, places Israel on a high literate plane.

These are just a few of the happy events that mark Israel's rebirth and the new state's seventh anniversary. They can be multiplied manyfold by pointing to the progress made in the rehabilitation of the Negev, the growth of the Hebrew University and the Technion, and the numerous new industries created there.

In addition to these achievements, young Israel has taken off the hands of Jewish communities throughout the world a great responsibility: that of providing asylum and caring for hundreds of thousands of persecuted, dispossessed, and disfranchised Jews. She continues to beckon to those who are threatened by tyranny and bigotry, and her only request is that we provide some of the means for the integration of the newcomers and that we make proper investments in her economy. It is very little to ask of us, whose kinsmen in lands of oppression have only Israel to look to for haven and succor.

Therefore, on the seventh anniversary of Israel's rebirth, while saluting the courageous young state, we must rededicate ourselves to friendship for Israel, to her economic defense, to striving to prevent attacks upon her, to an aim to avert dangers to her security.

In congratulating Medinat Israel, we also extend to her hands of friendship and an assurance that we not only rejoice in her triumphs but that we shall help her retain and protect them.

Nero Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this means of nominating the Veterans' Administration for the Nero Award.

If the Nero Award is not yet as famous as the Oscar Award, it is only because the Nero Award is a new invention.

Let me explain how it came to be.

This famous Roman Emperor, as we all know, is remembered for his fiddling while Rome burned. The Veterans' Administration, which I am hereby nominating to be its first recipient, has nonmusically equalled his efforts while a housing project in my State sinks into the ground.

Late in 1952 construction was started on Sun Gold Manor, consisting of 100 houses located in Panaca, Nev. Twenty-five of these houses were sold to veterans under the loan-guaranty program, and seven were sold under loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The subdivision was promoted and built for the employees of the Combined Metal Reduction Co., of Caselton, Nev., which operated a lead and zinc mine nearby.

Construction of the homes was completed in 1953. Before the end of the year the occupants of the homes were somewhat intrigued to find that their floors were sinking away from their walls, ceilings were cracking, driveways disappearing, and the very attractive project turning into rapid chaos.

The builder was called back to make repairs. The occupants were even more intrigued to find that the repairs sank, too.

When they became sufficiently intrigued, they naturally contacted their Congressman.

In September of 1954 I contacted the Veteran's Administration in behalf of the residents of Sun Gold Manor. My questions were simple, I thought. I only wanted to know why the homes were sinking and what the Veterans' Administration was going to do about it.

Sixteen days after writing I was advised that the Veterans' Administration "fully realizes the seriousness of such a situation and you may be assured that every effort, within the authority of the Veterans' Administration, will be exerted to alleviate the condition."

In the 8 months that have elapsed since that date, the condition of the Panaca sinking homes has been anything but alleviated.

Since the first of the year, I have been in almost weekly contact with the Veterans' Administration officials handling the case in an attempt to expedite some action.

Last week I finally received some definite word. This definite word is that no further report of no progress can be expected until the week of May 16.

When I am out in the field and ask for answers, they refer me to Washington. Back here they say they will have to check out in the field.

The problem has been back and forth between the Washington office and the regional office of the VA with the same regularity of a shuttlecock in a badminton game.

In badminton, however, somebody wins. The tenants of Panaca's sinking homes continue to lose.

There have been enough official investigations conducted to do credit to the FBI.

The Veterans' Administration and the Federal Housing Administration have just about decided what makes the houses sink. It is believed this is because the ground on which they are built also sinks.

Apparently, the ground is light alluvial and blow sand that compresses when water is applied from landscaping or sewage disposal.

The Federal Housing Administration seemed to have the interests of the tenants well in mind.

The builder had offered to refund $1,000 to each of the 7 purchasers of FHA-insured homes. This would have left these families in a fairly good position. Their monthly payments would have been regarded as rent and there would have been no deficiency judgment against them.

However, because of delays and an apparent effort to collect $1,000 from the builder for the 25 VA-insured homes—money that would have gone to the agency and not to the individual veteran—the Veterans' Administration caused the builder to withdraw the offer.

Now the FHA purchasers are back where they started from—without the $1,000 and minus the 6 weeks' time it took the Veterans' Administration to cause them this new problem.

Six weeks to produce a new obstacle is about par for the bureaucratic course.

I might also point out that the 32 families who have purchased these homes have not been able to sell them. As we know, the lead and zinc mining industry has been tragically depressed since the end of the Korean war.

These 32 families now find themselves with no jobs in their communities, homes that are sinking away, and a Government agency that has set a new record in bureaucratic delay and buck-passing.

To date the VA has caused the FHA-insured tenants to lose their chance for recovery from this disaster, and has demonstrated no apparent concern for the veterans involved.

I am more than happy to nominate the Veterans' Administration for the Nero award. I can think of no one more deserving.

Fanatic Arab Hate Still Blocks Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Journal-American, Thursday, May 5, 1955, entitled "Fanatic Arab Hate Still Blocks Peace," written by our former colleague, the Honorable Samuel W. Yorty. The article was originally written for the Herald-Express:

ISRAEL: KEY TO THE MIDDLE EAST—FANATIC ARAB HATE STILL BLOCKS PEACE

(By Samuel W. Yorty)

The Arab States of the Middle East must face reality before peace in that corner of the world will be possible. Lasting settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute is possible only after the Arabs recognize Israel's existence and the permanent place she holds in the community of Middle East nations.

Most reasonable people will subscribe to this statement and I am convinced of its truth as a result of my recent tour of Israel and the Arab countries of the Middle East.

My talks in Israel also convinced me that the Israelis have seriously attempted to settle the long-standing dispute with their Arab neighbors.

While the Arabs have clung to fanatical hate, Israel has shown a readiness to meet legitimate claims. The Government unfroze blocked bank accounts and safe deposit boxes of displaced Arabs, but the property and money of Jewish refugees who left Arab countries are still frozen.

Israel reunited split families through their return to Israel territory and gave full citizenship status to 19,000 Arab refugees in Israel. In addition, Israel has offered to help large scale plans for permanent settlement of the Arab refugees now beyond her borders under plans approved by the United Nations. As part of an overall settlement, Israel is also willing to pay these refugees for the property they left behind.

The Arabs, who refused even to recognize Israel's existence, stubbornly insist that Arab refugees be returned to the area of Palestine which is now part of Israel.

When I talked to Moshe Sharett, Israel's prime minister, he said:

"They can't come back. We have no place for them. There is room in the Arab countries."

Sharett said:

"We have tried to be fair and we are willing to make reasonable payments to them for their property as a part of an overall settlement. We recently agreed to unblock Arab accounts in our banks and let them draw out their money."

On this point of Arab bank accounts, I was told in Lebanon that the Arabs who negotiated that agreement did not then dare return home. To some fanatical Arabs any discussion with the Israelis is treasonable.

That is why it is virtually impossible to conduct reasonable roundtable discussions leading to an agreement for the conservation of Jordan River waters. With proper conservation of this water resource, from 150,000 to 200,000 Arab refugees could be resettled in the Jordan Valley.

The Israelis also desire to utilize the Jordan River water for irrigation. But Jordanians claim this would violate their water rights. The result has been an American special envoy to try to get these two countries to agree on a plan for conservation despite the fact that they are technically at war.

In the area of the Dead Sea there are minerals which Jordan would like to develop, but a stumbling block is the cost of building an expensive new road entirely within Jordan in order to haul the minerals to the Gulf of Aqaba. But for the Arab blockade Jordan could easily haul them on a good road across a narrow strip of Israel to the excellent Mediterranean port of Haifa in Israel.

Also, there is a long oil pipeline running from Dhahran on the Persian Gulf in Saudi Arabia to Haifa. In spite of the loss of needed revenue to Jordan as well as to Israel, the pipeline is kept empty because the Arabs will not let the oil flow through their lands to Haifa.

In view of such an atmosphere of fanaticism on the part of the Arabs, Isreal strenuously objects to American plans to supply arms to Arab nations as part of a security program. The Israelis are afraid that arms would be misused, that the guns would be turned on Israel and not any Communist aggressor.

Sharett said that giving arms to Arab States which refuse to make peace becomes a premium upon their policy of permanent warfare against Israel and that these arms "enhance their capacity for mischief."

The Israeli Prime Minister said it is not a step in the direction of peace but a step away from peace.

Sharett has been strong in his opposition to such a policy of arms, but he does not oppose technical aid which would help develop Arab countries and raise their living standards.

No Arab state has ever taken up arms against an aggressor in modern times, Sharett brought out. The Arabs did little to fight Turkey in World War I, although they achieved independence as a result of the war. During World War II they did nothing to help the Allies.

It is his feeling that arms given the Arabs are arms directed against Israel. He said Israel cannot reconcile such an arms policy with America's declared policy and concern to see Israel prosperous and secure.

Prime Minister Sharett firmly believes that the root of the problem is the persistent refusal of Arab States to make peace with Israel and thus reestablish stability within the Middle East.

Here is what some say:

First of all, the Arabs must be made to realize that Israel exists. Like it or not, they must face this fact. Next the killing on the borders must be stopped.

Some observers believe that the border incidents will continue to delay peacemaking unless the United Nations is enabled to effectively stand guard. Once border incidents end, things will quiet down, they believe.

Others feel that Israel should consider permitting a token repatriation in northern Palestine of some Arab refugees and also consent to certain minor border rectifications.

Israel would have to pay for Arab properties the Israelis now hold and the Arabs would have to lift their blockade and boycott of Israel. Arabs would have to pay for properties held by the Arabs of dispossessed persons of Jewish faith.

One thing is hopeful—and helpful. The Israelis are willing to sit down and talk, willing to admit responsibilities and even errors. But at the same time they rightly insist on recognition of the fact that Jewish people now at long last have a national home—and must keep it and protect it.

It is all too plain that the birth of Israel was made a needlessly painful process to the United Nations and to Jews and Arabs alike by the Arabs' rash resort to war against this tiny new state.

Under the circumstances, it appears neither wise nor fair to Israel for the United States to arm the Arab nations before peace is firmly established and Israel invited to take her rightful place in a defense program for this area.

It must be remembered that Israel is the key to Middle East security—and a firm friend of the United States.

May 3, 1791—May 3, 1955

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, May 3, 1955, marks 164 years since the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791. On May 3 of that year the people of Poland set forth this principle:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation.

But today, in 1955, the Polish people, under Communist dictatorship, have no control over their government. In accordance with Communist philosophy, the power in the state does not originate with or belong to the people, but to the leaders of the Communist Party.

Today, under the Communist-Soviet regime Poland is not a genuinely independent country. Freedom was lost practically from the moment the Red army entered Poland. Nazi oppression was replaced by Communist slavery. The Polish governmental agencies are merely fronts behind which Soviet leaders are the real masters. Whenever possible the Poles oppose the Red regime, but today it is virtually impossible to offer effective resistance in an organized way or on a national scale. In short, Poland is a Communist-captive country.

Although a captive, Poland is certainly neither friendless nor forgotten. Poles in exile, those in the free world, strive constantly to bring encouragement and assistance to their fellow men in Poland. There is a warm friendship between the Poles and the American people. We do not approve the unwilling subordination of Poland to the Communist regime, but

rather look forward to the day when the freedom of Poland will be restored. We should let the world know our hope and conviction that with God's help, Poland and the rest of the world under Soviet domination will soon again enjoy the liberties and independence which they anxiously await.

Are Southern Governors Frightened?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, southerners have a reputation not only for patriotism, but for courage.

Has something gone wrong?

Are the governors fearful of labor bosses who now have millions at their command to use in defiance of law and its enforcement—for political purposes?

Labor bosses, having driven some industries out of the North into the South, are now giving the southerners a return dose of carpetbagging at its worst. Apparently, the AFL, in the railroad strike against the Louisville & Nashville Railroad and its subsidiaries, and the CIO against the Southern Bell Telephone Co., have the southern governors running for cover.

Instead of calling upon local officials for the enforcement of the law and backing up those local officials with the power of the State, those governors appear to be either disinclined or unable to protect the peaceful, law-abiding citizens of their States from the violence of labor goon squads.

Note the following news story from Atlanta, Ga., under date of April 23, 1955:

THREE GOVERNORS STRIVE TO END PHONE STRIKE—RAIL PEACE HOPES SUFFER SETBACK

ATLANTA, April 23.—Southern governors, who are trying to settle the strike of 50,000 CIO Communication Workers of America against the Southern Bell Telephone Co., today expressed some optimism concerning their efforts.

But while Govs. Marvin Griffin, of Georgia; James Folsom, of Alabama; and Hugh White, of Mississippi, conferred with both sides here, sporadic violence continued across the southland in both the telephone strike and the strike of three independent operating unions and 10 A. F. of L. nonoperating unions against the Louisville & Nashville Railroad and its subsidiaries.

The telephone strike, affecting a 9-State area, and the rail strike, affecting 14 States, began March 14.

RAIL PEACE HOPES DIM

Prospects for an end of the rail strike appeared less favorable. The deadline passed today for the strikers' acceptance of a southern governors' proposal for arbitration of the issues. It was not accepted. Thereupon Gov. Lawrence Wetherby, of Kentucky, called a meeting of 13 governors next Tuesday in Nashville, Tenn., to consider their next move.

Governors White and Griffin both were optimistic as the phone strike parley recessed for lunch here.

Folsom, however, was noncommittal. W. A. Smallwood, southern director for the CWA, expressed hope that the meeting would result in a settlement but withheld more specific comment.

ILLINOIS CENTRAL YARDS PICKETED

Wages, arbitration, and a no-strike contract clause are among the major issues to be decided. In the rail strike, which the AFL unions began alone, the principal issues are a welfare plan, vacations, and Sunday pay. The operating unions joined the rail walkout last week, charging that the L. & N. had fired their members who refused to cross picket lines.

Rail picketing at Birmingham was extended today to the yards of the Illinois Central, Frisco, and Central of Georgia Railroads. These lines indicated some passenger trains might be canceled, but there was no immediate effect.

EIGHT RIOTERS ARRESTED

Eight rail strikers were arrested in rioting at the L. & N. station in Birmingham last night, when a mob of 150 threw bricks, rocks, bottles, and eggs at the station and main office.

Jim Atkins, a Birmingham Post-Herald reporter-photographer, was hit by a brick and knocked to the ground by 4 or 5 thugs who beat him in the face and robbed him of his camera at the L. & N. Boyles yards in Birmingham.

At Gadsden, Ala., 2 telephone strikers were arrested for throwing eggs at a nonstriker. Police chased the strikers 2 miles and shot all 4 tires off their car before they surrendered.

Relations With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a situation involving the relations of this country with Japan, which, in light of the aid we are giving that country, seems to me to be a proper subject for consideration by the Congress.

We entered into a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with Japan in 1953. Under article XIV of that treaty, it was specifically provided that no discrimination shall be practiced with reference to any restrictions on exports and imports of goods between the two countries, over and above the restrictions imposed with respect to any other nations.

However, in the face of this treaty and the GATT agreement, which contains similar provisions, and to which Japan has adhered, Japan has embargoed shipments to the United States only of certain merchandise without such an embargo being placed on such shipments to any other country. The Department of State has called this treaty violation to the attention of the Japanese very forcefully, and finally on April 22 presented to the Japanese Foreign Office a formal note setting out the treaty violation and asking that if a further delay in replying is required, the effective date of the embargo be postponed. To date, no reply whatever has been received to this note, and the embargo has gone into effect. As a result, the American interests, who entered into contracts in Japan in good faith and based on the integrity of our treaty obligations, have suffered very substantial losses.

Granted our desire to work with our friends abroad, as indicated by the tremendous military and economic aid program of this country, this cooperative spirit should in no manner interfere with our protection of the legitimate interests of our businessmen abroad. If our current attempts to encourage foreign investment and enterprise by Americans is to succeed, it behooves our Government to stand by our businessmen. The situation I have outlined is a vivid example, and I sincerely hope that our Department of State takes whatever measures it feels necessary to secure fair and legal treatment through compliance by the Japanese with their treaty obligations. Only in this way can we demonstrate the courage and conviction consonant with our position of leadership in world affairs. Without this courage and conviction, the development of American enterprise abroad must suffer heavily.

John William Flannagan, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep personal sadness that I read the obituaries of John William Flannagan, Jr. The press accounts of his passing took note of his distinguished record in the Congress and of the esteem in which he was held in Virginia. My recollections of our former colleague were occupied more with the human qualities not readily translated into print.

It was my high privilege to know Mr. Flannagan during my first years in this House. I learned early in my experience here that he was a man whose counsel was much sought by his colleagues and whose judgment commanded great respect and influence. On nine occasions this merited confidence also was manifested by his fellow citizens in Virginia, who elected him to Congress. He served faithfully and with distinction from 1931 until 1949. When he decided to return to private life this House lost one of its most earnest and astute Members.

On countless occasions Mr. Flannagan gave me the benefit of his experience and sound reasoning. When he left these Halls I was deprived of a friendly hand along the way. These few words are poor acknowledgment of the manifold kindnesses he extended. My sincere sympathy, Mr. Speaker, goes out to his family in this bereavement.

Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker: Virginia's Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 1, 1955, the Honorable RICHARD H. POFF, Representative in Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, delivered a very interesting address at the Bethlehem Methodist Church at Moneta, Va., incident to the presentation of an award to Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker as Virginia's Mother of the Year. Mrs. Rucker is highly deserving of the honor bestowed upon her and Mr. POFF's tribute is altogether appropriate.

At this time all of us are mindful of our obligation and revotion to motherhood and I extend hearty congratulations to Mrs. Rucker, who typifies all that is fine and noble among the mothers of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert Mr. POFF's address, which is as follows:

I am humbly grateful for the honor you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to pay tribute to one of your fellow citizens who has so nobly distinguished herself.

One rainy day a mother sat in here rocking chair mending clothes. Her noisy little boy, unable to go outside to play, was about to drive her to distraction. In desperation and in an effort to keep him quiet, she tore from a magazine a leaf on which was printed a map of the world. With her scissors, she cut it into a jigsaw puzzle. She scrambled the pieces together, handed them to her son and told him to fit them back together again. Thinking that would keep him occupied the rest of the afternoon, she went back to her mending. However, in less than 10 minutes the boy was back at his mother's elbow with the map of the world intact. His mother could scarcely believe her eyes, and she asked him how he had completed the task so quickly. Sheepishly, he looked up at his mother and explained, "On the back of the map was the picture of a man, and when I put the man together right, the world just took care of itself."

This is the story of the life of Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Rucker. For half a century she has been helping to take care of the world by fitting together the pieces of the lives and characters of men and women. It has been well said that a "mother in her office holds the key of the soul and stamps out the coin of character."

To her providential care and guidance God saw fit to entrust the keys of 13 souls, and the coins of character which she has stamped have circulated throughout the realm of human experience. Few parents have been so abundantly blessed as have Dr. and Mrs. S. L. Rucker. Still fewer can point with so much justifiable pride to the achievements of their children. How many parents can count among their offspring 2 physicians, 2 dentists, 1 pharmacist, 1 chemist, and 5 homemakers? And how many children owe so much to their mother—a mother who, after the death of a beloved husband and father 24 years ago, took upon herself the burden of feeding, clothing, sheltering, and educating such a large family?

As they—mother, children, and grandchildren—are gathered together here in their hometown, here within the hallowed walls of their home church on this wonderful Lord's Day, what glorious thoughts must crowd their minds and warm their hearts. Ringing and echoing down the long corridor of the years that have passed come the memories of hours of pain and pleasure; hours of woe and joy, gladness and sadness, tears and laughters, play and toil, failure and success. How humble and yet how very proud they must be.

And how very grateful must be the hearts of these fine children for a mother who has labored so long, so faithfully, so untiringly, and so unselfishly in God's great vineyard. How often has she, who 13 times entered the valley of the shadow of death to win a life at the peril of her own, laid down bit by bit and day by day a small segment of her life for her children? How often has she abandoned sleep to sing lullabies? How many times has she bandaged a wound or kissed a bruise; how many clothes has she mended; how many floors has she swept; how many meals has she prepared; how many dishes has she washed; how many stories has she read; how many lessons has she taught; how many times has she smoothed a rough path and brushed away a tear to make room for a smile?

Yes, Miss Bessie's hands have held the key to men's souls and I know through their minds today must be coursing the words of the poet who said:

"My mother's beautiful hands!
They're neither white nor small;
And you, I know, would scarcely think
That they were fair at all.
I've looked on hand whose form and hue
A sculptor's dream might be;
Yet are those wrinkled, aged hands
Most beautiful of all to me.

"Such beautiful, beautiful hands!
Tho heart were weary and sad,
These patient hands kept toiling on,
That the children might be glad;
I always weep when looking back
To childhoods distant day,
I think how those hands rested not,
When mine were busy at play."

But her labors have not been in vain. God has used her richly to bless not only her children but the members of this congregation and the citizens of the community in which she lives. By her Christian example, she has, in the windows of the lives of generations still unborn, lit a candle of faith and hope and inspiration, and in so doing has laid up for herself treasures in heaven where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt and where thieves do not break through or steal. And long after the Supreme Architect of the Universe, the Father of all mankind has seen fit to call this mother to her eternal reward, the fragrance of her life will linger on in the garden of humanity.

"Her heart is like her garden,
Old-fashioned, quaint and sweet,
With here a wealth of blossoms,
And there a still retreat.
Sweet violets are hiding
We know as we pass by,
And lilies, pure as angel thoughts,
Are opening somewhere nigh.

"Forget-me-nots there linger,
To full perfection brought,
And there bloom purple pansies,
In many a tender thought.
There love's own roses bloom,
As from enchanted ground,
And lavish perfume exquisite,
The whole glad year around.

"And in the quiet garden—
The garden of her heart,
Songbirds are always singing
Their songs of cheer apart.
And from it floats forever,
O'ercoming sin and strife,
Sweet as the breath of roses,
The fragrance of her life."

I think God in His Heaven must be smiling down on us today, and if His Son Jesus were here in the flesh, as He most certainly is in the spirit, I know He would say, "Well done, thy good and faithful servant."

The Russian Menace at Next Year's Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of May 5, 1955, reported that the Soviet Union, in an apparent bid for the 1960 or 1964 Olympics, has announced that it was spending approximately $62 million this year to expand athletic facilities in Moscow. Work has started on the construction of a gigantic stadium, indoor tennis courts, and a summer artificial ice rink. Moscow already has the big Dynamo Stadium and a second smaller stadium.

In a speech delivered at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1955, William Randolph Hearst Jr., following his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead fast. From Moscow, he said:

Radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism.

Avery Brundage, in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1955, reported that things look bad for us at the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, Australia. He said that Russia is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known. Unless there is a sudden awakening in this country, Soviet sportsmen are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne, Australia.

They threaten to seize the initiative even in track and field, the feature phase of the games, in which United States athletes have always been supreme—although to a lessening degree—since the games were revived 60 years ago—

Mr. Brundage warned.

Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists.

I have developed a plan, and presented it to this Congress, for meeting the propaganda offensive of the Russians. This plan is developed in several bills—H. R. 5040, H. R. 4307, H. R. 4215, and H. R. 4109—which are specificaly designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst. There is very little money involved, but, if adopted, they would go far toward meeting the major attacks the U. S. S. R. is making upon us in the fields of culture and sports.

Because the very survival of our way of life may depend on taking action now

I urge their early consideration and enactment by the Congress.

H. R. 4109 would establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia. The text of my bill is included here. Also included is the text of the New York Times report on the Moscow plans, as well as a recent article by David Sentner, chief of the Washington bureau of the Hearst newspapers, which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner. This article also appeared in the Chicago American, the San Francisco American, the Boston American, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, the New York Journal-American, the Milwaukee Sentinel, and the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

H. R. 4109

A bill to establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944, is amended by redesignating section 3 as section 4 and by inserting immediately after section 2 the following new section:

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created an advisory board, which shall advise and consult with the commission in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution. The advisory board shall consist of—

"(1) one person selected by each of the following national organizations in the field of recreation and sports: The United States Olympic Association, the American Recreation Society, the National Recreation Association, the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, the National Collegiate Athletic Asociation, the Amateur Athletic Union, the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Athletic Institute, and the Sports Fishing Institute.

"(2) one person selected by each of the following national organizations: The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, the Disabled American Veterans, the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, the Marine Corps League, the Marine Corps War Memorial Foundation, the American Veterans Commitee, the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, and the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States; and

"(3) one person selected by each of the following national service organizations: The United Service Organizations (USO), the Young Women's Christian Association, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

"(b) The advisory board may exercise its functions through a working committee composed of 6 members, 2 selected jointly by the organizaitons named in each of the categories enumerated in subsection (a)."

SEC. 2. The first section of such joint resolution is amended (1) by striking out "an athletic field and stadium" and inserting in lieu thereof "an athletic field, stadium, and parade ground," and (2) by striking out "World War I and World War II" and inserting in lieu thereof "World War I, World War II, and the Korean hostilities."

[From the New York Times, of May 5, 1955]

RUSSIANS ARE SPENDING $62 MILLION ON ATHLETIC FACILITIES—ACTION A PRELUDE TO OLYMPICS' BID—RUSSIA REGARDED AS SEEKING 1960 OR 1964 GAMES—MOSCOW SUBURBS GET NEW STADIA

LONDON, May 4.—The Soviet Union, in an apparent bid for the 1960 or 1964 Olympics, announced today it was spending 250 million rubles ($62 million) this year to expand athletic facilities in Moscow.

S. V. Pushnov, chairman of the Moscow City Committee on Physical Culture and Sport, said in a Moscow radio broadcast heard here:

"During this year alone 250 million rubles will be spent on sports facilities.

"Work has started on the construction of a gigantic stadium in Luzhniki (a Moscow suburban district).

"In Sokolniki (another Moscow district) a summer artificial ice rink will be opened on which hockey players, ice skaters and figure skaters can compete. Construction is being completed on new indoor tennis courts."

Pushnov said nothing specifically about trying to obtain the games for the Soviet Union. However, the Russians have been privately talking about it since the Olympic committee meeting in Athens last May.

In talks with foreigners they admitted the only thing preventing their lodging a bid for the games was lack of facilities in Moscow.

STADIUM GROUNDS SMALL

Hungary has been prominently mentioned as a possible 1940 site but the Russians may be aiming at 1964. Next year's games will be held in Australia.

Moscow already has the big Dynamo Stadium, but the grounds around it are small. There's another stadium in the Stalino district, but isn't big enough for the Olympics.

By using the available stadiums—and centering activities in the new one in Luzhniki—the Russians could easily handle the Olympics.

Housing would offer no particular problems to the Russians. If they did not put up an Olympic village, they could do as they've done for other international events—just empty several hotels and use them.

Pushnov also announced this summer would see the inauguration of the first Moscow games. About 300,000 athletes will take part.

SPECIAL POLICE FOR OLYMPICS

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA, May 4.—Melbourne officials announced today that a special police corps had been organized for the 1956 Olympic games "for the protection and general assistance of overseas competitors and visitors."

A committee of senior officers of all branches of the police force will work in close liaison with the organizers of the games. The police station building in the Olympic village of Heidelburg will be staffed by policemen speaking at least two foreign languages.

Special squads of plainclothes policemen will be assigned to safeguard the visitors against pickpockets and confidence men. All incoming ships and airliners will be scrutinized for foreign criminals, descriptions of whom are being obtained from the international police organization.

Meanwhile the Olympic games construction committee, after a stormy 2-hour meeting today, decided to proceed with a 333-meter concrete cycling track at Olympic Park. The track will cost 200,000 Australian pounds ($448,000).

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of April 29, 1955]

HOUSE URGED TO CONSIDER HEARST ART, SPORT PLAN TO COMBAT REDS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, today urged consideration of congressional measures to promote American culture and sports events in line with the program for "competitive coexistence" with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

Concurrently, the House District Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON's first bill on the subject, providing for the creation of a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts and mass communications center.

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers and Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing its supremacy at the international games.

PROPOSALS

THOMPSON said his legislation is specifically designed to put in to effect the proposals made by Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain, where he interviewed the four top leaders of Communist Russia.

The measures would create a national advisory committee under the welfare secretary to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby has approved a bill introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Democrat, of New York, for establishment of a Federal Commission on the Arts "and for other purposes."

WARNING

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

THOMPSON called attention of Congress to both the warning of Hearst and Olympic Committee President Brundage on the sports challenge from the Soviet Union.

He referred to a current magazine article by Brundage warning that Russia is building "the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known."

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic Games unless "there is a sudden reawakening in this country."

TWENTY YEARS OLD

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex," THOMPSON said.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system, which was started more than 20 years ago, was a very substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his recent speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said that sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

PRESTIGE

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic Games since their inception. It

has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-cosncious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

THOMPSON added the legislation introduced by himself, Representatives ROOSEVELT (Democrat, California), and REUSS (Democrat), Wisconsin, was designed to carry out "the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst."

Price Supports for Basic Commodities

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, from the argument advanced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] there might be drawn the conclusion there were no Members of the House other than the gentleman from Texas who had any sympathy or kindly feeling for people who were in the lower income groups or who were unfortunate. If I desired to cry all over the place about individuals or groups in my district, I might refer to those pepole who work on the lowlands, on their knees, weeding celery, onions, carrots or cabbage, or I might talk about the folks who spray their fruit trees, harvest the berries or pick the cherries, and tell you how little they get as the result of their labor. But that in a way, is quite beside the point, although if peanuts are to be on the list of basic commodities why not the other farm products which I have just mentioned?

Mr. Chairman, listen to this argument made by our good friend from Texas. He held up that peanut bar and he said he paid a nickel for it. I just went out and bought one. He said that peanuts cost so much, but he did not give the cost of the other ingredients. Then he said, and listen to this, that the manufacturer made a profit of 800 percent. When I went out and bought my peanut bar just 75 feet from where he purchased his I asked the young lady out there who sells them, the efficient, kindly, always pleasant daughter of our longtime faithful friend Ben "What is your profit on a 5-cent bar?" She said, "Two cents." So there goes two-fifths at least of the manufacturer's 800 percent. Had I used the computing methods of our colleague I would have come up with a loss.

If the gentleman from Texas cannot give us any better argument than that, and any better figures, any nearer approach to the facts than the ones he gave us, why should we accept his statements?

Mr. GROSS. Was the candy bar you bought made in Britain or the United States?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. From the quality of it I think it was made here. It was the better.

Maj. Gen. E. A. Pollock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a concurrent resolution adopted by the legislature of the State of South Carolina recommending Maj. Gen. E. A. Pollock to the President of the United States for appointment to the office of Commandant of the United States Marine Corps. We people of the State of South Carolina are extremely proud of General Pollock and the record he has made with the United States Marine Corps. I join with the State legislature of my home State in recommending this fine general for the position of Commandant of the United States Marine Corps.

The resolution follows:

Concurrent resolution commending Maj. Gen. E. A. Pollock to the President of the United States for appointment to the office of Commandant of the United States Marine Corps should a vacancy occur

Whereas Maj. Gen. E. A. Pollock has spent his life in distinguished service of his country; and

Whereas the members of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina have visited the Parris Island Recruit Depot, of which he is the commanding general, and have seen the efficient operation of the depot base and the splendid results of the training being given to the young men of the Marine Corps under his inspiring leadership; and

Whereas the high morale of the officers and men of the Parris Island Recruit Depot is the best indication of the universal admiration and respect inspired by him in all; and

Whereas the outstanding accomplishments of Maj. Gen. E. A. Pollock in time of war and in time of peace prove him to be eminently qualified for appointment as Commandant of the United States Marine Corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the Senate concurring), That the members of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina hereby commend Maj. Gen. E. A. Pollock, commanding general of the Recruit Depot at Parris Island, S. C., to the President of the United States for appointment as Commandant of the United States Marine Corps should a vacancy occur in that office; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, and to each Member of the United States House of Representatives from South Carolina.

Memorial Postage Stamp Honoring American Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the good people of the 25th Congressional District of southern Illinois, many of whom earn their livelihood by mining coal in the bowels of the earth.

A great many people in southern Illinois and other coal-mining areas of this country have felt that it is only proper and fitting that a United States memorial postage stamp be issued honoring the great American coal industry, its coal miners, and the over 115,000 brave dead, killed in the coal mines of this country.

I have joined with many Congressmen and United States Senators in requesting the Postmaster General to issue such a memorial stamp, but we have been unsuccessful to date. I think it is high time that our deceased coal miners be recognized for the great effort they have given in helping make America the greatest country in the world. I sincerely believe that this memorial postage stamp should be issued for these 115,000 heroes of our industrial "front" who sleep in unhonored graves over the Nation.

I want to pay tribute to a great American, Mr. Vachel Davis, Eldorado, Ill., a coal miner artist and include in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Davis entitled "This I Believe," which was delivered on a coast-to-coast broadcast, CBS network, April 14, 1955, at 3:10 p. m., central standard time.

THIS I BELIEVE—A COAL MINER WALKING CLOSE TO DEATH DAILY FORMS A PHILOSOPHY OF HIS OWN

After having lived in the coalfields for 50 years, with the smoke from the coal mines as a horizon, I know tragedy. The tragedy of mine explosions and the death whistle whose wailing sound strikes terror in the hearts of everyone who lives on company row and in every coal miner's humble shack. Often as a lad I stood with the crowd gathered around the mine shaft where a tragedy had occurred. With pale drawn faces, tears coursing down their cheeks, some sobbing, some praying, were the wives, mothers, and children of the men who worked in the pits. Sometimes a wife or a mother had to be held back from jumping into the open mine shaft. As a child, these scenes haunted me.

A coal miner walks so close to death daily, in the nether darkness of his world, he forms a philosophy of his own of necessity. When a man knows that he is utterly, helplessly surrounded by danger, with millions of tons of rock and earth above him, with only small mine props to support the roof over him, he must find something to have faith in. Sometimes there is a tendency to believe in ghosts and omens. Some carry good-luck charms, to help ward off danger. One may feel that he has a charmed life, or another may reckon that "what is to be will be," and there is no way to avert this predestination. There are many who believe in prayer and faith in the protecting hand of God.

The coal miner's creed might not always be orthodox and his cathedral has no costly

stained-glass windows. The mine safety props are the pillars of his temple where he whispers his prayers, without the solemn tones of the organ and the cushioned pews. But his horny, calloused hand brushes away a tear from his coal-blackened cheek, and he feels that God has heard him through the several hundred feet of earth that hangs over him. And he knows that there is a God, for he feels that inward Witness and Presence that satisfies him.

I believe when a man realizes how helpless and insufficient mortals are, when he faces inevitable danger and tragedy, he must put his faith in something greater than himself. When a man has looked upon the broken, crushed, and burned forms of his miner buddies, and when he dares to think on these things, he forgets the devil-may-care front that he wears. The words that come from his untrained lips are heard of God and He recognizes it as prayer.

So, this I believe, that men who face constant dangers, as do coal miners, do pray, for it is the only help they can expect. When all nature seems to cry out and revolt in the bowels of the earth, the helplessness of a man leaves no possible avenue of escape—other than help that is supernatural and divine.

But, while a miner to some degree becomes a fatalist, I believe that there are things a man is meant to try to change. With what knowledge and art I possess, I find my greatest satisfaction is in trying to save the lives of the men who mine our Nation's coal. I cannot doubt that there is a Supreme Being—there is a power above that of man—and I believe that in devoting myself as best I can to improve the welfare of others—by doing this—I am fulfilling His purpose.

City Council, Peabody, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution which was adopted by the city council, Peabody, Mass., endorsing legislation for the purpose of increasing the Federal minimum wage:

RESOLUTION ON RAISING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the President of the United States has proposed, and Congress is now considering, legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage above the present inadequate figure of 75 cents an hour; and

Whereas a fair and reasonable minimum wage would raise the living standards of underpaid workers, increase the national income, stimulate business activity, minimize unfair industrial competition based upon sweatshop wages and help to solve the problem of runaway shops; and

Whereas the city of Peabody, Mass., has suffered serious competition because of the inadequacy of the present minimum wage, and is threatened with further difficulties unless action is taken quickly; and

Whereas the President's proposal of a 90-cent minimum falls far short of meeting the needs of underpaid workers or of the population as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Peabody, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, and urge our Senators and Representatives to support such legislation, in the interest both of our own community and of the Nation.

Aodpted at a regular meeting of the Peabody City Council held Thursday, April 28, 1955.

Why Is the United States Unpopular in Europe?—The Real Crime of the Americans—American Giveaways Do Not Improve Other People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by one Indro Montanelli, Italian political analyst and author, who recently wrote in Milan's leading newspaper, Corriere della Sera, on the subject of American aid to European countries. He points out, in this article, that the Americans have a "craze for improving us, for making us try to be in every way kinder to each other, juster, richer, happier."

Mr. Speaker, here is more evidence that the foreign aid programs which have been pouring billions of dollars into many countries in Europe and Asia is not having the effect it was desired to have.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article by Mr. Montanelli:

THE REAL CRIME OF THE AMERICANS

Why is America so unpopular even in those countries which she has liberated and subsequently helped to rebuild and rescue from starvation? It is a legitimate question which I myself would ask if I were an American, and as such, had lost, let us say, one son in Normandy to save France. The only country which might have some reason for ingratitude is Germany. Yet Germany is the only country which looks amicably at the ex-enemy.

Of all the objective causes with which we justify our feeling of rancor against an enemy, guilty of having beaten us in a war which we declared, there's not one that holds good. They have taken from us neither ships, nor cannons, nor a foot of land; they treated our prisoners with great humanity; they have given us 40 billion lire ($65 million). Unfortunately all these claims on our gratitude are obscured by one defect of which there isn't the slightest hope that Americans can be cured, because it's in their blood, it's constitutional. It is the craze for improving us, for making us try to be in every way kinder to each other, juster, richer, happier.

The real trouble—the great inexplicable crime of the Americans—is that they really are better than us Europeans. I don't say more intelligent. Neither would I say that the Americans are more cultured, capable, refined, or courageous. I only say they are better intentioned, ready to sacrifice the individual for the common good, more candid, more trustful of others, and more ready than we are to see the good rather than the bad side of things.

It upsets all our criteria which for centuries have trained us to look for evil behind the mask of innocence, and to oppose it with malice even more subtle and perverse. The whole of Europe is envious of America, envious of her power, her well-being.

Does the Hatch Act Go Too Far?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post an editorial cites a case now pending on appeal in a Federal district court in Vermont which involves the Hatch Act and the rights of an American citizen to freedom of speech.

This case, now known as the Simpson case, involves one, W. Arthur Simpson, who is Vermont's commissioner of social welfare. His job involves administering State funds plus certain grants-in-aid from the Federal Government.

In October of 1951 Mr. Simpson wrote a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald in which he stated his own personal choice of Senator Robert Taft as Republican candidate for President.

Because Mr. Simpson dared to express his personal opinion as to which candidate he believed to be best suited for nomination by his party for President, the United States Civil Service Commission, in 1953, issued a "letter of charges" against him charging him with violation of the Hatch Political Activities Act. The basis of this charge was that Mr. Simpson had violated the law in writing his letter.

The State of Vermont was ordered by the Federal commission to fire Arthur Simpson, but refused, and in an effort to force compliance with its order, the Civil Service Commission then told the State of Vermont that the Federal Government would hold out from Vermont's share of welfare aid an amount equal to Simpson's salary for 2 years. At this point Vermont appealed to the Federal district court in Montpelier where the case is still pending.

This, in my opinion, is a case bordering on the ridiculous when the Federal Government will invoke the Hatch Act against a citizen who expresses his personal opinion, and signs his name as a private citizen.

The man or woman who enters Government service, either at the Federal or State level, does not renounce all citizenship rights as an individual upon taking such office.

But it would appear this is the view taken by those who administer the Hatch Act, if a man's discharge is ordered for expressing a personal opinion, and an attempt made to force the State to comply with the order by the withholding of welfare aid.

If this is an example of the extent to which those charged with administration of the Hatch Act intend to go in denying the rights of free speech and expression of personal opinion to employees

of Federal and State Governments, then I think it is high time we took a long look at the Hatch Act, and consider proper amendments to it, or, perhaps, its repeal, and replacement with better legislation in which the civil rights of Government employees will be protected adequately.

I am fully aware of the importance of keeping Federal employees out of politics. However, the Hatch Act was not enacted to deny to Federal employees the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

Freedom of speech is a privilege which every American cherishes. And so long as a man expresses his own opinion as a private individual, he should be protected in this right. Nor should he live in fear that his job will be taken from him if he exercises this basic right of citizenship.

In the totalitarian state men must live in silence, fearful that any expression of personal opinion not in accord with the will of the government in power will result in immediate retaliation.

Robert Simpson exercised his right guaranteed under the Constitution to express his personal opinion on a matter of importance to him as an American citizen. As a result, the Federal Government ordered his removal from his State position, thus expanding Federal power within a State. When the State refused to comply with this order, the Federal Government attempted to bring pressure to bear on the State government by withholding Federal-aid funds.

This is a situation that cannot be tolerated in the United States. And we should not delay in taking appropriate action to safeguard the right of free speech to every American, regardless of whether he is employed in government service or in private business.

The following article from the Post states the case of W. Arthur Simpson, a citizen in public service who dared express his personal opinion as to a candidate for public office, and was faced with dismissal from office after more than a third of a century of distinguished service for the State of Vermont:

IT'S HARD TO SEE A "LETTER TO THE EDITOR" AS REALLY IMMORAL POLITICAL ACTIVITY

When W. Arthur Simpson, a Vermont State employee, sat down to write a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald back in October 1951 he had no idea that this exercise of an ancient and honorable American privilege would eventually land him smack in the middle of a State rights fight to determine how much authority over its own affairs a State must surrender in exchange for Federal aid.

Mr. Simpson, a Republican, is Vermont's commissioner of social welfare, a job that involves administering State funds, plus certain grants-in-aid from the Federal Government. In the preconvention discussion of the best possible Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Simpson favored Senator Robert Taft. He wrote a letter to the editor of the Boston Herald saying that while he didn't think Robert Taft was the only alternative, "he at least has the virtue of being honest, forceful, a fighter, and a successful campaigner." Surely Mr. Simpson's views should have no more to do with his fitness to hold his job than if he had come out for Senator KEFAUVER.

However, the United States Civil Service Commission, in 1953, issued a "letter of charges" against the Vermont social-welfare head, charging that he had violated the Hatch Political Activities Act by writing the letter, and by presiding at a session of the Republican State convention in 1950. The Commission did this even though published Federal Security Agency rules and the laws of the State of Vermont seemed to Mr. Simpson to exempt him from the Hatch Act on the ground that he was putting in most of his time for his State, and not for the Federal Government.

The Federal Commission ordered Vermont to fire Arthur Simpson. Vermont refused. The Civil Service Commission then told Vermont that Uncle Sam would hold out from Vermont's share of welfare aid an amount equal to Simpson's salary for 2 years. At this, the Vermonters appealed to the Federal district court in Montpelier, where the case is now pending.

Incidentally, Mr. Simpson has worked for his State quite a while, apaprently without trouble. In April 1953 the Vermont Legislature adopted a resolution praising him for distinguished service over more than a third of a century, citing him as a "gracious neighbor and public administrator," and concluding, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Other States are up in arms about what was done to this Vermont Republican, and the expansion of Federal power which it implies. New Hampshire has joined Vermont in the court battle. Indiana, where four State employees have been charged with political activity, seems about to follow suit, with Hoosier Gov. George Craig leading an effort to persuade other States to support a bill by Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, Indiana Republican, which would make the Hatch Act apply only to Federal employees.

Lawyers for the State of Vermont urge persuasively that the Federal Government's idea that the Hatch Act applies to anybody who works even part time for a State agency receiving Federal funds could logically involve a State employee serving 1 day or members of any State board or commission financed by $1 of Federal funds. Such a person couldn't write a letter to the editor on a political matter, even if he didn't write in his official capacity. (Mr. Simpson signed only his name, didn't use his official title.)

Conceding that the Hatch Act was wisely intended to keep Federal employees out of politics, it is certainly doubtful that Congress intended to extend its prohibitions to every State office that gets a nickel of Federal money or to mere expression of preference for candidates for office. If that is what Congress did intend, a vote on the Beamer resolution provides an opportunity to make the intention plain. In the meantime a vote of thanks is due the Vermont, New Hampshire, and Indiana rebels for bringing the whole thing to light.

The Simpson case may go against them, now that the Federal camel has thrust its head legally into so many local tents. If it does, it will be time for a lot of Americans to get into politics in earnest and reverse the trend by which Federal control of State affairs is assumed as the price of Federal aid. If the Simpson case causes the citizenry to look these Federal gift horses in the mouth, there's nothing wrong with that.

Hon. John Taber

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to our attention that one of the great men of not only our time but of all times, today is celebrating his 75th birthday. I am referring to the Hon. JOHN TABER, the gentleman from New York.

Words fail me when I attempt to express my appreciation of the many kind things, the courteous treatment, and the consideration that has been shown me by JOHN TABER. He had attained high position but he never forgets the little man whether this individual is his colleague, his friend or—yes, even his political enemy. My experience has proven to me that JOHN TABER has only one rule and that is the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

He has never forgotten that he is a public servant and he is one who remembers not only the people that sent him to Congress but all the people.

And may I add, Mr. Speaker, just a note of praise and appreciation of JOHN TABER's helpmate, his wife, Gertrude. She, too, follows the rules that I have expressed above and they together make a team that will be remembered by those who write for the Archives.

Public Honor for Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter which I have written to Mr. Mark Wright, president of the San Jose Newspaper Guild of San Jose, Calif. This organization of working newspapermen and newspaperwomen recently honored the public servants of local government in our community by presenting its annual "Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award" to Mr. Francis Tanner, a patrolman on the San Jose police force:

Mr. MARK WRIGHT,
President, San Jose Newspaper Guild,
San Jose Mercury-News,
San Jose, Calif.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: The increasingly complex problems facing our local communities today could never be mastered were it not for the ability, loyalty, and devotion to duty of the men and women who are the civil servants of the public in the administration of our government. It is to the everlasting credit of our free American press that the public is kept informed about the activities of these public servants, and that a close link is maintained between the public and those laboring on its behalf.

Today I should like to express to you and the working members of the San Jose Newspaper Guild my sincere appreciation for presenting your "Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award" for 1955 to a plain patrolman of the San Jose police force. Most of us who keep up on local affairs are familiar with the names and activities of top officials, such as the mayor, the city manager, the chief of police, or the sheriff. Your award to Patrolman Francis Tanner points out admirably that the public is served with equal distinction by policemen, clerks, firemen, meter

readers, draftsmen, laborers, technicians, repairmen, and many other categories of men and women. We, as members of the community, have every reason to be proud of them.

In choosing the recipient of this year's award, your organization acted from firsthand knowledge of the merit which alone determined the choice. In doing so, you performed a considerable public service which cannot but benefit the community. May I commend the San Jose Newspaper Guild for doing such an excellent job in fulfilling its mission in our community.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Member of Congress.

Twentieth Anniversary of the REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the REA program, I deem it appropriate to give the Congress a report on the actions of the program in the First District of Arkansas.

There are 10 counties in the first district, and electric lines extend into each of these counties under member-owned electric cooperatives operation. There are 4 electric cooperative corporations located in the first district, and 2 of them are the largest in the entire State of Arkansas.

The Craighead Electric Cooperative Corp., with headquarters located at Jonesboro, Ark., is the largest in Arkansas, serving 16,500 members on 3,900 miles of line in Craighead, Greene, Poinsett, Lawrence, Crittenden, and parts of Independence and Randolph Counties. This cooperative was first put into operation in November of 1938, and in the years since has served an area principally devoted to agricultural crops of cotton, corn, rice, and soybeans, although the area is growing in the production of beef cattle, dairy animals, hogs, and poultry.

The Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corp., with headquarters in Forrest City, Ark., is the second-largest electric cooperative in Arkansas. This corporation has 3,400 miles of line serving 12,500 members. This organization went into operation in 1938, and serves members in St. Francis, Lee, Phillips, Cross, Crittenden, Woodruff, and Monroe Counties.

The Clay County Electric Cooperative Corp., located in Clay, Greene, and Randolph Counties, has its headquarters at Corning, Ark. This cooperative, since going into operation in November of 1939, has expanded to 1,798 miles of lines serving 6,207 members. Agricultural loads served by this cooperative are broiler operations, livestock, dairying, row crop and rice irrigation and cotton gins.

The Mississippi County Electric Cooperative, Inc., with headquarters in Blytheville, Ark., serves one of the richest agricultural areas in the Midsouth. This pioneer cooperative now has 800 miles of lines serving 4,200 members.

It would not be fitting to report on these fine cooperatives without mentioning some of the men who have made these organizations so successful. For these are the men who have worked through the years to bring electricity to the farms.

I would like to recognize the tireless work of such pioneers as Mr. Leon Presson, president of the Clay County Electric Cooperative Corp., and Mr. Adolph Lillard, their able manager. Others in this organization are Mr. J. Frank Ellis, Mr. Thomas Hall, Mr. Paul Moore, Mr. Clois Butler, Mr. C. T. Johnson, Mr. Mack Dalton, Mr. Roy Creek, Mr. W. Z. Porter, and the Honorable E. G. Ward.

In the Craighead organization are such fine men as Mr. S. C. Chapin, the president, and their fine administrative manager, Mr. Earl Walden. Working with these men are Mr. G. C. Jernigan, Mr. Oscar Robinson, Mr. E. L. Stillions, Mr. L. C. Sloan, Mr. C. H. Montieth, Mr. G. M. Shipman, Mr. W. A. Cunningham, Mr. Raybon Sullivan, Mr. Ode Chipman, Mr. Garland Arrington, and the Honorable Charles Frierson.

Associated with Mr. Charley Lutes, president of the Mississippi County Electric Cooperative, and their fine manager, Mr. H. C. Knappenberger, are Mr. Tom Callis, Mr. Charles R. Coleman, Mr. B. B. Threlkeld, Mr. Claude Duncan, Mr. G. W. Garrigan, Mr. J. B. Johnson, Mr. W. E. Hagan, Mr. R. L. Houck, Mr. Lloyd Shelton, and Mr. Earl Wildy.

In the large Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corp. and working with their president, Mr. John Doyel, and their fine manager, Mr. T. E. Bostick, are Mr. J. E. Breeding, Mr. V. O. Turner, Mr. James Smith, Mr. E. E. James, Mr. Joseph Whittenton, Mr. J. Crossett, Mr. Carson Brown, Mr. John Brooks, Mr. Homer G. Townes, and their excellent attorney, the Honorable John Eldridge, Jr.

These men, pioneers all in this great work, are continuing to give their service to their neighbors in the work of the REA.

The Meaning of Mother's Day in the Free World and Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have been setting aside special days to emphasize certain human relationships, among them Mother's Day. We have agreed that on the second Sunday in May of each year we will pay tribute to the virtues of motherhood, the love, the courage, and the strength of mothers down the ages, which we recognize as the molding and steadying force in every normal childhood and in every happy home.

There are many things I could say about the custom we are establishing—for to me these days are useful only if they give to every one of the 365 days of our calendar year a deeper sense of what these relationships mean. But today I want to speak for a few minutes about the use being made of Mother's Day and of Children's Day by the Communists who have become so consummately skillful in using the emotions of men and women to hide their purposes.

Women who believe in God—no matter what their form of belief—cannot do less than resent the the use the Communists are making of women in all lands—using words to deceive, to cover up reality. And they exploit these words and send them out to all the corners of the earth.

DANGER SIGNALS

Let me give you some danger signals:

On March 8 of each year, the Communist world celebrates International Women's Day. On this day the International Federation of Democratic Women mobilizes its 66 million women all over the world. On this day Communist women display their power and their contribution to building up the Communist world. All Communist governments, all Communist parties of all countries give special attention to this day, and praise the women for what they have done and scold them for what they failed to do. This is the day when Communist women feel the public tribute paid to them and when they are made to feel how important and how needed they are as a factor in building up communism. The wife is expected to influence her husband, the mother to educate the children, the working woman to speed up production to build the Communist state. Women in politics are expected to do a tremendous job as propaganda agents, as information agents, and as legislators to press for laws that aid the Communist plan.

On June 1 of each year the Communist-dominated world celebrates Children's Day on the national and international level. On this day they show the world "the wonderful Communist children—loyal to the State, and so mature when they reach the age of 14 that they do not need the guidance of their parents any more. They are free to do what they please. At this time it becomes their right and duty to spy on their parents and to do all assignments given them by the party leaders.

I would urge you to read the readily available Communist pamphlets on the Education of Communist Youth, to understand what is actually being done to youth.

COMMUNIST MOTHER'S DAY

On the 18th of June, a matter of only a few weeks from now, Communist Mother's Day will be tuned to the note of hate of the West, and above all else, hate of America. And in July another

World Congress of Mothers will be called. At this Congress an appeal will be addressed to all mothers everywhere—an emotional appeal—to ban atomic war, to stop "American imperialism" and its interference in the affairs of other countries. It will urge all mothers to work for peace and brotherly love among all nations. It will be beamed to the hearts of the mothers of the West—to the trusting women of the free world who listen eagerly to all voices in support of peace. But we women of America—yes, and our men as well—with women everywhere should listen intelligently. We should not permit ourselves to accept these high-sounding words until we have examined the kind of "peace" that is being offered us by the Communist leaders. We should be keenly aware that the Communist Mother's World Congress combines its channels of propaganda with those of the Vienna Peace Conference. We should be alert to see what a truly terrific outlet this gives with which to flood our press, etc. Somehow we must be prepared to refute this propaganda immediately and effectively, or we give the impression that what they say is true: that America is the aggressor and the warmonger, while Communists are doves of peace.

We who live in this free America—especially we who are women, whether we be mothers in fact or not—feel an especial urgency to bring to all people everywhere the realization of what the inevitable results will be should communism be able to becloud the true issues so thoroughly that women and men as well permit themselves to be taken in by their words.

What channels do we free people here in America have to counteract the floods upon floods of propaganda that are constantly poured over us and the increased flood that will be loosed on these special dates?

We have the United States Information Agency and we should use it more intelligently. We should see to it that it has the personnel and the tools to do a real job for us. I am thoroughly aware of the criticisms that have been hurled at it—some justified but much not justified—but it is our one general channel. Then there is Radio Free Europe that is doing much. We could concentrate our subject matter and refute the dove of peace of the hammer and sickle.

WOMEN FOR FREEDOM OF EUROPE

We have in our midst also a woman's group whose knowledge is far beyond our own, because it is drawn from personal experience and from the constant flow of information from the curtained countries that are theirs.

I speak of Women for Freedom of Europe, Inc. This organization at 8 West 40th Street, New York, is a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Its president is Geraldine Fitch; the chairman of its advisory board is Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, one of the finest representatives of American womanhood. These women have undertaken to study and analyze from firsthand information, the social changes introduced in these Communist and Communist-dominated lands, and to learn the effects of these changes upon the lives of women and their families. A seminar now in progress at the Baltic House of Freedom in New York City is giving out important information about the laws recently introduced in order to Sovietize the pattern of family life, the education of children—and again I urge you to read Lenin's brochure on the Education of Communist Youth—and the working conditions imposed upon women. We Americans should know more of the actual conditions. It is so difficult for us to picture such a situation. We do not realize how vital it is that we who are still free should work together to retain our freedom.

As you well know, Communist propaganda is constantly telling their own people and the world that only the U. S. S. R. works for peace—that America is responsible for all the war talk—all their need for ever more war strength. And they are good at it. Do not mistake that.

CONTRASTS IN PEACE EFFORTS

Let me review a few things which would seem not only to disprove their contentions, but to paint the picture in its true colors.

The historic record of the American people for peace stands despite the Communist labels of "warmonger" and "aggressor." The quick demobilization of the American forces after the war, tells clearly our dislike of war and love of peace. By contrast the whole Russian Army is still under arms and ready for action, with armies of the captive countries gradually integrated into a joint Soviet military plan. Drawn up this February by Soviet officiers and military delegates this plan designated Hungary, together with Bulgaria and Romania, as the second defense line. The delegates of the satellite states proposed that each country have its own military command with Soviet officers as "liaison." The Russians counterproposed that Russian military headquarters be set up in each country and their "proposal" was "accepted" by all the delegates, as the Minsk resolution. In view of the impending ratification of the Austrian Peace Treaty which implies withdrawal of Russian troops from Austria, Hungary and Romania, the Minsk resolution supplies another pretext for keeping the Russian armies in these countries.

After the Second World War the Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan for international agency control of atomic production was blocked by Soviet veto in the United Nations. Also another generous effort for the sharing of "atoms-for-peace" was presented by President Eisenhower to the United Nations and accepted by the General Assembly in November 23, 1954.

Assistance was originated and largely underwritten by the United States through the Marshall Plan, NATO, and the Point Four Program for the Underdeveloped countries. This is elequent testimony of the American people's striving for world peace based on higher standards of living, with freedom and justice strengthened by economic security and without political influence.

In the treatment of former enemies America actually donated billions of dollars for the reconstruction of Japan and Italy, while Soviet Russia looted billions' worth from the captive countries. Today Japan is a free country, with its own foreign policy as is Western Germany.

I could name many more matters which show our good faith, and the Communist infidelities. But my purpose today is not tied to these things. My purpose is to draw the attention of all women to the need for intelligent thought and action lest we let the soft words of those who talk peace, deafen us to the steady and persistent beat of the drums of war from which they emanate.

Peace never comes easily for it is a quality of the heart, of the personality. The work for peace is not a matter of mass gatherings, and propaganda banners. The work for peace involves instead a constant vigilance against the slavery which the Soviets are forcing upon millions and millions of people in the name of peace.

We who are free women in a free land must keep faith with our own dedication to peace and also with the trust that women of the rest of the world have placed in American womanhood. We must recognize the false and stand firmly behind each true and since step toward a just and lasting peace.

Such a rededication of ourselves to the true meaning of freedom, which after all is our responsibility to the Infinite, can bring new meaning to our so-called Mother's Day. May we work unceasingly and humbly that freedom may be reborn across the world.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY

Even before I had the responsibility of chairmanship of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs having to do with national and international movements, the committee that drafted the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, I had concerned myself with communism and its teachings, it methods, its goals. Insofar as I have been able, I have followed the tragic history of those peoples and countries who are behind the curtain, hoping that other countries and other peoples might learn from these tragedies and not be engulfed.

Let me give you something of the history as it has been laid bare:

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Ever since World War I, as an active and loyal member of the League of Nations, Czechoslovakia kept a constant record for peace and international cooperation. Confronted by the increased Nazi menace, it supplemented its system of alliances with France and the Little Entente by a treaty with the Soviet Union in 1935, which was renewed in December 1943, and was clearly based on nonintervention by the U. S. S. R. in the internal affairs of the postwar Czechoslovak Republic. Yet, its genuine effort to promote European reconstruction and the work of the United Nations was abruptly ended by combined machinations of the Soviet Union and its Communist agents within. By a violent coup Czechoslovakia was deprived of its traditional role of working for peace, its

democratic system was overthrown, and its people drawn into the orbit of Soviet slavery.

BALTIC STATES

Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Estonia and Latvia, existed in peace with Russia ever since the establishment of their independence in 1918. In the course of good neighborliness, peace treaties were made, nonaggression pacts signed, and mutual-assistance treaties concluded. The mutual-assistance treaties were for a term of 15 years. Yet within 8 months these Baltic States fell under such ruthless occupation as history has seldom recorded.

In Estonia, according to verified data, about 60,000 persons were deported to the Soviet Union in 1940–41. About 2,000 men and women were executed on the spot; 9,229 of the deported or murdered were minors or children under 20 years of age. In 1949 a considerably larger number of people were deported than during the mass deportation in 1941.

In Latvia, during the first occupation in 1940–41, a total of 37,500 persons was deported. Including the subsequent deportations after the reoccupation of the country in 1944, the allover amount is far over 100,000 persons.

Since the first mass deportation of the horrible night of June 13–14 in 1941, in Lithuania, six other deportations have taken place, taking young people, fathers, mothers, and children. Eighty-three thousand Lithuanians were driven off in the early part of May 1945. In May 22, 1948, Lithuania lost more than 100,000 of her inhabitants in a single night.

DEPORTATIONS

Today deportations proceed under the guise of voluntary work in remote regions of Russia, where the deportees are forced to perform specified duties and labor voluntarily. They are forced to sign a statement that they are leaving voluntarily for work in such-and-such brotherly republic or autonomous district. At designated points, these deportees are classified, some to go to penal camps, some to forced labor, some to free exile, which covers women and children. The places of deportees are filled by newcomers from Russia. Recent escapees from Vorkuta and other camps bring news of thousands of those Balts, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Rumanians, and Poles laboring unto death in the mines, railroad building, fisheries, and forests of the western Ural region.

This is the Communist peace that was accorded the Baltic States when they trusted the false independence, autonomy, and coexistence promised by the Soviets. Similar Soviet pattern was followed in other countries, like Bulgaria, which was also taken over, the Russian troops exercising pressure which gradually led to the transformation of the coalition cabinet in September 1944 into purely Communist government. From 1945 to 1947 thousands of members of the Peasant Party of the opposition in Parliament were imprisoned and their leader, Nicolas Petkoff, executed.

RUMANIA

Next was Rumania. On April 3, 1944, Molotov, the Soviet Minister of Soviet Affairs, in the course of the Rumanian armistice negotiations, made the following statement:

The Soviet Government declares that it does not pursue the aim of conquering any part of Rumanian territory or of changing in whatever manner the existing social order in Rumania. It equally declares that the entry in Rumania of Soviet troops is solely the consequence of military necessities and of the continuation of resistance of the enemy troops.

This solemn statement was repeated by Molotov on August 23, 1944, when Rumania joined the allied forces:

In the face of events in Rumania, the Soviet Government considers that it would not be without value to confirm the declaration it made in April this year, to the effect that the Soviet Union does not intend to appropriate any part of Rumania or to change the established social regime in that country, or, furthermore, to limit in any way whatever the independence of Rumania.

Almost at the same time, Vishinsky arrived in Rumania to overthrow the coalition government under the pressure of Russian tanks and force upon the country the Communist regime. Right now the Sovietskaya Moldavia of March 31, 1955, announced the planned displacement of the whole population of Bessarabia and Moldavia to Astrakhan, Rostof, and Pavlodar in Central Asia. One million six hundred thousand people, women and children and old people, are among those to be moved to a virgin cold region, where there is nothing but the bare frozen ground. These people are Rumanians, and the territory was incorporated in the U. S. S. R. at the peace treaty.

The same pattern was used in Hungary. In Hungary reports tell that in March 1955, while the Communists vigorously stepped up their peace campaign, the Government issued a decree stipulating that within a period of 14 days the enemies of the people be evicted from Budapest and other major cities.

The people of the captive countries have peace treaties, but they have no peace. Their countries have been looted under various pretexts. The misery and suffering of their people is hard to imagine by American standards. They have lost their freedom and are cut off from the rest of the world. Their people are subject to slavery, imprisonment, and mass deportation.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the peace the Communists offer the world.

Warrior-Tombigbee River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last a number of citizens of Alabama, who are interested in the development of the Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers and of the improvement of Alabama's only seaport at Mobile, Ala., appeared before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Appropriations Committee in behalf of the appropriations approved by the Budget Bureau on the Warrior lock and dam—$4,100,000—and of the 40-foot channel from Mobile Harbor to the mouth of Mobile Bay 500 feet wide in the bay, with 42 feet over the bar—$1 million to start the work of deepening and widening this channel which is estimated to cost a total of $5,971,000.

Mr. John M. Griser, of Mobile, who is president of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, which organization is a nonprofit association, was among those who appeared before the subcommittee and his statement is so comprehensive and so fully explanatory that I wish to insert his remarks in the RECORD. Mr. Griser is one of the outstanding civil leaders of Mobile, and has, down through the years, taken an active part in the development of the waterways in the State of Alabama. He is president of the Alabama Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Co., one of the largest shipbuilding and ship repair plants in the South:

STATEMENT OF WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 5, 1955

I am John M. Griser, president of Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, which has its offices located in Birmingham. The organization is a nonprofit association made up of members throughout Alabama's Warrior-Tombigbee River Valley. The association has one purpose: to seek development of the water resources of this valley for better use for navigation, for industry, for agriculture, for domestic consumption, and for recreation. We fully recognize as do the members of this committee, that these uses are all interlocked and that the developments we seek must be governed by a standard which will result finally in deriving the greatest public benefits possible from our water resources.

At the same time we must recognize that the Warrior-Tombigbee is already a vital, principal commercial artery serving an established industrial area whose heavy, basic industries are important factors in not only the economy of the Southeast but the Nation as well. The area's industrial growth continues to keep pace with the needs of the region and in line with the national average. One of the basic factors in promoting the industrial progress of the area is the availability of water transportation on the river system, as well as the availability of access to world trade through the fine Gulf port in Mobile Bay into which the river empties.

While we are interested in all the complex phases of water resource development which must be practiced in our river valleys, and while we are aware of the need for maintaining carefully balanced development to protect fully the public interest in every phase of water use, we come before this committee asking consideration and assistance primarily for navigation purposes.

This is the fourth consecutive year that representatives of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association have appeared before members of this committee. I am sure you are as well informed on most aspects of the project as we are. However, I do want to call certain facts briefly to your attention.

The public interest in the development of this river system is greater today than it has ever been. The interest in the program of our association, in the progress of work on the river, and the interest in use of the

river is more widespread and more intensive than it has ever been in the past.

Shippers, barge and towboat operators, and to some extent the public gained a new concept of the value of navigation improvements on the Warrior-Tombigbee River last August when the new Demopolis Lock and Dam was opened to traffic midway on the river system. This new facility made it possible to cut transportation costs on the river by a full 10 percent. Plans are underway for industrial expansion in the dam area. Heightened interest in water recreation above the dam is already adding a steady flow of dollars into the service economy of the area.

We are here, particularly, today to ask this committee's approval for a second appropriation for construction of the second such navigation facility on the waterway. This is the $19 million Warrior Lock and Dam on which construction was started last fall under an initial appropriation of $1,800,000. Warrior Lock and Dam is a replacement for existing Locks and Dams 8 and 9 which were built in 1903 and 1902, respectively. These locks were built for packet boats. They provide lifts of 10 and 11 feet, respectively. They are 284 feet long by 2 feet wide. Both the lock chambers and the dams are in such condition from age and wear and tear that a reputable civil engineer who made a study of lock and dam 9 for our association 2 years ago concluded that "To keep these structures in even a reasonable state of repair, that will permit operation of the lock, must involve a tremendous maintenance effort. To put them in acceptable state of repair is obviously impractical and probably impossible. While this report does not intend to suggest imminent complete failure of either the lock or dam, it does not rule out the possibility of such failure. There is, however, basis for the premise that even now there is not time for adequate replacement before failure." Maintenance by the Corps of Engineers has kept the structures operating but their basic condition is getting worse all the time.

As an indication of the public interest in the improvement of this river and particularly in the building of Warrior lock and dam, I would like to point out that 650 people gathered at a remote, isolated, and poorly accessible site on the river in October of last year to participate with the Corps of Engineers and 8 Members of Alabama's 11-Member delegation in the Congress in ground-breaking ceremonies.

There is in the budget under consideration an item of $4,100,000 of construction money for Warrior lock and dam. In our estimation it is money that is needed for worthwhile improvement of an already navigable waterway that is paying good dividends on investments already made and which in our estimation will return even greater benefits in the future. We earnestly ask your approval of the full amount in the budget for this project.

Four completely new locks and dams will be required to modernize the navigation facilities on Warrior-Tombigbee. Demopolis, which is practically finished, and Warrior, which is under construction, represent half of these facilities. Looking ahead in hopes that Congress will see fit to provide the funds to complete the modernization of this inland navigation channel in orderly, systematic fashion, we urge your consideration and approval to provide adequate planning and investigation funds for the Corps of Engineers. As a representative of a region that has a relatively small stake in the $3,600,000 included in the current budget for general investigations by the Corps of Engineers, we nevertheless recognize the need for such funds to be provided for the Corps. Good business practice requires that planning work proceed systematically far in advance of actual construction.

The next navigation project on Warrior-Tombigbee will be in the lower reaches of the river. There is at present a conflict of interest involved in the project. The conflict concerns the amount of land to be flooded. We are confident that the Corps of Engineers will find a way to design improvements to provide maximum efficiency of the river for navigation and at the same time minimize the amount of productive land affected. But this very conflict of interest and the need to find a mutually satisfactory solution emphasizes the need for the Corps to have adequate general investigation funds.

Ours was one of the first complete river systems in the United States that was authorized for Federal improvement. Today it is one of the most run-down river systems being used as a principal artery of commerce. In its present condition, with 2 of our locks and dams only 1½ miles apart and some of the others only 3, 4, and 5 miles apart, the river is actually crowded. There are 22 towboat and barge operators on the river with 44 towboats and 204 registered barges in operation. In barges that average only a little more than 500-tons capacity, they are carrying commerce at a rate this year well in excess of 3 million tons annually. They navigate over 467 miles of channel that has a 255-foot fall in 277 miles now canalized by 13 locks and dams. The upper half of the river flows through a narrow rock gorge. The lower half flows through a relatively flat plain where the river winds constantly and at times abruptly through soft soil where the banks are constantly eroding. Consequently, the Warrior-Tombigbee from Tuscaloosa south for 250 miles, except for the new Demopolis pool, requires constant maintenance dredging. We have the highest regard for the office of the Mobile District Engineer of the Corps of Engineers for the fine job of maintenance that has been done with limited funds. At the same time we ask this committee to recommend adequate inland waterway channel maintenance funds from which we on the Warrior-Tombigbee may receive our fair and proportionate share to keep our commerce moving.

Mobile Bay, into which this river system flows, affords access to oceangoing shipping over a federally maintained ship channel that was first authorized by the Congress in 1826. Last year the Congress authorized a project to deepen and widen the ship channel in Mobile Bay. The present project depth is 32 feet with 36 feet over the outer bar. The present project width is 300 feet in the channel with a 450-foot width over the bar. These project controls were established in 1934 when commerce through the port totaled 3,700,000 tons. Six years ago, in 1949, the people of Mobile and the shipping interests using the port asked for and were given a public hearing by the Corps of Engineers on the project. At that time they asked the corps to recommend a 40-foot channel. The corps did so and last year Congress approved the project for a 40-foot channel, 500 feet wide in the bay, with 42 feet over the bar. I mention this chronology of events to point out that the need for this project has been recognized for a number of years, and the need continues to grow. Tonnage handled through the port now exceeds 12 million tons annually. A major portion of this tonnage is bulk materials which can be most economically carried in deeper-draft vessels—vessels drawing in excess of 27 feet of water. Industries operating bulk material-handling plants at Mobile have added several million tons of capacity to their facilities in the last year. The vessels supplying these plants are giving up cargo ranging from 2,000 tons to 8,000 tons on every trip because the channel cannot accommodate them fully loaded. In the first 11 months of 1954, 608 vessels entered the port of Mobile which drew in excess of 27 feet of water when fully loaded. Not only do these deep-draft vessels lose cargo but they operate under constant hazardous conditions because of depth and width limitations of the channel.

There is an item of $1 million in the budget now under consideration to start the work of deepening and widening the Mobile ship channel which is estimated to cost a total of $5,971,000. We understand this project is estimated to return $2.77 in benefits for every $1 of expenditure—a very favorable ratio. We know the deeper, wider channel is greatly needed and we urge approval of funds for the work.

California Senate Resolves Memorializing Congress Stating That Civil Defense Is Primarily Federal Government Responsibility

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I wish to call your attention, and that of my other distinguished colleagues, a letter to me from the secretary of the Senate of California, together with the text of California State Senate Joint Resolution 24:

SENATE, CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
Sacramento, Calif., May 5, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Pursuant to instructions by the senate, I am handing you herewith a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 24, to which I respectfully invite your attention.

Very truly yours,

J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate.

Senate Joint Resolution 24

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to study the problems involved in civil defense

Whereas recent scientific developments have so altered previous civil-defense planning that it has now become apparent that an effective national civil-defense program can only be achieved by the Federal Government's acceptance of responsibility for both defining and financing such a program; and

Whereas the previous position of the Federal Government that civil defense is primarily a responsibility of the several States controverts the Federal Constitution which clearly assigns the responsibility for the common defense to the National Government; and

Whereas it has been clearly demonstrated during the past 4½ years that with the several States dependent upon each other for civil-defense support, many States are neither financially able nor inclined to go along with the current Federal program, which demands matching-fund participation to the degree necessary to provide adequate fall-back support for their sister States; and

Whereas California's neighboring State of Nevada has recognized its inability to provide adequate support for the people of California in the event of an enemy attack and its legislature has adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to make adequate provisions for such an event by establishing Federal supply reserves east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to study the problems involved in the new concept of civil defense resulting from the greater destructive powers of presently developed weapons and make adequate plans to realistically provide an effective national civil-defense program to the extent necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy.

Farley Addresses Career Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to insert the following address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the fifth annual conference at Tennessee A. and I. University in Nashville:

It has been quite some time since I have had the pleasure of visiting in Tennessee. Therefore, it gives me great satisfaction that you, Dr. Davis, and your fine staff here at Tennessee A. and I. State University have granted me this opportunity to come to Nashville.

This university has taken this period to show to the people of Tennessee, likewise the people of the entire United States, that it is fully cognizant of the role of education in the preparation of tomorrow's citizens, the heirs to America's greatness, and the most definite assurances that this Nation shall continue to flourish as a great and forward-moving democracy. For, to say the least, today's investment in our children is a tangible investment in our tomorrow.

I, therefore, wish to commend the progressive leadership, that this institution is affording in these events to the State of Tennessee and to the rest of the Nation and several foreign countries through the boys and girls who have found their way here.

The fact that Tennessee A. and I. State University in these projects has extended itself both beyond and below the level of its instructional obligations is another reason that indicates its depth of interest in a broader scope of educational service.

In the days just passed this institution has sponsored a marketing clinic, principally designed to aid the needs of men and women of the postcollege level who are engaged in the fields of marketing, advertising, and sales promotion.

Today, here in this vast arena, we view the eager and inspired faces of high school and college youngsters, and one cannot but offer commendation to Tennessee A. and I. State University for its generous foresight—indeed, its sincerity of purpose as it fosters these opportunities of enlightenment for the high-school students, its college enrollees, and men and women already launched upon their career.

My long experience in public life vividly testifies to me that the sort of results, here witnessed, could not have come of reality through mere circumstantial incident. Governor Clement, the fact that this institution on this beautiful hill, with its magnificent plant and its useful educational program, fortified by a will to serve, is, to say the least, a tribute to Tennessee.

So I feel the need to compliment, likewise the State of Tennessee, you, its first citizen, your predecessors in the Governnor's chambers, and the unit of this State's administrative arm which is entrusted with the important and challenging responsibility of providing your youth with the best educational experience that may be afforded.

Consider me not naive to the point, Mr. Davis, that it may be concluded that I feel that this institution, or any other such institution in the State of Tennessee or elsewhere in the Nation, has arrived at a point of static existence or a level of diminishing returns, for such cannot be true in a society in which needs change every day and challenges become greater.

But you and I, our precious boys and girls, can gather hope in the fact that Tennessee and the rest of the Nation will find ways and means, regardless of the race, color, or creed of the child, to assure it of the finest possible educational opportunity. And, thus, it was in this frame of mind that I accepted the invitation to come to Nashville.

Before I address myself to the subject of careers, since I am mindful of the fact that my role here today is that of keynoting the career conference, which this meeting officially opens, I would like to make a further observance.

I feel that the importance of the activities being held here during this period takes an added significance in acknowledgment of the consideration education is giving to business. I sense here a locking of arms between education and business, which is indeed wholesome in its implications. Beyond doubt, if we, as a Nation and a world leader in the system of free, competitive enterprise are to survive education and business must continue and accelerate this type of mutual cooperation.

Education has the obligation to prepare our young people for useful and productive roles in business and the many and important occupational areas which contribute, directly and indirectly, to the Nation's economy, and business has the responsibility of working with educators in vocational efforts such as this present career conference, as well as of offering challenging opportunities for the school trainee in areas for which he or she might be best suited.

In this sort of setting, my young people, you are called upon to exert a self-determination over which you as individuals have primary control. You must, within yourselves, decide what you wish to attain in life and establish within your hearts and souls a determination to achieve these objectives. I am suggesting, therefore, that the first steps toward a fruitful career rest within you as persons and finally only you can foster your inner urge for successful achievement.

You may choose one of the professions, the arts or the sciences, or a career in marketing, or selling, or any line of business or service endeavor. However, your first responsible to this chosen career is that of gaining for yourself a firm and sound foundation in its background—you must strive toward excellency in your everyday school work.

In searching for a subject upon which to address you this morning, I naturally concluded upon one with which I have had a close association for most of my life. I have been engaged in selling for a long time, therefore, I have chosen to speak with you on the subject of selling or salesmanship as a career. However, I do not proposed to represent myself as an expert in salesmanship. I am not a professor of salesmanship.

Nevertheless, let us take a look at the item, selling—this profession which we call salesmanship. I do not know of a truer statement than the famous remark of one of my very good friends and fellow salesmen, who says: "Nothing ever happens until somebody sells something." That is true in every field of endeavor, and it has been true since the beginning of time. To translate any worthwhile project, an abstract idea into concrete action, somebody has got to sell something.

Somebody has been selling something to get action right here on this campus and we see the tangible results all about us. It was somebody selling something, too, that has brought our country back and up and out of every crisis in its remarkable history. Through it all, creative salesmanship, somebody selling something, has made or remade or made greater our grand Nation.

Just what is salesmanship? There are a lot of fancy definitions, some of which you may have read. Of those that I have seen, I like the following best. It was put together by Dr. Alfred Gross, professor of marketing at New York University. In his book on salesmanship, Dr. Gross says: "Salesmanship is the art of increasing the satisfaction of customers by persuading them to buy specific goods or services as the best solution to their needs and desires."

That is very comprehensive, is it not? Notice that he says: It is an art; that it increases satisfaction; by persuading customers to buy; specific goods or services; as the best solution; to their needs and desires.

Now let us take Dr. Gross' 6 points and consider them 1 at a time:

First, it is an art, he says. I do not necessarily limit it to art for I rather consider it a profession and I think it is taking on those characteristics more every day. Of course, it is not taught as formally as other professions but the successful salesman will study it in all its phases, just as a doctor or lawyer would study his profession.

The label of art is appropriate, of course, when you consider that salesmanship, the most successful salesmanship, requires talent. Some people say a salesman is born, not made. I do not agree. Of course, all salesmen must have ability. Some have more inherently than others but all need study and training, whether talented or not. Naturally, the greater native intelligence you have the more likely you are to succeed as a salesman.

In point 2, he says salesmanship increases satisfaction. I think that is obvious. It must increase satisfaction or the customer will not buy.

Point 3, persuading them to buy, is very important. There is where the real talent comes in. Some people limit their definition of salesmanship to the art of persuasion and if we had no other that would not be a bad one.

But do not overlook the last word in the point 3 phrase, persuding them to buy. That word buy, which means that the sale is completed, is the real essential. All the persuasion in the world is of no account unless the customer buys or, as they used to say, unless he signs on the dotted line.

Point 4 is easy, specific goods or services. He means, of course your goods or services.

Point 5, as the best solution. In other words, any other action than buying will not solve the customer's problem. It must be the best solution.

And, point 6, to their needs and desires. I think he means that the salesman sees the need, points it out to the customer, then converts the need into a desire. Remember, this all takes place in the mind of the customer. And it happens when the need becomes a desire, or in my words, when the need becomes a want.

Now I know there are many good salesmen who never heard of that definition of sales-

manship. And if they never learn it they will probably continue to be good salesmen. It just happens they have what it takes.

But I would not venture to say that all of them might be better salesmen if they knew it and remembered the important elements. Surely I am safe in commending it to those of you who may enter the field.

Let us consider another important phase of salesmanship—the customer. Obviously, without a customer you cannot make a sale. The business analysts tell us there are three kinds of customers. I understand this is particularly true in retail salesmanship but I believe it is true also to a degree of all the other kinds, too. They say there are the casual, the attracted, and the permanent customer.

The casual customer, of course, is the fellow you catch on the wing. He is on the move and he just happens to come your way. Naturally, you cannot borrow much money on the prospective commissions you are going to get from the casual customer.

The attracted customer is a little better security because he is your man. And he is your man because of something you or your firm has done; some of your effort may be in the form of advertising or sales promotion has brought him to you. And you can count on him, or others like him, coming to you if you continue the volume and quality of your promotion effort.

But the customer of the highest degree, of course, is the permanent customer. He is your man and you can count on him. He will continue to be your man so long as you treat him right; so long as you give the quality merchandise and the quality of service and satisfaction it took to make him your customer in the first place.

A good thing about him is that every time you sell him, under those circumstances, he becomes more permanent than ever. Now your job as a true salesman is to convert these three types, ultimately into the one type. You turn a casual customer into an attracted customer and you make the attracted customer a permanent customer.

How can you do this?

Well, that is where most of the art of selling comes into play. But surely the real basis of it all lies in creating a relationship of mutual trust and confidence between you and the customer. It goes without saying, you must have a good product, a product you know is good, and you must know it thoroughly.

A complete knowledge of the product you are selling is indispensable to successful salesmanship. There is no place today for high-pressure methods or any kind of misrepresentation. The key to making any customer a permanent customer is the Golden Rule.

So, probably first, the salesman should have a depth of sincere integrity. Then he should have imagination, the ability to deal with unexpected situations. His curiosity about people should be of the genuine type, and in which he receives enjoyment from studying and understanding people. His education should be broad and diversified and of the sort that gives widespread interest in many facets of life. And, above all, he must be enterprising, possessed of determination to get ahead.

In my opinion, salesmanship would offer a fruitful career for any of you young people who may desire to enter the field. The income of our population is greater today than ever before in our Nation's history, and the people of the United States have greater leisure than ever before. As a consequence, we have more money to spend for the many fine things that are now available to us and greater time to enjoy these items. Therefore, I do not hesitate in the least to recommend salesmanship to you as a career.

So once again, I wish to express my sincere gratitude for the opportunity which has been afforded me to come to Nashville to address this opening session of the fifth annual career conference of Tennessee A. and I. State University.

Dr. Davis, you and your competent staff and faculty are indeed to be complimented for the tangible interest that you are showing in the youth of your State as well as to such people as the membership of the National Association of Market Developers and the men and women who travel to this location each year to be a part of your marketing clinic.

There is hope and there will always be hope for the perpetuation of the American way of life as long as there are institutions of learning such as this one. To you young people let me say in closing, there are many opportunities, many careers awaiting you if you will dream and work to make your dreams come true. I feel the need to try to impress upon you, however, that your self-determination to succeed in whatever career you may choose will depend to no small degree upon your desire to excel.

Therefore, you must be resourceful, flexible, and possessed of personal initiative. The world may not come looking for you, but it will certainly receive you if you carry to it the best in training, ideas, and a determination to succeed.

Last but not least, let us not overlook this other essential, work. It is not very glamorous but it surely produces results. There is no royal road to knowledge; no plush carpets leading to success; and any one will tell you that salesmanship is no exception to the rule.

Some salesmen do it easier than others; some organize it better than others; some are more proficient; some more talented. But this is always true, the more calls you make the more sales you make. It is just that simple. So, in the words of Roger Babson: "Tackle more than you can do, then do it. Bite off more than you can chew, then chew it. Hitch your wagon to a star; just keep your seat and there you are."

We Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American April 29, 1955:

WE AGREE

When the Brooklyn Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Hamilton was constructed original plans called for a large, nonsectarian chapel.

It was never built.

For reasons known best to Washington bureaucrats, a change in orders resulted in the present small place of worship.

All major veterans organizations are agreed that the substitute is completely inadequate to serve the religious needs of the almost 1,000 men and women who are patients at the hospital.

Recently, following protests led by Brooklyn Post, No. 500, of the American Legion, the Government attempted to make amends by starting installation of new benches and stained glass windows in the small chapel.

We agree with Post 500 that this is a waste of funds under the circumstances. We agree that the only solution is construction of the chapel originally planned.

It should have been done in the first place.

The American Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "The American Press," appearing in the May 7, 1955, issue of the Pilot:

THE AMERICAN PRESS

More than a week ago Dr. Robert Hutchins read the riot act to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It was a stirring and thoughtful speech and said a great many things worth pondering—whether anyone will pay serious attention to it is, of course, another question.

Even those of us who have the largest sympathy for the daily press sometimes get tired of hearing the old platitudes about the importance of the newspaper and how infinitely well it does its job in the American community. All this kind of talk breeds complacency. It is true that the American press is properly lauded for a whole string of virtues—but it is also true that it can do an even better job than what it is doing at the present time. No one knows this better than the editors, but they are not, in every case, able to do much about it.

The policies of many papers, normally set by the publishers, actually determine in advance how the news is handled by the editors and those who work with them. It does not require an alert reader a long time to discover what are the special preferences of a particular paper. It is not too much to say even that each paper has its own bias—its personal set of rules according to which it judges the passing events of the times. This is inevitable, and if it does not distort the news, it presents no great cause for complaint. It does suggest, however, as Dr. Hutchins points out, that a one-paper community is less well off than one which by having several papers presents more than one point of view.

The real crux of the whole question lies in the fact that newspapers are a medium for education. They are not merely informational, or inspirational or comical—they are organs of enlightenment and they have a job to do in the community. They are also, of course, big business and they are expected to make money. When these two interests conflict, however, it is usually the first that gives way to the second. Any one familiar with the press of our country can name several nice fat papers, full of advertising, which if measured on educational value and honest news presentation must be counted total flops.

The obvious question that presents itself at this point is how to reconcile the business and the educational features of the paper so that it is at once a prosperous and effective voice in the community. Neither Dr. Hutchins, nor anyone else, seems able to answer this one in a concrete and acceptable fashion. He suggests setting up a committee of press and lay people who will make annual reports on the effectiveness of our papers as educational media. This will pro-

vide a norm for publishers in testing just how good a job they are doing in some other scale than in that of dollars and cents. Such a plan certainly could work. It would depend so much on the qualifications of the committee.

Farther back in the picture however always stands the personality of the publisher and in the last analysis he is the one who determines what kind of a paper the public gets. Since we have a good, elert, oftentimes brilliant, and steadily courageous American press, we may suppose that we have also good, alert, oftentimes brilliant, and steadily courageous publishers behind it. However it is clear that we can have an even better and more effective American press if we care to. This calls for a larger vision and a greater dedication, once again, on the part of American publishers. It will be decided, we feel, by the answer to one question: Which is more to be valued, the American dollar or the well informed American citizen?

Jeanne D'Arc Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 526th anniversary of a French victory, in the Battle of Orleans, over an army which intended to impose their hostile rule upon the French people. This will to resist oppression was led by a gallant spirit of young womanhood in the person of Joan of Arc.

On the occasion of this anniversary, Philip A. Hart, the Acting Governor of Michigan, has issued a proclamation setting forth May 8 as Jeanne D'Arc Day.

I would like to take this opportunity, under leave to extend my remarks, to insert this proclamation into the RECORD and to show that resistance to hostile rule and oppression is not a recent idea among the free people but an inherent desire dating back many centuries.

I hope that the spirit against oppression as shown by Joan of Arc will continue to live in the hearts of all freedom-loving peoples of this world.

The proclamation follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN, EXECUTIVE OFFICE, LANSING—PROCLAMATION

JEANNE D'ARC DAY

May 8 marks the anniversary of the victory of the French forces led by Jeanne d'Arc at Orleans in 1429. This saintly maiden, canonized in 1920, long has symbolized French resistance to foreign oppression and hostile rule.

This triumph is among the most heralded in military history. But greater far are the vivid examples of virtue and Christian love the world may learn from her life.

It is more than fitting that the State of Michigan pay tribute to the memory of this magnificent girl saint.

Therefore, I, Philip A. Hart, Acting Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim May 8, 1955, as Jeanne D'Arc in Michigan, and urge all citizens to join with their brethren of French descent in paying homage to Jeanne D'Arc and to reflect on the quality of courage and sound value which she so dramatically demonstrated.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 2d day of May, in the year of our Lord 1955 and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

PHILIP A. HART,
Acting Governor.

By the acting governor:
[SEAL] JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

Reduction of Personnel at the Watertown Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statements of Mr. Kenneth T. Lyons, national commander, Federal Employees Veterans Association, Inc., and members of the FEVA Watertown Arsenal Post 5, Mr. John J. McGee, chairman, and Frank P. Brown, James Ready, and Ellis Crossland.

The organization, representing the employees of the Watertown Arsenal, delivered their remarks at a breakfast held at the Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., today, in which they made a direct appeal to the Massachusetts congressional delegation, for assistance in their efforts to prevent the pending layoff at this installation:

The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF KENNETH T. LYONS

Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, once again our organization, representing the employees of the Watertown Arsenal, is making a direct appeal to you to intercede with the Department of Defense and the President of the United States, if need be, to prevent the pending layoff at this installation. Recent developments over the past 6 months lead me to believe that the Watertown Arsenal is going to be reduced to a research and development center, which will necessitate a force of approximately 800 men to operate. The present on-board ceiling at the arsenal is 3,200. This followed a recent reduction in force of 600 men. The arsenal, going into the calendar year of 1955, had a ceiling of 3,800.

I imagine the important issue here is whether or not the reductions in force at the Watertown Arsenal are necessitated by a reduced budget, economy in the Department of the Army, inefficient operation, or lack of productive work. The answer, I believe, is quite simple, in that the Watertown Arsenal through an Executive order, a Defense Department policy, and the recent directive which moved the Army's Weapon Command Center to Rock Island, Ill., are the controlling factors in the deterioration of the Watertown Arsenal.

We only have to look at the work that the arsenal has lost to areas outside the New England area, and I believe you will be able to understand the reasoning behind our request to ask that you demand an investigation of the Defense Department's policy and the action of the Army's Weapons Command Center at Rock Island, Ill., as it concerns the arsenal.

Whoever has been handling the distribution of contracts for the Army certainly sold the Watertown Arsenal down the river. For instance, the original atomic cannon, 280-mm., as it is commonly known, was designed, developed, and built at the Watertown Arsenal. This gun was tested at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds, and much publicity was given to this cannon a few years ago, stressing the quality of workmanship at the Watertown Arsenal, together with the fact that this was the first atomic cannon ever built in the world. No further contracts for this cannon were given to the arsenal. A firm in Pennsylvania received this contract. However, the drawings, research data, and equipment was made available to this firm by the Department of the Army in order that they could go into full production.

Another large gun that was built, developed, and designed at the Watertown Arsenal, commonly known as the 75-millimeter skysweeper, received about as much publicity as the atomic cannon. This was another first for the Watertown Arsenal, but a firm in the Midwest has been given the contract for producing this gun. The tools, jigs, blueprints, drawings, and fixtures had to be moved from the Watertown Arsenal to this firm so that they could go into full production.

The 105-millimeter cannon was designed, developed, and equipped at the Watertown Arsenal but is now being manufactured and produced in plants in Warren, Ohio, and Elwood City, Pa.

The Watertown Arsenal designed, developed, and manufactured the first 280-millimeter shells for the atomic cannon. All these shells were inspected and tested at the arsenal without any failures. A concern outside of Massachusetts is now manufacturing these shells and many of them did not pass the specifications of the Departments of the Army and have had to be condemned. The Watertown Arsenal does not have the contract to manufacture these shells.

Another item which is important to our Defense Department is the field service equipment; that is, spare parts for heavy cannons such as the 280-millimeter and 75-millimeter cannons. Although the Watertown Arsenal formerly had these contracts, they have now been turned over to concerns in the Midwest. The bogies and gun carriages that were formerly manufactured at the Watertown Arsenal have also been turned over to firms in the Midwest and at the present time these firms cannot meet the production quotas set up by the Department of the Army.

Although the Watertown Arsenal was promised the guided missile project, and was assured by officials of the Department of the Army that they would receive the production contracts and research contracts, to our knowledge, none of this work has been assigned to the arsenal.

The cost to the taxpayer of manufacturing and producing these weapons, while higher than that of firms that are now manufacturing these same weapons is quite understandable, as the Watertown Arsenal has to design, develop, and test all of the pilot models that are introduced to our Nation's armory. The first cannon could thus conceivably cost 5 to 6 times that of continuing models that are manufactured. The firms that have received these contracts receive the finished product following the development and years of research that had to be initiated at Watertown.

There's no doubt that the Watertown Arsenal can design, develop, and manufacture heavy guns more economically than any other arsenal in the world. Now I think we should look into the matter of efficiency of operation and quality of workmanship as a guide for further contracts. I distinctly recall a letter I sent to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee during the fall of 1954 wherein our organization was

alarmed over some of the materials that were being manufactured by private contractors and these same materials could not withstand tests that were being conducted at the Watertown Arsenal. One of these in particular was the cylinders that were being manufactured by a private concern for the 280 mm. guns. These cylinders were originally designed and manufactured at the arsenal. However, the contract was given to a private manufacturer and then assembled at the Watertown Arsenal. During one of the tests of these cylinders an employee of the arsenal had his leg torn off and has been in the hospital for almost a year now and will be a cripple for life. It was only a miracle that many other employees were not killed or maimed at the arsenal as a result of this explosion. It would be interesting to ask the Department of the Army how many of these cylinders that were manufactured by this private contractor exploded at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. We can proudly point to the fact that the arsenal's record of manufacturing was perfect on all tests on these cylinders.

It is my belief and contention that to turn over to private contractors the manufacture of such highly technical and intricate weapons, when they do not possess the type of skilled gunsmiths, craftsmen, and technicians as that of the Army's arsenal, would be tantamount to disaster and a major scandal could develop in our armaments production.

I am in hopes that the Massachusetts congressional delegation will issue a unanimous protest to the Secretary of Defense and request that he take immediate steps to channel some of the lost contracts back to the Watertown Arsenal, both for the efficiency of the service and for the economy of the area here in Massachusetts. We certainly are not being treated very fairly by the administration when you consider the fact that the major portion of the contracts for heavy defense equipment has been given to firms in the Midwest and yet Massachusetts has been for the past two centuries the arms center of the Nation and the world.

If no action is taken on your request to the Defense Department the Watertown Arsenal will definitely be reduced to a research laboratory, and this will mean a reduction of over 2,000 employees within the very near future. We cannot allow this to happen.

WATERTOWN ARSENAL POST, NO. 5, FEDERAL EMPLOYEES VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC.

The vast membership of the Federal Employees Veterans Association, Post No. 5, at the Watertown arsenal, and the more than 3,000 employees at this installation feel that there are certain very important basic reasons why the layoffs should be stopped and more work sent to this arsenal.

1. Greater Boston has a tremendous amount of skilled labor that is not being utilized. Industry in this area is very depressed and if it is to be kept alive at all, the skills of these mechanics must be preserved.

2. The Watertown arsenal which has been the Country's foremost research and development center has been reduced to a mere depot. Back in the 1870's, the Watertown arsenal pioneered the entire steel industry as we know it today, with its tests to prove the durability and elasticity of steel in making guns.

3. The Federal Government should remember that New England contributes a very large amount of Federal taxes and therefore it is not unusual for us to expect the Government to spend money and provide work for its installations in New England and the Greater Boston area.

4. We feel, one and all, that the withholding and removing of vital work from the Watertown arsenal is a complete discredit to the highly skilled personnel now employed there. Since this is not a recession or a depression, we can find absolutely no justification for this unjust act of taking work away from Government installations and turning it over to big business.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC., ADDRESS OF JOHN J. MCGEE, CHAIRMAN, FEVA COMMITTEE, TO THE MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, may I take this opportunity to express our deepest appreciation for those of you who have been kind enough, and courteous enough to come to this meeting.

We have come to Washington for just two reasons. (1) To get more work for Watertown Arsenal, and (2), to bring about an end to the layoffs at our installation.

To say that we, at the arsenal, are shocked and bewildered at the treatment which we have been receiving would be indeed an understatement of fact. The treatment of Government workers in the past months has so greatly alarmed the more than 3,000 workers at this installation, as well as the vast membership of the Federal Employees Veterans' Association, that they have sent us here to bring this enormous act of injustice to your attention. The tremendous scale of layoffs at our installation, which have included men with long records of faithful and loyal service to our Government is without a doubt one of the worst moves ever conceived by the present administration. Men with 15, 20, and 25 years of service have been hit.

We strongly protest this treatment and we strongly urge each and every one of you to vote against Senate bill 1003 which provides for the termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise. We ask that you vote in favor of House bill 5115 which will prohibit the disposal, by contract or Executive order, of work traditionally performed by civilian components of the Department of Defense.

And now, I should like to introduce the secretary of our committee, Mr. Frank P. Brown.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC., ADDRESS OF FRANK P. BROWN, SECRETARY, FEVA COMMITTEE, TO THE MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, during the 83d Congress big-business interests sought enactment of legislation designed to give congressional approval to the termination of all commercial and industrial-type activities in which the United States Government is engaged. This legislation passed the House of Representatives but did not pass the Senate. Now similar legislation has been introduced in this session of Congress.

In the meantime, however, while this legislation has been awaiting committee action, the President has directed the Federal agencies and departments to review their commercial and industrial activities to determine which functions can be taken over by private industry. All such functions shall be terminated accordingly by administrative directive, and those functions which require specific legislation to terminate will be terminated via legislative process, with the support of the present administration.

This entire policy is being predicated without regard to the tremendous burden of cost which it will place upon the American taxpayer, without regard for our national security, and without the slightest regard for the Government's moral obligation to Federal employees who have devoted years of their lives in the service of the Federal Government.

I should like to take just a moment to name for you some of the manufacturing, repair, business, transportation, and communication services and activities which have already been terminated or are in the process of elimination or liquidation:

1. The manufacture of chain and rope.
2. The manufacture of special furniture for naval vessels.
3. The manufacture of special marine paint for the Navy.
4. The manufacture of clothing for the Navy.
5. The manufacture and development of prototype protective clothing for the Armed Forces.
6. The repair and overhaul of typewriters and office equipment.
7. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been placed in liquidation.
8. Assets of the Inland Waterways Corporation have been sold.
9. Synthetic rubber plants have been sold.
10. Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration is being liquidated.
11. The Army and Navy are divesting themselves of automotive maintenance and repair to private garages.
12. The Army has sold a $15 million chlorine plant in Alabama, thus stopping the manufacture of chlorine and caustic soda.
13. The Air Force is now contracting over one-half of its maintenance and modification work to private industry.
14. The Navy is increasing the farming out to private interests its manufacturing, research, and development and modification functions.
15. Contracts have been let for private delivery of Government supplies from the General Services Administration's stores depots in the Washington and New York areas; and similar arrangements are being made elsewhere throughout the Nation and in other Government agencies.
16. The cleaning of Government buildings has been placed under private contract.
17. The Government manufacture of dry ice for the Navy has been terminated.
18. The manufacture of crates and wooden boxes for Government shipments has been contracted.
19. An increasing amount of engineering and drafting services have been contracted to private industry.
20. The Army is divesting itself of increasing amounts of the research and development of prototypes and manufacturing and modification functions.
21. The intent and spirit of the Vinson-Trammell Act has been violated by administrative decree granting a larger proportion of naval work to private interest than is assigned to Government shipyards, arsenals, etc.
22. Increasing amounts of the Nation's public natural resources are being turned over to private interest for development for profit.
23. Bids are being sought for private operation of automotive service stations to serve Government motor pools.
24. Contracts have been awarded to private industry for testing, analysis, and inspection of minerals, ores, and pulps, and for freight movements.

These are just some of the activities and services which are being turned over to private industry. These instances are only partially representative of the vast movement of the present administration to direct and establish the operation of our Government into the hands of special interests.

These present policies would protract the existence of subversive elements having access to security information relative to our national defense. Senate Report No. 3 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress titled "Subversion and Espionage in Defense Establishments and Industry" clearly points out that our national security has been, and

is still, in jeopardy when Defense Department work is performed in private industry plants. In contrast, the investigations of the Subcommittee on Investigations clearly establishes our contention that Federal employees provide a nucleus of loyal and trustworthy civilian servants. Federal employees cannot strike, nor do they seek the right to strike, against the Federal Government; therefore, there is no danger of production delays caused by differences between employees and management.

Since the President's directive will not only terminate all Government functions, but will also prevent the commencing or establishing of any new functions or operations that can be performed by private industry; the Government will not have the means to gage the propriety of private industry cost bids. This means that the cost upon the taxpayer will be tremendous.

The Government will be forced to accept private industry's standards for the quality of the products and services received. The Government will further be forced to accept private industry standards of improved techniques, engineering, and technological progress, and inasmuch as these will be geared largely to the civilian consumer's acceptances, our national defense and the lives of service personnel could be seriously jeopardized by inadequate or arrested quality, production, development, and research standards.

The sum and substance of the policy would be to cause the terrific upheaval of the economic status of millions of Federal employees and their families, and the dissipation and dislocation of industrial "know-how" and industries. The policy should also have an adverse social and economic impact upon communities and States in which these Government functions are presently located. There is also a lack of proper evaluation of the vast sums of the taxpayer's moneys which have been invested in equipment, facilities, and the training of highly skilled operating personnel.

The policy would further spell the economic death of scores of supporting businesses and services of local communities throughout the Nation.

We must not let this happen.

THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC., ADDRESS OF JAMES REEDY, VICE CHAIRMAN, FEVA COMMITTEE, TO THE MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

I feel certain that all of you here today must be aware of the reduction in force which has been going on at the Watertown Arsenal over the past several months. Over 800 employees have been laid off in the past few months with many more reductions slated to follow in the near future. At this time it is of vital importance that more work be assigned to the Watertown Arsenal.

We cannot understand the shenanigans of the present administration. World tension is increasing faster and faster. We are virtually sitting on a powder keg, with war practically staring us in the face. Our national security is in dire peril, and at this most critical period of civilization, our present administration is cutting down on its most important arsenal and naval installations instead of building them up. We can only say that we do not feel that we are being dealt with fairly and honestly.

The background of the Watertown Arsenal cannot be overlooked in the contributions which the installation has made to the scientific research and development of our country and of the world. Here are just a few of those developments:

1. With the existence of the Emery hydraulic testing machine, the Watertown Arsenal Laboratory was the pioneer testing laboratory for metals in this country and one of the most important in the world.

2. The Watertown Arsenal Laboratory pioneered in the study of impact in this country.

3. The whole American steel industry could be said to have stemmed from tests made at the Watertown Arsenal.

The Watertown Arsenal has also contributed many, many other great scientific developments too numerous to mention. In time of need, this installation has been a bulwark that has supported our great country through many of its greatest crises.

Let me say in conclusion that we cannot accept the arguments of the Department of the Army, or those of the Department of Defense that reducing our New England installations is in the best interest of the economy or the defense effort. I feel that this is merely a matter of politics. Big business, or special interests, as they are known, have taken over the Government and are channeling all the work and money into their own pockets.

Our State and our installation can stand on their own records of achievement. We deserve to be treated honestly, and fairly in the handing out of work through Government contract.

I therefore ask that the Massachusetts congressional delegation request that the President of the United States and the Defense Department send more work to Watertown Arsenal and to the other Government installations throughout Massachusetts and the New England areas.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, INC., ADDRESS OF ELLIS CROSSLAND TO THE MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, we have been asked to meet with you today by the people we represent; the men and women of the Watertown Arsenal, and the membership of the Federal Employees Veterans' Association, Inc. They feel as I feel, that the present administration is breaking up the greatest team our country has ever known. It was this team that was the backbone of the Government all through World War I and World War II. It was this team again that came to the aid of a troubled Government during the Korean conflict. It is this team that has been instrumental in making the United States one of the world's greatest powers, and now the present administration is seeking to destroy this great team and sell the employees of our installation and the employees of other installations throughout the country down the river, just to satisfy the whims and demands of the big business interests who are seeking to devour the economic security and welfare of our country.

And now I should like to give you an outline of the complete history of our Watertown Arsenal. Laboratory activities began at the Watertown Arsenal as early as 1830 although in the beginning they were not associated with metallurgy. The first metallurgical work was done in connection with improvement of cast iron. Cannon developed at Watertown Arsenal were the envy of the world.

In the 1870's steel began to emerge as a competitor of cast iron for gun construction.

In 1876, Congress authorized the construction of a testing machine to settle questions raised as to the suitability of steel for cannon, particularly with regard to the contention that had been made that steel is not elastic and therefore would be dangerous to use in guns.

The machine, to become famous as the Emery hydraulic testing machine, was designed at Watertown Arsenal and installed in 1879. It has a capacity of 800,000 pounds, in tension and 1 million pounds, in compression and is sensitive enough to test the tensile strength of a horsehair. From around 1880 to 1918 tests made on the machine were reported direct to Congress and published in a series of annual volumes under the title "Tests of Metals." This series for a long time provided the largest single accumulation of experimental testing data for metals in existence and was consulted freely by metallurgists both in this country and from abroad.

The existence of this machine made Watertown Arsenal Laboratory the pioneer testing laboratory for metals in this country and one of the most important in the world.

Since the beginning of World War I the Watertown Arsenal Laboratory has become more than a testing laboratory; it has become a center for research and development in many phases of metallurgy ranging from the refining of steel to its final fabrication in finished products.

The influence of the laboratory on the industrial life of the Nation has been profound; for example, the steel industry may be said to have stemmed from the results of tests carried out on the Emery machine. However, its contributions have not been confined to the field of mechanical testing. In the January 1948 issue of Metal Progress, the editor takes a look at metalurgical progress since 1917 and lists 210 milestones of progress, 8 of which are credited to Watertown Arsenal Laboratory, this organization being the largest single contributor. These outstanding achievements are listed as follows: 1921, autofrettage of large gun tubes; 1922, radiography used as a method for steel foundry control; 1925, gun tubes made by centrifugal casting; 1929, all welded gun carriage; 1930, molybdenum high speed tool steel; 1934, spectroscope used for foundry control; 1935, cast armor plate; 1940, cemented carbide cores for armor piercing projectiles. All of these were peacetime achievements that were of vital significance in winning the battle for production that made possible the success of World War II. They benefited commercial industry also; for example, radiography and spectroscopic analysis have been generally adopted by industry.

During the recent war the major efforts of the laboratory were concentrated on the technical activities that were needed to solve emergency problems as they arose. However, even under war conditions, a great deal of scientific research was carried out and during this period the Watertown Arsenal Laboratory was one of the most prolific centers for advanced metallurgical research in the Nation. Around 40 papers were published in the field of physical metallurgy with such things as plastic deformation, mechanical testing in the planning range, fracture strength, plastic flow and rupture, impact, phase equilibria, hardenability, mechanical equation of state, temper brittleness, and others, practically covering the field. Also a book was published of great practical interest to metallurgical engineers setting forth the principles of metallurgical engineering design.

Gentlemen, I could go on and on naming the great scientific and metallurgical discoveries and developments that have been perfected at our arsenal. I could go on and on naming the many great machines that have been built and perfected at our arsenal, but the whole thing boils down to just one plain simple truth. We cannot get along without our great arsenals and Navy yards. They have pioneered the way for all industry, and they have set up and upheld the high standards of quality that makes our weapons and military service equipment second to none in the world.

I say, gentlemen, that we cannot, with a clear conscience, permit the administration to deprive us of these great backbones of our economic security. We cannot permit this total disregard for our national defense. It is you to whom we look to put a stop to this vicious trading in human grief. Most of you remember Pearl Harbor. Most of you

will remember how completely unprepared we were. If it were not for our arsenals at that time, it is hard to tell what might have happened. It was our arsenals that provided industry with the necessary knowledge and time to gear itself and tool up for this great conflict.

Yes, gentlemen, let me say in conclusion that the reducing of our arsenal must not happen or as sure as we are standing here, we will someday find ourselves facing another Pearl Harbor, and this time we may not surmount our fight for survival.

Mississippi Comes to the Front in National Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the announcement on May 3 that novelist William Faulkner and dramatist Tennessee Williams had been awarded 1955 Pulitzer Prizes is significant in that both are natives of the State of Mississippi. Also, their accomplishments exemplify a trend which has been going on for some time in our State. Mississippi, once considered a backward State, has long since emerged to the forefront of national leadership in practically every field of activity.

Recently, a writer for the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News wrote an interesting article on Mississippi's national leadership. In case some may still be doubtful as to Mississippi's position on the horizon of progress, I am including this article as part of my remarks. It is with pride that we Mississippians point to the acomplishments of our citizens as they are pointed out in this article:

(By Maurine Twiss)

Folks who swell the statistics in bigger, colder, noisier and what they consider more progressive cities than Jackson, Miss., are way behind the times in one respect.

They've heard tell of the Mississippi mocking bird lazily swinging on a honeysuckle vine in the solid noon sunshine and they've concluded that it's sleepy time down South all the time.

But citizens of Mississippi's wide-awake capital city not only know better, they can prove it with a statistic or so of their own to act as eye-opener for the rest of the country.

Millions of people from all over the United States and in foreign countries are turning their eyes on this one deep Dixie town, looking toward it for leadership.

Because right here in Jackson, among all the storied moonlight and magnolias are a half dozen or so men who currently serve as national presidents of some of the country's most influential organizations.

Let's tick those leaders off on our fingers: there's A. Boyd Campbell, newly elected president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

And Mayor Allen Thompson, who heads the American Municipal Association.

Plus Garner Lester, president of the National Tax Equality Association for the eighth year.

Then, there's William A. Vaughey, in his second term as president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

While J. F. Montgomery, heads the National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents.

In a class by himself is Supreme Court Clerk Tom Q. Ellis, General Grand High Priest, Royal Arch Masons, International, largest Masonic organization under one head in the whole round world.

That's not all: In the fall, Secretary of State Heber Ladner will move up to the presidency of the National Association of Secretaries of State of which he is now vice president.

There are a lot of firsts tied up in these first men of national organizations.

The South hasn't always been so splendidly represented or recognized.

When Boyd Campbell, chairman of the board of Mississippi School Supply, became president of the 1,600,000-member United States Chamber, he brought to Mississippi the highest civic recognition it had ever achieved.

Although Campbell says that he's the smallest in commercial stature to hold his office, he's a director of Mississippi Power and Light Co., the Gulf Mobile and Ohio Railroad and the First National Bank. Vice chairman of Region 5, Boy Scouts of America, Campbell is president of the board of stewards at Galloway Memorial Methodist church, and longtime treasurer of Millsaps College.

Jackson's dynamic mayor is the first president of the American Municipal Association to be chosen from a city of less than a half-million population.

He heads up the mayor associations from 46 States and was 1 of 5 mayors from the United States to go to the International Conference of Mayors in England in 1951. Thompson is also president of the Mississippi Municipal Association.

Counted as individuals, nearly a hundred thousand persons belong to the Tax Equality Association which Garner Lester, Jackson financier, serves as president.

An organization solely devoted to "informing the public, after true and diligent research, regarding equalities in the tax laws," with particular reference to exemptions and benefits for specialized group, the group has its general office in Chicago and lists many large associations as members on its rosters.

In his second term as president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, William M. Vaughey is one of Mississippi's outstanding independent oil producers, and intimately connected with the development of the industry in this State.

He has also served as vice president and president of the Mississippi-Alabama Division of Mid-Continent Association.

"Chick" Montgomery was elected president of the National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents in October 1954, and feels he has visited most of 6,000 regular and 2,500 associate members in the months since.

He is the first NAMIA president, from Mississippi, and from the entire Deep South.

Tom Q. Ellises' long list of Masonic and auxiliary offices and honors covers a 40-year Masonic career of exceptional honor.

A million Royal Arch Masons look to him as General Grand High Priest, and the last Mississippi legislature passed a concurrent resolution commending him for bringing such distinction to his home State.

These six men are not, by a long shot, the only ones to draw praise and notice to the magnolia State.

When Secretary of State Heber Ladner moves up to the presidency of what is probably the oldest such State organization in the country, he'll be joining such men as Commissioner of Agriculture Si Corley, a former president and now an executive committeeman of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture.

A. Ray Tillman of the First National Bank is former president of the Men's Garden Club of America and Woodson Jones of Jackson is now that group's national secretary.

One of the highest offices in boy scouting is held by Rex I. Brown, chairman of the Mississippi Power & Light Board, who serves on the national executive committee.

Another national executive committee member is Tommy Naylor of the department of education who serves with the national council of school house construction, while First National Bank's Orrin Swayze is third vice president of the finance-public relations association.

Nor is this surge to the South limited to Mississippi's biggest city.

W. T. Wynn, of Greenville, is president of the National Cotton Council and indications are that Van Richardson, of Greenwood, a former Hinds County boy, is strongest candidate for national president of the junior chamber of commerce.

Neither is Mississippi enjoying a sudden brief burst of acclaim born to blossom and die as rapidly as her sun-forced flowers.

Leaders are the South's newest, most profitable crop.

For evidence, if such be demanded, gaze at two of the largest and most worthwhile national youth organizations today.

These are the American Legion and the Legion Auxiliary sponsored Boys' Nation and Girls' Nation.

Know who heads these outfits?

President of Boys' Nation is Ed Perry of Bay St. Louis and president of Girls' Nation is Jerolyn Ross of Meridian.

That's who heads these groups in 1955.

Two Mississippi kids.

Change in Policy by the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1954, the National Labor Relations Board substantially changed its policy with respect to its jurisdiction under the commerce section of the National Labor Relations Act. Since that time, the Board has by administrative procedure limited its jurisdiction by the simple expedient of holding certain business practices not to be in interstate commerce. In practical effect this action has had the result of amending the National Labor Relations Act by administrative decree, thus flying in the face of congressional mandate and legal precedent. This procedure by the National Labor Relations Board has extensively limited the bargaining rights of organized labor, forcing labor organizations to rely on their last remaining weapon—the threat of strike.

I believe such a practice to be very dangerous to our economy and of such great importance that I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter and article by Mr. Claude Ballard, international vice president of the International Woodworkers of America, CIO.

Due to the length of Mr. Ballard's article, it will be included in the Appendix of the RECORD for the next legislative day.

Mr. Ballard's letter follows:

INTERNATIONAL WOODWORKERS
OF AMERICA, CIO,
Portland, Oreg., April 7, 1955.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: The International Woodworkers of America, representing the major organized operations within the woodworking industry, wish to enlist your support in correcting abuses which have been brought on by impractical application of the power of the National Labor Relations Board to administratively determine whether operations are either in or out from under the commerce section of the National Labor Relations Act or are deliberately changing the application of the act by their administrative decisions.

We feel that there must be some correction of the present trend by the Board to eliminate a major portion of the lumber industry from coverage under the National Labor Relations Act. This threat to coverage to our people is brought on by the change of the rules under which the Board operates and the changing of the criteria under which the Board rules on whether or not an operation is under the commerce section of the act.

The ruling of the Board on these matters has changed so radically during the last year that it is impossible for anyone to determine from day to day how far they intend to carry the present trend in limiting the coverage of the act by their administrative latitude.

We feel that you should give serious consideration to correcting this trend before the labor relations in the lumbering industry are completely destroyed by the necessity of union people having to strike to maintain collective-bargaining units which have long been regarded as being covered by the Board's jurisdiction.

When these union people, who have collectively bargained with their employers over a period of years, may find themselves without certification under the Board because of the changing attitude of the Board itself with relation to coverage under the commerce section, then the only recourse these people have, if their employer does not agree to bargaining with them is to use economic strength to maintain their bargaining rights to the benefit of labor and management in this industry.

I am enclosing with my letter, a summary of three cases which I prepared for your consideration which should point out the seriousness of the situation as it affects this industry.

In addition to this material, I found in the case of the Mast Lumber Co., No. 20–CA–944, that the history of this operation indicates that the company's sales ran, in prior years, considerably over a million dollars a year, out of which approximately 60 percent was sold to lumber brokers. This trend continued through the year the Board used to make their investigation.

Knowing the brokerage business, we are firmly convinced that if the Board had made the proper investigation, they would have found this operation was under commerce, even under the present rulings of the board.

Although we are presently requesting your support solely on the basis of the effect that this present trend of the Board is having on the lumber industry, we also wish to point out that it can affect the collective bargaining relationship in other industries to at least some degree.

Upon investigation, it can certainly be determined that the lumber industry stands apart from most industries in the manner in which sales are conducted through brokers and other sales agencies, some of which are merely a part of the producing company. Many of these producing units are now under contract to this union but the certifications are threatened by the twice removed theory of the present Board.

We feel that a grave injustice is being done the lumber workers by the present trend of the Board and would enlist your support to see that the situation is corrected.

Thanking you for your cooperation in these matters, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE BALLARD,
International Vice President.

Whither America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, Hon. Hugh G. Grant, of Augusta, Ga., who was formerly United States Minister to Albania and Thailand delivered an address to the Civitan Club of Augusta.

Mr. Grant's address is both pertinent and timely. It deals with some of the most important matters confronting our Government and the world today, and I insert this address herewith as a part of my remarks:

WHITHER AMERICA?

(Address of Hugh G. Grant, former United States Minister to Albania and Thailand, before the Civitan Club of Augusta, Ga., Thursday, April 28, 1955)

Mr. President and members of the Civitan Club of Augusta, blazing daily newspaper headlines and sensational radio reports about the tiny Chinese Islands of Quemoy and Matsu, about the comings, goings, and pronouncements of Chou En-Lai, Chiang Kai-shek and our own Far Eastern experts, whether by design or not, is serving as a smoke screen for events of far greater importance to the American people right here at home. While we are assuming the leadership of the so-called free peoples of the world in the crusade against communism we are losing sight of evil forces at work, directly and indirectly, openly and secretly, on the home front to destroy our individual liberties and our American way of life.

I ask, as an American citizen deeply concerned over the welfare of his country, what will it profit America to lead the world in the quest of freedom if we lose our own liberties?

First, what of our internal economic situation, which affects every individual living American, as well as generations of Americans yet unborn? Very briefly, since there is not time for details, 10 years after our participation in the greatest war in history we are spending $60 billion annually, most of it for military purposes and foreign aid. We have a huge national debt of some $275 billion, as compared with a debt of only a little more than $1 billion in 1917, the year we joined up with the internationalists to "make the world safe for democracy." And the current debt of $275 billion, we are told, is insufficient and must be increased soon to meet our global commitments. This public debt, which no one in authority suggests should be reduced, is estimated to equal more than $5,000 for every American family in our population of 161 million. Meanwhile, we are told by the Government experts in Washington that we are in an era of great prosperity with some 61 million persons employed. But the experts soft-pedal the fact that this prosperity is based largely on the production, on a vast scale, of things needed for war. American-made arms, armaments, tanks, planes, ships, and even shoes and uniforms for foreign military units, are being scattered around the world among our allies and so-called friends, with American taxpayers footing the big bill. Some of this friendship is extremely dubious, as indicated during the Truman police action in Korea, where American battle casualties totaled more than 140,000 men, while streams of strategic war material flowed to the Red enemy from some of our major allies. And despite the enormous expenditure of American lives and wealth in Korea, our military commanders were prevented, by our allies in the United Nations, from winning this war, the first example of its kind in American history.

In 1939, the year World War II broke out in Europe, our American dollar was worth 100 cents. Today it is worth only 52 cents. In a recent issue the U. S. News & World Report said, with apparent satisfaction, that the Eisenhower policy of bringing back the sound dollar shows every sign of success, and the 52-cent dollar gives promise of holding its value in the years ahead. Think of it. A 52-cent dollar—a sound dollar. What sort of economic twaddle is this?

Very definitely linked with our economic instability are our foreign commitments which circle the globe. Specifically, 161 million Americans, occupying 3½ million square miles, are formally committed in writing to defend approximately 700 million people occupying 22 million square miles in 39 nations on 6 continents across 3 oceans. In other words, the United States has assumed the military guardianship of approximately 30 percent of the world population. Mutual-defense and assistance pacts have been filed on top of pacts, making the United States morally obligated to assist, even in war, some 25 additional nations with a population approximating 800 million people. All of this adds up to a total of some 64 nations with 1½ billion people, or 61 percent of the world population, looking to American for defense and help.

Really this gigantic and unprecedented global program, which has been developed by both Democratic and Republican administrations since the end of World War II on the theory that it is necessary for the defense of the United States, is positively fantastic. We could be playing right into the hands of the Russians. It was Lenin, leader of the Russian revolution, who said: "We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

There is no end in sight to this global spending. Only 1 week ago, on the eve of the Asian-African conference at Bandung, Indonesia, to which we were not invited, President Eisenhower announced a proposed new $3½ billion foreign-aid program, two-thirds of which will be earmarked for 15 Asian nations. We are still engaged in the dubious business of trying to buy friends with American dollars. How naive we are.

A few recent newspaper headlines in regard to our foreign-aid program are revealing:

"India Calls for Talks on United States Financial Aid, Which Is Expected To Total $200 Million."

"United States To Foot Bills for Expansion of Jap Forces—United States Promises Japan $42 Million More This Year Than Last."

"Huge Fleet Supplied to Friends of United States—Navy Ships Furnished Big and Little Nations in 6 Years Total 870."

"United States Point 4 Technical Cooperation Program Costs American Taxpayers $107 Million in 1954, $116 Million This Year."

And this item from the New York Times: "Point 4 Helps Egypt Restore Grazing Land, Arid for 1,500 Years—By Keeping Goats Off,

United States Experts Spur New Forage for Herds."

And this one: "United States State Department Female Expert Organizes Women's Clubs Among Natives in New Caledonia in the South Pacific."

And from the Harvard Alumni Bulletin of April 9, comes this one: "Harvard Welcomes a Group of 41 People, Ministers, Millers, Manufacturers, Trade-Union Representatives, and Engineers, from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, and Turkey—Their Title, 'Productivity and Full Employment Study Group, EPA, 266,' Under the Auspices of Mr. Harold Stassen's Foreign Operations Administration in Washington"—at the expense of American taxpayers.

In addition to our pyramiding global pacts requiring huge sums of American dollars, we also have far-reaching commitments involving more big taps on the United States Treasury as a member of the United Nations organization in New York City. This organization, born in San Francisco just 10 years ago, is our baby and we are still babysitting. Supported by our national lawmakers as an instrument designed to keep peace in the world, the U. N. has developed into a huge bureaucracy, including many Socialist-minded members, American and foreign, who are out to reform the world, including us, largely at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) operates in every field of human activity—food, clothing, housing, civil rights, education, publishing, radio, television, museums, the theater and, of all things, birth control. As someone has said, "You name it and UNESCO has a plan for it." The threat of UNESCO and the United Nations Charter to the freedom of American citizens and to the sovereignty of the American Republic lies in a loophole in our Constitution which states that any treaty which the President and the Senate approves shall become the supreme law in the United States. Senator BRICKER, together with a group of alert, patriotic American citizens, are engaged now in an efforts to plug this loophole through an amendment to the Constitution. A subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee is beginning hearings on the Bricker amendment this week.

An enormous propaganda campaign is under way to perpetuate and expand the power of the United Nations. Even the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which are holding hearings around the country for the announced purpose of getting the viewpoint of American citizens in regard to the United Nations, appear to be a part of this propaganda campaign. This is what I and other witnesses observed at the public hearings in Atlanta last month. The three Senators, constituting the subcommittee, voiced sentiments most favorable to the U. N. and sharply challenged some witnesses who expressed fear of the U. N. as dangerous to American sovereignty.

There are many signs that influential sponsors of the United Nations are looking ahead to some form of supergovernment. For instance, The American Association for the United Nations, through its Executive Director, Clark Eichelberger, in 1950 recommended to a Senate committee that evolution of the United Nations into a World Government be achieved by a liberal interpretation of the U. N. Charter. And, Benjamin Cohen, writing in the October 1954 issue of the Journal of the American Association of University Women, warned against pressing for controversial amendments at the U. N. Charter Revision Conference, scheduled for next year if approved by the General Assembly. Cohen argued that "the same purposes can be achieved through the normal evolutionary processes projected in the Charter." As pointed out by Senator Bricker, this would be accomplished without the consent of the American people and their elected representatives.

Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, a U. N. sponsor, who heads the subcommittee which is conducting the hearings this week on the Bricker amendment, introduced in the Senate a few weeks ago a concurrent resolution designed to explore the possibility of forming not only a defense but an economic and political union of the North Atlantic Treaty Powers (NATO) which is organized within the framework of the U. N. Fourteen fellow Senators of KEFAUVER are sponsors of the concurrent resolution.

I have been talking about America's economic status, our foreign relations, and the United Nations. As pointed out, there are grave threats to American solvency through our vast international commitments, and to American sovereignty.

What about the threats to our individual liberties here at home as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States?

There are many threats. Foremost among these is the ever increasing concentration of power over the lives of the people in Washington. For instance, there is the menace of confiscation of the earnings and private property of the people of the Nation through the Federal Government's unlimited power to levy against the personal incomes of American citizens.

There is the danger of the growing power of the executive department of the Federal Government which today even challenges the Congress in its lawful right to investigate the acts of the Federal Bureaucracy. The executive department is delving more and more into matters that have been heretofore left to the sovereign States of the Union. White House conferences are called to consider the problem of education of the youth of the States. Huge sums of money which have been paid into the Federal Treasury by the people of the States are offered as Federal grants to the States, for education, housing, municipal projects, disaster relief. Federal grants mean Federal control. This business started at the time of the great depression of 1929–30. It was regarded then as a temporary stop-gap, but it has mushroomed into a Socialistic program of Federal paternalism which is sapping the initiative of the people and at the same time destroying their individual liberties.

Another threat to American freedom is the assumption of dictatorial power by the nine political appointees, constituting the Supreme Court of the United States, which was established by the framers of the Constitution to interpret the Constitution on the basis of law, and not sociology. For instance, the decision of May 17, 1954, declaring racial segregation in the public schools of the States unconstitutional. This decision is designed to revolutionize and dictate the human behavior of some 40 million white people and 10 million Negroes.

As Charles Wallace Collins, the distinguished author of Whither Solid South, points out: "If the Supreme Court succeeds in this effort the Constitutional Republic is dead and the Constitution itself has become a tattered scrap of paper. If the Court can thus take possession of the lives of the people of the whole Southern region and doom them to racial oblivion there is no limit to which the Court can go in any direction."

Another alarming factor in connection with the Supreme Court decision is the collaboration with the Court, for political purposes (votes, if you please) by the executive department of the Government. The Eisenhower Administration through its Attorney General, Mr. Herbert Brownell, played a major role in the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation. The Attorney General warned the Court against upholding legislation by the Congress under the 14th amendment in the field of civil rights because of the long line of precedents, and told the Court that it had the judicial power itself to declare segregation in the public schools of the States uncontitutional. And that is just what the Supreme Court did. This collaboration is a definite violation of a fundamental principle of our plan of Federal Government, namely the system of "checks and balances" between the legislative, executive, and judicial departments.

The Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, marks the culmination of the most insidous propaganda campaign in the history of these United States. This campaign was instigated many years ago by a minority group known as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the director of which was a colored man, the late Walter White, who is said to have had only one sixty-fourth Negro blood in his veins, and who divorced his Negro wife in order to marry a white woman.

I am not disparaging the Negro race in America. The Negro is not here by choice. Through contact with American white civilization (the product of thousands of years of struggle), the Negro has achieved much in a relatively brief period of time. With the continued friendly assistance of his white neighbor the Negro will accomplish more if he is let alone by the agitators.

These agitators have been aided and abetted by foreign Communist agents, left-wing groups, scheming white politicians in both major political parties, who want the Negro bloc vote for their own purposes, and by misguided theorists styling themselves as liberals. The campaign objectives of the NAACP leaders look beyond the integration of white and Negro children in the public schools. This is only a first step. The program is designed to bring about complete racial integration throughout the United States and the elimination of all racial distinctions—miscegenation, intermarriage, the extinction of the Negro race in America. Make no mistake about it—that is the ultimate goal. I say to you southerners, you northerners, you westerners whose forebears established this Republic of white Americans.

The Supreme Court decision if followed through and accepted will start this revolutionary movement on its way. It is to the interest of both races therefore that the decision, which is a violation of the Constitution of the United States, should be resisted by the people of the sovereign States by every lawful means. Citizens should stand up and be counted on this issue regardless of personal or financial sacrifices involved. The responsible State officials cannot accomplish this task alone. They must have the full and active support of the people.

In conclusion, from many responsible sources there are strong indications that the America, which the wise leaders of the Revolutionary era established and which has been developed by our forebears, through years of toil, struggle and sacrifice, is in grave danger from evil forces both within and without. It behooves all patriotic Americans, who love their country, to be constantly alert to the dangers which threaten the Republic. There are influential persons within the country that would destroy our unique and successful system of State and Federal Government through nullifying our constitutional rights as individual citizens. There are powerful borces abroad, aided by left-wing pressure groups within the country that would suck us into an international order of world government. Such a plan would destroy our political sovereignty, squander our national wealth, and in fact, doom us to ultimate oblivian as a nation.

Danger Obvious in Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD today a very timely and well-thought-out editorial that appeared in the State Times, Jackson, Miss., concerning the invasion of the gas business by the Federal Government. I commend it to all Members.

The editorial follows:

DANGER OBVIOUS IN PRICE FIXING

The issues, both immediate and fundamental, are sharply defined in the natural-gas legislation now pending in Congress.

First of all, there is the question of whether the Federal Power Commission shall have control over prices charged for natural gas at the wellhead.

Fundamentally, the issue is whether the Federal Government will have authority to fix the price charged for any basic commodity while still in the hands of the producer.

It goes without saying that Mississippi is vitally concerned in the matter. We are convinced that the best interests of the State will be served by passage of the bill which clearly exempts natural-gas producers from Federal price fixing.

The matter has a long and rather complex background. In 1938, the Federal Government was given the power to regulate rates charged by interstate transmission lines. In 1950, Congress made it explicit that the price-fixing authority did not extend to the producer. This was the Kerr bill which President Truman first supported and then vetoed. Finally, in 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Power Commission did indeed have price-fixing control over gas at the wellhead, a power which the FPC had never sought for itself.

Earlier this year, a Presidential advisory commission which had studied the entire subject of energy supplies, and policy concerning natural resources, came up with this statement:

"In the interest of a sound fuel policy, the protection of the national defense, and consumers' interest, by assuring such a continued exploration for and development of reserves as to provide an adequate supply of natural gas, we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line."

The bills now before Congress carry out the intent of that recommendation.

Opponents of the measure contend that unless wellhead prices are rigidly fixed, consumers of natural gas will be gouged by unwarranted price increases. Figures show, however, that about 10 cents of every dollar paid by natural gas consumers go to the producer. The remaining 90 cents go to the local distributor of the fuel, and to the company which transports it by pipeline from the field to the distribution point. Both of these are under governmental control, the distributor as a public utility and the transmission line as an interstate carrier.

Natural gas production, on the other hand, is a fiercely competitive field. At that point price regulation is certain by the old law of supply and demand.

The price the producer receives for his gas must be sufficient to provide the incentive for continued exploration and development of new sources. The difference between the price fixed by competition and that which might be fixed by Federal control may be decisive. If the producer is convinced that he is playing a losing game, then we are apt to see a drying up of natural gas production.

Rate regulation is necessary at some points in our complex economic system. In these instances, it clearly serves the public interest. However, where regulation extends to the prime producer, it threatens the basis of the private initiative system. If gas is to be so controlled, other fuels may not be far behind.

Rayburn To Speak Here Wednesday at REA Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 20th birthday anniversary of rural electrification, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution for Sunday, May 8, entitled "RAYBURN To Speak Here Wednesday at REA Meeting."

There is no way to measure the benefits that have accrued to my own State, not to mention the entire Nation, as a result of the rural electrification program which had its birth in my State.

The article follows:

RAYBURN TO SPEAK HERE WEDNESDAY AT REA MEETING

(By Jack Nelson)

The father of legislation which electrified most of the Nation's farms will address Georgia REA cooperatives at a meeting here Wednesday celebrating the Rural Electrification Administration's 20th birthday anniversary.

He is Representative SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the United States House of Representative and author of the bill setting up the statutory authority for REA.

Congressman RAYBURN will address representatives of 41 cooperatives of the Georgia Electric Membership Corp.

The idea for the progressive and revolutionary REA was born in Georgia, a leader in development of power facilities through REA loans.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt conceived the plan during one of his early visits to the little White House at Warm Springs. He saw the need in Georgia and envisioned what electricity might mean not only to farmers in this State, but to rural people throughout the Nation.

In an address at Barnesville in 1938, President Roosevelt told how the idea for REA came to him at Warm Springs. D. M. Pollock of Monroe, president of GEMC, said Wednesday's anniversary program will include flashback touching on the address and other events concerning REA in the past 20 years.

When REA was established by President Roosevelt's executive order on May 11, 1935, only 6,956 Georgia farms, or 2.8 percent of the total, had electric service.

Today 92.7 percent of the State's farms are electrified, according to Walter Harrison of Millen, manager and former president of GEMC. Of the farms with electric service, 79.4 percent get power from REA cooperatives, Mr. Harrison said. The other electrified farms are served by private utilities.

Mr. Harrison said that 240,733 farms and rural establishments in Georgia are connected by 60,121 miles of REA lines.

REA loans to Georgia borrowers now total about $98 million.

Cold statistics also tell how the REA led the way in carrying electricity to all but about 5 percent of the Nation's farms. When REA began, only 11 percent of the farms were electrified. (REA claims systems financed by it supply 54 percent of the rural users.)

They tell how a sharp reduction in power costs followed the organization of REA. In 1935, electrical power cost farm users an average of about 10 cents a kilowatt-hour. Today the cost averages about 3 cents.

Much of the increase in farm use of electricity has come during the past 10 years. In 1944, for example, consumers bought 1,988,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical power for REA units. By 1954, usage totaled 14,309,000,000 kilowatt-hours, an increase of sevenfold.

As impressive as they are, the statistics alone can't tell the warm, human story of REA's impact on rural areas.

For that story, look at the face of the farmer whom electric power is helping to run his farm more efficiently and profitably. Or ask the farm housewife, released from many drudgeries of the farm home by electricity.

The blessings bestowed upon country folks by REA was simply, but indelibly, expressed by "Uncle" Lucius Darby, former slave who was 108 years old when his house near Elberton was serviced by REA in July 1948. He said:

"I been prayin' for years for dis light, and de Lord sent it."

Although REA is close to realizing its goal of electrical service for all farms, it still has a big job ahead. As officials see it, the job is threefold.

One is to help present REA-financed systems expand their power supplies and facilities to meet a swiftly increasing demand for farm power.

Another is to help the REA system keep pace with developments in the atomic field. Experts say the day is coming when nuclear energy will be used to provide cheaper electrical power. The REA wants farmers to get the benefits of such power when it becomes available.

The third chore is to help carry telephone service to as many rural residents as possible.

One of the pressing problems for REA in Georgia is telephone service, according to Mr. Harrison.

When REA loans for telephone facilities were first made available in 1950, only 10 percent of Georgia farms had telephones. Since then loans totaling $7,180,000 have financed 3 cooperatives and 13 independent companies in providing service for 8,843 rural customers in Georgia.

However, Mr. Harrison estimates that 80 percent of Georgia farms are still without telephone service. "The REA intends to see that the service is provided," he said.

Georgia's REA cooperatives plan to build new facilities at a cost of nearly $7 million in the 1956 fiscal year, Mr. Harrison reported.

He said a survey shows that through 1961 the coops will spend an estimated $25,279,000.

"One of our biggest jobs in the immediate future is to expand the capacity of present lines to meet the increasingly big demand for rural electricity," Mr. Harrison said. He pointed out that the average farm consumption of electrical power had increased from 116 kilowatt-hours in 1949 to 233 kilowatt-hours in 1954.

Mr. Harrison says the number one immediate objective of REA in Georgia, however, is "the development of all water power sites to provide power. We are vitally interested in this. It is necessary for REA to continue its rapid pace of progress in Georgia."

Appendix

Customs Simplification Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis of H. R. 6040, the Customs Simplification Act of 1955, there follows an explanation of this legislation for the information of the Members of Congress and the public. The Committee on Ways and Means has announced public hearings to be held on H. R. 6040 beginning Monday, May 23.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6040, THE CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 1955

The President, in his message of January 10, 1955, on the foreign economic policy of the United States, stated that the uncertainties and confusion arising from the complex system of valuation on imported articles caused unwarranted delays in the determination of customs duties and he urged the Congress to give favorable consideration to legislation for remedying this situation. Furthermore, he asked for continuing efforts to improve the procedures for customs administration. The proposed Customs Simplification Act of 1955 is designed to carry out, in part, these recommendations of the President. The Treasury Department is continuing its study and will in the future submit additional legislative proposals in line with the President's recommendations.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND EFFECTIVE DATE

This section contains a short title and provides that the act shall be effective on and after the 30th day following the date of enactment.

SECTION 2. VALUE

The present section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 402) tells how appraisers shall determine the value of imported merchandise for the purpose of assessing duties. Briefly, it provides that the "foreign value" or the "export value" shall be used, whichever is higher, but that if neither of these can be ascertained, then the "United States value," and if that also is unascertainable, then the "cost of production." In a few special cases, the rate of duty is to be based upon the "American selling price." Decisions of the appraiser are reviewable in the Customs Court. The statute then goes on to define the foreign value as the market value or price at the time of exportation to the United States "at which such or similar merchandise is freely offered for sale for home consumption to all purchasers * * * in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade * * *." Costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the merchandise ready for shipment which are not included in such value or price are to be added thereto. The export value is the price at which the merchandise is freely offered for sale to all purchasers in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade for exportation to the United States, with the same charges added. The United States value is the freely offered price in the United States which is available to all purchasers, in the usual wholesale quantities and in the ordinary course of trade, with allowance for duty and other expenses, a commission not exceeding 6 percent, if any has been paid, and allowance for profit not to exceed 8 percent. The cost of production is defined as the sum of four items: (1) Cost of materials and fabrication or manipulation; (2) the usual general expenses, not less than 10 percent of (1); (3) the cost of containers and coverings and other incidental costs and charges; and (4) an addition for profit, not less than 8 percent of (1) and (2). The American selling price of an article manufactured or produced in the United States is the price at which the article is freely offered for sale for domestic consumption to all purchases.

The amendments proposed by the bill would effect the following changes in the law as above stated:

1. Eliminate the use of foreign value and make the export value the preferred method of valuation if it can be ascertained.

2. In determining United States value, the actual commissions, profits, and other deductions are to be used, not arbitrarily limited amounts.

3. In determining United States value of new lines in which there is no previously established trade, the earliest actual sales of the merchandise undergoing appraisement or similar merchandise may be considered if made before the expiration of 90 days after importation.

4. In the case of constructed value (previously called cost of production) the actual addition for general expenses, profit, etc., are to be used, not prescribed percentages which may exceed the actual figures.

5. The appraiser may use actual sales instead of offers, where both exist, in determining export value or United States value.

6. A definition of "freely sold or offered for sale" is provided for the first time. It will permit determination of an "export value," "United States value," or "American selling price" on the basis of sales or offers to wholesalers which are unrestricted, except for restrictions which are imposed or required by law, which limit the resale price or sales territory, or which do not affect the value of the merchandise to the purchaser. It will also permit the use of sales to exclusive agents and other restricted sales where such limitations do not affect the price. The present statute has been interpreted to make a "foreign value," "export value," "United States value," or "American selling price" unusable when the only offers made are subject to restrictions of the kinds stated. Furthermore, under the present law the price, in order to qualify, must be available to all purchasers, including retailers and consumers.

7. The proposed bill goes on to provide definitions for the words "ordinary course of trade," "purchasers at wholesale," and "such or similar merchandise."

8. It also defines "usual wholesale quantities" in such a manner as to mean the quantities in which the greatest aggregate quantity of the merchandise is sold, whereas under the present law the usual wholesale quantity is the quantity in which the largest number of individual transactions occur.

9. Certain references to the customs appraisers, and to appeals to reappraisement in the Customs Court, which were duplicative of other provisions, are eliminated for conciseness. No change in the functions of appraisers or court is effected.

The bill also provides that in considering any tariff adjustments by executive action, such as trade-agreement reductions under section 350 of the Tariff Act, the Tariff Commission and each officer of the executive department shall take full account of any reduction in tariff protection resulting or likely to result from these changes in valuation standards.

SECTION 3. CONVERSION OF CURRENCY

Under present law conversion of foreign currency values for customs purposes is made at the gold coin parity proclaimed quarterly by the Treasury Department, unless that parity varies by more than 5 percent from the buying rate for the currency in the New York market as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. If there is no proclaimed rate for the currency in question, or if the proclaimed rate does vary by more than 5 percent from the certified rate, then customs collectors are required to convert foreign currencies at the daily rate certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The result is that in most cases the daily certified rates are used. Consequently, each collector is required to check the daily rate for each day's importations since those rates, certified to 6 to 8 decimal places, are subject to frequent, often daily minor variations.

The amendment of section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 31, sec. 372) proposed by section 3 of the bill would retain the quarterly proclamation of gold coin parity. It would also continue in effect the requirement that the Federal Reserve bank certified rate be used if that rate varies by more than 5 percent from the gold coin parity. The amendment would then authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide by regulations for the use of the rate first certified for the quarter as long as the rate certified for the day of exportation did not vary by more than 5 percent therefrom. This would permit one customs officer to determine if the daily certified rates varied by more than 5 percent from the first effective certified rates or from the proclaimed gold coin parity and to notify all customs collectors of any such variations. In the absence of such notification each customs collector would continue to use the same certified rate throughout the quarter.

This will simplify currency conversion procedures without major alteration in the existing statutory framework.

SECTION 4. OBSOLETE PROVISIONS OF THE CUSTOMS LAWS

Section 4 is devoted to the repeal of a number of obsolete provisions of the Tariff Act. The reasons that the provisions repealed are obsolete, inoperative, or unnecessary, are set forth below.

Sections 12, 13, 14, and 15 of title 19, United States Code (subsecs. 1, 2, 3, and 4 of section 4 (a) of the bill), provide for appointment by the Secretary of the Treasury of a limited number of special agents for the purposes of checking the accounts of collectors and other customs officers for the prevention and detection of frauds upon the

revenue, and for the better guarding against frauds upon the revenue, authorize appointment of special agents to reside in foreign territory. The title "special agent" is no longer used in the customs service (see U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 5, sec. 281b (c)). The customs agents who, among other functions, perform the functions formerly exercised by the special agents now are appointed and serve under the operation of the Classification Act like other customs employees.

Sections 16, 17, and 18 of title 19, United States Code (subsecs. 5, 6, and 7) are survivals of the act of July 27, 1866 (ch. 284, secs. 4, 5, and 8, 14 Stat. 303), to reorganize the office of the customs appraiser at New York. Section 16, prescribing qualifications and a special oath for examiners at New York only, is superfluous since placement standards for the position are fixed in accordance with the Classification Act by the Civil Service Commission, and the oath requirement is met by the provisions of section 1757, Revised Statutes (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 5, sec. 16), applicable to all Federal officers. Section 17, prohibiting employees in the office of the appraiser at New York from engaging or being employed in any commercial activity is discriminatory against this group of employees. Its repeal would leave such employees subject to the same restrictions on outside employment as other like employees. Section 18, relating to the duties applicable to the appraiser and assistant appraiser at New York, was originally enacted as a saving clause when a special statute was enacted to reorganize the office of the customs appraiser at New York (act of July 27, 1866, supra), but it now serves no useful purpose since all duties of appraisers are prescribed by section 500, Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1500).

Sections 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27 (subsecs. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) of title 19, United States Code, prescribe special oaths of office for the officers enumerated therein and designate persons who may administer such oaths. These provisions are unnecessary, since a form of oath for all Government officers is prescribed by R. S. 1557, supra. The number of copies of oaths of office to be required and their disposition can readily be prescribed by regulation; and since an employee may not receive his salary until the oath of office is taken, there seems to be no purpose in prescribing a penalty for failure to take the oath. As to the designation of persons to administer the oaths, sections 16a of title 5, United States Code, gives authority to persons designated in writing by the head of an executive department to administer the oath of office. The above sections are therefore unnecessary and obsolete.

In addition, section 26 of title 19 is obsolete (as is also sec. 379, infra, for similar reasons) in that it relates to special examiners of drugs, medicines, and chemicals, officers who are no longer appointed. The Food and Drug Administration now performs the functions formerly exercised by the special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals (see U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 21, sec. 381). For these reasons, these sections should be repealed.

Section 28 of title 19, United States Code (subsec. 14), providing that the headquarters of the customs district in Florida shall be at Tampa, is unnecessary and serves no practical purpose. It is the only statutory provision expressly designating the situs of the headquarters of a customs district, and there are 45 such districts. Section 1 of the act of August 1, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 2), vests authority in the President to, among other things, change from time to time the location of the headquarters customs-collection district. By Executive Order 10289 of September 17, 1951, the President designated and empowered the Secretary of the Treasury to perform this function.

Section 40 of title 19, United States Code (subsec. 15), prescribes the duties of the surveyor of customs. The title of surveyor of customs has been discontinued, except at the port of New York, and the duties there performed are those which are usually handled at any seaport by the officer in charge of the activities performed for the collector outside of the customhouse. The act of July 5, 1932 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 19, sec. 5a), abolished the offices of surveyor of customs at all other ports and their duties were transferred to career employees under the collector. Many of the functions prescribed by section 40 for the surveyor at New York have been obsolete for years and are no longer performed by that officer. This section should be repealed as obsolete.

Section 53 of title 19, United States Code (subsec. 16), which provides for the apportionment of compensation according to the time served, is believed to be obsolete in view of the act of June 30, 1945 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 5, sec. 944), which established the basic workweek, pay periods, and pay computation methods for all full-time officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government.

Sections 54 and 57 of title 19 (subsecs. 17 and 20), which relate to the furnishing of blank forms, books, stationery, blank manifests for sale, etc., are obsolete. Section 54 is superseded by provisions of the act of June 30, 1949 (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 40, sec. 481), with respect to procurement of supplies by the General Services Administration. Section 57 is obsolete because in lieu of payment of compensation out of commissions and fees, collectors of customs are now on a fixed salary basis under the plan of reorganization of the customs service authorized by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 434).

Section 55 of title 19 (subsec. 18) provides that collectors of customs, and comptrollers and surveyors performing the functions of collectors, shall render quarterly accounts to the Secretary of the Treasury of fines collected, moneys received as rents, etc. These functions are presently being performed under authority of other statutes, and this section is unnecessary.

Section 56 of title 19 (subsec. 19), which relates to additional hours of service at public stores in New York, was made obsolete by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 5, secs. 901–954), which provides for the establishment of a basic administrative workweek and for overtime compensation at prescribed rates.

Section 59 of title 19 (subsec. 21) prescribes requirements, related to section 57, supra, which date back to the time when the compensation of customs officers was primarily the proceeds of the specific fees fixed by law. Many of the functions for which fees were fixed are no longer performed. While it is believed that a table of the rates of fees demandable by law should be posted in a conspicuous place in each customhouse, convenient for public inspection, and a receipt should be given for all fees paid, this is rather a matter for handling under existing regulatory authority without statutory prescription of impracticable and inflexible requirements.

Section 61 of title 19 (subsec. 22) is inoperative and obsolete. Revised Statute 2580, from which it was derived, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint inspectors at San Antonio, Eagle Pass, and other places in Texas, at an annual salary of $2,500, to report to the Secretary of the Treasury semiannually on goods exported to Mexico. Regular customs offices are now established at necessary ports, stations, and places along the Texas-Mexican border whose officers inspect and supervise imports, as well as exports, to the extent required.

Section 62 of title 19 (subsec. 23), which was intended as a means of maintaining discipline among customs officers, authorizes suspension from duty for neglect or minor delinquency. The procedures which have been and will be followed in regard to the conduct of customs officers and employees are those prescribed in section 863, title 5, United States Code, and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission.

Section 67 of title 19 (subsec. 24), which provides for a report to each session of the Congress by the Secretary on customhouse business, is inoperative and unnecessary. The Secretary submits an annual report to the Congress in accordance with sections 262, 264, and 265, title 5, United States Code, substantially superseding the requirements of this more limited provision of the customs laws.

Section 379 of title 19 (subsec. 25) provides a method for preventing importation of adulterated drugs, etc. (see sec. 26, supra), at ports where there is no special examiner of drugs. As indicated in commenting on section 26, supra, special examiners of drugs are no longer appointed and the provisions of this section are inoperative, functions with relation to spurious or adulterated foods, drugs or cosmetics now being handled by the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under United States Code, 1952 edition, title 21, section 321, et seq. The section is obsolete and inoperative and should be repealed.

Section 390 of title 19 (subsec. 26), which provides for the adoption of a hydrometer for use in ascertaining the proof of liquors, is unnecessary. The hydrometer in use by Customs is the same as that which is approved for use of the Internal Revenue Service under section 5212 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The standards for spirits are the same as those applicable to spirits of domestic manufacture under paragraph 811 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 811).

Section 494 of title 19 (subsec. 27), which provides for the seizure of merchandize as security for fines imposed under the provisions of section 12 of the act of June 22, 1874, 18 Statutes 188, an ancestor provision of section 591 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1591), now superseded in turn by section 542 of title 18 of the code, is absolete and unnecessary. The 1874 provisions relating to unlawful importation have been repealed and this particular provision thereof is no longer operative.

Section 526 of title 19 (subsec. 28) provides that the cost of prosecution in cases where seizure, condemnation, and sale of merchandise takes place within the United States and the value is less than $250, shall be paid from the part of the forfeiture which accrues to the United States. This section is obsolete since the subject matter is now covered by section 613 (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1613 (1)).

Section 541 of title 19 (subsec. 29) authorizes the collector of each customs district to provide and use small open row- and sailboats, which shall be necessary in boarding vessels and for other purposes. Coast Guard crafts are used by customs officials for boarding purposes and section 541 is therefore obsolete.

Section 542 of title 19 (subsec. 30) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to use elsewhere as the exigencies of the service require, the motorboat provided for Corpus Christi, Tex. No motorboat is now provided or needed for Corpus Christi and there has been none for many years. The provision is obsolete.

Section 549 of title 31 of the code (subsec. 31) directs the comptrollers of customs and surveyors, registers of land offices, and the superintendents of mints to examine the books and accounts of their depositaries, collectors, and treasurers and to make a report to the Secretary of the Treasury. The

functions referred to are performed by the Comptroller General under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 23 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 31, secs. 41–58)), and therefore section 549 is now obsolete.

Section 579 of title 19 (subsec. 32) provides that in a suit on bond for the recovery of duties the court shall grant judgment unless the defendant makes an oath that an error was committed in the liquidation of the duties demanded. This section has been superseded by the protest provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1514).

Section 711 (7) of title 31 (subsec. 33) authorizes a permanent appropriation for the repayment to importers of the excess of deposits for unascertained customs duties, or duties or other moneys paid under protest. This section has been superseded by a permanent indefinite appropriation covering all refunds of customs collections or receipts authorized by law (see act of June 30, 1949, ch. 286, 63 Stat. 360).

Subsection 34 of section 4 (a) of the draft bill will repeal that part of the act of September 30, 1890 (c. 1126, 26 Stat. 511 (formerly codified as U. S. C. title 19, sec. 30)), which provides that such clerks and inspectors as the Secretary may designate shall be authorized to administer oaths of office. This section is related to sections 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27, of title 19, which also are proposed to be repealed, supra. The section is obsolete and should be repealed.

Section 4 (b) of the bill seeks to amend subsection (f) of section 500 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1500 (f)), which provides for the designation of an acting appraiser at ports where there is no appraiser and requires that such acting appraiser take the oath provided in section 21, title 19, supra. It is proposed to repeal the requirement that the acting appraiser take the special oath provided in said section 500 (f) since the provision for that oath is being repealed by subsection 8 of section 4 (a) of this bill. The oath prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 5, sec. 16) will be sufficient.

Section 4 (c) of the bill proposes to amend section 583 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 19, sec. 1583). Section 583 provides that the customs or Coast Guard officer's certification regarding the inspection of the manifest required by that section shall be made on "the back of" the original manifest. The manifest forms now in use have the space for such certification on the front. The procedural detail as to place of certification on a manifest is a minor one that should be left to administrative regulation and it is proposed to delete the language "the back of" in that section.

The 10th of May: Rumania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the national holiday of the Rumanian people. Three great events of its history are celebrated at that date.

The Rumanian people, after more than a thousand years of battles and sacrifices, have succeeded in forging their national unity and in gaining their freedom and independence. Since then—gathered around their King—they have been celebrating their national holiday, May 10, which stands for independence and unity. Today, Rumanians at home cannot celebrate any of their traditional holidays.

During their long history the Rumanians have always stood up against invaders and they have battled against hordes of barbarians pouring into Europe from the East. They have also fought against the forces of the Ottoman Empire.

Some 500 years ago the Turks succeeded in overcoming by their superior numbers the defenders of freedom. The same thing happened a few years ago when the dark forces of communism swallowed up the people of Rumania.

However, the will of the Rumanian nation was not broken. In recognition of the people's drive for freedom, the Rumanian principalities received a special status—as autonomous States—in which the Turks could not interfere. Mircea the Elder, Vlad the Impaler, Stephen the Great, Michael the Brave, John the Fierce are names of brave Rumanian rulers who have fought in the past for independence and unity.

On May 10, 1866, Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Signaringen, was proclaimed in Bucharest Prince of Rumania and so founded the Rumanian dynasty. It was the successful outcome of the nation's long struggle to acquire the right of electing as its sovereign a member of one of the Western nonneighboring reigning families in order to put an end to the strifes and rivalries among native candidates to the throne. This ardent wish, though it had been officially expressed as far back as 1857 by the Moldavian and Vallachian Assemblies—known as the Ad-hoc Divans, which convened as a result of the Paris Treaty of 1856, was nevertheless opposed by both the Russian and Austrian Empires, which were equally alarmed by the growth in power and prestige of the young bordering nation, which they both secretly hoped to absorb some day. Thanks to the unrelentless efforts and thanks to the wise steps taken by Rumanian patriots, and, also, to the constant diplomatic assistance of Napoleon III, all political obstacles were gradually removed, and that which was to be the prosperous and glorious reign of Charles I could be inaugurated on May 10, 1866.

Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, during the turmoil of the Russian-Turkish War, the principality of Rumania, until then nominally a vassal of the Sultan, proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated bonds which still linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube, where the young Rumanian Army, as an ally of Russia, played a noteworthy part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Congress of Berlin of 1878 confirmed Rumania's independence and conferred Europe's official recognition, a bright page in the country's dreary history, though marred unfortunately by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched by Czar Alexander II and his government from the ally who had helped them obtain the victory over the Turks.

Another 4 years elapsed since the Rumanian people had proclaimed their independence and a further step was taken as they decided to raise their country to the rank of a kingdom. On May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned, by the will of his people, King of Rumania. A prosperous era, which lasted over six decades, opened on that day for the nation. Its apex was attained when national unity within the historical boundaries was reached after World War I. The socially progressive country had now become a factor of peace and equilibrium in the southeast of Europe.

During all those years and up to the present time, Rumanians have cherished and revered the 10th of May as their national holiday, the anniversary of glorious events in their history, in which the achievements of the monarchy and of the people were interwoven. This date remains the symbol of the Rumanian permanency and perseverance through woes and hardships in order to reach the ultimate end of freedom and well-being.

The consciousness of the Rumanian people, concerning their unity and independence, is the result of centuries of sacrifices. Today this consciousness remains intact. It cannot be destroyed by either brutality, lies, or oppression.

Soviet Russia, through the intermediary of the Communist regime which it helped install by force, has attempted to tear out of the Rumanian history the sacred days of this nation. Today the Rumanian people are forbidden to celebrate their national holiday. Today, in Rumania, any demonstration of independence is banned. Rumanians no longer can sing their national anthem, nor can they raise the flag of their Independence Day.

However stark the present situation in Rumania may be, this nation which in the past has achieved independence rallying all its forces and courage and enthusiasm around the King, is once more closing ranks around King Michael I, who has remained a symbol of independence and unity.

The ruthless foreign rule which now oppresses the Rumanian nation has not been able to uproot the people's attachment to the traditional celebration of the 10th of May. In order to try and alter at least its significance, celebrations were shifted from the 10th to the 9th of May, the anniversary of a Soviet victory. Although flags are now hoisted on May 9, Rumanians in their captive homeland celebrate nonetheless in their hearts the following day, awaiting with faith and courage the dawn of new times when freedom shall be restored to them.

The Rumanian people have kept their courage and faith. They know that freedom cannot be destroyed. The Rumanian nation looks up with hope toward the free world.

We can assure the Rumanian people that their suffering is known to us and that we are sensitive to the trust they have bestowed upon us, the American people.

The United States will continue to help the progress of the people's free-

dom and the independence of states in the world, certain that the Rumanian people will enjoy once again their national freedom and independence.

Teen-Age Poll on Lowering the Voting Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, a bright group of high-school students in my district under the direction of Dr. Ella Leppart, of University High School, and Professor Gage, of the University of Illinois facility, compiled a poll on teen-age voting. The question was whether or not to lower the minimum voting age from 21 to 18.

This is the only complete and detailed study I know of that has been conducted by tenn-agers themselves on this important problem. We have had that matter before the House in the form of bills on many occasions. Thus far no bill has come out of committee on the matter.

I do believe it is of greatest importance for the Members of the House to read this poll in order to have not only an understanding of the poll but also the reasons given by various students as to why the voting age should be lowered from 21 to 18. This is a most interesting poll and contains some very impartial conclusions.

At this point, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the summary of Teen-Age Poll on Lowering the Voting Age, including the names of the students who worked on the survey:

SUMMARY OF TEEN-AGE POLL ON LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

(Conducted by students in a United States history class, University High School, Urbana, Ill., spring 1955)

OUR AIMS

Our class conducted this poll to ascertain the opinions of high-school juniors and seniors in central Illinois about lowering the voting age. We excluded freshmen and sophomores from our sample because we did not think the problem is as pertinent to them as to uperclassmen. We polled 1,585 juniors and seniors in 10 high schools.

Since we wanted to determine the factors that influence the opinions held on the question of lowering the voting age, we included questions on sex, age, grade, number of social studies courses taken, political party preference, and place of residence.

It was also decided to compare the results of the teen-age poll with another poll. This was a survey of 103 adults in Champaign-Urbana conducted by members of our class. The two polls were planned along the same general lines so a comparison might be made. In planning the teen-age poll the class studied the form used by the Purdue opinion panel.[1] We adapted some of the questions on personal information and our major poll question from this material. We also consulted Prof. Nathaniel P. Gage, bureau of educational research, University of Illinois, on items included in the questionnaire.

In addition to the key question on lowering the voting age, we included questions to determine strength of opinion, reasons for opinion, and whether or not the voting age should be changed by Federal or State action. We were interested in finding out how well-informed teen-agers in central Illinois are on the position that President Eisenhower, ex-President Truman, Senator Douglas, and Senator Dirksen have taken on lowering the voting age. A final question asks for information on the voting requirements in Illinois.

Schools participating in the survey

	Number of students	Percent in survey
Champaign High	364	24
Clinton High	151	10
Henry High	48	3
Lakeview High	152	10
Metamora High	116	7
Urbana High	234	15
Norris City High	94	6
Roxana High	208	13
University High:		
Normal	134	8
Urbana	73	5

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT LOWERING THE VOTING AGE?

A class at University High School, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., is conducting a poll on the question of lowering the voting age from 21 to 18.

DIRECTIONS

Please do not write your name on this paper, as names will not be used. We would like you to answer the following questions by placing a check mark (☒) in the space provided.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. What was your age at your last birthday? ☐ 14 or under. ☐ 15. ☐ 16. ☐ 17. ☐ 18. ☐ 19. ☐ 20 or over.

2. Are you a ☐ junior or a ☐ senior.

3. What is your sex? ☐ M. ☐ F.

4. Which of the following courses have you taken or are you now taking in high school? ☐ United States History. ☐ American Government. ☐ Problems of American Democracy. ☐ Economics. ☐ Sociology. ☐ World History.

5. What political party do you prefer? ☐ Democrat. ☐ Republican. ☐ Other. ☐ No preference.

6. What is the extent of your mother's education? ☐ Did not finish high school. ☐ Did finish high school. ☐ Attended but did not finish 4 years of college. ☐ Finished college. ☐ Don't know.

7. Where have you lived most of your life? ☐ Farm. ☐ Town under 2,500. ☐ Town over 2,500.

POLL QUESTIONS

1. Do you or do you not think that the age requirement for voting should be lowered from 21 to 18 in Illinois? ☐ Should be lowered. ☐ Should not be lowered. ☐ Undecided.

2. Please state briefly your principal reason either for or against the proposal. If you are undecided, please tell why you are undecided.

---

3. How strong is the opinion you gave in answer to question 1? ☐ Very strong. ☐ Moderate. ☐ Don't care.

4. If you are in favor of the proposal (that is, if you marked "Should be lowered" in answer to question 1), how do you think the voting age should be lowered? (If you are not in favor, disregard this question.) ☐ By an amendment to the Federal Constitution lowering the voting age in all States; or ☐ by individual State action; or ☐ undecided.

The following questions will be used to find out how much information people have about the issue of 18-year-old's voting.

This is not a test since you should not sign this paper.

5. Do any of the States now allow 18-year-olds to vote? ☐ Yes. ☐ No. ☐ Don't know.

6. What is the position of Illinois' Senator PAUL DOUGLAS on the question of 18-year-old's voting? ☐ He is in favor. ☐ He is against. ☐ Don't know.

7. What is the position of Illinois' Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN on this same question? ☐ He is in favor. ☐ He is against. ☐ Don't know.

8. What is the position of President Eisenhower on this same question? ☐ He is in favor. ☐ He is against. ☐ Don't know.

9. What is the position of ex-President Truman on this same question? ☐ He is in favor. ☐ He is against. ☐ Don't know.

10. What are the requirements for voting in Illinois?

---

[1] Report of poll No. 40 of the Purdue opinion panel. Division of educational reference, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., November 1954.

Analysis of teen-age poll questions

[Percent]

	Total sample	Sex		Grade		Courses		Political party			
		Boy	Girl	11	12	0-1	2-6	Democratic	Republican	Other	None
1. Do you or do you not think the age requirement for voting should be lowered from 21 to 18 in Illinois?											
Should be lowered	55	57	42	53	44	36	63	33	37	1	27
Should not be lowered	31	40	50	54	42	39	61	24	38	2	32
Undecided	14	42	58	54	42	38	60	28	22	2	45

Boys in the survey sample seem to be more in favor of lowering the voting age than girls, and less uncertain about the question.

Teen-agers who expressed no party preference in the survey seem to be undecided about lowering the voting age.

[Percent]

	Total sample	Should be lowered	Should not be lowered
2. How strong is the opinion you gave in answer to question 1?			
Very strong	45	55	42
Moderate	49	43	54
Do not care	4	13	2

Teen-agers in the poll who favor lowering the voting age tend to have stronger feelings than those who are opposed.

	Number
3. What reasons do you have either for or against the proposal?	
Reasons for:	
"Old enough to fight, old enough to vote"	641
Teen-agers are well informed	234
Teen-agers are mature	101
Teen-agers are assuming adult responsibilities	87
Miscellaneous	53
No answer	37
Reasons against:	
Teen-agers are immature	244
Teen-agers are not informed	205
Teen-agers are easily influenced	118
Miscellaneous	112
Teen-agers lack interest	54
No answer	20

[Percent]

	Total sample	Political party			
		Democratic	Republican	Other	None
4. If you are in favor of the proposal, how do you think the voting age should be lowered?					
Federal amendment	65	32	37	1	28
State action	27	36	36	0	25
Undecided	6	30	25	2	40

Teen-agers in the sample do not seem to follow traditional party lines in determining the method of lowering the voting age.

Again, teen-agers who expressed no political party preference are undecided about this question.

[Percent]

	Should be lowered	Should not be lowered	Undecided
5. Extent of voting information on poll questions 5 to 10:			
Below average (0–3 right)	32	34	41
Average (4–6 right)	47	47	40
Above average (above 6 right)	21	20	18
	In favor	Opposed	Don't know
Position of Eisenhower on this question	[1] 56	10	34
Position of Truman on this question	10	[1] 58	50
Position of Douglas on this question	[1] 26	17	55
Position of Dirksen on this question	14	17	67

[1] Figures in italics are correct responses.

Percentages do not always add up to 100 percent due to rounding errors.

ADULT POLL FINDINGS

1. Do you think the age requirement for voting should be lowered from 21 to 18?

	Percent
Should be lowered	41
Should not be lowered	40
Undecided	19

2. Why do you feel this way?

For:	Percent
Old enough to fight, old enough to vote	56
Teen-agers are mature	16
Teen-agers are well informed	9
Teen-agers are assuming adult responsibilities	19
Against:	
Teen-agers are immature	67
Teen-agers are not informed	19
Teen-agers lack interest	4
Teen-agers are easily influenced	8

Gave no answer to question: 16 percent of total sample.

3. How do you think the voting age should be lowered?

	Percent
Federal amendment	57
State action	23
Undecided	20

4. How strong is your opinion on this subject?

	Percent
Very strong	30
Moderate	56
Don't care	14

The opinions of the 103 adults interviewed in Champaign-Urbana are evenly divided on the question of lowering the voting age.

The greater portion of the adults who approve of lowering the voting age favor an amendment to the Federal Constitution. Half of the remaining favor State action, while the rest are undecided.

Those in favor of lowering the voting age gave as their principal reason that if teen-agers are old enough to be drafted then they are old enough to vote. The main reason given by those adults who oppose lowering the voting age is that teen-agers are not mature enough.

Composition of survey samples

TEEN-AGE POLL

Category:	Percentage in sample
Sex:	
Male	53
Female	46
Grade:	
11th	54
12th	43
Environment:	
Rural	35
Urban	62
Political Party:	
Democrat	30
Republican	35
Other	1
No preference	31
Education in social studies:	
0–1 course	37
2 or more courses	62
Extent of voting information:	
Below average	37
Average	45
Above average	20

ADULT POLL

Category:	Percentage in sample
Sex:	
Male	30
Female	70
Age:	
21–35	39
36–50	34
Older	27

Composition of survey samples—Continued

ADULT POLL—continued

Category—Continued	Percentage in sample
Environment:	
Rural	24
Urban	76
Political party:	
Democrat	25
Republican	41
Other	4
No preference	30

STUDENTS WHO HAVE WORKED ON THE SURVEY

Cochairman: Meg Chalmers, Don Morris.

Mailing Committee: Maribeth Hamp, Corky Lovett, Lela Peters, Dean Wallen, Jane Green, Bill Johnson.

Charts: Jane Bartlett, Elizabeth Garrett, Maribeth Hamp, Tina Howe, Ann Simpson, Jackie Sowers.

Adult Poll Committee: Fred Brightbill, Susan Heller, Tina Howe, Bill Johnson.

IBM machine operators: Elizabeth Garrett, Jane Green, Charles Hassell, Tina Howe, Lela Peters.

Coding: Jane Bartlett, Fred Brightbill, Elizabeth Garrett, Jane Green, Maribeth Hamp, Charles Hassell, Susan Heller, Tina Howe, Bill Johnson, Bob Jones, Dave Lantz, Corky Lovett, Lela Peters, Ann Simpson, Jackie Sowers, Dean Wallen.

Panel: Fred Brightbill, Elizabeth Garrett, Susan Heller, Dave Lantz, Don Morris, Jackie Sowers.

Summary report: Fred Brightbill, Meg Chalmers, Don Morris.

Resolution Urging That Fort Leonard Wood Be Designated a Permanent Military Installation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in an effor to bring to the attention of the proper authorities a serious problem in my district, I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, a copy of the Missouri House of Representatives Resolution 123 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The resolution follows:

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood has served as the training area for thousands of members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood is strategically located in the heart of Missouri's rugged hill country and is climatically situated so that military personnel can be trained under all weather conditions and over a varied terrain which is recognized as one of the best training areas in the United States; and

Whereas the United States has spent great sums of money on Fort Leonard Wood and has one of the greatest concentrations of earth-moving equipment in the world at Fort Wood for the training of Army engineers; and

Whereas Fort Leonard Wood has been designated and is now operating as a temporary installation; and

Whereas Fort Leonard is of great value to the Nation and to Missouri and the closing of Fort Wood would be harmful to the State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this house earnestly urge that Fort Leonard Wood be designated a permanent military installation and operated as a permanent military training center; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk send copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress from Missouri.

Adopted May 3, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that Fort Leonard Wood be designated a permanent Army installation. Fort Leonard Wood is one of the best equipped Army camps in the United States, yet for the want of a permanent designation this installation is operating on a costly short-time basis.

It is neither fair to the soldier nor to the State of Missouri to be constantly threatened with the disbandment of this Army installation. The soldier is adversely affected by lack of off-base housing and countless other facilities which would be provided if there was the security of permanence at this installation. The State of Missouri loses because of the reluctance in developing the area due to the temporary status of the fort. Fort Leonard Wood is one of the best in the Nation and needs development of the surrounding area which would immediately follow if provided with the proper business climate which a declaration of permanency would provide.

Senior Class of the Sunset High School, Sunset, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the fundamental requirements for a continued strong and enlightened America is that more and more of our young people become better acquainted with our democratic principles of government. One way that this could be accomplished would be for every high school student to be allowed to visit the Nation's Capital to view the inspiring sights created by the leaders of this great land; to see the representatives of the people sitting in session to formulate laws for the betterment of our Republic.

One such group is visiting Washington today, Mr. Speaker, it being the senior class of the Sunset High School of Sunset, La., in my district. I feel that I must congratulate the people of Sunset, and especially my old friend, Mr. Ferdie Duos, principal of the school, and the teachers for having undertaken this tour for the students. Mrs. Floyd Domengeaux and Miss Elva Bernard are the type teachers we should strive to retain in our schools in order to continue education which maintains the high ideals of America. The names of the students on this tour, who are seniors of the Sunset High School, represent names of future leaders of our country. They are: Barbara Beaugh, Beatrice Bellmin, Norris Bourgeois, Calvin Bourque, Betty Cazaudebat, Cecilia Cormier, Joyce Courvelle, Ravis Courvelle, Florine Credeur, Earline Dalfrey, Janelle Guilbeaux, Jimmy Guilbeaux, Kathleen Guilbeaux, Nolan Guilbeaux, Dell Horaist, Nell Horaist, J. E. Leger, Eva Dell Meche, Jason Meche, Bobbie Miller, Harold Miller, Agnes Olivier, Alfred Richard, Gayle Richard, Nettie Richard, Shirley Richard, Lincoln Savoie, Lou Wilda Sibille, Nolan Stelly, Sally Thomas, and Ethel Tweedel.

Rock Creek Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, every great city lays claim to some exclusive distinction. The city of Washington of course boasts of the National Capital and all that goes with it.

But Washington possesses something else besides the home of the Government of the land of the free, something else the equal of which is known to no other city in the world. There is not a city that would refuse to trade the greatest distinction it has for the equivalent of Rock Creek Park, thousands of acres of nature at her best, stretching through the length of the city and into Maryland, area available to the people for their recreation and enjoyment. Its picnic areas, its recreation areas, its riding trails, and its abundance of bird life in the very heart of the city is something that a great city could have only because men who dared to look ahead provided the asset when it could become a public possession at other than inflated costs. Hundreds of millions of dollars would replace what is Rock Creek Park today if it were to be lost.

We, in Congress, can take pride in the fact that our predecessors provided this great park. As recently as 1930, and some are still here remember the undertaking, Congress provided for the extension of Rock Creek Park for miles into Maryland. The Capper-Cramton Act of that year was evidence that Congress not only stood ready to protect this great national and community prize but sensed a growing need for its enlargement to accommodate growing populations.

But the things which Congress thought it was providing for in the creation of Rock Creek Park and its extension, are being challenged in no uncertain way. If the planners and builders of roads and express highways can have their way, Rock Creek Park is to become the location of a great six-lane highway throughout its entire length. Already the encroachment is under way, with planning agencies giving a little way here and a little way there to the highway people who love to build roads where right-of-way is free.

Local residents in Maryland have waged a 2-year fight against abandonment of Rock Creek Park to expressways. They have thought the laws governing the park, laws passed by Congress, were adequate. Challenges are riding in the courts at the present time, but in spite of them the Maryland Roads Commission continues to cut its right of way through the park, build overpasses, and so forth.

I have introduced a joint resolution in the House which is completely similar to one introduced in the Senate and upon which the Senate Interior Affairs Committee has conducted hearings. This resolution proposes to preserve Rock Creek Park to its dedicated purposes. I hope the appropriate committee of the House will give the subject early consideration to the end that we may act with expedition and in coordination with the Senate on the subject.

I know I speak the mind of many Members of the House when I say that we ought to go all out in preserving Rock Creek Park. Those predecessors who created it are entitled to whatever action is necessary to save it.

In connection with Rock Creek Day on Sunday, May 15, I am sure that Members and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in the following article entitled "Everybody's Invited to a Fine Park," by Irston R. Barnes, president, Audubon Society of the District of Columbia:

EVERYBODY'S INVITED TO A FINE PARK

(By Irston R. Barnes, president, Audubon Society of the District of Columbia)

Rock Creek Day is Sunday, May 15. The Rock Creek Day committee, a group of community leaders who value outdoor recreation in all its forms, invites all who appreciate Rock Creek Park to spend a part of the day engaging in a favorite pastime in the park.

The invitations are being accepted by Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, hiking clubs, equitation enthusiasts, nature societies, and a host of other groups. And each group, planning its chosen outdoor recreation, is inviting any interested members of the public to join in.

The plan for Rock Creek Day was initiated by the Potomac Valley Conservation and Recreation Council, an information clearing house for citizens' associations, recreation clubs, nature societies, and conservation groups. The council was formed as a result of many individuals and organizations writing to this columnist and endorsing various articles devoted to the importance of preserving the C. & O. Canal, Rock Creek Park, Glover-Archbold Park, the Dyke Marsh, and other park and natural areas.

It is appropriate that we pause in the hurried round of daily living to contemplate, not simply as individuals but as members of the Washington community, what our National Capital would be like if our parks and woodlands were allowed to be eroded further by neglect or ill-advised highway building. I wish that those who loved and enjoyed the Rock Creek Valley of 100, or even 50, years ago had carried their thinking beyond the mere reservation of the park to assure its retention as they knew it.

Rock Creek, in the not distant past, was a lusty, clear, flowing stream which filled its banks and covered the great boulders that now stand amid its shrunken and discolored waters. There is simple testimony to its wild beauty.

President John Quincy Adams had a retreat in the valley where he sought refreshment from the pressures of politics in this romantic glen, listening to the singing of a thousand birds. John Burroughs, when he

resided in Washington, found Rock Creek as wild and savage, and apparently as remote from civilization, as anything one meets with in the mountain sources of the Hudson or the Delaware. And Viscount Bryce, then British Ambassador, thought Rock Creek made Washington unique: "What city in the world is there where a man * * * can within a quarter of an hour and on his own feet get in a beautiful rocky glen such as you would find in the woods of Maine or Scotland—a winding rocky glen with a broad stream foaming over its stony bed; and wild leafy woods looking down on each side."

Such was Rock Creek not many years ago, as pictured in the sober, unexaggerated testimony of responsible witnesses. What would it not be worth if we could have kept Rock Creek as these men knew it.

And how Theodore Roosevelt, if he could return today, would berate those between his day and ours who have already appropriated most of the park below Porter Street for motor roads. As a practicing apostle of physical fitness and the rugged life, he has described his joy, when he was President, in going on rough cross-country walks, perhaps down Rock Creek, which was then as wild as a stream in the White Mountains.

Louis J. Halle, author of Spring in Washington, writing in the Atlantic Naturalist, gave his evaluation of Rock Creek today in these words:

"In the midst of a city whose piles of brick and concrete and whose stretches of macadam represent the temporal devices of mankind, an area like Rock Creek represents the elements of eternity. Exposure to these elements is essential if men are to keep their contact with ultimate reality, and an area like Rock Creek Park ought consequently to be regarded as an indispensable feature of our National Capital. It is there to nourish the vision that justifies the Nation."

So as we prepare to participate in Rock Creek Day, we are joining a notable company of the great men of other days who have found in the natural majesty of Washington's setting that re-creation of body, mind, and spirit which they needed to fit them for the trials of their days.

Another United States Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Van Richardson, of Greenwood, Miss., is a candidate for president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. From my knowledge of Mr. Richardson as a personal friend, I regard him as ideally suited for this challenging assignment. This regard is shared by those who know him in Mississippi, as evidenced by the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) State-Times:

ANOTHER UNITED STATES LEADER

By the happy circumstance of Boyd Campbell's residence here, Mississippi has among its citizens for the first time the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Our pride in his accomplishment is shared by all Mississippians.

Now it appears the State may provide the chief officer of another national organization, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. Van Richardson, of Greenwood, a native of Hinds County, by the way, is considered high on the list of possibilities for that post.

Mr. Richardson has made an outstanding record in junior chamber affairs, serving as president of the Mississippi organization and as director and vice president of the national group. He was selected as Mississippi's outstanding young man for 1953, on the basis of his business and civic achievements.

We are quite aware that junior chamber conventions are exceeded in political pressures per square inch only by the Democratic and Republican conclaves, and we don't intend to intrude in the affairs of a private organization. All we can say is, we don't believe the junior chamber could do better than select Mississippi's Van Richardson as its national president.

Anyway, it would be handy for the United States chambers, junior and senior, to have their top-level leadership within the bounds of a single State. That State, of course, should be Mississippi.

H. R. 4267

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 14, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a petition signed by a number of the members of the General Baptist Church, Maunie, Ill., who favor legislation, as proposed in House bill 4267, which would prevent the advertising of alcoholic beverages.

The petition follows:

GENERAL BAPTIST CHURCH,
Maunie, Ill., May 5, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
Member of House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VURSELL: We, your constituents, respectfully petition you to protect us in our rights as parents and as purchasers, and to help us bring up mentally and morally sound children in a way to conquer juvenile delinquency in our midst by exercising the powers of Congress to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders of commodities which have been declared unlawful either by their legislatures or by the people exercising the rights of local option granted them under State law. We also earnestly beg you to appear personally at the hearings in support of House bill 4267, Senate bill 923, and the Bryson bill, if and when introduced. Request that a brief note of this petition be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. Nolen Pruitt, Rev. Clifton Evans, Mrs. Theodore Phelps, Mrs. Jessie Weedman, Mrs. Donald Gaines, Maxine Evans, Rev. Bobly G. Holtzclaw, Mary Lou Simmons, Rose Parker, Lela LaMar, Mary Wells, Irene Davis, Reba Grunlee, Stella Weare, Rev. Thomas Holtzclaw, Freda Mick, Fred F. Mick, Rachel Mick, Anna Mick, Dulca Rose, Theron Bonner, Anna Bonner, Lola Cooper, Edna Fern Westergard, Estle Pardue, Roscoe Pardue, Mrs. Anna Wells, Mrs. Ethel Frashies, Mrs. Donald Youngman, Marjorie Thomas, Anna Stuky, Mr. Fred Roser, Mrs. Fred Roser, Rev. Clifton Evans, Rusch Rippy, Iona Brown, Zev Reynolds, Ione Elliott, Ida M. Gaines, Mrs. Florence Holtzclaw, Mrs. Z. W. Reynolds.

Creation of a United States Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, from a military viewpoint, the United States has won all of its wars. It has not been so successful, however, in its efforts to protect the rights and advance the interests of our Nation through diplomatic negotiations. Some of our defeats in diplomacy have been tragic preludes or postludes to our Nation's great sacrifices in blood and fortune on the altars of freedom and justice.

Because of the utter destructiveness of modern nuclear weapons, winning a war may never again mean a real victory for either side—if it ever has meant true victory. Global warfare, if it ever occurs again, may mean global suicide. More than ever before it has become necessary that this Nation win through diplomacy rather than try to win through war. Maintenance of peace has become necessary for the preservation of civilization.

Why has the United States in the past sometimes won a war and lost the peace? What is the significance of our military victories and diplomatic losses in relation to the future?

Our victories in warfare have been due largely to our foresight in making suitable provisions for selecting and training men for military leadership. Our shortcomings in diplomacy have been due largely to our failure to make similar provisions for selecting and training men for our Foreign Service. The increasing need for maintenance of peaceful relationships with other nations has now made necessary the strengthening of all our forces engaged in diplomatic negotiations.

On April 11 of this year Soviet Russia suddenly offered to restore Austria's freedom on the condition that that country must remain neutral and permit no foreign bases on its soil. Soviet propaganda agencies are hinting at a similar offer to Germany—holding before the nationality-conscious German people the luring vision of a neutral, united Germany. Soviet Russia has thus taken the diplomatic initiative away from the West, and has strengthened neutralists not only in Germany but throughout the free world. It goes without saying that the importance to the United States of the rearmament of Western Germany is incalculable. Yet Soviet Russia has forced us to negotiate at her bidding concerning Austria, and may later force us to negotiate concerning Germany.

The current tensions in international relations in general and recent developments respecting Germany in particular point up the continuing need for the advancement of the interests of freedom throughout the world. Prominent political scientists have predicted that serious international tensions will continue

for many years to come. The United States must select and train its best qualified young men to work for the easement of these tensions and for the preservation of our freedom and the promotion of our national welfare through diplomacy.

I am therefore introducing a bill proposing "that in order to promote greater understanding and goodwill throughout the world and to provide for a trained force for the Foreign Service of the United States, ambassadors, ministers, and other officers, there is hereby established an academy to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy."

Applicants accepted for training in the Academy would be required to pass entrance examinations testing their general knowledge and their intellectual capacities and aptitude for the Foreign Service. They would be selected in a manner insuring nationwide representation in the Academy.

The course of study would be designed to assure that graduates would have the ability effectively to represent the interests of the United States abroad, and would have an understanding of the foreign peoples with whom they would live and work.

In general the Academy would provide an educational system for the Foreign Service comparable to that which the Congress has established for officers of the armed services. I have pointed out circumstances which show that selection and training of officers for our Foreign Service has become of paramount importance. Let us create a Foreign Service Academy now while there is hope for the extension of international understanding, peace, and freedom throughout the world.

Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis of H. R. 6059, the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955, there follows an explanation of this legislation for the information of the Members of Congress and the public. The Committee on Ways and Means has announced public hearings to be held on H. R. 6059 beginning on Monday, May 16.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6059, THE PHILIPPINE TRADE AGREEMENT REVISION ACT OF 1955

EXPLANATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATION OF 1946 TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES

Preamble

The preamble is revised to delete the reference to the war against Japan and to emphasize the need to strengthen the economy of the Philippines.

Article I

Recommendation: Replace the schedules for the disappearance of tariff preferences for Philippine articles imported into the United States and for United States articles imported into the Philippines by new schedules which are more liberal to the Philippines, as set forth below:

Percentages of customs duties applied

Calendar year	By the United States to imports from the Philippines		By the Philippines to imports from the United States	
	1946 agreement as extended	Revised agreement	1946 agreement as extended	Revised agreement
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1956	15	5	15	25
1957	20	5	20	25
1958	25	5	25	25
1959	30	10	30	50
1960	35	10	35	50
1961	40	10	40	50
1962	45	20	45	75
1963	50	20	50	75
1964	55	20	55	75
1965	60	40	60	90
1966	65	40	65	90
1967	70	40	70	90
1968	75	60	75	90
1969	80	60	80	90
1970	85	60	85	90
1971	90	80	90	90
1972	95	80	95	90
1973	100	80	100	90
1974	100	100	100	100

The Philippines undertakes to eliminate the present 17-percent tax on sales of foreign exchange and to replace this tax with a temporary special import levy, exempt from the preferences applicable to United States articles, which levy will be progressively reduced at the rate of 10 percent per year, beginning in the calendar year 1957. Provisions are included for the suspension of this schedule of reduction in the event Philippine revenues in any calendar year from tariffs on United States goods and from the temporary special import levy on United States goods fall below the proceeds of the foreign-exchange tax on payments for United States goods in the calendar year 1955.

Discussion: Modification of the tariff relations of the two countries so as to give the greatest possible impetus to the lagging Philippine economy was the most urgent objective of the Philippines in requesting revision of the 1946 agreement. The Philippine Economic Mission stated that free entry for American goods entering the Philippines had prevented the development of Philippine industry and had deprived the Philippine Government of revenues vitally needed for the economic development of the country. It argued that although the reciprocal preferences were intended to be equally advantageous to both countries, the Philippines for the first few years after the war had been unable to make much use of their privilege in the American market because of the havoc which the war had caused to their productive facilities, whereas American goods, and especially nonessentials, had poured into the Philippines during the first 5 years of independence. To correct this state of affairs the mission proposed a selective free-trade arrangement whereby free entry on all United States imports from the Philippines would continue through 1970 and rapidly disappear between that date and the expiration of the agreement, while free entry into the Philippines would continue to be extended through 1970 to selected American articles which were essential to Philippine needs and the remainder of American articles (constituting roughly two-thirds of the total) would become immediately subject to full Philippine duties. Revision of article I on any such basis was rejected by the United States delegation on several grounds, including the difficulty of separating American exports to the Philippines into two categories, one to be greatly benefited and the other to be greatly penalized. It was made clear that any change in this part of the agreement would have to be on a general basis. The preference schedules that were finally agreed to, as set forth above, represented the result of gradually working the Filipinos away from the extreme demands with which they began.

It is the general opinion of the United States negotiators that unless substantial satisfaction, such as the recommended modification, is given to the Philippines on the question of tariff preferences, and particularly on Philippine preferences in the United States, there is a real possibility that the Philippine Government will decide to give notice of termination of the 1946 agreement.

In return for these tariff modifications the United States delegation insisted on and obtained the undertaking described above with respect to elimination of the 17 percent exchange tax. Much of the sacrifice that will be entailed from 1957 to 1966 in meeting the higher rates of the Philippine tariff, under the reduction of preferences recommended, will be compensated by the decline in the temporary special import tax that will replace the exchange tax. A further advantage of this provision is that the exchange tax on invisibles will disappear as soon as the revision is adopted, a fact which should be generally encouraging to the establishment of new American investments in the Philippines as well as a material gain for existing investments. The disappearance of the exchange tax will at the same time remove a discrimination against American shipping which has been subject to this tax while competing air carriers have been exempt from it.

Article II

Recommendations: Amend paragraph 1 to delete any reference to rice (item C of schedule) and to remove the present absolute quotas on cigars, scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons (items D to G, inclusive, of schedule). Insert a statement that the present absolute quotas on Philippine raw and refined sugars shall be without prejudice to any increases which the United States Congress might allocate to the Philippines in the future. Amend paragraph 2 to provide for a new and slower schedule for the progressive decrease of the duty-free quotas on cigars, scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons. For the sake of clarity divide the schedule in the 1946 agreement into two schedules to show separately the items subject to absolute quotas and those subject to tariff quotas. Delete paragraphs 3 and 4 which specify how the allocation in the Philippines of United States quotas on Philippine products is to be made.

Discussion: The recommendation for removal of the absolute quotas on cigars, tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons is based on the following reasons: That these quotas being applicable only to the Philippines are discriminatory; that they are unnecessary for the purpose of protecting domestic industry since the United States retains the right under article III to impose quotas where there is injury or threat to a domestic industry; that the quotas on Philippine cigars and scrap tobacco are so much greater than the amounts on these articles presently exported to the United States that they are practically meaningless; and that the quota on coconut oil for the same reason is likewise without any restrictive effect on Filipino exporters and without any protective effect for American producers. A further argument, advanced by the Filipinos, was that the Philippines had been unable, because of the time required to rehabilitate their export industries, to take much advantage of the quotas in the early years following

independence. Rice has been deleted from the quota list altogether for the reason that the Philippines has been and for some time will probably continue to be an importer rather than an exporter of rice, and that if it should ever have a surplus rice production available for export, neighboring countries, notably Japan, offer a natural market for this product. No change was recommended with respect to the quota on cordage (item B of the 1946 schedule). The sugar quota was not modified, and the United States delegation repeatedly emphasized during the negotiation that this quota was not a limitation so far as the Philippines was concerned, but rather a privilege to share in a premium market for sugar where the Philippines would probably be unable to sell at all in free and open competition with other foreign countries.

The quantities specified in the 1946 schedule for cigars, scrap tobacco, coconut oil, and buttons (items D to G), although recommended for elimination as absolute quotas, were recommended for retention as the bases for calculating the duty-free tariff quotas on these articles. The progressive diminution of these duty-free quotas was slackened so that the products subject thereto might receive a benefit comparable to the slower application of United States customs duties to Philippine articles as recommended under article I, and the rates for the disappearance of the United States tariff preferences will be seen to be the same as the rates for the disappearance of the United States tariff quotas.

The Filipinos were insistent upon the elimination of the provisions specifying how United States quotas were to be allocated among the several producers in the Philippines. They felt that these provisions were an infringement of Philippine rights, and they considered also that the continued maintenance of the original quotas tended to arrest development in the respective industries by discriminating against new producers. The United States delegation reached the conclusion that these allocations had served their original purpose which was to facilitate the recovery of firms whose businesses had been destroyed by the war. It found that the American interests in these several industries were not so great as to warrant such special protection, particularly since they enjoyed general protection under other provisions of the agreement. No objection whatever to the elimination of these allocation provisions has come to the attention of the United States delegation.

Article III

Recommendations: Make reciprocal provision for the establishment of quantitative restrictions on imports to protect domestic industries from injurious competition and to safeguard monetary reserves.

Discussion: Article III of the 1946 agreement permits the United States to impose quantitative restrictions on imports from the Philippines for the protection of domestic industry, but it says nothing about the establishment of import quotas by the Philippines, either for protective or for any other reasons. Whereas the United States has found no occasion to utilize its power under this article, the Philippines has imposed numerous quantitative import restrictions, some amounting to absolute prohibitions on the importation of products of the United States. The introduction of the new reciprocal provisions should therefore give American trade a measure of protection which it has not had under the existing agreement. The article attempts to define the size of quotas which may be imposed for protective purposes and to insure the admission of at least token quantities of any commodity to protect regular channels of trade. It defines also in general terms the circumstances under which quotas may be imposed for balance of payments reasons. There is a consultation provision which should discourage arbitrary or precipitate action. This article is considered by the United States delegation as an important improvement in the agreement from the standpoint of the United States. Had there been such a provision in the original agreement, the Philippines would not have been free to adopt drastic limitations on imports of American tobacco for the purpose of protecting domestic industry.

Article IV

Recommendation: Delete paragraph 3 prohibiting the imposition of an export tax by either country upon products which it exports to the other.

Discussion: In its urgent need to raise additional revenues the Philippine Government wishes to be free to impose export taxes if it sees fit. Since the United States does not attempt to put a prohibition on the use of export taxes on other countries with which it does business, no justification is seen for retaining the prohibition in the Philippine agreement. The United States delegation has, however, pointed out the danger to the Philippines from an abuse of this power.

Article V

Recommendation:

1. Delete the entire article on currency and exchange as it appears in the 1946 agreement.

2. Insert in this place a new article V whereby the Philippines undertakes to enact legislation to complement that which was passed in the last session of the United States Congress to facilitate the reciprocal entry of traders.

Discussion: From the outset of the negotiations the Philippine Economic Mission laid stress on the need to eliminate the provision of the 1946 agreement whereby the Philippines had to get the agreement of the President of the United States to change the value of its currency or to impose controls on the transfer of funds to the United States. It maintained that this was an infringement of the right of the Philippines as a sovereign nation, and insisted on complete elimination of the article. The United States delegation endeavored to substitute for the old article reciprocal provisions with respect to exchange restrictions comparable to those used in recent treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation to which the United States is a party, but the Philippine Mission claimed that as a member in good standing of the International Monetary Fund, the Philippines was already making all of the commitments in this field which it was willing to make. The sentiment of American business, as ascertained in the public hearings which were held and in the briefs which were submitted to the United States delegation, indicated a general willingness to see this article deleted and no strong objection thereto from any business quarter.

The new article V with respect to treaty merchant status was inserted at the request of the United States delegation to make sure that the Philippines would carry through on their side the legislation necessary to permit the two countries to enter into an agreement to facilitate the entry of traders from each country into the other. The absence of such an agreement, and indeed of any agreement with respect to immigration, is a source of genuine anxiety to Americans in the Philippines today. Action taken prior to signature of the agreement by the Republic of the Philippines with respect to proposed article V will be reflected in modification of that article, as permitted under section 203 of the proposed authorizing legislation for the revised trade agreement. Thus, if the necessary legislative and executive actions are taken by the Philippine Congress, provisions on entry of traders could, if desired, be incorporated into the revised trade agreement as article V, or, if a separate agreement on this subject is desired, the proposed new article could be deleted.

Article VI

Recommendation: Article VI in the original agreement related to immigration, and its provisions have now expired. This subject is treated in article V of the recommended revision. Article VII of the 1946 agreement, concerning parity rights, therefore, becomes article VI in the revised agreement. The recommended modifications of the parity article would delete the obsolete provisions, including part of paragraph 1 and all of paragraph 2, mutualize the rights provided in paragraph 1 with respect to the exploitation of natural resources and the operation of public utilities, and specify the reservations which the United States must make to protect existing Federal legislation and the constitutions and laws of the States, which reservations would also be mutualized.

Discussion: The Philippines has long resented the parity provisions of the 1946 agreement as an infringement of their sovereign rights, since no corresponding rights were granted in the agreement to Filipinos in the United States. The Philippine Economic Mission requested the complete termination of these provisions unless a satisfactory mutualizing formula could be found, and during the negotiations it was clear that the mission would have preferred the former. The United States delegation declined to consider termination of parity, which was regarded by American business as perhaps the most important benefit which the United States gained through the agreement. To mutualize the provisions, the reservations had to be spelled out in detail, and this has resulted in some rather complicated language. The purpose of the revision is to protect American rights already acquired under the 1946 agreement, and to continue parity rights for the duration of the agreement to the extent that the United States and the individual States of the United States are prepared to grant similar rights to Filipinos. So strongly did the Philippine mission feel about the necessity to mutualize this provision in every respect that had completely mutualizing language not been found, it is doubtful whether the parity article could have been retained.

Article VII

Recommendation: Insert here a new article providing for reciprocal nondiscrimination by either party against the citizens or enterprises of the other with respect to engaging in business activities, subject to the reservation of the constitutions and laws of the States of the United States and the mutualization of these reservations.

Discussion: The 1946 agreement contained no clear statement of rights of Americans to engage in business enterprises in the Philippines other than those referred to in the parity article, but there was a penalty provision (par. 4 of art. X), unilateral and regarded by the Philippines as harsh, whereby the President of the United States could suspend the agreement in whole or in part if the Philippines discriminated in any way against Americans or American companies. The recommendation in the final act provides for reciprocal national treatment with respect to engaging in business activities, subject to the necessary reservation of the constitutions and laws of the several States, which reservation is also mutualized. The rights of Americans already engaged in business in the Philippines are protected.

Article VIII

Recommendation: The substance of old article VIII is transferred to article IX and a new article is inserted here containing security exceptions for which there was no provision in the 1946 agreement.

Discussion: The new article contains the usual type of security exceptions included in international agreements to which the United States is a party.

Article IX

Recommendation: This article as revised contains the amended substance of article VIII of the original text. The last clause of paragraph 1 of old article VIII is deleted as obsolete. All of paragraph 2 after the first sentence relates to the allocation of quotas and is deleted in view of the recommendation under article II that all provisions for the allocation of quotas be eliminated. All of paragraph 3 is deleted as now obsolete since the work of the Philippine War Damage Commission is completed and the Commission is no longer in existence. There remain only the general provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 with respect to implementation by the two parties of the provisions of the agreement.

Article X

Recommendation: The subject of old article IX (consultation) has been transferred to article X and amended to provide for a consultation not later than July 1, 1971, on joint problems which may arise as a result or in anticipation of the termination of the agreement.

Discussion: The added language is to ensure that at a reasonable length of time before the expiration of the agreement the two parties meet to consider what the situation will be after expiration. The important problems for American investment in the Philippines which will arise in connection with expiration of the agreement should not be left to last-minute consideration.

Article XI

Recommendation: The amended substance of article X of the existing agreement, with respect to termination, is transferred to article XI. Paragraphs 1 and 3 are deleted as obsolete. Paragraph 4 is deleted inasmuch as its purpose, which was to provide for nondiscriminatory treatment of American citizens and firms, has been put into positive reciprocal undertakings in the new article VII. Only paragraph 2 remains of the article. Add a new paragraph providing for entry into force of the revising agreement.

Discussion: Paragraph 4 of article X, because of its unilateral and penalizing character, was offensive to Philippine national pride and regarded by Filipinos as unjust. The Acting Secretary of Foreign Affairs referred to this provision in 1954 as intolerable. American business firms in the Philippines have felt that the provision gave them no positive security since it contained no assurance by the Philippine Government that the latter would in fact not discriminate against them, and the American Chamber of Commerce in Manila informed the United States delegation of its members' wish that this article be clarified. The meaning of "discriminating" was not defined, and while the United States Government understood this term to mean national treatment for Americans in most circumstances, theer were indications that the Government of the Philippines did not view it as necessarily requiring more than most-favored-nation treatment. The usefulness of the provision in the hands of the President of the United States in the event of Philippine discrimination was problematical, since it obviously would not be invoked except under great provocation, and the provision had in fact never been invoked.

The positive undertaking of the Philippine Government as contained in article VII of the recommended revision assures Americans in the Philippines of national treatment with respect to engaging in business activities and is a marked improvement over paragraph 4 of article X in the existing agreement. The portion of old article X that is retained in the revision, former paragraph 2, contains all of the termination provisions that are regarded as necessary. The new paragraph provides that the revising agreement shall enter into force on January 1, 1956.

Protocol

Recommendation: Add to the definitions of "United States article" and "Philippine article" as contained in paragraph 1 (e) and (f) a statement that such articles do not lose their status as such by reason of being imported from a country other than the Philippines or the United States or from an insular possession of the United States or by way of or via such a country or insular possession.

Discussion: The Philippine Government has been treating items manufactured in the United States and imported from Guam and from third countries as not entitled to the tariff preferences accorded United States articles under the 1946 agreement.

General

Certain stylistic changes and changes in references or citations where appropriate are also included in the proposed revising agreement.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, for the week of May 9, 1955, which recalls the ending of the European war 10 years ago:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Do you remember your thoughts on that miraculous day 10 years ago when the word came flashing through that the war in Europe had ended? Were you among those who breathed a prayer of thanks to Almighty God, and felt utopia had arrived? Or were your thoughts—happy in the victory but tinged still with fear—turned rather to the Pacific?

It is hard now to recapture the feeling of that moment when we learned of Nazi Germany's surrender. It was one of the great climactic moments of life.

It was also a moment for dreams—dreams of reunited families, of renewed ties, of doing together many things long delayed. It was a time, too, for dreams of a perfect world.

The term "postwar world" was a phrase which meant to each of us the achievement of every goal, the realization of every dream, the accomplishment of a durable peace in which people everywhere would be free and content.

Of course, no such perfect world has come into being. Life still has many heartbreaks and private tragedies; life still has the ever-present threat of war—of a more horrible kind of war than we had even imagined possible just 10 years ago.

The United Nations, to which we were going to assign the responsibility for keeping the peace and making it into that dreamed-of reality, has rather stumbled along and muddled along. East and West are divided, armed camps nervously watching one another in deepest suspicion and mistrust.

No, the dream we dreamed 10 years ago has not materialized. The human race lived through the kind of ordeal in that war which should have cleansed the soul of mankind—but, alas, we have retained our contrary and oh-so-human characteristics. We have failed to live up to dreams we fashioned for ourselves. We wanted to wish our way to world peace.

But let us look, too, at the other side of the coin. Ten years ago we won the right to try to establish a basis for enduring world peace. We brought liberation to vast areas of the earth—liberation from dictatorship and tyranny and oppression. True, there are still vast areas which are not free.

But we are free to keep working for their freedom. And we shall never be deterred from that goal. For in its achievement lies, finally, the realization of all of our own dreams of that perfect world we thought 10 years ago was then just a matter of days, or weeks, or months—at most just a few years—away.

Do you remember?

The 100th Anniversary of Louisiana's State Board of Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the past 100 years have been memorable ones for Louisiana in the field of health. All of us—all the American people—are, in a very real sense, reaping the benefits of the advanced thinking and courageous pioneering which emanated from Louisiana on March 15, 1855. For on that date the first State board of health in this country was authorized.

The story of the development of public health administration in Louisiana from its beginning is a fascinating one, shot through with the threads of our national history—civil war, reconstruction, and the emergence of modern America as a scientific leader. A mere fragmentary historical note will serve to pay incomplete tribute to the "giants that walked the land" in those pioneer days.

Since the early struggles of Louisiana are largely to be read in the flow of events which shaped the growth of the city of New Orleans, it is to its history we must turn. Its strategic location at the foot of the Mississippi River and as a great port of entry gave rise to one of the major events in United States history—the Louisiana Purchase.

In the shaping of its own destiny, the location of New Orleans greatly favoring the recurrence of those "malignant, pestilential, and infectious diseases" which ravaged its population down to the 20th century, was most important. And as the growing trade brought to the city and State a constantly increasing and fluctuating population, the question of disease and adequate provisions for treatment and control were the major

health problems which faced the new State.

From 1793 to 1901 New Orleans is reported to have lost 41,348 inhabitants from yellow fever alone. Lack of scientific knowledge regarding the cause of this dread scourge down to the 20th century was one reason for its relentless recurrence. It was the disastrous yellow-fever epidemics of 1853 and 1854 in Louisiana which prompted a small band of pioneers to set up a bold experiment—to establish a board of health which would be responsible for the protection of the entire State. This was only 5 years after the publication of one of the most remarkable documents in the history of public health—the Shattuck report of the Massachusetts Sanitary Commission. This document recommended many public health duties which should be undertaken by the State, but which for those days, were practically revolutionary. Many of its wise recommendations, especially those pertaining to quarantine measures, were incorporated in Louisiana's public health act 336 of 1855.

Quarantine was not the only duty of the Board. Its broader duties are stated in section 6 of the act which provides:

The Board of Health shall have power to remove, or cause to be removed, any substance which they may deem detrimental to the health of the city of New Orleans, and the Commissioners of Streets shall execute their orders, whenever not in conflict with the ordinances of the city or the laws of the State; to pass and enforce sanitary ordinances for the city, provided the same are approved by the council and published as city ordinances; and impose additional duties to officers appointed under this act; to issue warrants to any constable, police officer, or sheriff in the State, to apprehend and remove such person or persons as cannot be otherwise subjected to the provisions of this act, or who shall have violated the same, and whenever it shall be necessary to do so, to issue their warrants to the sheriff of the city or parish where any vessel may be, having violated the provisions of this act, commanding him to remove said vessel at the quarantine grounds, and arrest the officers thereof.

Nearly 20 years were to elapse before other States followed suit and established State boards of health. In 1869 Massachusetts established what historians usually credit the first permanent State board of health. It must be remembered that Louisiana was vitally involved in the turmoil of the Civil War and Reconstruction periods, so that for a very brief period during the 1860's, records for the Louisiana State Board of Health are incompleted. There is, however, a recent article which carefully documents the continuity and permanency of the health board established in 1855. According to this article, published in the October, 1951 issue of the American Journal of Public Health, "at no time from 1855 on was the State of Louisiana without a law requiring the establishment of a State board of health, nor was the State without such a board of health for any appreciable period that might be considered as a gap in its continuity. The year 1898, which has sometimes been given as the date when the Louisiana State Board of Health was established, is really the date when a more comprehensive act was passed to include all the provisions for public health recommended by most of the previous boards in the 42-year period beginning with the tenure of the first State health officer, Dr. A. Forster Axson.

From 1898 on, the Louisiana State Board of Health has continued to build on the foundation laid in 1855. The 20th century brought an avalanche of new scientific knowledge to the field of public health. It provided also a great impetus to the Louisiana State Board of Health, to take advantage of the newly discovered ways of preventing disease and improving health.

The concepts of public health as we know them today have their roots, therefore, in the act of 1855, establishing State governmental responsibility for the health protection of Louisiana citizens. The success of this principle has demonstrated that State and local planning is the only foundation on which we can build toward our national health goals. Progress at the national level depends on action by the people in individual communities throughout the Nation; on their initiative, and the urgency of their demand for better health. In this light, it is not an exaggeration to pay tribute to the "giants that walked the land" in Louisiana in 1855.

The Heritage of Schiller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the 150th anniversary of the death of Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller, great German poet and author of some of the world's greatest literature, including the immortal story of William Tell:

THE HERITAGE OF SCHILLER

The burden of my message on the 150th anniversary of the death of Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller is that in this genius we have a deeply German poet with a universal ideal. The ideal, nurtured in the German milieu of his time, was a savage love of liberty. No nation has ever been without its quota of tyranny, bigotry, and stupidity, not even the most enlightened at the peak of its enlightenment. This perfection is as rare of achievement in nations as it is in individuals. And tyranny was the target at which this brilliant poet leveled the wit, the insight, and the skill of his articulateness. He cut the tyrant and tyranny to pieces with language that spoke from the influences of German culture and that expressed qualities inside the soul of the German people. In days like these, heavy with the bitter remembrance of recent evil, this fundamental trait in the people of Germany is worthy of emphasis.

For it is as impossible to think of Schiller without thinking of Germany, as it is to think of Shakespeare without thinking of England. Or Homer without thinking of the ancient Greeks. Or Racine without thinking of France. Or Walt Whitman without thinking of America. If I had to say what do I think is Schiller's greatest service to the German people I would say it is his representation to the German people themselves, and his representation to the world of the noblest characteristics in the German character. He did it through his poetry and through his dramas. It is what I call the noblest trait which is embodied in the word "liberty." And it is his accent on liberty which, in my judgment, gives his lifework a universal ideal. For liberty has, since the beginning of man, been the goal for which man strove most mightily.

It is, of course, an interesting speculation—but only a speculation—to judge how the thinking of Schiller, getting its roots from the climate of the Germany of his time, influenced those Germans who, coming to this country, have enshrined themselves in American history. Or was it not Schiller per se, but the atmosphere that was German and influenced Schiller, which also influenced those Germans who, emigrating to America, did so much to make America great? Either way, it seems to me, the evidence should help us to dampen the fires of postwar acrimony in our own time, and build up in us that "malice toward none, and charity for all" which is the better side of civilized behavior.

Schiller is hardly a name too well known in America. But that cannot alter the fact that what he wrote not only fertilized freedom of thought everywhere, but may, indirectly, have produced profound results for the forward march of the forces of freedom. Until Schiller made of the story of William Tell, for example, the great legend that it has become it was only a fragment of the forgotten history of the Swiss and the Austrians. Today wherever almost any language is spoken the epic of William Tell is the story, on the highest dramatic plane, of man's intrepid struggle to be free. It is a part, in fact, of the universal literature of mankind. We, and no other people, except his own, can claim Schiller, for he is a German of the Germans. But I venture to guess that God—who, we have been told, moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform—had in mind the freedom not only of Germany, but of all mankind when He gave us this universal genius as His gift. In that sense Schiller, who died 150 years ago, lives forever and for all of us.

Polish Constitution of the 3d of May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted May 1, 1955, at the Third of May Polish Constitution anniversary celebration held in Humboldt Park, in Chicago, Ill., at the foot of the Kosciusko Monument.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED MAY 1, 1955, AT THE 3D OF MAY POLISH CONSTITUTION ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION IN CHICAGO, ILL.

We American citizens of Polish ancestry, assembled in Humboldt Park, in Chicago, Ill., at the foot of the Kosciusko Monument, the hero of the battles for the independence of

Poland and the United States, to honor the memory of the adoption of the Constitution of the Third of May and its distinguished authors, declare:

1. Americans of Polish ancestry have time and time again demonstrated their unquestioned loyalty and devotion to the institutions and traditions of America and are ever ready to defend them.

2. The Polish Nation, as shown by the Constitution of the Third of May, has always been a champion of freedom and liberty for all the people.

3. During World War II America and Poland were comrades in arms in the battle to preserve the liberties of nations against ruthless aggression, and Poland remained throughout the war the most faithful ally of the peoples of the West.

4. We most solemnly condemn the betrayal of the people of Poland at Teheran and Yalta and their surrender to the domination of communistic Soviet Russia.

We further declare that American foreign policy should be based upon the spirit of our Founding Fathers as fully expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States.

In making the foregoing declarations, we demand:

(1) The repudiation of the infamous and unjust Yalta pact by the Senate of the United States.

(2) The immediate closing of all Communist embassies which are now used primarily as espionage centers and are a threat to our national security.

(3) A determined, unwavering stand in all negotiations with the Communists in the Far East.

(4) An unequivocal declaration that the United States does not recognize the seizure of Polish territory nor the destruction of Polish sovereignty with the right to free unfettered self-expression as a nation and a people.

We appeal to all Americans to join in the battle to destroy materialistic communism and to reassert the dignity of individual man sought by humanity from the beginning of time.

Long live the United States.

Long live restored, integral, and independent Poland.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
Chairman.
MICHAEL MOKRZYCKI,
Secretary.

Centennial of Organized Public Health in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the public-health program of the United States has saved thousands of lives and has made happier and healthier living for millions. I am proud that my home State of Louisiana has been a pioneer in this great program. This year marks the centennial anniversary of organized public health in Louisiana, and this significant event is being commemorated in connection with the annual meeting of the southern branch of the American Public Health Association with which the Louisiana Public Health Association is affiliated. Public-health workers from 16 Southern States, the District of Columbia, and Latin America are gathered in New Ordeans today for sessions continuing 4 days.

While there is some difference of opinion concerning the first official State board of health in this country, the evidence is that the first Louisiana State board of health was established in 1855 and this has become an accepted fact.

I am glad of the opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues, the long and important part Louisiana has had in this wonderful work.

The Business Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, appended herewith is an editorial of the New York Times as of April 28 giving a further picture of the business recovery that has been made in this country in the past few months. It is a credit to the New York Times that it has followed this matter as closely as it has and has been frank in its attempt to point this out to its readers. So much was said last year about the condition of the country in election year, but it appears that very little is being said this year to reassure the people of the work the Eisenhower administration has been doing to keep the country on a high economic standard.

The editorial follows:

THE BUSINESS RECOVERY

When a country has definitely put the trough of a recession behind it and started to move upward the business statistics sometimes give the appearance of being better than they actually are. This is attributable to our habit of comparing the most recent figures with the comparable figure of the previous year. It is probably no great surprise to most persons, therefore, that the Department of Commerce in its current Monthly Survey reports that 56 percent of our durable goods concerns and 65 percent of our nondurable goods producers recorded increased sales for January-February, 1955, as compared with the corresponding 2 months of 1954.

What makes the current figures on the business situation particularly encouraging is not that they show things to be better than a year ago, but that (1) the American economy is now back at a level close to that of 1953, the best year in history, and that (2) the preponderance of evidence indicates that in the absence of unforeseeable developments the trend is going to continue upward for some time to come.

"The expansion of disposable income and the associated broadening of consumer demand," notes the Office of Business Economics of the Commerce Department, "have provided the main channel through which the recovery from the 1954 low point has spread." And it adds: "Since last summer, according to the survey, manufacturing payrolls have advanced 9 percent, on a seasonally adjusted basis, with larger employment, additional work hours and higher average hourly earnings contributing to the rise in roughly equal measure."

The Nation's gross national product touched its all-time high in the second quarter of 1953, when it was running at an annual rate of $369.9 billions. That year set an all-time record as a whole at $364.9 billions, but by the last quarter the indicated annual rate had receded to $360.5 billions. The low point of the readjustment stemming from the cessation of hostilities in the Far East was touched in the first quarter of 1954, at $355.8 billions. Thereafter it flattened out for the succeeding two quarters at $356 billions.

With the fourth quarter the gross national product showed that not only had the recession been halted, but that the expansion process had begun. In that quarter the gross national product, at $362 billions, was not only $6.5 billions above the previous quarter, but for the first time since the readjustment got underway exceeded the corresponding quarter of the year before. But in the first quarter of 1955 this figure, which represents total production of goods and services, had risen by another $7 billions. At its new level of $369 billions it not only topped the corresponding figure for the year prevoius; it exceeded every quarterly mark in 1953 except the record second quarter of that year, and was less than a billion short of even that historic mark.

That the recovery we are now witnessing is not fluff, but goes deep into the capital goods industries, was testified to earlier this week in figures published by the machine-tool industry, whose new orders reached a new 18-month high in March. The index of such orders, regarded as one of the best barometers we have of the industrial outlook, stood 26 percent above the same month a year ago. Taken with the McGraw-Hill survey of capital expenditures planned for this year and next, this goes far to confirm the growing suspicion that high level business activity may be with us for quite a while.

Keep Chelsea Naval Hospital Opened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolutions memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital in Chelsea

Whereas it is proposed to close the Chelsea Naval Hospital; and

Whereas the facilities at the Chelsea Naval Hospital have been invaluable to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents for over 10 years; and

Whereas the closing of the hospital would be detrimental to many of the retired naval personnel and would also deprive the dependents of such men and others in active service of a privilege granted to them by Congress; and

Whereas the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital at this time would be an uneconomic action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Federal Government take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the closing of the Chelsea Naval Hospital; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of

Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of representatives, May 2, 1955, adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

[SEAL] EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

West Virginia's Daughter of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in these busy days, it is not perhaps amiss to think at least briefly about some of the finer, and, as we might say, sweeter things of life. During the past weekend, the thoughts of each of us turned again to remember that person who, in almost every life, represents the epitome of affection and loyalty and love, and, in remembering our mothers, it was quite natural that we would also honor our wives and sisters and sweethearts, because a man never gets so far down nor so high up in the world that some woman does not love and comfort and usually sustain him.

The faith and loyalty of woman, even to the point of blindness to our faults—beginning with our mother's love for us, including that of our sisters, and not ending with our wives—because daughters and granddaughters also enter into this delightful conspiracy—is wonderful to those of us who enjoy it. The classic oath of loyalty so familiar to us all was made, not by a man but by a woman—and then about her mother-in-law.

It was Walt Whitman who said, "A man is a great thing upon the earth, and through eternity—but every jot of the greatness of man is unfolded out of woman." Woodrow Wilson stated the same thing in a different way when he said, "No man ever amounted to a snap of the finger who was not constantly surrounded by a bevy of admiirng females." So, it is most appropriate that, at this time of the year, we should pause to pay special respect to those of the fairer sex who are Members of this House. Much could be said about the services so capably performed by the gentle ladies who serve with us, and even then it would be impossible to find words to adequately express our esteem and admiration for their quiet dignity and charm, but I should like to speak briefly of the lady Member of my own delegation, Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE. You will understand my inestimable pride when I inform you, Mr. Speaker, that on Saturday evening, May 7, the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia held its annual son and daughter banquet honoring West Virginia's outstanding son and daughter of the year 1955, and Mrs. KEE was selected as our State's most distinguished daughter. She was presented with a beautiful plaque by a former Member of this House, the Honorable Jennigs Randolph, and she also received a great number of letters and telegrams from friends. Because these messages are expressive of the confidence and the high respect reposed in this great woman by all who know and love her, I am inserting some of these in the RECORD. All who were present rejoiced that one so richly deserving had gained this signal honor. It was a tribute to her record of eminent service, and a fitting reward for her stedfast devotion to her people. It was recognition of her fervent desire to help mankind. I and my fellow Members of this House join in saying that we are happy for the high privilege of serving with West Virginia's daughter of daughters, our sister, and our true friend.

MAY 7, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C.:

I am happy to know that the West Virginia State Society of Washington, D. C., has chosen Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE as the outstanding daughter of the year 1955 for the State of West Virginia.

This honor could not have been more worthily bestowed, as Mrs. KEE is outstanding in ability, character, and a fervent desire to serve mankind. Please convey to her my warmest congratulations and best wishes.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States.

MAY 6, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C.:

ELIZABETH KEE'S colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee wish to join the West Virginia State Society in paying tribute to a fine Congresswoman and a grand person. We appreciate the contribution which she is making to our committee's work. West Virginia must be proud of her illustrious daughter.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, United States House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1955.*

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C.:

I have learned with pleasure that you have designated the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE as West Virginia's outstanding daughter for 1955. We who work with her each day and know her well realize how richly she deserves this recognition. She has won the affection and respect of her colleagues in the Congress for her gifted and devoted service to her State and Nation. My warm congratulations to you and to her on this happy occasion.

GRACIE PFOST,
Member of Congress, from Idaho.

MAY 7, 1955.

The Honorable ELIZABETH KEE,
Care of Mr. Joe Weeda, President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations and my very best wishes on this glorious occasion. The West Virginia Society has shown excellent judgment in selecting you as their daughter of the year. Your friendship is precious to all who know you and this fine tribute is righly deserved.

VERA BUCHANAN,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1955.*

Hon. ELIZABETH KEE,
Member of Congress,
Care of Mr. Joe Weeda, President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

West Virginia is no prouder of you tonight than all of us in the House who consider it an honor and pleasure to serve with you. Congratulations.

LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Third District, Missouri.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 6, 1955.*

Hon. JOSEPH WEEDA:

Mrs. Kilgore and I deeply regret it will be impossible for us to attend the West Virginia Society's son and daughter banquet due to the fact that we will be out of town. Please extend our heartiest congratulations to Mrs. KEE and Mr. Reuther upon their receipt of this well-deserved honor. The State of West Virginia can well be proud of these outstanding citizens.

Senator H. M. KILGORE.

MAY 4, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

Regret very much unable to be present for affair honoring Mrs. KEE and Mr. Reuther. Please extend to Mrs. KEE my sincerest congratulations for being chosen daughter of the year. It is a deserved honor. Her hometown of Bluefield is extremely proud of Mrs. KEE as West Virginia's first and only Congresswoman. Best wishes to all for a successful dinner.

A. S. BARKSDALE, Jr.,
Editor, Sunset News, Bluefield, W. Va.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1955.*

Mr. JOSEPH WEEDA,
President, West Virginia Society, Washington, D. C.:

The West Virginia Society is honoring the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE, Member of Congress from West Virginia, as the outstanding woman of the year. I fully expected to attend this dinner to join with others in paying respect to this very distinguished woman, who, in my judgment, is worthy of any honor that might be conferred upon her. However, circumstances beyond my control prevent me from doing so. Her services in the Congress and her dignified record reflect the high intelligence of the electorate from the district she represents.

West Virginia should be proud of ELIZABETH KEE and I wish to join with the officers and members of your society in extending felicitations to her. I express the fervent hope that she will continue to be blessed with good health to the end that we may indefinitely enjoy the fruits of her labors in the United States Congress.

THOMAS KENNEDY,
Vice President, United Mine Workers of America.

We salute the rule of life by which ELIZABETH KEE lives, so aptly expressed by the poet:

"How far away is the temple of fame?"
Said a youth at the dawn of the day.
He toiled and dreamed of a deathless name,
And the hours went by, and the evening came
Leaving him feeble, and old, and lame
To plod on his cheerless way.

"How far away is the temple of good?"
Said a youth at the dawn of the day.
And he strove in the spirit of brotherhood,
To help and succor as best he could.
The poor and unfortunate multitude,
In their hard and dreary way.

He was careless alike of praise and blame,
But after his work was done,
An angel of glory from heaven came,
And wrote on high his immortal name,
To proclaim this truth that the temple of fame,
And the temple of good are one.

For this is the lesson that history
Has taught since the world began;
That those whose memories never die,
But shine like stars in the human sky,
And brighter grow as the years go by,
Are the men who live for man.

Controlling Vaccine Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 9, 1955. It is a column by Roscoe Drummond entitled "Controlling Vaccine Distribution." In my opinion Mr. Drummond's comments are particularly pertinent at this time. His analysis of the polio-vaccine situation is objective and penetrating and puts the entire problem into its proper perspective.

The article follows:

CONTROLLING VACCINE DISTRIBUTION
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Because the Salk polio vaccine will remain in short supply for some time, it is evident that only the Federal Government can guarantee its equitable distribution to the States.

This problem will be with us again as soon as distribution is resumed, and the sooner it is faced the better.

Thus far there is an odd reluctance on the part of the administration to request and on the part of the Congress to initiate giving the Government the legal authority to enforce its distribution system.

The three basic facts seem to me to be these:

That the Federal Government alone can deal with the manufacturers of the new polio vaccine on a nationwide basis.

That the Federal Government alone can exercise the power to require the vaccine producers to carry through a visibly just system of allocation which will favor no State, no group, and no child.

That the objective of the Federal Government should be to act in behalf of all the States to guarantee each its proper quota, not to attempt to manage the distribution within the States.

Until supply of the Salk shots can catch up with demand anything less than a federally policed distribution leaves much to chance and to wishful thinking when the parents of the Nation deserve to know and to see that the Government is not sitting back with its fingers crossed.

President Eisenhower has endorsed in principle two aspects of Federal control of vaccine distribution. He has said that if the voluntary system of distribution—by which the producers promise to ship the vaccine in allocations recommended by the Federal Public Health Service—develops serious breaches, he would favor direct Federal control. He has said that if it developed that children, whose parents want them vaccinated, are not getting it because of inability to pay, he would recommend that the Government buy all the vaccine and guarantee its availability to all.

Federal purchase should not be necessary if the States discharge their responsibility. But there is a strong case to be made for giving the Federal Government the power to see that the manufacturers carry out a system of allocations by law, not merely by promise.

This would be no extra burden upon the manufacturers. It would mean that all producers would be more protected against a breach by any one.

This would attribute no moral opprobrium to the manufacturers who have promised to carry out the Federal allocations. No moral opprobrium attaches to the taxpayer because our tax laws have teeth in them.

Right now the medical profession, private charity, private industry, the States, and the Federal Government are joined in a war against polio. In time of war when a precious commodity is in short supply, its use has to be allocated first to where it is most needed. Only the National Government can guarantee an equitable national distribution of the Salk serum. This is why a considerable number of Senators, Republican and Democratic alike, are offering legislation to give the Government powers to allocate the vaccine in this emergency as it had to allocate steel in the war emergency.

The opposition of federally controlled distribution say that Federal control could not possibly increase the supply. Nobody said it would. It would only guarantee the most equitable distribution of limited supply. They say that Federal control would delay distribution. They offer no reason. The method of distribution would remain the same—manufacturer to the States. The difference would be that the Federal health service would get its information on distribution by right, not by sufference, and would have authority to act.

Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, refers to "the splendid voluntary system that is now operating so effectively."

The truth is that we just don't know whether it is operating effectively or not. The public hasn't the facts and the Federal Government hasn't the facts. The Government is still not getting them fully or promptly from the manufacturers. This is part of the reason why something more needs to be done.

The need is temporary. Federal authority over distribution should be temporary. No permanent increment of Federal power is required or desirable.

Appropriations for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my pleasure to read our colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS, of California's, weekly newsletter. This letter is written for the Congressman's own constituents, but it has facts and figures of importance to all our people.

The last letter is of especial interest to all of us who have been told of late by certain groups that the United States has been, and is being, niggardly in its contributions to the United Nations. Nothing could be further from the truth. If the United Nations does not succeed, its lack of success can never be attributed to a lack of American money.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

I RISE TO REMARK
(By Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS, of California)

Last week I wrote a little about a current pressure campaign, being carried on by some good-hearted ladies of this country, to prevent any reductions in the appropriations for the United Nations, and its subsidiaries. I was sitting here at my Corona, wondering what to write about this week, and on my desk, right in front of me, is a slip of paper with an old Latin proverb on it: "It is easy to be generous with other people's property."

Do you suppose it is only a coincidence that this should turn up this morning? If anyone is worrying that good old Uncle Sam, the softest touch in all history, is not giving enough to the United Nations (which statement has nothing to do with the merits of the U. N. or its work) let me condense and recite our support, over the years:

The U. N. itself has received, from all members, $343,601,172; of which the United States contributed $144,238,394. Our percentage has decreased slightly, from 39.89 percent in 1946 to 33.33 percent this year.

UNESCO has received (in addition to the above, of course) $65,063,651, of which the United States of America contributed $27,191,299. In this organization, our share started at 44.03 percent in 1948 and is now 33.33 percent, as in U. N. itself.

We have contributed $21,178,928 to the World Health Organization, of a total of $50,372,225. Our percentage dropped from 38.77 percent in 1949 to a present 33.33 percent.

The FAO, about which I wrote last week, and which I want earnestly to keep from the domination of those influential members of the U. N., who have never taken a direct interest in its work and have not, up to now, supported it directly, has received a total of $49,020,000, of which the United States of America has contributed $14,905,467. Our percentage has risen, in this organization, from 25 percent in 1946 to 30 percent for the current year.

The ILO (International Labor Organization) has received $50,809,433 and of this the United States of America has given $21,339,691. The United States of America contribution increased from 17.53 percent in 1946, to 25 percent in 1955.

We contribute 25 percent of the money but the British managed to slip in that extra "u."

The International Civil Aviation Organization has had $24,129,192, of which we gave $6,941,464. Our share has increased from 11.95 percent in 1946 to 32.6 percent for 1955.

The International Telecommunications Union has received $11,399,692, and we gave $1,248,701 of that. Our share for 1955 is only 8.96 percent and this has changed very little since 1950, in which year we gave 8.04 percent.

Of course, we ought to do something about the weather, so the World Meteorological Organization has had $1,038,152, in 4 years, of which we gave $169,867. We are giving 11.45 percent this year, which is about par for that course, as we gave 12.67 percent in 1952.

I point with pride to the last of the regular organizations, the Universal Postal Union. It has received $2,669,031 and of this we gave $118,912. Those postal boys are pretty good bargainers, as any Congressman can tell you, and we are contributing this year 4.36 percent to this fund. The largest percentage was 4.63 percent in 1946.

All the above adds up to $508,212,548, of which the United States has given $228,332,723, which is not bad for a nation whose dollar has been cut in half, and which already has a per capita debt greater than any of the other contributors to the same funds. But don't go away. There are still more.

We will now take up contributions to voluntary and special programs. I only have the figures, for these programs, to include 1953. There should be 2 additional years, to have them comparable with the ones already given. The first is UNTA, the U. N. expanded program of technical assistance, about which I wrote last week, and which is now duplicating, in part, three other programs. This received, in 3 years only, $51,610,380, of which we gave $31,578,833.

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) which, for 2 years, was called U. N. Relief for Palestine Refugees, received, in 5 years, $156,437,753, of which we gave $109,450,000.

The U. N. International Children's Fund (UNICEF) has had $163,471,042 in 7 years, not including the 2 recent years, for which I do not have figures, and of this the United States of America apparently gave $54,620,834.

The U. N. Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA) received $86,289,023 between 1950 and 1953, of which the United States of America gave $50,750,000.

The U. N. High Commissioner for Refugee Emergency Fund had $847,908, but I am unable to give the United States of America's share, because we did not begin to appropriate directly until 1954. We took the money from other appropriations.

The International Refugee Organization was in existence from 1947 to 1950, inclusive, or under the U. N. during that time, and received $412,691,915, of which we are shown to have paid $166,091,457.

All in all, I do not think Uncle Sam has been penurious, so the good ladies can stop worrying, and I'll end this letter with another quotation, this one from La Rochefoucauld: "What is called generosity is usually only the vanity of giving; we enjoy the vanity more than the thing given," or perhaps, more simply, just "The gift without the giver is bare."

Rumania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, 78 years ago on May 10 the Nation of Rumania threw off the yoke of Turkish subjugation and proclaimed its independence. The people cherished their freedom, and during the First World War took their place at the side of the democracies in the struggle against the Central Powers. Unhappily, the chain of events of the Second World War forced a new tyranny upon the Rumanian people, the tyranny of Soviet communism.

Under their Communist overlords, the people of Rumania today are in a state of enslavement. Only "reliable" Communists are permitted to leave the country and travel, even within the country, is severely restricted. Books have been purged, and the press, the movies, and the schools are forced to become channels of Communist propaganda. Religious freedom is denied, and hundreds of priests have been thrown into prisons or concentration camps because they opposed the atheistic regime.

The ordeal of the Rumanian people under the ruthless foreign occupation of Soviet communism, their economic exploitation, and their deprivation of elemental human rights and liberties are now a matter of record. On the other hand, through Soviet political and military pressure, Rumania has been transformed, against the will of its people, into a satellite base for the aggressive schemes of Moscow.

The Soviet Union will not permit the open celebration of the 10th of May in Rumania because this day stands for the liberty and justice which the Communist conspiracy is intent upon destroying. Nevertheless, loyal Rumanians will never reconcile themselves to the loss of the liberty which their forefathers died to obtain. To them, May 10 will be a time of solemn dedication to the rebirth of freedom. On this day they have the assurances of the American people that their plight is not forgotten, and our prayers that freedom will be theirs once again.

A Tribute to Thomas Murdock Brooks and Floyd Jackson Boling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 29, at a banquet in Siler City, N. C., I had the honor and the privilege of presenting portraits of two of my beloved friends to Chatham Hospital and to all of the people of Chatham County. These two friends made great and grand contributions to the building of modern hospital facilities in that progressive community and county. Such institutions are frequently referred to as Hill-Burton Hospitals. Actually, Mr. Speaker, while the Federal contribution was substantial and important, the hospital probably never would have been built but for the generosity of Tom Brooks and the untiring efforts of Jack Boling. Both of them gave freely of their time, talents, and fortunes. The building of this hospital proves just what can be accomplished if governments and people cooperate in trying to build better communities in which our citizens are to live. In presenting the portraits, which are wonderful works of art, I paid a brief tribute to Tom Brooks and Jack Boling, and here is what I said on that occasion:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, last week I was in the ancient city of Rome, and I stood on the spot where the great Caesar was mortally wounded. I recalled the eloquent oration delivered by Mark Anthony over the body of his dead friend. In that speech, Mark Anthony said:

"The evil that men do lives after them—
The good is oft interred with their bones."

I have never been willing to agree with the sentiment expressed by that great orator. It occurs to me that exactly the opposite is true. This statement by Anthony, as he stood over the body of the mighty Caesar, has lived through the years, but, actually, the good that men do lives after them.

So it shall be with the two illustrious citizens to whom we, at this moment, pay homage. The good that they have done shall live after them.

Impulses of sincere affection and friendship inspire us as we meet here at this hour. We are not here to beautify the character, nor to exalt the lives of these beloved men, but rather, we are here to commune wtih the magnificent spirit which has guided and directed them through all the years of their lives.

Thomas Murdock Brooks and Floyd Jackson Boling have made great and grand contributions to the health, the welfare, and the happiness of the people of this community. By their lives, their labors, and the brilliant splendor of their mental exertions and dynamic and untiring efforts, they have endeared themselves to all the people among whom they have lived and labored. They have built lasting monuments in the hearts of the people of Chatham County. During every moment of their lives they have believed in the majesty of love—in the dignity of man—in the traditions and institutions of our country—and in the omnipotence of a good and gracious God.

I shall not violate the proprieties of this occasion by attempting to recapitulate, nor to review, their many magnificent achievements, but I shall attempt only to express the deep gratitude of this whole community to Tom Brooks and Jack Boling for the lives they have lived and the priceless contributions they have made to the great sum of human happiness, and to the alleviation of human suffering.

By their lives and their labors, Tom Brooks and Jack Boling have made thoroughfares of friendship in all of the highways and byways of Chatham County. Both of them in their hearts disdain and despise the "trappings of pride." Both of them are modest men. A nobility of purpose has inspired them, and prompted them to serve well the cause of humanity. They have enriched the world, and have helped to make it a better place in which to live.

Turning away from a multitude of things that distract and disturb us in the toiling hours of our daily work, we meet tonight in a beautiful spirit of friendship. We abandon for a while the vocations and avocations of both public and private life, and come here to honor these distinguished men.

THE GOOD THAT THEY HAVE DONE SHALL LIVE AFTER THEM

Their time, talents, and fortunes shall not have been given in vain. They shall enjoy the richest compensations of life. In magnanimous fashion they have given generously, and they shall reap abundantly the rewards they so richly deserve.

When I left Washington a few short hours ago, and looked from the plane window down upon that beautiful city—the Capital of our great country—the greatest Nation that ever thrived in all the tides of time—I contemplated for a moment the youth of our Nation, its vicissitudes and struggles, and I thought of its greatness. What has made this young Nation of ours so great and powerful? Surely it is not its lofty peaks and lovely lakes and beautiful countryside, nor its flourishing fields and factories—nor its soldiers, ships, and planes, and military might and power. The real greatness of America is in the moral fiber and fabric of a free and unfettered people who have cherished the altars of freedom throughout the years.

"Not gold but only men can make
A nation great and strong.
Men who for truth and honor's sake
Stand fast and suffer long.

"Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly.
They build a nation's pillars deep.
They lift them to the sky."

Tom Brooks and Jack Boling have helped to build their Nation's pillars deep, and they may take just pride in their achievements. For 14 long years Jack Boling has

been the beacon light and the guiding star in this community's efforts to establish and maintain the great institution of mercy which now adorns that lovely hillside out yonder. He has given freely of his valuable time, business ingenuity, and administrative ability, and as president of Chatham Hospital he has served with great devotion through all the years.

Tom Brooks, from an humble beginning, has become a great benefactor. He put his very life and labor, and a large part of a fortune, into the building of the magnificent structure—a home for the sick and the suffering, where all of the sciences and skills of modern medicine can be provided. All the people of this county owe to Tom Brooks and Jack Boling an everlasting debt of gratitude. Their lives have been a blessing and a benediction. We hope that Heaven will light their pathways, and the Lord of Mercy will bless and keep them.

The modern hospital facilities they have helped to provide, to maintain, and to operate, are unsurpassed by those in any other community in this great Commonwealth. To you, Tom and Jack, may I say that our hearts are filled with gratitude. We cherish your friendship, and salute you as two great Americans.

The lovely daughter of the retiring president, Jack Boling, will now unveil these works of art, and on behalf of the sponsors, I have the honor and the privilege of presenting these beautiful portraits to Chatham Hospital, to the people of Chatham County, and to generations yet unborn. They shall be hung in appropriate places on the walls of that great institution which they helped to build, in recognition and in remembrance of their grand and glorious efforts, and the contributions they have made. To them may I say again, may the Lord bless and keep you.

Mr. Speaker, the portraits of the great benefactors, Thomas Murdock Brooks and Floyd Jackson Boling, were painted by Miss Mabel Pugh, director of the art department of Peace College, in Raleigh, N. C. Miss Pugh is an artist of exceptional ability, and has been listed in Who's Who in American Art as well as Who's Who in the Southeast. Incidentally, she is the same artist who painted the portrait of the present chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, which was presented to the committee, as a great surprise to me, on February 10.

"Dear Lady"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the health of a nation is contingent upon the morals of its youth. The morals of its youth is often reflected in the songs they sing. Therefore, it is heartening to note, that statistically, the clean, wholesome country and western song is now characterized as "pure Americana."

The Nation has recognized Ralph S. Peer—Peer International, New York City—as foremost contributor to this field; and now takes cognizance of his latest publication, "Dear Lady," a popular song with religious overtones, designed to combat suggestive and off-color ballads.

The colleges and universities of the Nation which have fostered "Dear Lady" in hopes of starting a new trend, welcome his leadership in furthering their cause.

Legion, and documentary, are the letters of approbation from leading educators, radio and television executives, and disk jockies of the country.

Grateful indeed, are the above mentioned, to RCA president Frank M. Folsom and Joseph R. Carlton, for the cooperation of RCA Victor.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout history Rumania has been a crossroad between East and West. Partly for this reason, up to the latter half of the 19th century Rumania remained divided among her neighbors for nearly 400 years and the Rumanians had to endure alien rule. During those centuries Rumania was part of the Ottoman Empire and it was ruled by the callous and corrupt agents of the sultans.

History often repeats painful experience, perhaps even more painful in view of modern aspirations. Today the Soviet Union, through its puppet government in Rumania, has followed a course of systematic enslavement of the Rumanian people. It has exercised economic abuse by its exploitation of the Rumanian economy. The economic programs applied by the Soviet Union have had a disastrous effect on Rumanian national stability. For if Rumania were able to deal with the outside world as an independent nation, it would have a much more favorable balance of trade and the Rumanian people would now be enjoying a more nearly decent standard of living.

It was on May 10, 1877, that the liberty-loving Rumanians were able to proclaim their independence. And in 1878 with the Treaty of Berlin, Rumania received recognition of their independence by other nations.

Thousands of Rumanians have been welcomed to this country and they have settled here as hardworking and loyal citizens. They have made a distinct contribution to the American way of life, and have contributed their portion in building and defending it.

But today, for more than a decade, Rumania itself has been sealed off from the free world, and some 16 million Rumanians live in what is practically a vast prison camp. There they are denied all forms of freedom and have been ordered to follow the Communist line. Democracy as we know it here has been banned, and tyrannous dictatorship is the order of the day.

We Americans whose forefathers have come from countries dominated by the Soviet dictatorship are continuing to strive to bring about the liberation of those oppressed peoples.

In my House Concurrent Resolution 120, introduced last week, May 3, I called for the condemnation of the violations committed by the Soviet Government. The resolution declares that measures should be taken to inform the peoples of the world of such violations. It states, and I quote:

> That all men should be publicly informed that the United States never acquiesced in, and overwhelmingly reprobates such distortion of the purpose of the agreements, which has resulted in the subjugation of free peoples in many lands, in the domination of a totalitarian despotism over whole nations.

The resolution asks that these broken promises by Soviet Communist leaders should be openly condemned before the eyes of the world.

It is my hope that all of us who are interested in freedom for all nations will be united in order that we may have an effective policy in this matter. Just as the spirit of freedom can never be destroyed, so the Rumanian people will never lose hope for freedom.

Rumania's National Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, is the most significant date in the history of the Rumanian nation. It is unique, in that it marks three distinct milestones on the Rumanian path to independence and nationhood. First, on May 10, 1866, Prince Carol, who was to become King Carol I, the first King of modern Rumania, arrived in the country from Germany. Then, on May 10, 1877, Rumania proclaimed its independence from Turkey. Having done so, Rumania fought for that independence with determination and skill. Her efforts were instrumental in bringing victory in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 to Russia, and in the Treaty of Berlin in 1878 her independence was recognized. Finally, May 10 is celebrated as the anniversary of the unification of all Rumanian Provinces.

We wish that it were possible to salute this anniversary with a spirit of joyfulness. However, for the past 10 years, during one of the most fateful decades in all human history, the Rumanian people have not been masters in their own house. Instead a Communist dictatorship, staffed by the puppets of Moscow, and maintaining a full apparatus of terror, purports to act in the name of the Rumanian people.

This shabby illusion deceives no one. For all their secret police, their spies, for all their suppression of thought and religion, the Communists have not

crushed the spirit of the Rumanian nation. This has been evidenced by the solidarity of Rumanian farmers against the Government's policy of forced collectivization of agriculture. Today, Rumanian farmers have been reduced virtually to serfdom, but their spirit remains unimpaired. Rumanian intellectuals have faced prison and concentration camp rather than manufacture Communist art and literature to order.

It is incumbent on the United States to encourage this spirit of resistance, to continue its task of marshaling the resources of world opinion against final acquiescence in Russia's fait accompli. If we do so, we have reason to hope that Rumania may greet some not-too-distant May 10 in the spirit which it deserves.

The Anniversary of Rumanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 the people of Rumania have been accustomed to celebrate their national holiday, an anniversary that includes a commemoration not only of their national independence but of their national unity as well. Rumanians all over the world cherish this day, but in the homeland the celebration cannot even be held, for today Rumanian independence is a figment of Communist propaganda, and Rumanian unity is the unity of the enslaved.

The Russian armies marched into Rumania in 1944 in their victorious campaigns against the Germans, and in 1945 the Russians, through the late Andrei Vishinsky, forced the Rumanian Government to accept Communist control. From that day to this Rumania has been in the grip of tyranny.

This tyranny proclaims that it works to benefit the Rumanian people. It exemplifies its beneficence by looting Rumania of its natural resources, particularly its oil, persecuting religion, refusing to permit emigration of people desiring to leave the country, forcing collectivization of agriculture on an unwilling peasantry, and suppressing all manifestations of a dissenting attitude in political and cultural affairs.

The Rumanian people want no such hypocritical benefactor. They know the Soviet tyranny for what it is, a regime of ruthless exploitation, maintained by terror, against the heartfelt desires of the people. They have manifested their opposition to that regime with the most remarkable courage and tenacity. Their resistance has rightfully earned them the admiration of all men who value freedom.

Within the last 2 years we have had several manifestations of that courage and tenacity. First, there was the instance of Mr. Georgescu, an American businessman of Rumanian birth. His sons were still in Rumania, and the Communist approached him with a request to spy for them, threatening death to his sons if he did not. Mr. Georgescu withstood this most cruel pressure, and in the end his sons were happily reunited with their family in this country. Then there was the seizure of the Rumanian legation in Bern, Switzerland, by a small group of inspired refugees, who chose to take this manner of demonstrating Rumanian contempt for the regime that claims to represent them. Diplomatic usage required action against them by the Swiss Government, but the lesson of their desperate act was not lost on the world.

On this May 10 Rumanians look to the United States to champion their cause. Unable to speak for themselves, they ask that our voice continue to be lifted in behalf of all oppressed peoples in the councils of nations. It is most important that this be done, for Moscow would like nothing better than to lull the conscience of the world into permanent acceptance of satellite slavery.

If we act in accordance with our historic principles, we will continue to be regarded as the champion of human liberty, and we may witness the dawn of a new day of freedom in Rumania, and in other nations now groaning under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

Father of Cowboy Shrine Tells His Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 I called attention to the fact that the National Cowboy Hall of Fame is to be located in Oklahoma City, and on that occasion I issued a cordial invitation to every American to visit my native State.

Last Wednesday, the man who originated and put across the idea of this cowboy shrine, Mr. C. A. Reynolds, of Kansas City, went to Oklahoma to see for the first time the site for this memorial.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article about Mr. Reynolds which appeared in the Daily Oklahoman of May 6. It was written by that able country boy and reporter, Mr. Roy P. Stewart, who represented his newspaper here in the Nation's Capital for several years, and who himself played an important part in bringing the shrine to Oklahoma:

FATHER OF COWBOY SHRINE TELLS HIS DREAM
(By Roy P. Stewart)

It's sort of fitting that the National Cowboy Hall of Fame will be in Oklahoma because it was in Oklahoma 8 years ago that C. A. Reynolds conceived the idea of the shrine.

At that time, Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds were taking a motor trip and paused at the Will Rogers memorial at Claremore. As he walked around that excellent shrine to the great Oklahoman, whose humor was enjoyed around the world, Reynolds had quite a few thoughts.

Here was a magnificent memorial to a man who always spoke of himself as a cowboy, Reynolds mused. Everything Rogers did—everything he talked about—sooner or later got around to that cowboy label. So, in effect, the shrine was a memorial to a warm, human cowboy spirit.

Why not have a shrine somewhere in the West that would, without detracting the least from that for Rogers, be a tribute to the best representatives of that hardy breed who were part and parcel of America's historic heritage?

Reynolds, president of a major clothing manufacturing firm, tucked that idea in a clean drawer of his mental filing cabinet and for nearly 8 years he took it out periodically and studied it, along with talking to a great number of people.

At any point, he says, he would have been glad for anyone to take the idea and make it become a reality. Those to whom he talked, whether they were businessmen, rodeo hands at Cheyenne, or ranchers along the Pecos, thought he was the man to fan the spark and make a prairie fire out of it.

So he did. He got the governors of 17 Western States to become ex officio members of the board of the nonprofit foundation, and to appoint two members of the board of trusteees to make plans for the Hall of Fame. Reynolds went to Cooperstown, N. Y., to look at baseball's shrine and to other places.

The organization became a working unit, the location was decided at a recent Denver meeting, and now Reynolds, 2 months away from retirement as president of the H. D. Lee Co., is in town working with the Oklahoma committee on action plans.

He talked to the chamber of commerce board of directors Thursday, and Friday will address the public forum luncheon of the chamber in the Persian room of the Skirvin Tower. A small statured, likable fellow, there is something else about Reynolds you ought to know.

He is a frustrated rancher himself. He would like to wear a pair of high-heeled boots but he wouldn't wear them—and hasn't—because he has never been in a business in which boot wearing was an accepted and integral part of his costume.

Born in Ohio, son of a United Brethren minister who moved to Kansas when the boy was a year old, Reynolds homesteaded on some land in Colorado when he was old enough. He meant to be a rancher. But it took money to live on the land and money to buy cattle. He worked for day wages part of the time then got a job selling Lee clothing, meanwhile proving up his homestead.

It isn't his fault that he didn't make money with which to buy cattle—he made the money all right but before he knew what was happening to his ranch ideas, he was president of the company and still no rancher, although he still owned the Colorado land and even added to it.

Perhaps from his minister father, Reynolds inherited some evangelical zeal, although in his case it takes the part now, publicly, of seeing his dream of a national cowboy shrine become a reality. From taking a large part of his time and quite a bit of his money the past 2½ years, it will take more time in the future.

He sees a magnificent building on the site out on the expressway, a building starting perhaps in a modest way but planned so additions in the future will enhance it, not detract from its styling. He sees a place that will belong—not just to Oklahoma City—but to the Nation, in which the best of the colorful saga of American history can be preserved.

Mining Claims on National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for several years past the Committee on Agriculture has been working diligently on a problem of great concern in the field of natural resources—the problem of harmonizing the search for and development of the minerals and mining values in our national forests with the other values such as timber production, grazing, watershed protection, recreation, and wildlife development—which are also of great importance. Our efforts to solve this complicated and knotty problem were spurred on by the fact that over the years in the neighborhood of 100,000 mining claims have been filed in the national forests and without some change in the law these claims may continue into perpetuity tying up valuable timber resources and denying access to the areas covered by the claim for other public or conservation purposes.

Many of these claims are valid, having been filed by mining prospectors in a legitimate effort to discover and develop valuable minerals. Many of them, on the other hand, are clearly claims which have been filed for some other purpose than mining, usually with the objective of obtaining presumptive title in the surface of the land for some personal or commercial use entirely unassociated with mineral development.

Our study of this problem as a committee began as early as 1950 and resulted in the introduction by me in the 82d Congress on May 27, 1952, of H. R. 7023, the first comprehensive bill on this subject.

Following the introduction of that bill the committee continued its study of this problem assiduously. Conferences and meetings were held with officials of the Forest Service, with the mining industry, the lumber industry, with representatives of conservation and wildlife groups, and with other elements having a direct interest in this matter.

Our bill was revised and improved several times as the result of this work and in the 83d Congress an improved version of the bill was introduced by Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE, the then chairman of the committee.

This bill was still further improved during the 83d Congress and early in the 84th Congress improved and amended versions were introduced both by Mr. HOPE (H. R. 110) and by me (H. R. 3414).

In the meantime, organizations outside the Congress, notably the American Forestry Association, had followed the leadership of this committee and were making their own efforts to work out a bill which would present an acceptable solution to this difficult problem.

Within the past few weeks, I am happy to report, these efforts have met with apparent success and there has been worked out a bill which apparently will take care of the major part of the problem involved. It is reported to be acceptable to the mining industry, to those primarily interested in conservation, and to officials of the Government responsible for the administration of the mining laws, the national forests, and the public lands. In the hope that this bill is the solution toward which we have been working for the past 5 years, I have been happy to introduce it although the bill (H. R. 3414) will be referred to another committee—the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of our able colleague, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, of California.

I would be happy, of course, if the Committee on Agriculture might carry through to a conclusion the work it has been engaged in for these several years, but since the bill has been broadened in its scope to include not only the national forests but also the public lands which are not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and since it actually amends the mining laws, the jurisdiction of the committee headed by the gentleman from California is clear and I will be most happy to further in any way I can the progress of the bill before that committee.

At this point I would like to include in the RECORD an article which will be printed in the forthcoming May edition of American Forests, the publication of the American Forestry Association, describing in some detail this measure to which I have referred:

FIRST STEP TOWARD CORRECTING ABUSES OF THE MINING LAWS

The board of directors of the American Forestry Association on April 15 passed a resolution urging all groups and individuals to join with them in strongly supporting proposals now pending in Congress that, once enacted, will enable the Agriculture and Interior Departments to wash out the bulk of invalid or fraudulent mining claims on public lands in from 6 months to a year.

Purpose of identical bills introduced in both the House and Senate last month is to revise the mining laws to permit multiple use on the surface of mining claims, both in national forests and other public lands, and to eliminate the incentive to locate mining claims for purposes other than actual mining and related activities.

The proposed measures were introduced as the result of cooperative action by the mining industry and the Interior and Agriculture Departments. The campaign originated in the American Forestry Association when it called on representatives of the three groups last February to sit down around a table and map out a solution to a problem that has been vexing both the industry and the public alike.

Today the proposals which have the support of the Interior and Agriculture Departments, the mining industry, and a growing number of conservation groups including the American Forestry Association, would:

1. Ban the location of mining claims for common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders and make them subject to disposal by the United States under terms of the Materials Disposal Act. (This provision is similar to the Regan bill in the 82d and 83d Congs., which had the endorsement of the Forest Service.)

2. As to mining claims hereafter located, it would, prior to patent:

(a) Prohibit use of the mining claims for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities.

(b) Authorize the Federal Government to manage and dispose of the timber and forage, to manage the other surface resources (except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws), and to use the surface of the claim for these purposes or for access to adjacent land, without endangering or materially interfering with mining operations or related activities.

(c) Bar the mining claimant from removing or using the timber or other surface resources except to the extent required for mining or related activities. Any timber cutting by the mining claimant, other than that to provide clearance, must be done in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

3. Provide an in rem procedure, similar to a quiet-title action, under which the Federal Government could expeditiously resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant or unidentifiable mining claims, located prior to enactment of this measure, in any given area. This procedure calls for adequate notice to mining claimants in the area involved, and a local hearing to determine any rights to surface resources that may be asserted by claim holders. If a mining claimant fails to assert rights to surface resources, or if the rights he asserts are not upheld, or if he voluntarily waives such rights, the claim would thereafter have the same status as claims hereafter located, with the Government having the right to manage and dispose of the timber and forage and to manage other surface resources in accordance with sound principles of good management.

In this manner an area in which a timber sale, for example, is contemplated could be subjected to a conclusive determination of surface rights within as short a period as 6 to 12 months.

Identical bills embodying these proposals were introduced last month in the House by Mr. DAWSON, of Utah (H. R. 5561); Mr. FJARE, of Montana (H. R. 5563); Mr. YOUNG, of Nevada (H. R. 5572); Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Oregon (H. R. 5577); Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina (H. R. 5595); and Mr. HOPE, of Kansas (H. R. 5742). As American Forests went to press, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, chairman of the House subcommittee on mining, and perhaps still others were preparing similar bills.

In the upper House, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, joined by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming; BENNETT and WATKINS, of Utah; and AIKEN, of Vermont, introduced the same measure (S. 1713).

It is particularly significant to conservationists that those who have worked closely in the past with AFA and other groups in the effort to remedy mining law abuses—men like Representative HAROLD COOLEY, who introduced the first surface mining bill (H. R. 7023) in the 82d Congress, and Representative CLIFFORD HOPE and Senator GEORGE AIKEN, who fathered bills in the 83d Congress for corrective mining legislation, have joined in on this proposal.

These proposals represent the answer of the Interior and Agriculture Departments and the mining industry to the growing chorus of demands by the public to correct the already widespread and growing abuses of the mining laws that have been impeding sound land management. Public demands for corrective measures reached a new high last year with announcement by the Forest Service that only 2 percent of the 84,000 unpatented mining claims on national forests were producing commercial quantities of ore and that in too many cases they were being used for purposes other than mining. These 84,000 claims, the Forest Service said, cover more than 2 million acres and support over 8 billion feet of merchantable timber worth over $100 million.

Of the 37,000 claims which have actually gone to patent, only about 15 percent have produced ore in commercial quantities. These facts demonstrate, the Forest Service said, that the mining laws are being used to obtain claim or title to valuable timber, summer home sites, or access to preferred hunting or fishing grounds—activities far removed from commercial mining operations. Moreover, with the advent of the current uranium rush, the number of unpatented claims has more than doubled in recent months.

To launch a program to clear up the irregular claims situation as called for in AFA's program for American Forestry adopted last year, Lowell Besley, executive director-forester, in January contacted representatives of the Interior and Agriculture Departments and the American Mining Congress and proposed a conference to work out the problem under the auspices of the AFA.

The response to this proposal was favorable. Aided by an assist from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the groups concerned were brought together February 10 at the Washington office of the American Forestry Association. Purpose of the conference was to evolve a workable solution that would eliminate questionable claims while fully protecting the legitimate interests of both the public and the mining industry.

Working under the chairmanship of DeWitt Nelson, vice president of AFA and director of California's Department of Natural Resources, it quickly became apparent that industry representatives were primarily interested in leaving the present patent system undisturbed. (At present, approximately 200 claims go to patent every year.)

"Above all things, your prospector knows and is decidedly aware of one fact," one industry spokesman said. "That is if he works hard and develops his claims he can obtain a patent. To remove that incentive or to otherwise interfere with the patent system would, in our judgment, have an adverse effect not only on mining exploration and development but on the economy of the country at a time when more and more minerals are of vital importance."

While the industry took a dim view of previous suggestions that a miner, in patenting his claim, should purchase his timber rights, it did concede it was in full sympathy with a revised system that would enable Government representatives to wash out invalid claims in a short time. The industry spokesmen also reiterated that they were against use of claims for any purpose other than legitimate mining operations, and favored giving the Government the right to manage and dispose of the timber and forage on all claims hereafter located up to the time of patent. The claimant, at the same time, would be permitted to use such timber as is needed for carrying on mining activities but would be barred from removing the timber or other surface resources for other purposes.

While the Agriculture Department representatives believe that claimants should pay for timber on claims at the time of going to patent, spokesmen said that the proposals advanced by the industry as regards handling of claims was a constructive proposition and one that would materially aid in the management of public lands. At the present time, the Forest Service, for instance, cannot remove timber from claims, and in some cases claimants are actually impeding management of land—including rights-of-way—to timber and forage on holdings adjacent to their claims.

The so-called in rem or quiet-title action under which the Government could resolve title uncertainties resulting from the existence of abandoned, invalid, dormant, or unidentifiable mining claims was also cited as a constructive move by Agriculture spokesmen. As proposed at the conference, the new system would enable the Government to wash out invalid claims in selected areas in 6 months or a year—a development that would be a decided improvement on the laborious search-and-sue method now in effect. At the same time, it would enable the Government to determine surface rights to resources without disturbing miners' rights to the minerals in the prepatent stage.

Under Chairman Nelson's guidance, the conference arrived at a meeting of minds, and a three-man committee comprised of representatives from the two Departments and the mining industry was named to draft a bill based on the findings and conclusions of the conference.

Both Chairman Nelson and Mr. Besley praised the constructive attitude of the conference. Mr. Besley commented, "From the standpoint of those of us long interested in clearing up the mining-claim abuses on the national forests and other forest lands, this proposed legislation represents a compromise only with respect to the 'all or nothing' school of thought. We can wholeheartedly approve of everything it is designed to accomplish. It is definitely a tremendous step in the right direction. Forest Service officials estimate it will clear up 75 percent or more of the mining claim troubles on the national forests. Some think it may go even further. None of us can know for sure until we have given it a fair trial over a period of years."

The position of the mining industry has been that it does not condone the use of mining claims on public lands for other than mining purposes. Its position is and has been that it should have the continued opportunity to locate mining claims, to mine any minerals found, and to make a profit if it is fortunate enough to discover and develop commercial deposits. It seeks security of its investment through a full title to mining claims when all the requirements for patent have been met. It does not seek to prevent the use of the surface of unpatented claims for other desirable uses so long as those do not materially interfere with mining operations and related activities. This position has widespread support from public-minded citizens who recognize the need for continued development of the mineral resources needed for our economy and our national security.

From the outset, the board of directors of the AFA has made it clear that it had no intention or desire to interfere with legitimate mining operations but was solely interested in helping to clear up abuses on the part of people who were using the framework provided by the mining laws for purposes other than mining. In the opinion of the board, these abuses will be brought under control if the present proposals are enacted into law.

The United States in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from the May 9, 1955, issue of Time and entitled "The United States in 1960":

THE UNITED STATES IN 1960—$6,180 A YEAR FOR THE AVERAGE FAMILY

What kind of United States economy will a youngster now getting ready for college find when he gets out? What is the prospect for 1960?

Last week, in America's Needs and Resources: A New Survey, a Twentieth Century Fund research staff headed by Economist J. Frederic Dewhurst issued a 1,148-page statistical description of the present economy, plus a projection of what the United States would be like 5 years hence. Dewhurst's key prediction, on the assumption that United States peace and prosperity will continue, is that 1960's gross national product will be $413.5 billion, up 29 percent from 1950, 16 percent from 1954. The United States, with less than 7 percent of the world's population, already produces one-third of all the world's goods and services, almost one-half of all its factory products. United States total output in the 1940's was worth $2.9 trillion; for the 1950's $4.1 trillion is expected.

The forecasts are speculative at best, but in their widely read first survey, made during the 1940's, Dewhurst and associates erred on the conservative side, forecasting 1950's GNP 7 percent below what it turned out to be.

POPULATION

The economy's predicted growth of 29 percent during the 1950's is based on population growth during the decade of 16 percent and a 12 percent growth in the labor force. Among 1960's 177 million people will be 40 percent more 5- to 9-year-olds than in 1950, 54 percent more 10- to 14-year-olds, 35 percent more oldsters over 70, but 12 percent fewer 25- to 29-year-olds (the depression babies). In 1960 there will be 42 million schoolchildren, 50 percent more than in 1950. The present decade's marriages, down 20 percent from the 1940's, will create only 13.7 percent more families. The trend to the suburbs will continue during the decade; rural nonfarm population will burgeon by more than one-third to 43 million. California in 1960 will have a population of 14.6 million, a jump of 38.3 over 1950.

PRODUCTIVITY

By 1960 there will be 69 million jobs, 7.5 million more than in 1950. A drop of 2.3 hours in the nonfarm workweek will put the average worker on a 36.5-hour week, but his productivity, while it can hardly match the last decade's 47 percent rise, is expected to be up 25 percent. National income per man-hour worked will be $2.68 (against last year's $2.41).

FARMERS

By 1960, 6,700,000 farmers, only 9.3 percent of the labor force and 670,000 fewer than in 1950, will have brought into cultivation 35 million acres of new crop land. They will produce 21 percent more food, but work only 44 hours a week, 3 less than in 1950.

WEALTH

In 1960 individuals will be saving a smaller portion (5.5 percent) of their disposable income than they do today (7.7 percent). But gross private savings (including corporate) will have climbed 33 percent in the decade to $62.5 billion, against $52.8 billion last year. Gross capital investment will also be $62.5 billion in 1960, up a healthy 37 percent from 1954.

INCOME

Spendable per-household income in 1960 will reach a comfortable $5,600 a year, up 5 percent from 1954. Before-tax income per household will be $6,180. The tax bite will ease. While Government costs will rise 15 percent, they will be paid for by soaring revenues from prosperous businesses. Personal taxes will drop from today's $32.9 billion to $29.6 billion. Social-security benefits will more than treble during the decade, reaching $4.4 billion in 1960.

SPENDING

United States consumers will be spending 24.1 percent more in 1960 than they were

spending in 1950. Some of the biggest jumps will be in luxury items. With rising living standards, the Nation's food bill would normally be expected to drop in proportion to total spending. Instead, it will precisely equal the 24.1 percent pace set in all spending. Reason: The United States housewife is buying more packaged and processed foods, and families are dining out more often. (The real significance of the ratio of food bills to total spending is a cut in the housewife's workweek.)

In 1960 Americans will eat 10 percent more citrus fruits and tomatoes than in 1950, 11 percent less nuts, dry beans, and peas. Outlays for participant recreation will be up 36.3 percent. This rise chiefly reflects the boom in parimutuel betting and pinball and slot-machine playing (whose net receipts more than trebled in a decade, to $419 million in 1952. Contributions to political and civic organizations will climb 45.8 percent. Buying of jewelry and watches will be up 37.2 percent, foreign travel 53.7 percent, medical insurance 60.6 percent, private schooling 101.4 percent, and airline travel 187.4 percent. The Nation's highways will teem with 59 million cars, 47 percent more than in 1950. Looking farther ahead, in 1975 the United States will be generating 1,400 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power, 3½ times 1950's output. Also in that year, it will use 200 billion gallons of fresh water every day, 2½ times 1950's consumption.

NEEDS

Dewhurst's researchers attempted to calculate how much more money would have to be spent to reach a "standard of living at a health and decency level." This concept is hard to pin down, even in societies with lower economic levels. With Americans it is all the more conjectural because an adequate supply of TV sets and pinball machines is harder to determine than an adequate diet level. Nevertheless, the economists figured that 1950's gap between needs and supply—$13.1 billion, or 6 percent of expenditures—would be slashed to $11.4 billion in 1960, only 4 percent of expenditures. The figures showed changes in types of shortage. Housing accounted for 30 percent of 1950's unavailable needs, only 12 percent of 1960's. But more than half of the 1960 gap will be a shortage of medical care, against 36 percent in 1950.

FOREIGN TRADE

The survey forecasts a major shift in the Nation's foreign-trade position: 1960's imports will exceed exports. Europe will continue to be troubled with a dollar deficit, but the rest of the world will enjoy a dollar surplus. Although imports will rise less than gross national product, they will reach $11 billion in 1960, a 26-percent gain during the decade. Biggest gainers will be bauxite (up 97.5 percent), crude oil (up 103 percent), and iron ore (up 300 percent). Biggest losers: tin (down 5 percent), wool (down 10 percent). Assuming that foreign aid ends, exports will edge up only 1 percent, but they will all be paid for. United States capital outflow will have doubled.

TECHNOLOGY

Are Americans prosperous simply because they stumbled upon a fabulous lode of natural resources? The book quotes the late economist, Wesley Mitchell, who pointed out that American Indians "lived in a poverty-stricken environment. For them, no coal existed, no petroleum, no metals beyond nuggets of pure copper. * * * A precarious food supply, flimsy housing, mystical medicine, and chronic warfare limited the increase in numbers." Says Dewhurst: "Technology, in fact, can be thought of as the primary resource; without it all other resources would be economically nonexistent. * * * Technological progress during the past century, especially since 1900, appears to have been more rapid in the United States than anywhere else in the world." Looking ahead, Dewhurst makes a vivid prediction: in the year 2050 a worker will produce in one 7-hour day what takes today's man a 40-hour week.

Correspondence With Walter P. Reuther Relative to Remarks by Secretary of Commerce Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1955, Walter Reuther, president of the UAW–CIO, wrote to me, and probably other Congressmen, complaining about certain remarks of Secretary of Commerce Weeks. He accused Mr. Weeks of "reckless and irresponsible behavior," "distorting the truth and attempting to divide and disunite our people." Mr. Reuther said such action "deserves Presidential and congressional attention."

I certainly agree with Mr. Reuther that if the actions and remarks of Mr. Weeks warrant the grave charges Mr. Reuther has levied against them, such attention is deserved.

I am inserting at this point Mr. Reuther's letter and the enclosures to which the letter refers:

The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I enclose a letter and pamphlet which I have forwarded to Mr. Sinclair Weeks. I respectfully urge that you take note of the reckless and irresponsible behavior and statements to which I refer on the part of the Secretary of Commerce.

Such distortion of the truth on the part of a Cabinet Member in an attempt to divide and disunite our people deserves Presidential and congressional attention.

I think you will agree, as I suggest to Mr. Weeks in my letter to him, as Americans we should stand together to protect and respect our right to differ but our differences should be based on facts, not fancy; on knowledge, not prejudice.

WALTER P. REUTHER.

The Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your remarks on automation in a recent speech in New York are a startling and shocking demonstration of reckless irresponsibility on the part of a Cabinet officer.

In your references to "scaremongers" who are trying to frighten automobile workers with the "bogeyman of automation," you spoke either in ignorance of the facts or with willful distortion of the facts, as other reckless propagandists, with less stature than your position gives you, have done before.

As a cabinet officer, it is your responsibility to get the facts and, having got them, to state them accurately and truthfully. It is also the responsibility of a public official of your rank to devote his energies to pulling the people of our country together on the basis of a sound, constructive program of united action to meet and overcome the economic, social and political problems that confront Americans and the free people of the world generally. The objective results of your uninformed or untruthful remarks on attitudes toward automation are to divide our people into warring economic groups.

While you did not mention the UAW–CIO or any of its officers by name, it is obvious you were referring to us because the distortions you uttered coincide exactly with the false propaganda which has emanated from other sources.

The truth about our position on automation was and is available to you from government as well as from union sources.

Let me quote to you certain passages from an introduction which I wrote to a recent UAW–CIO publication on automation:

"Automation must be met sanely and constructively so that the miracle of mass production—and the ever greater economic abundance made possible by automation—can find expression in the lives of people through improved economic security and a fuller share of happiness and human dignity.

"Sensibly, rationally, scientifically we intend to harness this radical new force in our lives, using its potential to produce an era in which well-being, justice and peace will be the universal possession of all mankind.

"Historically, the problems of mankind have been set in conflict between people, groups and nations each engaged in a struggle to divide up economic scarcity. We have had a world divided between the "haves" and the "have-nots"—those who were fed and those who were starving. Now, science and technology have at last given us the tools of economic abundance, and we are confrontaed no longer with the need to struggle to divide up scarcity.

"Economic abundance is now within our grasp if we but have the good sense to use our resources and technology, fully and effectively, within a framework of economic policies that are morally right and socially responsible.

"The UAW-CIO and its 1½ million members welcome automation, technological progress, and the promise of the peacetime use of the atom. We offer our cooperation to men and women of good will in all walks of life in a common search for policies and programs within the structure of our free society that will insure that greater technological progress will result in greater human progress.

"We in the UAW-CIO believe that we can solve the problems of UAW-CIO members as wage earners only as we work with other people in our free society in the common effort to find answers to the problems of all the people in our country—and ultimately in the world, for only as we learn to work with people everywhere in finding answers to the problems of the world community can we find answers to our own. As citizens of the atomic age, we have the tools of abundance at our disposal. We are confident that the free people of America, in cooperation with free men everywhere, will demonstrate the good sense and courage to use the tools of abundance for constructive and moral purposes."

For your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of the publication from which these quotations are taken.

I would also like to refer you to the transcript of both my prepared statement and my oral testimony before the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives on February 25 and also my prepared statement and my oral testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress on February 10, where I elaborated in greater detail on the position of our organization on this subject. I am sure a transcript is available to you. One would think that a Cabinet officer would avail himself of the information compiled by congressional hearings before speaking on matters covered by those hearings. In fact, it would seem obvious that an official with the rank of Cabinet mem-

ber would find it incumbent upon himself to check all possible sources of information and find out what is going on in particular areas of American life before making public pronouncements that carry the weight and authority of that high office.

The difference, Mr. Secretary, between you, like other critics who have misrepresented our position, and us in the UAW-CIO, is that you are trying to run away from problems attendant upon automation, trying to sweep them out of sight under the rug, while we are stepping up to our responsibilities by exploring all the problems and possibilities and, within our abilities, taking positive action to assure the maximum social good.

It is our considered judgment that you owe to the UAW-CIO and to the American people a public apology for your intemperate and untruthful statements.

Let us as Americans stand together in fully protecting and respecting the right to differ. Let us act responsibly and base our differences upon facts, not fancy; upon knowledge, not prejudice.

Sincerely,

WALTER P. REUTHER.

Upon receipt of this communication from Mr. Reuther, I wrote to him on March 25, 1955, as follows:

Mr. WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, UAW-CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. REUTHER: Thank you for your letter of March 18, 1955, enclosing a copy of your letter to Secretary Weeks in which you take exception to the remarks Secretary Weeks makes in a recent speech in New York. I have asked the Secretary to send me a copy of that speech.

I think the UAW-CIO and yourself personally have taken a fair position on the serious problem of automation. I thought your testimony before our Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which I read carefully, was fair and objective. I do not regard yours, or the position of the UAW-CIO on this matter, as that of scaremongers, nor do I regard the problem of automation a bogeyman. I think you are justified in objecting to the use of such language in reference to the position of the UAW-CIO and yourself.

I do believe, however, that the problem of automation is not a new one. It is a new term but it refers to a problem over 100 years old. I have been a great admirer of the way most of the American labor leaders have approached this problem in contrast to the way in which European labor leaders have approached it, both in the past and in the present. I wonder if you have had occasion to read a recent (1953) pamphlet entitled: "European Impressions of the American Worker," by Robert W. Smuts. This is one of a series of studies being conducted at Columbia University Graduate School of Business under the heading "Human Resource Studies." I was quite impressed with this 58-page document and hidden between the lines there is much thought on the problem of automation.

I am glad that you feel that it is important not to attempt to divide and disunite our people and that we should stand together to protect our right to differ—based upon facts not fancy; on knowledge, not prejudice, because I have felt that some of your public speeches and some of the statements of the PAC-CIO were subject to just this kind of criticism. I think this has been particularly true in your treatment of the recent Internal Revenue Code of 1954. I would call to your mind some correspondence we had about such matters as depreciation and stock dividend credits. Certainly calling a major piece of legislation like this a "rich man's tax bill" is attempting to divide our people; it is based upon fancy not fact; on prejudice not on knowledge. This does not mean that there is not ample room for honest men to disagree on the details in this piece of legislation. Certainly there is, but let's stand together as Americans to respect and protect our right to differ, granting to each other the motive which I feel we all share of trying to do our best to solve the human problems of the day in the best interests of our people and our posterity.

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

I wrote to Secretary Weeks on March 26, 1955, to get a complete transcript of the speech he delivered on March 5, 1955, to which Mr. Reuther took exception. On April 1, 1955, I received a copy of the speech from Mr. Weeks. This is it in its entirety:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE SINCLAIR WEEKS AT DINNER OF THE PILGRIMS OF THE UNITED STATES, HONORING THE RIGHT HONORABLE ROBERT GORDON MENZIES, C. H., Q. C., PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA, WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 5, 1955

It is a great pleasure to join with you in welcoming your distinguished guest, the Right Honorable Robert Gordon Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia.

I am delighted to have this opportunity of addressing your society, which since 1903 has been strengthening the bonds of friendship between the United Kingdom and the United States. Together with your sister organization in the British Isles, you have fostered a better appreciation, on both sides of the Atlantic, of our common heritage in such fundamentals as language, literature, law, and democratic government.

You have facilitated a two-way exchange of ideas and cultural achievements which has brought better understanding between the two oldest English-speaking peoples of the community of nations. With better understanding has come unity of purpose, strengthening our common devotion to freedom and our determination to help each other preserve it.

I congratulate the Pilgrims of Great Britain and the Pilgrims of the United States on this great accomplishment.

It is highly appropriate that from time to time you entertain the representatives of other English-speaking nations.

When such a representative is from the Commonwealth of Australia, which in war and peace has made contributions to international freedom and progress out of all proportion to its population and wealth, we do honor to ourselves in honoring him.

Australia is a country that always steps up and meets its responsibilities. It is doing so again today. It has realized the danger to the free world of Communist aggression in Asia and is doing something about it. It has established diplomatic missions in southeast Asia. It is giving aid to those countries through active participation in the Colombo plan whose very establishment owes much to Australian initiative.

The recent meeting at Bangkok of the Council of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization reminds us of our joint interest in the Far East. There the foreign ministers of Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, and the representative of France, forged closer ties of defense.

In particular they recognized the insidious threat of Communist subversion and infiltration to the peace and security of the area. Henceforth, the eight governments will carry on continuing consultation and mutual assistance, each drawing upon the experience of the others in dealing with this danger.

No less important in preserving the integrity and authority of the freely-constituted governments in southeast Asia are their economic strength and the social well-being of their citizens. At Bangkok the member states inaugurated steps to increase economic cooperation, and to promote economic progress.

Of course, the Bangkok meeting is merely the latest of many successful steps free governments have taken in the past few years to deter aggression and preserve peace. I need not recite for this audience the long list of our accomplishments in mutual help and firm solidarity. You and I know that today free nations are collectively stronger than at any time in recent years.

Perhaps the utter futility of modern warfare may become more evident as time goes on. In any event, and whatever happens, the United States and Australia not only will, but must, continue to stand shoulder to shoulder.

With so much in common, we should and do enjoy most satisfactory business relations with Australia. When it comes to investing capital abroad, businessmen naturally look for a welcome on the mat, and American businessmen have always found it in Australia.

About 475 United States firms have established, acquired interest in, or otherwise participated in the development of a wide variety of Australian manufacturing industries. About 175 of these investments are in corporations classified as subsidiaries or affiliates of the American firm. The others operate under various arrangements such as licensing.

Many American companies have constructed plants in Australia today. Among these are included names which are known to you all: Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, California-Texas Oil, Ford, Chrysler, General Motors, General Electric, Goodyear Tire & Rubber, International-Harvester, Johns-Mansville, Swift Co.

United States direct investments in Australia totaled $328 million at the end of 1953, as compared with $161 million at the end of 1949. In other words, such investments have more than doubled in a 4-year period.

In connection with the investment of American capital in Australia, it is interesting to recall the words of Acting Prime Minister Sir Arthur Fadden at the opening of the new Philip Morris plant in Melbourne in January of this year, when he referred to Australia's policy of welcoming foreign capital from abroad in these words:

"The policy of the present Commonwealth Government therefore is to welcome overseas capital to Australia, particularly if it is intended for permanent investment and if it is likely to contribute to the desirable development of Australian resources."

Trade between our two countries is equally important. Wool, over the years, has been one of the leading items of trade. As a lifelong resident of New England, I have, of course, been brought up to think of Australia as an important supplier of wool for our textile industries. In this connection, I am pleased to have participated in the revamping of our wool policy last year, so as to make it more equitable both to foreign suppliers and to our own domestic wool growers.

Currently, imports from Australia are showing greater diversification. For example, the figures indicate a striking increase in the import of metals from 2 percent of total imports in 1937 to 33 percent in 1953.

As Australia develops and increases its population, it can be expected to become an increasingly important market for a diversified line of American goods.

These mutually profitable business relationships between the United States and countries such as Australia are a model for the world. They are the economic counterpart of that mutual cooperation between the English-speaking peoples of the world which

your organization has fostered for these many years.

The importance of this common interest cannot be overstressed. With it goes the interchange of not only goods but of our people and our cultures. What better way is there to develop lasting friendship and peace between nations for the common good of all.

I believe that a bright economic future is in store for Australia and the United States if we do those things which promote economic growth.

There are many steps we can take to attain long range prosperity. One of them is to encourage the advancement of technology. Scientific progress in agriculture, mining and manufacturing is giving this generation the greatest material blessings in all history, security from destruction by aggressors and the assurance of a much better future for ourselves and children.

The industrial revolution's machinery released man from muscular slavery and is supplying him with a wealth of new goods and new jobs. Today the dawning age of truly automatic machines—which we describe by the word automation—is providing man with mechanical senses of feeling, hearing and sight—in some cases even with electronic "brains."

The result of this fresh surge in productivity is a higher standard of living for everyone. New technological progress is the greatest creator of more and better paid jobs.

Yet some doubting Thomases have arisen in both countries who seem afraid to take full advantage of the new technology with its new self-regulating machinery, automatic memories and other labor-saving innovations.

Some apprehension stems from lack of knowledge; some from misleading propaganda.

Recently a new rash of opposition to and fear of new technological progress has been voiced in some circles in the United States. Here unscrupulous demagogs and economic illiterates are trying to scare people into the belief that automation is a vicious Frankenstein devouring their jobs. I am certain that this is the most stupid and the most cruel misguidance that can be given to the free workers of the free world.

Such dread of progress, however, is not new. History is filled with examples of those who erroneously thought new machines would wipe out their livelihood.

An ignorant mob invaded Hargreave's home and smashed his spinning jennies. Quill penmen rose in anger against the introduction of the printing press. Paris workers rioted against the sewing machine. English hand-knitters used sledge hammers to smash Cartright's power loom. The teamsters of Pennsylvania wrecked the first oil pipelines.

Suppose these panic-stricken deluded people had been able to stop progress? Millions of new jobs never would have been created. Untold numbers of new products never would have been manufactured for the pleasure and well-being of mankind.

Karl Marx, whose false doctrines have brought limitless misery to his dupes, bitterly condemned the machine as the soul of capitalist exploitation. Let's not permit his modern echoes to get away with similar deceptions. Let's confront wild charges about technological unemployment with facts which refute falsehoods.

As Secretary of Commerce it is my duty to study the economy and to foster measures to improve it. Here are some statistics on economic expansion in America which prove without question that machines make more and better jobs. From 1939 to 1953 the population of the United States increased 22 percent. But employment in manufacturing increased 70 percent. The machine created new industries and made new jobs.

A breakdown in figures is quite revealing. In this period jobs in electrical machinery rose from 393,000 to 1,200,000—a jump of around 200 percent. In 1910 there were 444,000 employed teamsters, draymen, and carriage drivers. In 1950 there were 1,919,000 employed motor-vehicle drivers and delivery and route men.

Some scaremongers at the moment are attempting in particular to frighten automobile workers with the bogeyman of automation. But the record shows that this industry, a pacemaker in technological advancement, employed 987,000 workers in 1953 as against only 466,000 in 1939.

Economists estimate that every job in auto manufacturing stimulates five additional jobs in occupations connected with motoring, such as mines supplying metals, farms furnishing raw materials for plastics, highway construction, motels, filling stations, and other roadside enterprises.

The late Philip Murray, the American labor leader, said, when addressing the CIO as its president in 1951, "I do not know of a single, solitary instance where a great technological gain has taken place in the United States of America that it has actually thrown people out of work. I do not know of it, I am not aware of it, because the industrial revolution that has taken place in the United States in the past 25 years has brought into the employment field an additional 20 million people."

Automation is the modern term for what has been known as labor-saving machinery. The Socialist—the irresponsible demagog—hurls the words "labor-saving machinery" in the face of inventors, scientists, managers with the accusing connotation that it must be designed to throw people out of jobs.

As a matter of fact, labor-saving machinery means exactly what it says—it saves labor. The backbreaking jobs on the farm, in the home, in the steel mills, and elsewhere in industry have, for the most part, yielded to pleasant, agreeable work on the farm, in the home, and in clean, well heated, well ventilated mills and factories producing products which but for this same labor-saving machinery the people could never have or even dream of.

Example after example can be cited to show that instead of being the destroyer of jobs, the new industrial robots are the best friends of workers, managers, and consumers.

In short, can anyone who thinks about these things believe that we have reached the end of the road of progress?

Can anyone believe that further and greater technological progress and development in the field of labor-saving machinery will fail to make jobs and advance the welfare of all the people? Of course not. My conviction, supported by every bit of available evidence, makes me sure that the road ahead is still wide open for almost unlimited further progress.

In conclusion, let me reaffirm my trust in the partnership of Australia and the United States. We have in common a colonial background from which have grown two proud, independent nations, united by fond memories and ties of warm friendship among ourselves and the United Kingdom. Nothing can sever that bond.

We cherish similar ideals and spiritual values. Thrice as Allies we have mingled the blood of our sons in battle. Our mutual desire is for good will among all the peoples of this earth. But in any grave emergency in the Pacific or elsewhere the United States and Australia not only will, but must, stand resolutely side by side.

We will not shrink in fear from encouraging further industrialization and technological progress because we know that on the expanding economic strength of the free world is based mankind's best assurance of freedom and deepest hope of a just and lasting peace.

On April 18, 1955, after carefully reading Mr. Weeks' speech, I wrote to Mr. Reuther again, as follows:

Mr. WALTER REUTHER,
President, UAW–CIO,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. REUTHER: On March 25, 1955, I replied to your letter to me (and other Congressmen) of March 18, 1955, in which you took exception to remarks made by Secretary Weeks in a speech he made in New York City, March 5, 1955, at a banquet honoring Prime Minister Menzies, of Australia. I said in my letter I would obtain a copy of Mr. Weeks' speech so I could better judge the complaints you make against it.

Having read the speech, I am somewhat amazed at your letter of March 18, 1955. Having, as I stated, read your views on automation as presented before our Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I cannot for the life of me see how you determined that Secretary Weeks was referring to your position on automation when he was referring to "scaremongers," using the "bogeyman of automation," even though he said "in particular to frighten the automobile workers," unless you had made speeches which presented a different approach than the one you took before our committee. My own assumption would be that you have retained a consistent position on the subject of automation.

I feel certain that Secretary Weeks agrees with you that automation, though essentially a good thing, does present immediate problems that require thought in their solution. We may all disagree as to the extent of these problems, and certainly as to the methods which are best suited to meet them.

Reverting back to your statement, which I so fundamentally agreed with, that it is important not to attempt to divide and disunite our people, I have found one of the most-used techniques to accomplish this undesirable end, today, is the claim of being insulted when, indeed, no insult was intended. I am certain Mr. Weeks intended no insult, and if he did, it falls flat on its face in light of the fair and objective presentation you made to our committee.

Because this matter was brought to the attention of all the Congressmen, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of Mr. Weeks' speech, your letter to Mr. Weeks, and the forwarding letter to me, plus my correspondence with you. If you care to make an answer to my letters, I shall be happy to include your answer along with the rest of the material.

THOS. B. CURTIS.

I am sorry that Mr. Reuther has not availed himself of my offer to reply to my letters. The matter has received some congressional attention, at my hands, as Mr. Reuther suggested. It now lies with Mr. Reuther to come forward and explain the basis of his grave charges against the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks. Certainly, Mr. Weeks was not dreaming up "scaremongers" who "at the moment are attempting in particular to frighten automobile workers with the bogeyman of automation" inasmuch as the pamphlet put out by UAW-CIO education department entitled "Automation" to which Mr. Reuther refers and quotes from in his longer letter, on page 8 quotes a person who might well be described as a scaremonger—without identifying him anymore than Mr. Weeks did except to refer to him as an "expert" instead of a "scaremonger."

The following is a direct quotation from the pamphlet:

The experts disagree on what the future holds. (One says automation is only "a new chapter in the continuing story of man's organization and mechanization of the forces of nature.")

Another says that automation "will produce an unemployment situation, in comparison with which * * * the depression of the thirties will seem a pleasant joke."

Now, I do not think one can quarrel too much with Mr. Weeks for referring to this person, whoever he may be, as a "scaremonger" even if he is also an "expert." Personally, I do not like to use words which might be passed off as epithets even when they seem to be properly descriptive. I would prefer to have people judge for themselves from the person's own words and actions. Nonetheless, to call the Secretary of Commerce "reckless and irresponsible and distorting the truth," and so forth, because of it, seems to be in itself reckless and irresponsible and distorting the truth.

Sick Leave in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned, as I know many Members of the House of Representatives have been concerned about the press reports on the report of the Comptroller General regarding sick leave abuses in the postal service.

I have given this report very careful study and feel that in fairness to our 500,000 loyal and conscientious postal employees this unfortunate impression should be corrected.

It is apparent to me that many press accounts of the contents of this report contain slanted emphasis—unintentional, I am sure—which reflects on both the work productivity and the integrity of our postal employees. My remarks are directed at this slanted emphasis, which does not at all represent the tone of the Comptroller General's report.

In truth and in fact, this report heavily scores the management of the Post Office Department from top to bottom. The keynote appears in the line beginning on page 7 of the report:

The failure by officials at the top management level to effectively administer and control sick leave has resulted, principally from a departmental policy, which, in the past, condoned the liberal interpretation placed on existing regulations or perhaps ignored a practice which was common knowledge.

The report goes on and cites chapter and verse in support of its statement that departmental officials had been made aware of the unsatisfactory sick leave practices. Here are some other excerpts from the report:

The Department issued a directive in May 1953 * * * relative to abuses of sick leave, but corrective action has not been taken to strengthen sick-leave policies, procedures, and reporting.

This is on the first page of the report. A few lines later the reports goes on:

Inadequate supervision of this vast number [500,000] of employees could result in considerable monetary losses as a result of man-hours lost on the job.

Elsewhere it is said that—

Responsible approving supervisors and officials in post offices have disregarded policies concerning the control and administration of sick leave * * *; that improper approval of sick leave results from the policy of the Department in delegating to immediate supervisors * * * authority to grant sick leave without providing adequate review and control; and that although departmental officials have assigned the responsibility for approving sick leave to the lowest level of supervision, they have not established procedures for a systematic review.

It should be pointed out that the discussion of abuse in paragraph No. 9 on page 2 of the Comptroller General's report will be corrected by the pending postal pay legislation. This legislation, as agreed to in conference and in the House, contains a new "biweekly pay period system" for the postal field service which will prevent the practice complained of in this paragraph. This legislation I seriously doubt will be vetoed by the President, for he would be definitely acting contrary to all responsibilities of his office just to placate the Postmaster General.

It should further be pointed out that in the past the Department has been very reluctant to appoint supervisors when the postmasters of post offices have requested same. The Department itself is primarily to blame for the action of the employees as to sick leave.

The very first recommendation of the Comptroller General is "that the Department reappraise the authority granted to immediate supervisors and strengthen the procedures relating to documenting and reporting of sick leave to those responsible at higher levels."

With further reference to the part played by the postal employee, the Comptroller General's report points out that organizations of postal employees are aware of the situation and have taken action, so far as would be appropriate for them to act, to cooperate with the Department in preventing abuse of sick leave. For example, one of the exhibits with the report is an excerpt from the M. H. News, a publication of Branch 29 of the National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers in Cleveland, Ohio, dated December 5, 1954. The M. H. News quoted its national office as asking employees to cooperate with the Department in this matter, and said:

You are subject to removal and heavy penalties. * * * We are asking you to cooperate with the local office and the Department to cut down on this abuse of sick leave. * * * Sick leave is the best insurance you can have. * * * Try to keep your record clean.* * * Watch your sick leave.

I think this should help set the record straight, as it should be in justice to our postal employees. I am presenting this material with the belief that will be helpful to those who must have received a distorted picture of this situation, as I can well understand from the press accounts that I have read.

Change in Policy by the National Labor Relations Board—Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer a statement by Mr. Claude Ballard, international vice president of the International Woodworkers of America, CIO, in support of his letter to me, which appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD of May 9, 1955:

EFFECT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD'S CHANGING POSITION ON THE COMMERCE SECTION OF THE ACT

On July 1, 1954, the National Labor Relations Board in Washington, D. C., released to the morning papers, and announced a change of the standards under which it would exercise jurisdiction under the commerce section of the National Labor Relations Act. It seemed that the Board, in establishing these new standards, expressed the opinion that although they had the power delegated by Congress to take jurisdiction under the old rules, they felt that by expeditious handling of the caseload which was presently before it, that the purposes of the act could better be effectuated in the revision of the standards.

Everyone was aware of the general change which changed the direct flow into commerce from $25,000 to $50,000 and in indirect flow from $50,000 to $100,000. There was no indication at that time that the Board would materially change their yardstick on accepting jurisdiction where it can be reasonably proved that the material flowed either directly or indirectly from the producer's operation into commerce.

We in the lumber industry are faced with the difficult situation of determining to what extent that operators are in commerce under the present administrative decisions of the Board. In the first place, our industry is one where there is much contracting and subcontracting, not only for major operations but for smaller producers, brokers, and corporations selling lumber, and otherwise, where it is difficult to follow the flow of goods into commerce. This situation was always a problem, even before the present trend of the Board which has made it almost impossible. In some instances the Board, in our opinion, does not make a thorough investigation where a petition has been filed against a company to determine where the material produced by the employer actually flows. We do not believe their investigations are complete in any respect in making a final determination whether the company should come under the commerce section of the act or not.

Since the release of the new jurisdiction standards made on July 1, 1954, the Board has moved into the position of throwing out petitions in the lumbering industry which will, in our opinion, materially damage collective bargaining in the lumber industry if it is not stopped. We are firmly convinced if the present trend of the Board on decisions which generally finds operations

not in commerce continues, that the lumber industry, as such, will experience more labor strife than has been known in the industry for years. There is no doubt in our minds that a major part of the industry, by simple maneuvering, can, under the present policy of the Board, be released completely from the Board's jurisdiction.

There have been three specific cases in change of policy by the Board in our industry which we will enumerate as examples. We are not saying, in enumerating these cases, that the Board, under its present policy, will not go further than they already have in narrowing their jurisdiction in the industry. If this policy is continued, it will be a catastrophe as far as collective bargaining is concerned in the lumber industry because it will force upon the organized workers, where the jurisdiction is removed, the policy of striking to establish their bargaining rights and we have no doubt that a great many employers will take advantage of the present trend of the Board and attempt to take themselves out from under the commerce section of the act.

We raise for consideration the three cases that will follow, because we feel that they substantiate our thinking at the time of the release of the changes and standards of July 1, 1954, that the policy for the future was not that which the Board expressed at that time. We feel that the Board is, as fast as possible, using every excuse to narrow its jurisdiction down to make the Board ineffective and to undermine the right of the working people to establish bargaining rights by Federal law.

The first case was a charge case, number 20–CA–944, involving the Mast Lumber Co., Inc., and the International Woodworkers of America, CIO. This case developed out of the election campaign in the operation where our representative had signed up a vast majority of the employees in this company. The discrimination against those active in the union, along with the release of the men actively engaged in union affairs, finally caused the union to file a charge case against the company for their antiunion activities.

The record shows that the company sales of the lumber sold from its operation was approximately $900,000. The company sold $39,622.64 of lumber to an Arizona company who trucked the lumber directly from the Mast Lumber Co. plant to their distributing centers in Arizona. There was $38,530.68 worth of lumber that was sold to companies which admittedly shipped those amounts out of State but was not considered directly in the flow of commerce. There was $11,724.63 worth of lumber which was shipped by the company to a company in Michigan which the Board determined was directly in the flow of commerce. Up until this time there would have been no question as to the $39,622.64, going from the company's plant directly to the Arizona distributing company, being in commerce, so along with the $11,724.63, it would have placed this company well within the rules as laid down by the July announcement of policy of 1954, but by a simple maneuver, the Board finds it convenient to say, because these companies purchased the lumber and hauled the lumber from the producer's plant after buying it, that this amount was indirectly in commerce. We believe that also the amount sold to the two companies who shipped into interstate commerce should have been designated as directly in commerce but the Board had far overstepped their former policy, which had been followed for many years, when they eliminated the direct shipment by the company to the Arizona buyer.

Now in addition to the approximate $100,000 worth of sales, there was $800,000 worth of material that left the employer's plant which was still not accounted for, as the Board ruled that this company would not fall under the commerce section of the act. Now the Board says that in their decision and order in the case, that all of the sales concededly were, for the Board's jurisdictional purposes, wholly intrastate in character, with the exception of the amount which we have mentioned above. We have no way in which to prove that an inadequate investigation of this amount of $800,000 worth of lumber, which was shipped from the employer's plant was made but we are firmly convinced, knowing the industry, that a substantial amount of this lumber finally found its way into the stream of commerce, and if a proper investigation had been made by the Board, that would have been the findings rather than their abrupt dismissal of the case.

The General Council of the Labor Relations Board filed a brief, taking exception to the decision of the Board in the above-numbered case and pointed out the errors in respect to the reasoning of the trial examiner in recommending that the company did not fall under the commerce section of the act. Some of the General Council's argument, which is contained within the brief, was very interesting and should have been taken into consideralton by the Board in making a final determination of the case. However, the General Council did not urge the Board to accept his reasoning with too much force and only asked that the Board make a definite commitment as to what its policies would be in the future. We have yet to see where the Board has established any policy on which anyone can depend as being the yardstick. Tomorrow we cannot reasonably expect in the lumber industry that a company is either under, or out from under the commerce section of the act as far as the NLRB is concerned. The situation changes from day to day and there seems to be no rhyme nor reason to the present policy of the Board in this respect.

The second case is one which involves the George Secor Logging Co., Case No. 12–RM–149 and Case 19–RC–1527. The Secor Logging Co. produced approximately $300,000 worth of logs which were logged at the direction of the Albian Logging Co., who bought the timber and directed its exploitation. The Albian Logging Co. not only told the Secor Logging Co. how and when the timber was to be logged, but also directed them to deliver the logs to various companies unquestionably in interstate commerce.

The Albian Logging Co. was set up simply for the purpose of buying and exploiting timber in the burn area of the Olympic Peninsula in behalf of two other companies. The Albian Logging Co. is owned by the Nettleton Timber Co. who owns 50 percent, and 50 percent is owned by an individual in Hoquiam, Wash., is a part owner of the Nettleton Lumber Co. The Nettleton Timber Co. is a totally owned subsidiary of the Nettleton Lumber Co. The Albian Logging Co. is just a creature of convenience set up by the Nettleton Timber Co. which is the same as the Nettleton Lumber Co. Now the Albian Logging Co. directed a great volume of the logs produced by the George Secor Logging Co. to be delivered to the parent company, the Nettleton Lumber Co. The peeler logs, which were to be used in the manufacture of plywood, was directed by them to be delivered to the National Plywood Co. and the cedar logs were directed to be delivered to a shingle mill in the area. It is clearly shown that the Nettleton Lumber Co., the Nettleton Timber Co. and the Albian Logging Co. are one and the same company as to operational direction. It is also clearly established that the George Secor Logging Co. is completely dependent upon their direction as to how he does his work, with the exception of him having a few employees whom he pays, he is in no position other than that of an employee who takes his direction for a job he is performing on an hourly rate.

In face of the facts in this case, the Board unreasonably ruled that the George Secor Logging Co. was not only twice removed from commerce but thrice removed, and dismissed the case. These cases clearly show that by the simple device of setting up a dummy corporation for sales purposes, or for any other purpose where the material can flow into someone else's hands within a State prior to the time of entering the flow of commerce, that they can now be eliminated from the commerce section of the act. It also indicates that the very nature of the industry will force the unions and their membership to strike more and more often for recognition in the future because of the lack of understanding on the part of the National Labor Relations Board.

The third and final case I wish to call to your attention is the Robert Tuttle Logging Co., case No. 19–RC–1584. The record in this case shows that the average sales of logs of this company was $125,000. The record also shows that these sales were made locally to the National Logging Co., a dummy corporation which sold the logs to companies engaged in interstate commerce. The record also showed that the National Logging Co. was owned by 3 logging operators, Robert Tuttle being 1 of them. They all operate on the same basis and all of their sales were made through the so-called National Logging Co.

The 3 small operators, including Tuttle, were the 3 officers of the National Logging Co. and directed their policies entirely. The Board in this case, ruled that because the National was an independent company, Tuttle is twice removed from commerce and is not covered by it under the act.

We must assume by the actions of the Board that if the case had involved the two other operators in the National Logging Co. and their operations, they also would be placed under the twice removed theory and would have been eliminated from the commerce section of the act. Inasmuch as it has been the long practice of the Board that when interlocking ownership was apparent, such as it is in this case, the twice removed theory would not have been applied and if they met the dollar requirements, the companies would necessarily have come under the commerce section of the act but the Board is now completely disregarding the interlocking ownership and is using the fact that the dummy company, such as the National was set up for sales purposes, as an excuse to place the operating companies in a position of being twice removed from commerce.

These three cases and their handling by the National Labor Relations Board, fully sets forth the intentions of the Board to eliminate a major portion of the lumber industry from protection, if any, under the NLRB. The Board, by its administrative prerogatives, is not only cutting down to the smaller caseload which it had indicated prior to its release of the standards under which it would exercise jurisdiction on July 1, 1954, but they have continued to enlarge on these prerogatives to the point that they have eliminated, by administrative manipulation, a major share of the companies in the industry from coverage under the act if those companies choose to use the loopholes which the Board has provided for them.

As we have said before, if the present procedure continues, and if the employers are allowed to extend it by the simple device of setting up dummy corporations within the State, many of the operations which are presently under contract to our union can lose the coverage under the act by simply questioning the bargaining rights at the time of expiration of the contract on the appropriate notice as required by the act, prior to the termination of the contract. It follows that if this matter comes to the attention of the Board in the form of an employer questioning a majority held by a union, the Board will immediately, in these cases, declare the operation not under the

commerce section because of being twice or thrice or even further removed from commerce. The end results will be that if the people still working in the operation still desire a union, and in most cases they do, there will be only one way to answer the problem and that will be to strike for the recognition desired by the employees.

The intent and the purpose of the Board at the present time in these cases is well set forth by the statement by Mr. Farmer when he says that aside from the legal limitations, it also has some practical considerations to weigh, and these are time and space, and money and personnel. Consideration of the heavy number of cases it was receiving, Farmer says, led to the Board's decision last July to cut down its exercise of jurisdiction by establishing new standards for assertion of authority. This statement by Farmer would indicate to us that the Board is not really interested in who is, or who isn't involved in interstate commerce as to the coverage of the act. It would seem by Farmer's statement that they were only interested in the major companies at the present time, and only to the degree that each case would affect the money and personnel that the Board has available. The Board, on its own motion, seems perfectly willing to have money and personnel cut to have an excuse to reduce the caseload, so it seems that the Board is placing themselves in a position of a court which has a large number of cases to hear and because of this caseload, they, on their own motion, threw out those cases that they feel are least important and try only those cases that, in their wisdom, they feel should be tried. Of course a court of law does not have the administrative latitude that Mr. Farmer's board has, so regardless of the caseload, they cannot, through administrative procedure such as the Board has, get rid of their work and actually change the law by administration.

It would seem to us that the administrative procedure of the Board has changed the existing National Labor Relations Act to their convenience to the point, in the lumber industry at least, that it will be difficult to establish bargaining rights without the weapon of the strike in the near future. This will be the case in the large part of the industry with the exception of very few major operations which represent and constitute only a fraction of the total industry.

Peanuts Are Basic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the New York Times of May 7, 1955, entitled "Peanuts Are Basic":

The House of Representatives has voted, 206–201, for a restoration of fixed 90-percent price supports for the so-called basic commodities. But unless and until the Senate gives evidence that it is prepared to back the House up on this rejection of flexible supports without even a trial it is difficult to take the House action too seriously.

It seems doubtful that the Senate will go along in this irresponsible action, especially since the measure would invite an almost certain Presidential veto. On the other hand, it seems doubtful that Mr. RAYBURN, who helped push this week's farm prop measure through, would have done so in disregard of a possible second rebuff from his own party in the Senate. The most logical assumption, therefore, would seem to be that the proposal for high price supports will not even get to the floor of the Senate. This would mean that the House vote was intended merely for the record; and if that proves to be the case it isn't likely to contribute greatly to Democratic strength in the Farm Belt.

Meanwhile, we have seen an interesting demonstration in the last few days of why the term "basic" is applied to the commodities wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts. The average person is likely to assume that basic here means that these crops are, let us say, more fundamentally important to the economy than any other crops. Actually they are basic chiefly to one another, and for political purposes. That this is clearly realized by the leaders on both sides of the House was to be seen in the strategy they used. The Republicans sought to have peanuts dropped as a beneficiary of the legislation, knowing that representatives of all five commodities leaned on each other. It was by using his influence to defend the peanut amendment that Mr. RAYBURN saved the day for his colleagues. But the contest was so close that, just to make sure, the representatives of the basics coaxed the dairy farmers into a temporary alliance with them by the lure of an 80-percent floor under their products.

Some Plain Facts on Farm-Labor Deals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the farm bill last week we heard much about a so-called deal between urban area Congressmen and their rural brethren to support farm legislation in return for the farm bloc's support of a minimum-wage bill.

What was an appeal to rural area Congressmen to consider the plight of low-income workers, was interpreted by some as a "shady" or "shabby" proposition. What was an attempt to arouse some interest in the welfare of consumers and to present their views on farm issues, was interpreted in certain quarters as "logrolling."

Both farmers and city workers are entitled to share in the prosperity of our Nation and they should not be deprived of the opportunity of a decent living. Somehow, this thought seems to have escaped those who are constantly on the lookout for sinister deals and shabby propositions.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial on the subject was published in Labor's Daily on May 7, 1955. I am pleased to insert it into the RECORD in order to bring it to the attention of all my colleagues. It reads as follows:

THEIR HELP IS WELCOME
(By Willard Shelton)

Representative ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, showed discontent during the farm bill debate, with the fact that union spokesmen had endorsed amendment of the Eisenhower-Benson flexible price-support program. The suggestion has been bandied about that unions and farm spokesmen have made a deal, whereby city Congressmen would support the farm bloc and rural Congressmen would support labor's desire for a better minimum wage.

This alleged deal probably exists more in somebody's imagination than in actuality, but it would be hard to think of a better deal for the country.

The plain fact is that rural Congressmen have depended on city support for practically all the major farm programs of the past two decades.

City Congressmen supported the Agriculture Adjustment Act, farm conservation plans, rural electrification, and commodity credit. The bills would never have been passed without help from city Congressmen elected with labor votes.

There isn't anything new in the fact that both AFL and CIO believe that the farmer has a right to share in prosperity, that the city worker can't prosper if the farmer is deprived of a decent living.

Chairman COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, of the House Agriculture Committee, gave Walter P. Reuther and George Meany a chance to testify this year on the farm problem, and their views thus got wide circulation. But the views were honestly conceived and honestly uttered; they were not invented or doctored up as a result of any shabby little deal.

It is perfectly true, on the other hand, that some Congressmen from rural districts have shown an extraordinary lack of sympathy with the problems of organized labor.

It was rural votes that passed the Taft-Hartley law in 1947 and it was rural votes that held down the rate of pay and the spread of coverage under the latest amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

There is nothing wrong in an invitation to Congressmen from farm districts to take another look at the problems of city workers, to think a bit more deeply about the rights of unions, to realize that reciprocity is often a virtue.

This observer found great pleasure in the fact that Chairman COOLEY stood in the House and defended his committee for asking Meany and Reuther to present the viewpoint of city consumers on the farm bill. Why shouldn't labor leaders be invited to discuss major issues affecting the economic well-being of millions of farmers?

There is a minimum-wage bill making its way through Congress, although Chairman BARDEN, Democrat, of North Carolina, hasn't yet scheduled House Labor Committee hearings on it. It is a bill about which labor feels deeply and in which labor's interests are vitally involved.

If a few farm Congressmen have been awakened to the facts of life by debate on COOLEY's farm bill; if they realize that the broadest interests of both city workers and farmers are identical, maybe they will help the city Congressmen this time. Their support would be very welcome.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record. It follows:

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan (83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954		
1	Jan. 6	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5337, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy:	
3	Jan. 21	On passage. (Passed, 329 to 36)	Yea.
		H. J. 358, to discharge indebtedness of Commodity Credit Corporation:	
4	Jan. 27	On passage. (Passed, 323 to 27)	Yea.
5	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
6	Feb. 3	do	Present.
7	do	do	Present.
8	Feb. 4	do	Present.
9	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 3300, authorizing the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under direction of the Secretary of the Army, to divert water from Lake Michigan into Illinois Waterway:	
10	do	On amendment designed to prevent additional diversion of water until survey of lake levels had been completed by Corps of Engineers and submitted to Congress. (Rejected, 177 to 202.)	Yea.
11	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 150 to 234.)	Yea.
12	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Absent.
13	do	do	Absent.
14	Feb. 17	do	Absent.
		H. R. 4646, providing for the exchange of certain public and private lands in order to prevent Federal lands acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations:	
15	do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 226 to 161.)	NV.
16	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 400, to provide funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
17	Feb. 25	On passage. (Passed, 363 to 1.)	NV.
18	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Mar. 2	do	Present.
		H. J. Res. 355, relating to supplying of agricultural workers from Mexico:	
21	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 156 to 250.)	Nay.
22	do	Quorum call	Present.
23	do	do	Present.
24	Mar. 4	do	Present.
		H. R. 8067, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for fiscal 1955:	
25	Mar. 5	On an amendment to increase funds for subsidies to air carriers from $23,000,000 to $40,000,000. (Adopted, 265 to 105.)	Yea.
26	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 10	do	Present.
		H. R. 8224, reducing and extending certain excise taxes:	
28	do	On motion to recommit, with instructions to remove taxes on admissions of 50 cents or less. (Rejected, 200 to 213.)	Nay.
29	do	On passage. (Passed, 411 to 3.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 15	do	Present.
32	do	do	Present.
33	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8300, revising the internal revenue laws:	
34	Mar. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase personal exemptions and eliminate section dealing with double taxation of dividends. (Rejected, 204 to 210.)	Nay.
35	do	On passage. (Passed, 339 to 80.)	Yea.
36	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	Mar. 23	do	Present.
39	Mar. 24	do	Present.
40	Mar. 29	do	Present.
		H. R. 8224, reducing and extending certain excise taxes:	
41	Mar. 30	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 395 to 1.)	Yea.
42	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8583, appropriating funds for various independent offices for fiscal 1955:	
43	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to adopt language preventing FNMA from liquidating mortgages. (Rejected, 180 to 214.)	Nay.
44	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
45	Apr. 2	do	Present.
	do	H. R. 7839, aiding in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities:	
46	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide 35,000 public housing units each year for 4 years. (Rejected, 176 to 211.)	Nay.
47	do	On passage. (Passed, 352 to 46.)	Yea.
48	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
49	Apr. 7	do	Present.
50	Apr. 8	do	Present.
		H. R. 8649, authorizing the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of wiretap information secured in national security investigations:	
51	do	On amendment requiring a court order in order to make wiretap evidence admissible. (Passed, 221 to 166.)	Nay.
52	do	On passage. (Passed, 379 to 10.)	Yea.
53	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	Apr. 14	do	Present.
55	Apr. 27	do	Present.
		H. R. 7397, amending the Public Health Grant-in-Aid Act by consolidating and simplifying the several public health grant-in-aid programs for assisting States and local communities in providing necessary public health services:	
56	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
57	Apr. 29	do	Present.
		H. R. 8873, appropriating funds for the Defense Department for fiscal 1955:	
58	do	On passage. (Passed, 077 to 0)	Yea.
59	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
60	do	do	Present.
61	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2150, providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in the United States territory:	
62	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 157 to 242.)	Nay.
63	do	On passage. (Passed, 241 to 158.)	Yea.
64	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
65	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 2556, amending United States Code relative to extradition of certain fugutives from United States to countries occupied by United States jointly with 1 or more powers:	
66	do	On motion that enacting clause be stricken out (that the bill be killed). (Adopted, 228 to 68.)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan (83d Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954		
67	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 533, citing Bernhard Deutch for contempt of House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
68	do	On adoption. (Adopted, 346 to 0)	Yea.
		H. R. 9040, authorizing cooperative research in education:	
69	May 12	On passage. (Passed, 296 to 55.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 532, providing for consideration of H. R. 7434, establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education:	
70	do	On resolution. (Adopted, 194 to 140)	Yea.
71	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7434, establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education:	
72	do	On passage. (Passed, 179 to 157.)	Yea.
73	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7001, providing for a White House Conference on Education:	
74	do	On passage. (Passed, 269 to 69.)	Yea.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9242, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska communications system:	
76	do	On passage. (Passed, 346 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 568, providing for the consideration of H. R. 9366, amending the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code:	
77	June 1	On adoption. (Adopted, 270 to 76)	Yea.
		H. R. 9366, amending the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increasing the benefits payable thereunder, preserving the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits:	
78	do	On passage. (Passed, 355 to 8.)	Yea.
79	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 580, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7494, extending the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year:	
80	June 11	On adoption. (Adopted, 273 to 63.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7494, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, for 1 year:	
81	do	On passage. (Passed, 281 to 53.)	Yea.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9517, appropriating funds for the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal 1955:	
83	June 15	On amendment fixing the Federal payment to the District of Columbia at $20 million instead of $16 million. (Passed, 186 to 168.)	Nay.
84	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8729, extending for 2 years the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.	
85	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit bond purchasing authority to periods when no cash is available. (Rejected, 80 to 250.)	Nay.
86	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 583, providing for disagreement to a Senate amendment to the Housing bill providing for public housing and agreeing to conference requested by Senate:	
87	do	On passage. (Passed, 360 to 19.)	Yea.
88	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		S. Con. Res. 91, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement:	
89	June 29	On passage. (Passed, 372 to 0.)	Yea.
90	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9678, promoting the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations (mutual security bill):	
91	do	On amendment stating it to be the sense of Congress that no funds should be used for governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory of Asia. (Passed, 389 to 0.).	Yea.
92	do	On passage. (Passed, 260 to 126.)	Yea.
93	do	Quorum call	Present.
94	July 1	do	Present.
95	July 2	do	Present.
		H. R. 9680, providing for continued price support for agricultural products, augmenting the marketing and disposal of such products, and providing for greater stability in the products of agriculture:	
96	do	On amendment to provide flexibility in price supports from 82½ to 90 percent of parity for the 1955 crops of basic commodities. (Passed, 288 to 170.).	Yea.
		H. R. 9640, amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds and otherwise improve the provisions of that act:	
97	July 8	On passage. (Passed, 347 to 0.)	Yea.
	do	H. R. 9709, a bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program:	
98	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to impose Federal standards upon State programs. (Rejected, 110 to 241.)	Nay.
99	do	On passage. (Passed, 309 to 36.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9580, revising and extending the laws relating to espionage and sabotage:	
100	do	On passage. (Passed, 324 to 0.)	Yea.
101	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 623, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8356, the health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill:	
102	July 13	On passage. (Passed, 274 to 88.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8356, the health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill:	
103	do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 238 to 134.)	Nay.
104	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 627, reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations:	
105	do	On passage. (Passed, 381 to 0.)	Yea.
106	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7839, the Housing Act of 1954:	
107	do	On recommittal motion designed to provide 140,000 new units of public housing over a 4-year period in lieu of the 35,000 new units for fiscal year 1955. (Rejected, 156 to 234.)	Nay.
108	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 358 to 30.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9888, extending the time for initiating training under the Korean GI bill of rights to 3 years instead of the present 2 years after date of induction:	
109	July 21	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9020, granting increases in compensation and pension to veterans of all wars and their dependents:	
110	do	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9245, providing postal rate increases and postal pay increases:	
111	do	On motion to suspend rules and pass with an amendment. (Rejected, 228 to 171. A ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension of the rules.)	Yea.
112	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 604, citing Bolza Baxter for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
113	July 23	On passage. (Passed, 376 to 0.)	Yea.
114	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9757, amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended:	
115	July 24	On amendment relating to atomic patents. (Passed, 203 to 159.)	Yea.
116	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9757, amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended:	
117	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 165 to 222)	Nay.
118	do	On passage. (Passed, 231 to 154.)	Yea.
119	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 10051, the mutual security appropriation bill for fiscal 1955:	
120	July 2	On passage. (Passed, 266 to 128.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8300, a bill to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States:	

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan (83d Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954		
121	July 2	On motion to recommit with instructions for House conferees to agree to Senate amendment which deleted section providing credit against the income tax of an individual of a percentage of the dividends received from certain domestic corporations. (Rejected, 169 to 227.)	Nay.
122	...do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 316 to 77.)	Yea.
123	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 626, providing for the consideration H. R. 236, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado:	
124	...do....	On passage. (Rejected, 188 to 195.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9756, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation:	
125	July 29	On passage. (Passed, 317 to 57.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 265, providing for sine die adjournment of the 2d sess. of the 83d Cong. on July 31:	
126	...do....	On passage. (Rejected, 183 to 193.)	Yea.
127	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 30	....do....	Present.
		H. R. 7840, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act:	
129	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 360 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9666, amending sec. 1001, par. 412, of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to hardboard:	
130	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 235 to 109.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 266, providing for sine die adjournment of the 2d sess. of the 83d Cong. on July 31:	
131	...do....	On passage. (Adopted, 179 to 167.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8384, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon:	
132	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 144.)	Yea.
133	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
134	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 16, amending the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or its committees:	
135	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 293 to 55.)	Yea.
136	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9245, establishing a joint committee of Congress to study postal field service reclassification and providing a 7-percent pay increase for postal employees:	
137	...do....	On motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 590, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 9245. (Passed, 348 to 29.)	Nay.
138	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 352 to 29.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 687, providing for consideration of S. 2033, relating to the labeling of foreign-produced trout sold in the United States:	
139	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 209 to 159.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9678, promoting the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations:	
140	...do....	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 97 to 266.)	Nay.
141	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
142	...do....	On passage. (Passed, 305 to 2.)	Yea.
143	...do....	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
144	...do....	On motion to instruct conferees to accept Senate amendments. (Adopted, 208 to 100.)	Nay.
		H. R. 10051, making appropriations for Mutual Security for fiscal year 1955:	
145	Aug. 19	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 188 to 77.)	Yea.
146	...do....	On motion ordering previous question on amendment providing $55 million and providing 80 percent of the foreign currency generated shall be used to strengthen and improve the civilian economy of Spain. (Adopted, 186 to 76.)	Yea.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
147	...do....	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 265 to 2.)	Yea.
		H. R. 2236, providing for regulation of certain public transportation in the Washington metropolitan area:	
148	Aug. 20	On recommittal of conference report with instructions to eliminate establishment of Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulatory Commission. (Rejected, 95 to 164.)	NV.

GOP Politics Warps Regulatory Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one questions the right of the Eisenhower administration to represent the interests of big business, but a serious question does arise when this administration endeavors to influence and carry out this policy in our regulatory bodies which were established to protect the public interests. I have just read the following very interesting article on this subject which appeared in the May issue of the Democratic Digest, and I wish to include it as part of my remarks:

UNCLE SAM'S UMPIRES SEEM TO BE TAKING SIDES

Mrs. Marie Natvig waved a metal water jug at the defense attorney.

"Mr. Brown," she shouted, "I'll kill you."

This threat was delivered during hearings at the Federal Communications Commission, the Government agency which hears applications for new TV and radio stations across the Nation, and then is supposed to grant a license to the most worthy applicant.

That was some months ago, but repercussions from Mrs. Natvig's outburst are far from over. Since then the Senate has appropriated $200,000 for an investigation which will delve, among other things, into the FCC's handling of telephone, telegraph, radio, and TV.

The case in which Mrs. Natvig appeared as a witness also called public attention to the deepening suspicions that the Eisenhower administration is making political use of traditionally nonpolitical Government agencies. Uneasiness on this score has led Congressman EVINS, of Tennessee, to favor an investigation of all the Federal regulatory commissions.

"These regulatory commissions," he says, "were originally conceived to be nonpartisan, or at least bipartisan, and they were intended to be of a judicial character. If it proves to be true, as we frequently hear, that these supposedly independent commissions have become political puppets on telephone wires leading from the White House, or from a political committee, then it is time we made the facts known."

It may be difficult for people who are unfamiliar with FCC hearings to understand why Mrs. Natvig's threat has had such an impact. Hearings at the Commission ordinarily consist of stodgy, fact-packed testimony on financial qualifications or equipment proposals.

But when Edward Lamb applied for an extension of his license to a TV station in Erie, Pa., the FCC brought forward a string of questionable witnesses to testify on his qualifications. There was a man being sought on a warrant for bigamy, another convicted of feeding liquor to underage girls in a cemetery, and still another who, after a career as a strongman and strikebreaker, was sentenced to life imprisonment for murder.

Mrs. Natvig was probably the most colorful of the lot. She was described by the press as a prim-looking 50-year-old grandmother, but this facade was belied by her confessions of sexual promiscuity and Communist affiliations. So far as the examiner was concerned, the importance of her testimony lay in her assertions that some 20 years ago, Mr. Lamb had associated with Communists and contributed to their causes.

Said the Associated Press:

"Mrs. Marie Natvig, who has testified she remembers in detail Communist conversations she had with publisher Edward Lamb in 1936, answered 'I don't remember' a score or more times yesterday when asked about other events and persons of the same period.

"Among the things Mrs. Natvig, a self-styled former Communist, said she did not remember were:

"Where she lived in Washington in 1943; where she was married to her second husband; where her second husband had a fur shop in Akron; the address in Chicago of an organization called Public Affairs Informa-

tion Service, which she said employed her; who her PAI boss was; or who any of her fellow PAI workers were."

Four months later, people who had followed the hearing were not surprised when Mrs. Natvig dismissed her testimony as a series of crazy statements.

"Only an idiot would have put any credence in anything I said," said the new Mrs. Natvig. She was subsequently indicted for perjury. Mr. Lamb countered these accusations by offering a reward of $10,000 to anyone who could prove he had misrepresented himself to the Commission in denying Communist sympathies. Though no one came forward to claim the reward, the FCC took the colorful testimony of 19 witnesses over a 5-month period.

After Mrs. Natvig reversed her testimony, this comment came from the Toledo (Ohio) Times, a long-time competitor of Mr. Lamb's Ohio interests:

"We've been sitting by, rather calmly and unconcernedly, we regret, as the Federal Communications Commission has conducted its hearings on Mr. Lamb's petition for a renewal of his radio station license in Erie, Pa. We regret it because it is now clear, beyond peradventure, that Mr. Lamb is being persecuted and the FCC's record in the matter is abominable, to say the least.

"The time is past for calmness and unconcern in his case, and every operator of a radio or television station in the country should realize that fact.

"The power to license, vested in the Government, is the power to destroy. Mr. Lamb is being given a conspicuous example of this power to destroy.

"We think it is time the sorry business was stopped."

What motive lies behind this hearing?

It is difficult to see from any evidence produced so far that any question of public interest is at stake. Mr. Lamb has suggested that he is the victim of a political vendetta touched off by Federal Communications Commissioner Doerfer. Indeed, Mr. Lamb has told a congressional committee that Mr. Doerfer frankly told him "it would be better if you were still a Republican."

Doerfer has denied this, but in the absence of any other explanation, more and more people around Washington are coming to believe that this is quite possibly the case. Moreover, the impression is growing that the Lamb hearing is only one byproduct of a general political bias which the Eisenhower administration is imposing on the "fourth branch" of our Government—the various regulatory commissions in Washington.

Thomas L. Stokes is one columnist who has expressed his concern over this matter:

"Something needs to be said," wrote Mr. Stokes, "about the way Federal regulatory commissions have come under the dominant influence of business and financial interests which the commissions are supposed to regulate, and how their function ordained by Congress to protect the public interest has been submerged."

Just what are these regulatory commissions?

Everyone is familiar with the names. There is the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Tariff Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and perhaps half a dozen more.

But few people realize that these Commissions were created to regulate business in the public interest. They are the administrative police power, and they speak with the public voice on such matters as rates on interstate transportation, telephones, and power; licenses for radio and TV stations, airline routes, and fissionable atomic material; various safety standards, tariff adjustments, and labor disputes. On these Commissions, the public interest is ordinarily protected from political infiltration through staggering the terms of the commissioners (so that they are not all appointed by one President) and through limiting by law the number of commissioners who may be from any one political party. Apparently this is not always effective.

When President Eisenhower filled the chairmanship of the Federal Communications Commission with a highly successful public-utilities lawyer, George C. McConnaughey, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch said:

"No one would argue that it would be fair to take a ballplayer from one of the two competing teams in a world series and make him the chief umpire for the championship game.

"When then did President Eisenhower appoint a telephone-company lawyer as chief regulator of the interstate telephone business?

"The McConnaughey appointment is in the Eisenhower administration pattern for the regulatory agencies," the Post-Dispatch went on. "Edward F. Howrey, corporation lawyer, goes to the Federal Trade Commission, before which he has argued cases. Albert M. Cole, congressional foe of housing, becomes Public Housing Administrator. Robert E. Lee, friend of Senator MCCARTHY, is put on the Federal Communications Commission. Jerome K. Kuykendall, opponent of public power, is named to the Federal Power Commission. Albert C. Beeson, appointed to the NLRB, has a record so dubious that the Republican-controlled Senate cast 42 votes against him. Enemies of the President's trade program are slipped onto the Federal Tariff Commission. And so on and on."

Unfortunately, once politically minded Commissioners have taken over at the top, it is apparently not too difficult to whip the supposedly impartial Commissions into partisan shape. Columnist Thomas Stokes has shown how this was done at the Federal Power Commission.

"The FPC has emerged finally from a reorganization instituted by the Eisenhower administration," wrote Mr. Stokes. "The result is that the 'guts,' heart, and spirit once possessed by this agency have been nearly reorganized out of it. It's the old story. Things were made uncomfortable for key members of the expert staff whose conception of regulation does not coincide with that of the now prevailing business-minded element of the FPC. Some have been demoted and shunted aside to make way for more amenable personnel. Some have quit, including a number of lawyers on the staff as well as technical experts."

There results were achieved in part by letting "the top executives of natural gas and electric utilities" give advice on the reorganization.

Two First-Rate Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1955.

It is my fervent hope that President Eisenhower will nominate these two able jurists to the two vacancies in the United States Court of Appeals, Second Judicial Circuit.

TWO FIRST-RATE JUDGES

There are two vacancies in the Federal court of appeals in this circuit. The importance of the Federal bench needs no elaboration; it goes without saying that partisan politics should have no place in filling these positions. It would be a fine demonstration that this truth is recognized if the places on the appeals court go to J. Edward Lumbard, Republican, and Irving Kaufman, Democrat.

Both men are young, vigorous, and have unblemished reputations, personally and professionally. Mr. Lumbard, at present the United States attorney for the southern district, has a long and excellent record in Federal and State prosecutions; he has occupied, with distinction, a seat on the State supreme court. Judge Kaufman, on the Federal district court since 1949, met his most severe test in the Rosenberg case, where his fairness and courage in the face of Communist vilification was typical of his consistently high standards of judicial conduct on the bench. His appointment would strengthen the principle of promotions within the Federal judiciary and thus aid morale among all the judges.

Both Mr. Lumbard and Judge Kaufman are favorably known to lawyers and laymen in this community and nationally. To see them on the court of appeals would enhance confidence in the Federal court system and in the way its members are selected. President Eisenhower has an opportunity to perform a public service, to rally nonpartisan sentiment, and to open new and wider fields for two able jurists by nominating Mr. Lumbard and Judge Kaufman to the vacant posts.

I Speak for Christian Citizenship Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to learn that a young woman from Peoria, Ill., in the 18th Congressional District, was greatly honored by receiving first prize in a contest on the topic entitled: "I Speak for Christion Citizenship." It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I introduce into the RECORD her very well-prepared and excellently delivered speech on this subject.

I hope that Miss Brodbeck will continue with renewed vigor the work she has already begun in the interest of the Christian Endeavor Society.

A LETTER TO MY CONGRESSMAN
I SPEAK FOR CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP
(By Barbara Ann Brodbeck, Peoria, Ill.)

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: All of us are alarmed by the rapid progress which communism is making all over the earth. We have seen it swallow up much of Asia in recent years. We have noted its growing influence over some of our most important European allies in the past few years. As we look at these oppressed nations we are forced to the conclusion that many of the evils which confront them, and us, are a direct result of man's failure to serve God.

The creation of godless ideals, the setting up of wealth, power, and personal success as the chief aims of life, has contributed more thany any other single factor to precipitate the moral and economic crisis with which these lands are faced today, and with which

we will be faced if Christians do not provide our country with leadership in its fight to preserve freedom. Yes—there is a chance we might lose our freedom. Democracy is freedom, but you cannot continue to build a free country on lack of initiative and independence, on selfishness, on cowardice, or on godlessness and immorality. Fortunately, democracy doesn't depend upon one wise leader, but upon thousands of men, women, and young people who will work together.

A fundamental belief in God is the essence of citizenship, democracy and freedom. Our country was founded by Pilgrims who were seeking freedom to worship God the way they pleased. Our Constitution is based on the fundamentals of Christianity. The home and constitutional government depend upon it. Christianity is more, however, than good moral character; it is more than the belief that all men were created equal and that the government should be of the people, by the people, and for the people; it is more than a sense of honesty and integrity. Christianity is humble repentance by sinners, followed by belief in the Lord Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour through His death on the cross and His resurrection.

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast." "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."

A Christian is a changed being through faith and the result of this faith is good works. Christian citizenship, therefore, is a logical and necessary expression of one who loves God. Our free enterprise system is great because Christians do not rely solely upon the free part but upon their own enterprise. Personal achievement which lies in devotion to Christianity and freedom has made and will continue to make this a great Nation.

People do things because others do them. This places a great burden upon all of us to be always a proper example for others who might follow or imitate. Unconsciously, even more than consciously, young people are making this world a better or worse place. It's up to each young person what somebody will be. Nothing has ever been done as well as it can be done. And it's up to Christians to improve their communities, the Nation and the world.

Mr. Congressman, this is the need for Christian citizenship.

Daniel Webster once said, "Whatever makes a man a good man, makes him a good citizen." It is never hard to think of greatness in terms of heroic deeds, or of rising to dangerous opportunities. But too often men feel no responsibility for greatness in good citizenship. Everything we have came from God, our parents, and our community. Isn't it logical to put something back?

There are always enough projects to go around. Yes, projects for young people in the community. When there is an election, there is always work to be done to get out the vote. Churches vitally need Sunday-school teachers. Their city's recreational program offers many opportunities for young people to help by leading craft classes, supervising recreation for children, and doing general office work. Fund drives for the Community Chest, Red Cross, Heart, Boy Scouts, and so forth, require a lot of volunteer help. The many temptations for young people in drinking, gambling, narcotics, class distinctions, etc., can be overcome by group projects in the schools and churches.

The greatest thing we can do is to make every possible effort to be a good citizen. We are fortunate people within a fortunate land. God has given us His only Son as our Saviour and has blessed us much more abundantly than we deserve. Our forefathers have given us a philosophy of government that gives every man, woman, and child the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As we take these blessings and give them back measure by measure, so we become beautiful in our citizenry, much as the Sea of Galilee is one of the most beautiful spots in the world because it allows its waters to flow out into the other parts of the land. If our citizenship is not Christian—if its goal is selfishness, personal success, wealth, honor, and power—it is no longer great and we become as miserable as the Dead Sea which harbors all of the water of the River Jordan to itself and gives back nothing.

That to me is the great challenge of Christian citizenship. A Christian is a mind through which Christ thinks, a heart through which Christ loves, a voice through which Christ speaks, a hand through which Christ helps, a life through which Christ lives.

That is why, Mr. Congressman, I speak for Christian citizenship.

Sincerely,

BARBARA BRODBECK.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, is a day which the people of Rumania and also of Rumanian descent living in the United States highly revere and commemorate. May 10, 1866, May 10, 1877, and May 10, 1881, stand out as milestones in the centuries of struggles of Rumania for independence and self-government.

On May 10, 1866, Prince Carol was chosen for the throne of Rumania and a constitution of liberal principles was adopted. For the first time in almost two centuries began a breathing spell for Rumania's development.

On the eve of the war between Russia and Turkey on May 10, 1877, Rumania signed a convention with Russia which established further progress toward Rumania's freedom and self-rule.

On May 10, 1881, Rumania was recognized as a sovereign kingdom and proceeded to develop and expand its ancient culture without interference from her powerful neighbors to the north, east, and south. The history of Rumania's fight during the First World War on the side of France, England, and America brought about freedom and unity of all Rumanians. The recent history of the Soviet and Communist infiltration and aggression in Rumania is well known by all who are familiar with Communist aggression. The same communistic blueprint was used to place Rumania under Soviet tyranny as was inflicted upon other captive nations now under the heel of the Kremlin.

Last Sunday, May 8, I addressed a mass meeting at Detroit, Mich., of Rumanians and friends of Rumania which was held in commemoration of the day, May 10, which stands out as a day of celebration in Rumania's history.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate with my remarks a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the assemblage gathered in Detroit in joint commemoration of Rumania's Independence Day:

RESOLUTION OF THE RUMANIAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE AND RUMANIAN-AMERICANS OF MICHIGAN—JOINT COMMEMORATION OF MAY 10, RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, SUNDAY, MAY 8, 1955, DETROIT, MICH.

Whereas the declaration on liberated Europe of the Yalta agreement, to which the United States is one of the three signatory powers, provides that the peoples liberated from domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of former Axis satellite states of Europe are to be assisted to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement further provides that the establishment of order in Europe and rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of nazism and fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice; that this provision is a principle of the Atlantic Charter, namely, the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those people who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations; and

Whereas the three Governments, namely, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, are pledged that they will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe where, in their judgment, conditions require—

(a) To establish conditions of internal peace;

(b) To carry out emergency measures for the relief of distressed peoples;

(c) To form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the populations and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsible to the will of the people;

(d) To facilitate where necessary the holdings of such elections; and

Whereas the Yalta agreement, on the part of the Government of the United States was, in good faith, a determination to build, in cooperation with other peaceloving people, a world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom, and general well being of all mankind; and

Whereas because of devious and underhanded methods employed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to avoid the fulfillment of their stated obligations under the terms of the Yalta agreement, in effect has enabled the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to foist upon the peoples liberated from Nazi Germany a government other than one of their own choice, and thereby have secured for the peoples concerned only a change of masters; and

Whereas this Nation has a sacred obligation to right the wrongs committed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Be it

Resolved, That we Americans of Rumanian origin first and foremost reaffirm our unswerving loyalty without reservation to the Government of the United States of America; that we are determined at any cost to maintain our American form of democracy; that we are opposed to all forms of subversive ideologies; that we desire to alleviate in every way legally possible the sufferings of our Rumanian brethren; that we desire to assist our Government in every peaceful way to attain the restoration of the freedom not only of our Rumanian brethren, but of all enslaved peoples everywhere, from a tyrannical and Godless Communistic regime; and be it further

Resolved, That we Americans of Rumanian origin urge our subjugated Rumanian brethren to remain steadfast in their devotion to democratic ideals, institutions, and processes and to await with faith and hope the day of their liberation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, the United States delegate to the United Nations, the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the two United States Senators from Michigan, and to all Representatives from Michigan whose districts include citizens of Rumanian origin.

The Changing Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely editorial from today's Springfield (Mass.) Union as follows:

THE CHANGING PICTURE

When Secretary Humphrey closed his books for the fiscal year ending last June 30 he found that his Treasury owed some $270.8 billion. Since the debt ceiling fixed by law is $275 billion, this meant that the Treasury's borrowing power amounted to $4.2 billion. Mr. Humphrey thought this was not enough, so he asked Congress to give him the authority to borrow an additional $15 billion, lifting the Federal Government's debt ceiling to $290 billion.

The prudent Mr. Humphrey had not suddenly turned profligate. There had been no unexpected expansion in the administration's spending plans. The argument was that the Treasury would need more than $4.2 billion in extra cash to tide it over until the spring tax flood. The protestations of Senator BYRD stopped Congress from raising the debt ceiling then, and there was talk of a "busted" Treasury and the need for a special session of Congress before Christmas. But nothing of a dire nature happened at all.

On Monday Secretary Humphrey told a group of business leaders he had high hopes for both tax cuts and a balanced Federal budget next fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The surge of business activity, if continued, will increase income and corporate tax revenues. The most substantial reductions are expected to be made in individual income tax rates.

The economic committee of the Business Advisory Council of the Commerce Department predicts that high-level business activity will continue through 1955 and into 1956. Chairman Donald K. David, who is also dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, cautioned, however, against too rapid expansion that could become an abortive boom, and against overexpansion of credit.

However, the boom is not built on an accumulation of business inventories. And Federal Government spending has dropped 17 percent from a year ago and 27 percent from the peak of 1953, which means that the gains in production have been wholly in the private sector of the economy, since State and local spending has also declined.

Secretary Humphrey will share the optimism of the business leaders and most economists over this highly promising business outlook—not to mention the taxpayers who will profit through the lowering of individual tax rates and the balancing of the Federal budget sooner than anybody had a right to expect when the Eisenhower administration came to office. It will be a truly magnificent accomplishment against tremendous accumulated odds.

News Reporters Urged To Be Fearless and Truthful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the great responsibilty of reporting the news fearlessly and truthfully was expressed recently by Pope Pius in Vatican City and by Cardinal McIntire in Los Angeles. No institution serving the public has equal influence on the public mind than the press, the daily newspaper, and the thousands of news weeklies which keep the public informed on local, national, and international affairs. The American press has the reputation of fearless, honest reporting but in the hands of the wrong kind of people with little care or regard for truth or honesty it could become an agency of dishonest propaganda.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees a free press, but the honesty and fearlessness of the press is in the hands of newsworkers and management. Let us keep the American press honest and fearless as advocated by the following sound advice:

BE FEARLESS FOR TRUTH, PRESS TOLD

VATICAN CITY.—Pope Pius XII this week adjured a group of United States newsmen touring Europe and the Near East to be fearlessly faithful to the truth.

He said that while this task is not an easy one, it is "a precious service, as well as your bounden duty of the hundreds of thousands of people who are going to be influenced by your words."

The pope granted an extraordinary audience to the group, led by James L. Wick, of New York, president of the Wick Newspapers.

"Eternal truth and eternal justice must be your strength and your monitor," the pontiff said. "Hence, with fervent prayers for your success in your profession, we are happy to be able to call down upon you and those near and dear to you the blessing of Almighty God."

NEWSMEN REMINDED OF OBLIGATIONS

Catholics who are reporters and publicists may not often have the opportunity to be direct apologists for the church, but they always have the obligation to be morally sound in all of their work.

Father John V. Sheridan voiced this reminder last Sunday to 200 members of the Catholic Press Council of Southern California gathered in Our Lady Chapel downtown for their organization's annual mass and communion.

"It is unthinkable," he said, "that a Catholic reporter would deliberately excite the obviously morbid, the lascivious, the sensuous instinct in his readers.

RESPONSIBLE FOR FACTS

"He should be able to cover his subject, whatever it might be, as thoroughly, as completely, and as interestingly by developing an attractive style, a sensitivity for the strictly human—not animal—element and a memory for the facts. After all, it is the facts for which a reporter is responsible."

His Eminence James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, chaplain of the Press Council, celebrated the mass.

In the elections at the Statler breakfast, Michael Todd, public relations executive, was chosen president of the Press Council. Herald-Express artist John P. Maloney is vice president; Paramount publicist Doug Bridges, treasurer; Tidings, assistant managing editor; Bob Labonge, secretary; and Don Lee. Radio and TV executive Tony Lafrano was voted sergeant at arms. Elected to the executive board were Joseph Reddy, of Disney; James Shea, Southern Pacific public relations director; and Harold Walsh, Times financial editor.

Father Sheridan, director of the Catholic Information Center, told council members that a mere glance at the letters of St. Paul, the confessions of St. Augustine, and even Boswell's life of Johnson "will disclose how thoroughly clear a writer may be when dealing even with sin without creating in the reader or listened anything but a revolt against sin."

TEST OF GREATNESS

"The real test of a man's greatness," Father Sheridan told the newsmen, "is not in his ability to exploit environmental trends for his own advantage or to please others. It is rather his daily struggle to live his moral principles, regardless of trends, that demonstrates his greatness, brings him unmeasured happiness, and edifies and uplifts his weaker associates."

Lawrence Welk provided entertainment at the breakfast, as did the four Schmitt brothers' barbar shop quartet. David Bongard was breakfast chairman.

Admit Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the May 6, 1955, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

ADMIT ALASKA AND HAWAII

In a time when defense and the avoidance of war are necessarily prime, if negative, objectives, the United States and its President might well be eager to take some step on which later times could look back as a noteworthy and positive advance. The opportunity for such an advance has been appearing in Washington for session after session of Congress and has been fumbled each time because petty political considerations and unthinking, fearful conservatism have not been overcome.

The opportunity lies in statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Their admission would increase the area of the United States by one-fifth and add 600,000 persons to the population. It would establish conditions under which vast natural riches could be made more easily and equitably available for normal development, rather than being preserved for exploitation by groups which betray their motives by their opposition to statehood. It would end the long-standing injustice of taxation without representation for residents of the two Territories. Finally, it would say to the world that the United

States had ended second-class status for two areas which deserve better.

Under the joint statehood bill scheduled to come up for 2 days of House debate on Monday, 4 percent of northern Alaska can be set aside as a defense zone under exclusive Federal jurisdiction. This has softened the Pentagon's objections. The political considerations which have defeated statehood before are unworthy and discredited. There has been an argument that statehood would stretch the Nation's defense commitments, but this would appear to rest on the untenable supposition that Hawaii or Alaska could be sacrificed to an advancing foe more easily if they were Territories than if they were States.

There is no good reason for further holding back. Alaska and Hawaii cannot forever be held in the confinement of territoriality. Let us have strong leadership; let use make them States now.

Prize-Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Roxanne Long, age 16, who resides in Alameda County, submitted the award-winning essay on the subject of One Nation Under God, which was judged the best over all others written by students of the high schools of Alameda County.

When you have read Roxanne's essay, copy of which I insert herewith, I am sure that you will join me in congratulating this fine, talented young lady:

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

(By Miss Roxanne Long, Alameda, Calif.)

"The world stands or falls with the laws of life which Heaven has written in the human conscience."

These laws of life could be called the four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. One nation under God must be founded on these four freedoms.

One freedom stands out in my mind as the most important. That freedom is the freedom of religion. As mankind progresses on the path toward a goal of freedom of religion throughout the world, freedom from want and freedom from fear and freedom of speech will become a living reality.

If all peoples of the world would turn to religion, they would overcome any fear they have of evil forces, poverty, or discouragement. They would realize that all men are brothers and that God is their father. If we want peace we must treat other nations in the spirit of democratic Christianity. No nation can reach its fullest development alone.

It is accomplishment, not by declarations of leaders but upon acceptance by the peoples of the peoples of the world.

Whatever direction the future moves, right or left, we must move onward and learn to live and act in the knowledge that we as a leading nation are responsible to and for one another. We must have one common eternal destiny because we are dependent on the one Father who made brothers of us all.

The statement so often used, "A family that prays together stays together," can also be applied to a nation. "A nation that prays together, stays together."

If we as a nation can turn to God, other nations will follow in our footsteps.

Living proof of our progress is the addition to our pledge of allegiance:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

A Free, Independent Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, it is fitting that we commemorate the 164th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791—a document which adopted many of the concepts of freedom which were put forward only a few years earlier by the new United States of America. It was, of course, natural that the Polish patriots of 1791 should derive a degree of inspiration from the United States in this regard, since freedom-loving Poles had played an important role in our own American fight for freedom and liberty.

In Westmoreland County of Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, we have today many fine citizens—outstanding citizens—of Polish descent who are completely steeped in the principles of freedom and who are bitterly unhappy over the continued denial of freedom to their friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain. Our laws and red tape intended to make it so difficult if not impossible for escapees from Communist terror behind the Iron Curtain to get into the United States rankle with these Americans because of their implication that Polish people who want to come here are some kind of security risks. No such implication is justified. It is because the Poles love freedom so deeply that they try to escape from the Iron Curtain and come here. People so imbued with a love of freedom make outstanding citizens of a free country.

Despite the most intensive kind of "Russification" attempts in Poland by the Communist rulers trying so hard to turn Poland into a Russian colony, the natural leanings of the Polish people are to the West, to freedom and to independence. The "Russification" will fail, just as previous attempts to destroy the Polish national character have always failed.

We must never cease our efforts, Mr. Speaker, to work for the freedom of the Polish people and of all peoples now prisoner behind the barbed wire and machinegun emplacements of the Iron Curtain.

On Poland's great national holiday—free Poland's holiday, that is, since of course the Russians would not permit Poland today to celebrate its past traditions of freedom—we should reiterate the conviction of the free world that Communist tyranny must be ended over the minds of men, and over their lives as well.

We pray that there may be a new birth of freedom in Poland soon.

Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention the philosophy expressed in the editorial which follows. Although this editorial from the Green Bay Press-Gazette of April 30, 1955, relates to the subject of Federal aid for education, it should serve as a guide in the consideration of other programs of Federal aid to the States and local units of government:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE SCHOOLS

A great many people in this country are deeply concerned over the problem of financing public education for the millions of young children that are now growing up as a result of the baby boom that has been going on since the end of World War II. Various citizens and educators groups have studied this matter, and more and more the pressure is growing for the Federal Government to subsidize, to some extent, the school construction and operating costs with which the Nation is going to be faced.

Why is it that invariably when we are faced with a situation of this kind we turn to the Federal Government for help? There are several reasons for this, but the only one with any merit is that some States are poorer than others and a Federal subsidy can be justified as an equalizer. But every time we go into a Federal-subsidy program we end up sending dollars to Washington which are then funneled back to the States considerably shrunken. Another serious long-term effect has been to cause people to lose interest in their State governments since the taxes they pay to Washington are so much larger than those they pay to their State tax departments.

Schools are about as local an institution as we can think of. And they are certainly one in which the average citizen wants to have a direct voice, and over which he wants to exert fairly direct control. In the interests of uniformity, we have surrendered some of that control to our State government. But making Washington the focal point of school financing is something else again.

Recognizing the soundness of this objection to Federal subsidy plans, the people who are interested in channeling more money into the public school system are suggesting a Federal subsidy without the usual controls that go hand-in-hand with such grants-in-aid. This point of view was outlined at a recent meeting of the American Association of School Administrators by Beardsley Ruml, the economist who invented the pay-as-you-go income-tax system. Mr. Ruml pointed out that the national income is expected to increase rapidly during the years when school populations are going to be increasing, and that the problem is simply to channel a small portion of that increased national income into the school system.

Mr. Ruml gave his reasons as follows:

"The use of income or sales taxes for the support of public education is theoretically possible at either the State or National level. In fact, however, the State level is entirely impractical. Differential sales or income taxes among the States would be required which would injure the poorest State competitively and would shortly force national uniformity as indeed happened in the case of the community-property basis for personal income tax. It is therefore recommended that the revenues needed for basic support of the schools be raised at the Federal level."

Let us admit that there are some States which do not have the industries or other income-producing activities to support school programs at a level most of us believe is necessary.

If that calls for subsidy, why should it not be an honest subsidy? The "differential" of which Mr. Ruml speaks might be eliminated by grants to the States with less than average income at the expense of the richer States. This would not have the flavor of "free money" from Washington and it would not give Washington the authority to enforce its bureaucratic rules on all of the States for the privilege of spending their own money.

For a long time government in this country consisted of doing on the local government level what we could not do as private citizens; doing on the State level what we could not do through our local government; and doing on the national level that which was not feasible at the State level. But more and more we have been using the Government at Washington to do things that could very well be done through our State and local governments. It may be the easy way, but it is certainly not the best way.

The Bicycle Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith Resolution No. 66 which was adopted on May 5, 1955, by the House of Representatives of the Illinois State Legislature. The resolution, which urges the President to confirm and approve the findings of the United States Tariff Commission suggesting relief for the bicycle industry from the pressure of excessive imports, follows:

House Resolution 66

Whereas the bicycle industry represents considerable business to several cities within the State; and

Whereas an overwhelming flood of foreign made bicycles are being imported from several foreign countries; and

Whereas the rates of pay in these countries for the fabrication of materials and the construction of these bicycles is greatly less than prevailing rates in the United States, therefore making it impossible for the manufacturers of this country to compete in this business under the present tariff treatment; and

Whereas the United States Tariff Commission, after exhaustive investigation and extended public hearings has voted in favor of relief for the bicycle industry from the pressure of excessive imports: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Illinois hereby strongly urges the President to confirm and approve the findings of the Tariff Commission in the bicycle action, which action is now awaiting the President's final decision.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the Members of Congress from this State.

The Anniversary of Rumanian Independence and Union Is Celebrated in the Hearts of the Brave Rumanian People Now Living in Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the anniversary day of Rumanian independence and national unity. The Moscow-controlled regime in Bucharest has abolished this celebration according to the Soviet plan of denationalization of Rumania. But in this free country it is for us a moral obligation to remember those who fight and suffer for human liberty, because such heroic sacrifices lie at the very source of our own history as a free nation.

History reveals that the Rumanian people, descendants of the Roman colonists of Dacia—the ancient name of the land inhabited by the Rumanians—formed a strong Latin and Christian outpost at the eastern confines of Europe. The country, numbering now twenty-odd millions, has preserved its national integrity throughout centuries of vicissitudes. A deeply rooted nationalism and Christian faith are once more today the inspiration which welds the Rumanian people together in an unyielding resistance to communism.

After a period between the 17th and 19th centuries, when the Ottoman Empire had the suzerainty over the Rumanian lands and Russia brutally sought their annexation under the pretext of protecting them, the Rumanians succeeded in regaining their liberty following the Crimean War in 1856. They were given political autonomy under the guaranty of the European powers. It was to put a barrier to Russian expansion which 100 years ago represented a threat similar to the one plaguing Europe today, that the ancient position of Rumania as the guardian of the southeast gates of Europe, was restored as the most effective step against Moscow's imperialistic drive toward the heart of Europe. In 1878 the Berlin Congress recognized the full independence of Rumania which had been proclaimed by the Rumanians on May 10, 1877, and which they achieved in blood by defeating the Turks on the battlefield.

But today Rumania is no longer a free and independent country. In 1945, after an ultimatum delivered by Andrei Vishinski 2 weeks following the Yalta declaration, Rumania was subjugated by the Soviet Union, and a puppet government under Groza was imposed on the Rumanian nation. It is the ardent hope of every liberty-loving American that the time is not far away when the great injustice done to Rumania will be corrected, and from her status as an enslaved country she will soon be restored to the ranks of the free nations. This is the sincere wish of America on this day of national commemoration and mourning of the Rumanian nation.

America's Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week I had the privilege and pleasure of attending the reception and luncheon at the Waldorf Astoria in New York honoring the American mother of the year, Mrs. Lavina Christensen Fugal, of Pleasant Grove, Utah.

I also attended a special Mother's Day service in Scarsdale, N. Y., where Mrs. Fugal was the honored member of the congregation.

On both of these occasions I was deeply impressed with the spirituality and the fine dedication of the members of the American Mothers, Inc., which organization is responsible for the selection of the mother of the year. The objectives of the mothers' committee are to develop and strengthen the moral and spiritual fiber of the American home, and to give to the observance of Mother's Day a more spiritual significance outlining the important role of the mother in the home, the community, the Nation and the world. Annually each State selects a mother of the year for the State, and from among this total number, the American national mother is chosen.

Mothers attended the Friday function from every State in the Nation, from the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. The assembled State mothers of the year entered the room, each carrying a lighted candle, to the softly played tune Lead Kindly Light.

It was a stirring and inspiring sight. One felt that mothers indeed epitomized the light in the encircling gloom and shadows of today's world. The mothers who spoke stressed without exception the power of prayer in the home, its deep-rooted significance, and important influence throughout the Nation, the need for a Bible in every home, the blessing of food, and family prayer.

This House, too, has a religious service every Thursday morning. We all feel more and more poignantly the need for prayer and for divine guidance in solving today's problems.

Congressmen can help to further this fine movement in their own States by endorsing and encouraging its work. Commendation should be given to the national body of the American Mothers,

Inc., who work tirelessly and without recompense of any kind in their effort to improve the homes of America and to bring about the solution to the problems of juvenile delinquency. It is hoped that Congressmen will realize the seriousness of juvenile delinquency and enact some kind of legislation that will help to fortify the homes of America.

This is a land of much industrial accomplishment and much time is spent on economics. There is a finer part to play, greater far than that of economics. It is the support, endorsement, and encouragement of spirituality in our homes, the foundation on which our Nation is built.

This great spiritual strengthening and developing of the moral fiber of our home, which is the work of the American Mothers, Inc., deserves the support and commendation of this body.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Louisiana State Board of Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it has now been proved and generally accepted that the first State board of health was established in Louisiana in 1855. Public-health workers from 16 Southern States, the District of Columbia, and Latin America are gathering today in New Orleans to commemorate this centennial. They will be in session through the 13th.

Every so often it is good that we should pause in the press of our day-to-day activities and look to our past. This is such a time for Louisiana on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its State department of health.

Forged out of trial and struggle, this department today is conceded to be one of the most important divisions of Louisiana State government. But in 1855 the idea of State responsibility for the health of its citizens was a new and challenging one. No other State in the Union had recognized this responsibility. Indeed, the board of health in its early years met with the opposition of many shortsighted and faint-hearted men in Louisiana. But they could not impede the wheels of progress once they were set in motion.

It was the scourage of yellow fever that prompted the enactment in 1855 of the act "to establish quarantine for the protection of the State," extending along the entire Gulf of Mexico shore of Louisiana. Combining with the city board of health of New Orleans, it fought the spread of yellow fever. Incidentally, this pattern of State-local cooperation in matters affecting the public health has become one of the keystones in our democratic form of government. This joint cooperative enterprise lasted until 1898 when the present organization of the State board was set up in the constitution of that date. Up until that time the function of the board was primarily, but not solely, the establishment and maintenance of quarantines. In the words of the first State health officer, Dr. A. Forster Axson:

> Quarantine forms only a part of what the law contemplated as a system of health measures.

The evolution of public health in Louisiana, from its beginning in 1855, has provided precedent and inspiration for every other State in the Union. The present machinery for health action-in-partnership was mirrored in the prophetic vision of those early trailblazers. Today, every State in the Union has a State health organization which, with the local and Federal organizations, constitutes the modern public health team.

We have not arrived at our present stage of development without some tragedy. It was many years, for example before the scourge of yellow fever was finally brought under control. It took another epidemic in 1897 at Franklin, La., to provide the groundwork for present Federal, State and local cooperation in promoting public health. At that time, the Federal Government sent 2 medical officers and 2 pharmacists to Franklin to work with the State and local officials to prevent the spread of the epidemic.

Thus, the past 10 years have been notable ones for Louisiana, as well as for the entire Nation in the field of public health. Let us all hope that the next century will be filled with even greater accomplishments, even more momentous triumphs. We have largely conquered the contagious diseases, such as yellow fever, but we have new problems threatening the health of our people. Longer lives, made possible by the conquest of communicable diseases, bring with them the chronic diseases of old age. It is in this area that we must look for future accomplishments. It is in this area that I feel certain the next 100 years will bring even greater triumphs. It is with pride that I salute the Louisiana Department of Health on its 100th birthday.

H. R. 4627 and S. 923

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have been requested by Mrs. Earl Wagoner, who is legislative representative of the West Virginia Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to inform my colleagues of a petition I have received from the West Virginia Womans' Christian Temperance Union supporting H. R. 4627 and S. 923. The petitions in support of these bills have been signed by more than 330 citizens of West Virginia.

Red Government Protests Special Report No. 8 of Kersten Committee Dealing With Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia — Also Subversive Balloons and Czechoslovakia Guard Units Attached to United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article entitled "Red Government Protests Special Report No. 8 of Kersten Committee Dealing With Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia; Also Subversive Balloons and Czechoslovakia Guard Units Attached to United States Army":

RED GOVERNMENT PROTESTS SPECIAL REPORT NO. 8 OF KERSTEN COMMITTEE DEALING WITH COMMUNIST TAKEOVER OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA—ALSO SUBVERSIVE BALLOONS AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA GUARD UNITS ATTACHED TO UNITED STATES ARMY—CZECHOSLOVAKIA MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS DELIVERS NOTE TO UNITED STATES EMBASSY

On April 19, 1955, the following note was sent to the Embassy of the United States of America, Prague, by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

Referring to a number of its previous protests, the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic deems it necessary to call the attention of the United States Government once again to the fact that in spite of the existence of normal diplomatic relations between Czechoslovakia and the United States of America, the United States Government and its agencies continue in their systematic hostile activities against the Czechoslovak Republic.

AGGRESSIVE UNITED STATES POLICY

The Government of the United States of America which, under the hypocritical slogan of "liberation" of the countries of the people's democracy has openly declared its interventionist and aggressive intents, spends millions of dollars on subversive activities against sovereign, peace-loving, and democratic countries, including the Czechoslovak Republic, and has not ceased its attempts to interfere in their internal affairs. Official American propaganda, aimed at creating war hysteria, publicly glorifies all provocations and subversive (acts) carried out in the interests of "containing communism" and thereby only underlines the aggressive nature of United States policy.

PROTESTS BALLOONS SPONSORED BY SENATOR DOUGLAS WITH SUPPORT OF EISENHOWER

Thus, in February and March 1954, both Houses of Congress discussed a resolution authorizing the Secretary of State of the United States of America to prepare as soon as possible a program of dispatching balloons carrying subversive leaflets into the people's democracies. The resolution submitted by Senator Douglas, with reference to the initiative of President Eisenhower, authorizes the Secretary of State to use the staff and means of the Department of State, or of any other governmental department or agency, for the carrying out of this "operation," and allocated the amount of $2 million from the budget of the United States for this purpose.

Shortly thereafter this subversive operation was started, and from the United States

Occupation Zone in Western Germany, balloons carrying leaflets aimed at inciting unrest and exhorting the Czechoslovak people against their lawful government were released for months into Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak people reacted to this provocation—as brazen as it was foolish—with proud contempt.

CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM HIT

The attempts of the Government of the United States of America to interfere in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia failed dismally in spite of the fact that the so-called American Crusaders for Freedom, who had been entrusted with the actual carrying out of this operation, continued for almost a year to pollute Czechoslovak airspace and the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic with their subversive leaflets.

The responsibility of the Government of the United States of America for this subversive action constituting an attempt at interference in the domestic affairs of Czechoslovakia and a systematic violation of the territorial integrity is beyond doubt, and the indignation of the Czechoslovak people, as well as of democratic international public opinion, at the subversive methods which the Government of the United States of America has carried into international relations is fully justified.

Despite all these failures, the aggressive circles in the United States of America do not want to reconcile themselves to the fact that the Czechoslovak people, after their liberation from the Fascist yoke, started out on the road of the building up of socialism. The representatives of these aggressive circles continue to call for intervention and war against the peace-loving countries which ridded themselves of capitalism and refuse to submit to their dictate.

PROTESTS KERSTEN COMMITTEE REPORT ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

At the beginning of this year an official document of the American Congress was published in the United States, which deals with an alleged usurpation of power by Communists in Czechoslovakia. The document, dated December 31, 1954, and published as Special Report No. 8 of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, headed by former Representative Kersten, has set itself the objective of presenting to the American public "the essentials of the history of Czechoslovakia and its people," of proving the impossibility of peaceful coexistence of various social systems, and of warning the world of the so-called Communist threat.

REPORT INVESTIGATES CRUSADE VERSUS COMMUNISM

This insolent pamphlet is up to the standard of the vilest products of Goebbels' Fascist propaganda machinery. It is nothing but a conglomeration of lies and slander which are to spread hate against Czechoslovakia, foment war hysteria, instigate a crusade against communism, and prepare a preventive war against peace-loving countries.

KERSTEN KNOWN FOR SUBVERSIVE WORK VERSUS COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS

Former Representative KERSTEN, the chairman of this House select committee, is known to the Czechoslovak people as the author of the ill-famed amendment to the so-called Mutual Security Act of 1951, under which the sum of $100 million was allocated from the budget of the United States for subversive activities against Czechoslovakia and other peace-loving countries. The blood-stained record of this act includes also numerous murders of Czechoslovak citizens and other crimes of American agents committed on the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic.

INSULTING TO COMMUNISTS

The profascist beliefs of Mr. KERSTEN and his intimate friendship with Fascists and collaborators, who have escaped punishment after World War II and found haven in the United States, are generally known. The Czechoslovak Government cannot, however, ignore the fact that an official document of the Congress of the United States described Czechoslovak history in a Fascist spirit and in a grossly insulting manner, in particular as concerns the interpretation of the events of the World War II when the Czechoslovak people fought in a hard struggle against the Fascist intruder and their domestic quislings.

REPORT EXTOLS SLOVAK STATE

The report of the Kersten committee extols the so-called Slovak state, covers up the crimes of the occupants and their henchmen, and stresses their merits in their fight against the Soviet Union and communism. The anti-Fascist resistance of the Czechoslovak people is disparaged in the report, the Slovak national uprising is described as an improvised rebellion of subversive elements, and the liberation of Czechoslovakia by the heroic Soviet Army is described with bitter sorrow at the defeat of Hitlerite occupants.

The Kersten committee reports is a gross provocation not anly against all Czech and Slovak patriots, but also against all honest and democratic Americans who, together with the peoples of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and other democratic countries, sacrificed their lives in the fight against their common Fascist enemy.

KERSTEN REPORT "FABRICATES" ANTICOMMUNIST TESTIMONY

At the present time, reports, both in the American and the world press, daily give the reader a picture of how American justice and various congressional investigation committees fabricate anti-Communist testimony. As to the investigations of the so-called Kersten committee and its report on Czechoslovakia, however, it is worthy of note that the principal witnesses and experts named and quoted by the report are primarily notorious Fascists and collaborators from the time of World War II.

Thus, for instance, the section dealing with the anti-Fascist struggle of the Slovak people is based on the testimony of the former charge d'affaires of the so-called Slovak state in Madrid, Josef Mikus, to whom the report gives his full title, obviously in order to eliminate any doubts as to his qualifications or loyalty. The official circles of the United States of America base their hostile activities against Czechoslovakia on the most reactionary Fascist emigree groups.

The present Government of the United States of America quite openly gives support to and encourages those elements, who as early as the period before World War II, sided with Hitler in the breaking up of the unity and territorial integrity of the Czechoslovak Republic, who gave convincing proof of their political convictions by their servility to the Fascist occupants and who, speculating on a new world war and a new occupation of Czechoslovkia, have now placed themselves fully at the disposal of aggressive groups in the United States of America.

UNITED STATES COOPERATES WITH "TRAITORS" WHO ESCAPE

Similarly, the United States occupation authorities in Western Germany, in the organization of plots against Czechoslovakia, cooperate closely with the traitors of the people, with convicted war criminals. Thus, under the protection of the United States occupation authorities, the former minister of the so-called Slovak state in Berlin, Matus Cernak, together with a number of other traitors who escaped from Czechoslovakia and other eastern European states, continue in their treacherous activities under a new master but along the same Fascist line.

UNITED STATES SUPPORTS REVIVAL OF GERMAN MILITARISM

Thus, American policy in relation to Czechoslovakia already reflects the consequences of the war alliance between the American and the West German militarists and revanchists, the worst enemies of the peoples of Europe, who have also in the past brought so much suffering upon the Czechoslovak people. The policy of the revival of militarism in Western Germany and the building of a Fascist Wehrmacht under the leadership of Hitlerite generals, carried out by the United States Government, is aimed also against the freedom and independence of the Czechoslovak Republic.

For a number of years, Western Germany, and in particular the American zone of occupation, have been the breeding grounds for various provocations and subversive operations aimed against Czechoslovakia.

HITS RADIO FREE EUROPE

The constant campaign of incitement issuing from the broadcasting station, Free Europe, which is nothing but a branch of the Voice of America, the sending of subversive leaflets to the territory of the Czechoslovak Republic, the violations of Czechoslovak airspace by American military aircraft, the instigation of border incidents, the dispatching of spies, saboteurs, and subversive agents to Czechoslovak territory—all these are open acts of hostility of the United States of America against the Czechoslovak Republic, carried out primarily from the territory of Western Germany in flagrant contradiction to the international obligations of the United States as an occupying power.

CZECHOSLOVAK GUARD UNITS IN UNITED STATES ARMY

On January 18, 1955, the American radio broadcast a report that the first so-called Czechoslovak guard unit had been established with the units of the United States Army in Western Germany. The report further notes that this unit, whose members wear on their uniform an insignia bearing the inscription "Czechoslovakia," uses the Czechoslovak national flag, which, according to the report, was presented to the commander of this unit at a ceremony in the presence of officers of the United States Army. In connection with the organization of this unit, the designation of which is in itself a gross insult to Czechoslovakia and all of its people, the aggressive intentions of the United States Government have been revealed even more clearly than in a number of previous provocations and hostile acts aimed against Czechoslovakia.

USE OF CZECHOSLOVAK FLAG WITH UNITS INSULTING TO COMMUNIST "FREEDOM"

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic raises emphatic protest against the fact that in times of peace and in disregard of the existence of normal diplomatic relations between the United States and Czechoslovakia, in opposition to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and in abuse of its position as an occupying power, the Government of the United States organizes in its zone of occupation a military unit composed of criminal elements hostile to the Czechoslovak Republic, using the official designation, "Czechoslovakia," and the Czechoslovak national flag in an unlawful and insulting manner.

There is no doubt as to the character of this unit of mercenaries. In its hostile activities against Czechoslovakia the United States Government bases itself primarily on criminal elements from among the emigrees. This is demonstrated, among others, also by the case the criminals, Ctirad Masin, Josef Masin, and Milan Paumer, who committed a number of murders, robberies, and other crimes on Czechoslovak territory and succeeded in escaping to Western Germany where they were taken care of by the American authorities.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic notes that the aggressive policy of the United States of America and the hostile

acts of the United States Government against Czechoslovakia are in flagrant contradiction to the most fundamental provisions of international law which regulate peaceful coexistence among nations and peaceful international cooperation.

This policy meets with the determined opposition of all the Czechoslovak people. This policy of cold war and interference in the internal affairs of other states only compromise the United States in the eyes of world public opinion and injures the interests of the American people themselves, with whom, were it not for the hostile attiude of the United States Government, the Czechoslovak people could develop friendly economic and cultural relations.

CZECHSLOVAK RED GOVERNMENT DEMANDS STOP TO "INTERFERENCE" BY UNITED STATES

The aggressive policy of the United States of America is a source of international tension and the cause of the unsatisfactory state of the relations between the Czechoslovak Republic and the United States of America. The Government of the Czechoslovak Republic calls upon the Government of the United States of America to discontinue, in accordance with the provisions of international law and in the interest of lessening international tension and improving international cooperation, its hostile activities against Czechoslovakia, against its freedom and independence, and to conduct its relations with Czechoslovakia in accordance with the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution on the subject of Federal Aid for Schools adopted by the directors of the Taxpayers Association of Oshkosh, Wis., on May 5, 1955:

Whereas where children go to school and what they are taught have historically been the responsibility of local and State government, with the Federal Government taxing heavily to discharge other obligations it has assumed; and

Whereas current reports show our Federal debt is now equivalent to the full value of all land, buildings, mines, machinery, livestock, everything of tangible value in the United States; and

Whereas any new or enlarged program involving Federal aid, such as Federal aid to education, would necessarily require either increased Federal taxes, deeper Federal debt, or both; and

Whereas the school facilities survey being used as a basis for justifying Federal entry into local school financing has been shown to be erroneous, with Wisconsin, for example, not $70 millions short of meeting its school building requirements but actually having no deficit and a potential sum of over $200 millions which can be raised for school building when local decisions find it necessary; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Taxpayers Association of Oshkosh at a directors meeting held this 5th day of May 1955, in Oshkosh, Wis., That Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and Congressman VAN PELT are hereby urged to take whatever action is necessary to point congressional action in the direction of lower taxes, a reduced Federal debt, and lessened interference in local affairs such as would follow Federal aid to schools; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY, Representative VAN PELT, Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and to Representative GRAHAM BARDEN, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Adopted, Oshkosh, Wis., May 5, 1955.

DAN MANION,
President, Taxpayers Association of Oshkosh.

Resolution Opposing Duplication of Air Service on the Great Circle Course to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Resolution 49 adopted May 5, 1955, by the Senate of the 69th Illinois General Assembly. The resolution expresses opposition to any application for duplication of air service on the great circle course to the Orient, which is also operating on the central Pacific course:

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board, after thorough and exhaustive study, has again concluded there should be two separate and competing United States flag air routes across the Pacific, one through the California gateway to the Orient via the central Pacific, and the other through the Seattle gateway via Alaska and the short Great Circle course to the Orient; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board maintain that retention of these different flight courses under existing conditions is vital to keep the balanced competitive pattern required by public convenience and necessity and that modification of this policy would undoubtedly require substantial Government subsidy; and

Whereas a request by the airline now serving the Orient through the Central Pacific for authority to also fly over the Great Circle track is pending before the President of the United States; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board recommended denial of that request because the duplicating service would destroy the balanced competitive air pattern in the Pacific and result in additional Government subsidies; and

Whereas the airline now authorized to fly over the Great Circle course serves Chicago on direct flights to the Pacific Northwest and is the only direct air tie between the State of Illinois and Alaska, Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines; and

Whereas this direct international air service has assumed increased importance to business, industry and the traveling public in the State of Illinois and the Midwest generally and has helped broaden markets and expand trade territories for Midwest products; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of Illinois, realizing the importance of this service to the State and the necessity of a balanced air pattern across the Pacific urged the office of the President of the United States in effect to continue a policy of two separate and competing air routes to the Orient; and

Whereas the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and the City of Chicago Aviation Committee also conveyed similar communications to the President's office: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully request that the proper governmental authorities take heed of these circumstances; that we express our adherence to the policy set forth by the Civil Aeronautics Board, an authoritative governmental agency thoroughly familiar with all aspects of international air problems, and therefore oppose any application for duplication of service on the Great Circle course as contrary to the interests of the State, the Government and the public generally; and, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to forward a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the President of the United States and United States Senators and United States Representatives from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the senate, May 5, 1955.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Polio Vaccine and Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
POLIO VACCINE AND PUBLIC POLICY

There are those who have had great misgivings ever since April 12 about the dramatic build-up, the theatrical suspense and the spectacular publicity with which the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine was proclaimed. It was more like announcing the results of an election than the results of a scientific inquiry. The whole performance was contrary to the spirit and morale of good science, which is to be very scrupulous about not claiming, or appearing to claim, more than has been proved.

This rule was violated on April 12 not by what Dr. Thomas Francis Jr. actually said in his report but by the way the big show was staged. For while his actual report contained reservations in the fine print, the blazing publicity was bound to convey, as it did convey, the misleading impression that a full solution had been found of the problem of making an effective vaccine for the mass immunization of the children of this country. For the public the proof that polio had been conquered was not in what was actually said in the report. It was in the elaboration of the show, the eminence of the actors, the high-powered publicity itself. The public concluded fairly enough that such publicity could mean only that the scientific experimentation had in fact been completed and concluded.

We know now that the responsible authorities, both private and public, had not made sure that they could fulfill the promise which the people believed had been made. The authorities could not know how large would

be the available supply of the vaccine at the critical dates. For obviously they had not yet settled definitively, as the President made known in his press conference, the question of whether a shorter or a longer test of the manufactured vaccine was necessary. Not having settled that, they had not settled the critical problem of passing from the laboratory to mass production in factories. The trouble they have now run into, compelling them to recheck the factory production, proves that they allowed hopes to be raised before they had concluded the period of experimentation.

Yet it is commonplace in the field of applied science that new technical problems are posed when a process is carried from the laboratory into the factory. In his statement on Sunday the Surgeon General said that "a great deal of new information has been developed during the past 10 days as the result of continuing consultation between the Public Health Service and its consultants, and between these groups and the senior technicians of industry." Is there any good and plausible reason why these consultations did not take place before the American people were invited to believe that the problems of the vaccine had been solved?

The fact of the matter is that on April 12 the responsible authorities went off half-cocked. The problem of mass production had not been reliably solved, and there was, therefore, no justification for the publicity which created a mass expectation of mass immunization for this polio season.

The real situation called for at least one more season devoted to an enlarged and fully controlled experiment. It was a case where the way to make genuine progress—and to avoid lacerating the feelings of the parents of small children throughout the land—was to adhere to the strictest standards of scientific caution. The tests made last year did indeed show very promising results. But the only practical conclusion to be drawn from the tests made last year was that tests on a bigger scale were warranted for this year. This would have meant keeping to laboratory standards before passing to the looser standards of mass production.

It is established public policy that medical advertising shall not be misleading. It was the duty of the Federal Government, and specifically of Mrs. Hobby's department, to have frowned upon and to have prevented the theatrical exploitation of Dr. Salk's work. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which sponsored the experimentations and the development of the vaccine, sponsored also the publicity attending the announcement. The Foundation has done great and necessary things in its field. But it is dependent upon voluntary popular subscription. This requires promotion and publicity which should have been kept carefully distinct from the publication of medical news.

Quite apart from the question of whether the Federal Government should have asked specific legislation in regard to polio vaccine—and in view of the short supply it should have—the Federal Government had a general public duty to protect the people against being misled on a burning question of public health. The consultations it has been holding in the past 10 days should have been going on for months—ever since the decision was taken to manufacture the vaccine on a large scale.

I do not know why the Federal Government did not assume the direction of this great public health operation as soon as enough was known about last year's tests to start the pharmaceutical firms making the vaccine. But it would seem as if the inaction of the Federal Government was due in some considerable degree to theoretical misconceptions—to unexamined and false notions of the general principles of free enterprise, voluntary cooperation, and decentralization—and to the strange prejudice that the only way the Federal Government can assume direction and control of anything is to build up a vast bureaucracy.

The principles of free enterprise and voluntary cooperation are beneficent and widely applicable. They are the rule in our society and a departure from them should be regarded as an exception from the rule. But not all public principles in this workaday world can be applicable at all times and under all circumstances. They are beneficent and are workable only if we apply them with good sense, only if we apply them when conditions make them applicable, and do not apply them when conditions do not make them applicable. As politics is a crude art, and not a mathematical science, there are many borderline cases where it is a close question whether to rely upon free competition and voluntary cooperation or to assume central government direction and control.

But the case of the Salk vaccine was not a borderline question. The vaccine was bound to be in short supply at least for this season; its proper use touched the vital interests of the families of the Nation. There should, therefore, have been no more doubt here than there has been in Canada that the public authorities were in control.

Protest in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Protest in Order," which appeared in the Boston Traveler of May 2, 1955:

Defense Secretary Wilson has taken another blasting from the press, this time from the top echelon. He asked for it when he decided to impose a Pentagon news gag.

Now Richard W. Slocumb, president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, has warned his fellow publishers that the flow of legitimate news is being dammed by unnecessary censorship and restrictions.

As a point of illustration, Slocumb has cited the situation resulting from Wilson's order. It has cut sharply into the normal traffic of news, speeches, statements, and opinions.

Probably at heart Wilson doesn't agree with the principle of rigid censorship any more than we do. But when his Department recently came in for criticism it was natural for him to direct his subordinates to tie down their tongues. Then bureaucracy started to function, and suddenly the press found that everything had to be cleared.

The business of clearing a bit of information or a story can get complicated and ludicrous in a huge setup like our Defense Department, spread out all over the free world.

On the heels of a tightening-up such as that ordered by Wilson, the press finds that virtually nobody in the defense network—Army, Navy, Air Force, or whatnot—wants to take responsibility.

The results are ridiculous. A correspondent in Japan wants information about a new building going up on a defense installation. The Army won't even admit there is a building, although it's in plain sight for all to see. A correspondent in Washington wants an obituary on a dead naval officer. He faces a long delay while the information is cleared.

Every correspondent in Washington knows the frustrations of bureaucratic censorship. He knows, too, that the situation would get worse unless the American press put up an occasional loud squawk.

Protests are always in order when the press feels that the public is being denied the news to which it's entitled.

Bank Holding Companies: Views of Chicago Bankers on H. R. 2674

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the 3 Congresses during which I have served on the Banking and Currency Committee, I, as a Representative from Chicago, have made it a practice to mail to all the bankers in that great financial center copies of banking bills under consideration by our committee and to request expression of their judgment on the validity of the pending measures and their own thoughts as to the advisability of their enactment into law.

For the past several weeks the Banking and Currency Committee has held lengthy public hearings, followed by executive sessions, on H. R. 2674, the bill introduced by Chairman SPENCE for the regulation of bank holding companies and their divestment of nonbanking interests. It is, of course, in the area of legislation of major importance, being the measure of greatest banking interest and effect on future banking operations to come before the 84th Congress.

Following my practice of acquainting the House with the thinking of individual Chicago bankers as reflected in their correspondence with me, I am extending my remarks to include all the replies received to date on the matter of H. R. 2674, as follows:

AMERICAN NATIONAL BANK

DEAR MR. O'HARA: There is little question that one of the true assets of this country throughout its entire history has been the recognition of the rights of the individual. It has been the independence of the individual that has made our country great. In recent years we have all witnessed a great trend toward bigness in business. In the automobile industry, the steel industry, in the retail field, and more recently in the banking system of the country, we have seen the growth of the large firms and chains and the gradual squeezing out of the independent.

You are now considering holding company legislation through your bill H. R. 2674 which, if passed, will do much to guarantee the survival of the independent bank, which is the backbone of our banking structure. Let me urge you to support that bill and by so doing keep alive the rights of the individual and the independence of small banking.

Most sincerely,

WILLIAM O. KURTZ, JR.,
Vice President, American National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago.

CHATHAM BANK

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The majority of the bankers in this State are opposed to holding companies for several logical reasons.

Mainly the capital is supplied from other than residents of our State and the money that is earned by the bank is siphoned off to other parts of the Nation. In addition, many times they are interested in profits above stability. The dividends paid are usually large and normally would be used in part as additions to capital if the bank were locally owned.

Secondly, the absentee ownership does not understand the needs of the community as well as the unit banker who resides in the area he serves.

Also, recently we had three Beutel banks in Chicago that caused the banking industry great concern. This would not have occurred had we had holding company legislation at that time.

Also permitting holding company groups to acquire banks is merely a vehicle to evade the law in those States that prohibit branch banks, which is the law of Illinois. The various banks owned are for all intents and purposes operated as branches of the parent bank.

Therefore, I personally feel that H. R. 2674 is just and equitable.

Very truly yours,

WALTER J. RILEY,
President, Chatham Bank of Chicago.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of March 1 asking for my comments on H. R. 2674. I happen to be president of the American Bankers Association, whose committee on Federal legislation has made a full study of this bill. Mr. George R. Boyles (whom I think you know), is president of the Merchants National Bank of Chicago, and is chairman of the American Bankers Association committee on Federal legislation. Mr. Boyles is scheduled to appear before your committee next Monday and present the views of the association on this legislation.

May I commend you for soliciting the views of your constituents on this important piece of banking legislation.

With personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

H. J. LIVINGSTON,
President, First National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have your letter of the 1st, enclosing a copy of H. R. 2674, the so-called Spence bill, on bank holding companies legislation.

I think the bill in its present form, or anything like it, is highly undesirable and would do much more harm than good. I have read, and am sure you have, the testimony of Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve System, and I think his conclusions on what should be in a holding-company bill are, on the whole sound and that it would be advisable for Congress to adopt his recommendations.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD E. BROWN,
Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR BARRATT: On my return to Chicago I find your letter of March 1 regarding H. R. 2674—so-called bank holding company legislation.

I have studied this question quite intensively since 1947 and have twice testified in regard to it before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. My viewpoint is well known by the various groups involved in the discussions.

Briefly, I believe H. R. 2674 is unnecessarily restrictive in some respects to accomplish the best results in the light of the goal of the proposed legislation, to wit, (1) the maintenance of sound, adequate, and competitive banking, and (2) a progressive coordination of our country's banking structure as it now exists.

From the beginning, my thinking on this legislation has been along the lines outlined by the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency at the recent hearings before your committee. I believe legislation of that type would be more desirable and that it would be quite sufficient for the attainment of needed regulation—without playing favorites to any particular banking group.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD V. AMBERG,
Vice President, First National Bank.

LAKE SHORE NATIONAL BANK

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you for sending me the copy of H. R. 2674, the bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies.

I served the Illinois Bankers Association as its president for the fiscal year 1950–51 and I am currently serving as the chairman of the Federal legislative committee. In that capacity I have had the opportunity to discuss holding company operations in Illinois with several Chicago and downstate bankers. The Illinois Bankers Association has taken action through its Council of Administration favoring H. R. 2674 as far as it pertains to the right of Illinois banks to continue to operate as individual units. We favor Federal legislation that would freeze bank holding company operations and divest them of their nonbanking interests. We are advised that State legislation can be adopted prohibiting bank holding company operations in Illinois corporations but that we would be very much in need of Federal legislation to control foreign corporations licensed to do business in Illinois from acquiring ownership of stock in our Illinois banks.

Kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH R. FREY,
President, Lake Shore National Bank, Chicago, Ill.

PULLMAN BANK

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter enclosing a copy of H. R. 2674 (bank holding companies) arrived when I was out of town. Consequently, I ask that you excuse my delay in replying.

We are grateful to you for your kind remarks about the administration and operations of our bank, in the course of the hearings. We feel that we have done a real service to our community in making use of capital which we have secured outside of the community, to provide support for a banking structure which has been able to extend the widest variety of banking services of any bank in Chicago. The capital that one needs for such an operation must be well informed capital, under the control of people who understand the banking business, and who encourage the local managers of the bank to extend the bank's services in fields which are of great value to the people living in the community in which the bank operates.

The biggest objection I see in the proposed bill is that it goes a long way toward freezing certain independent banks into monopolistic positions in their communities. If they do not have to face any competition, particularly competition which has been developed in other sections of the country where some new thinking in banking may have been discovered, then the community in which such a monopolistic bank operates is definitely the loser, because it does not gain the services and the lower rates established by competition, that are found in other communities.

This is especially true in Illinois. I have done a good deal of traveling around banks in the State, particularly up in the Chicago area, and I have been shocked, from time to time, by situations in which the banker in a given community denies his community all kinds of bank services and competitive rates, simply because he is without the competition to force him into them. This picture is radically different in communities where branch banking is permitted, and the local offices of big city banks bring to the communities the wide variety of services and competitive rates which the big banks have been able to discover in the larger metropolitan centers. Certainly the public is the gainer under this latter condition, and is the looser under the condition wherein the independent banker, wholly without competition, metes and parcels out to the community just whatever kind of banking service he in his own undisputed judgment determines the community shall have.

Today we are witnessing the return to the American business scene of the independent grocer, backed up by such huge grocery co-ops as certified grocers, IGA, Royal Blue, etc. This new independent grocer is gaining the full advantage of the mass-buying capabilities of his co-ops, and of the research in marketing practices done by his co-ops, and is setting up his stores according to the very finest standards of store management. From our observation in our own area, he is earning, in many cases, twice as much as the best that any chain store has been able to produce in the same location.

Where did he learn these practices? From the big food chains. No one of us would like to go back to the old, musty, confused, and high-priced independent grocery. Yet the change from those bad methods of merchandising groceries was accomplished because the big food chains were able to operate throughout the length and breadth of the United States, and bring to all of our communities the benefits of mass buying, scientific merchandising, and vigorous competition. It really has not taken very long for the American independent business system to find how to copy the practices of the chains, and, through the co-ops, to enable individual grocers to merchandise more effectively than the chains themselves.

If we ham-string competitive banking, so that it will be impossible for the highly efficient and competitive banking organizations of the larger metropolitan centers to bring their services and competitive practices into local communities, then the banking business will never enjoy the enlightening effects of good and intelligent competition. I don't think that any legal or political measures which protect independent bankers by freezing them into monopolistic positions in their communities, is worth the cost to the American public of the lack of the beneficial effects of vigorous competition, which has always been good for any American business.

These are my general feelings toward the banking holding company bill. In looking through the copy of the bill which you sent me, I note the following:

Page 2, line 25: I am vigorously opposed to giving to any mutual savings bank any greater privilege to own the stock of a commercial bank than is given to any other type of corporation. There has been far too much granting of power to these mutual institutions, whose managements are frozen into office by the simple practice wherein new trustees or directors are elected by the existent board of directors. This really results in the creation of a private enterprise, and not a cooperative, consisting of the group of men who retain themselves in office at very attractive salaries.

Page 6, lines 23 to 25: As a Congressman from Illinois, you are probably aware of the fact that bank holding companies are not prohibited by law in Illinois, but neither

are they authorized. Under these provisions, banks have operated very successfully in Illinois, and bank holding companies also. I object to allowing the Federal Government any greater prerogative in regulating this sort of thing than the State has of itself. I feel most postively that these particular lines should be stricken from the bill.

Page 7, lines 6 to 9: This would apparently preclude a bank from engaging in any way in the insurance business. I am most positively opposed to this provision, which places banks at serious disadvantages in competition with savings and loan associations, mortgage brokers, and all other corporations which are permitted to engage, directly or indirectly, in the insurance business. There is no reason in the world why banks should not be able to do the same things here that other corporations are permitted to do.

I appreciate especially your interest in writing to us about these matters. I sincerely hope that these thoughts may be helpful to you.

Yours very truly,

DONALD O'TOOLE,
Executive Vice President of Pullman Trust & Savings Bank.

MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK

George R. Boyles, president of the Merchants National Bank, is chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Bankers Association. He was one of the principal witnesses at the public hearings of the Banking and Currency Commitee. His testimony will be found on pages 405–429 of the public hearings.

Parental Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger under date of May 10, 1955:

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

Newark should watch with interest the program which New York City says it will put into action to stem juvenile delinquency.

Our problems are not identical, of course, but this much is certain: We have too much juvenile delinquency, too.

New York's answer is to spend money. It proposes to spend $3,410,000 over 3 years. This year's budget is $1,500,000. The money will go to hire recreation staffs, for testing the work of police agencies, for expanding facilities.

Perhaps it will work. We fervently hope so. At least the big city is trying.

All of the money and all of the reports and all of the studies won't change the fact, however, that parents are at the root of juvenile delinquency.

Too many parents are indifferent to what their kids do. And it's not just poverty that makes parents indifferent. Some of the worst delinquents come from the best homes.

Perhaps the answer is parental responsibility. It's been suggested before, but it's not practiced.

The community has a right to protect its interests. If a parent, through neglect, permits a child to endanger the community, should the parent not be held responsible? Lots of parents might suddenly develop a wholesome interest in where their kids hang out, and in what they do, if they know that they're liable to be fined for the mischief done by the kids.

Ike's Economic Report Is a Tribute to the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following condensation of Thomas L. Stokes article from the Toledo Blade which appeared in the April 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest is deserving of our attention:

IKE'S ECONOMIC REPORT IS A TRIBUTE TO THE NEW DEAL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It often takes time, sometimes adversity, to put past events in just and proper perspective. Take, for example, that era of reform known as the Roosevelt New Deal back in the middle and early 1930's which has been slammed and pilloried, even down to the last congressional election campaign.

It is worthy of note that it now is paid high tribute at long last—and significantly by the first Republican administration since then. You will find this scattered throughout President Eisenhower's Economic Report to Congress. That gives repeated credit to antidepression measures put on the statute books by the Roosevelt New Deal in helping to keep the recession of last year from snowballing into a real depression.

Naturally the Eisenhower report does not identify those as Roosevelt New Deal measures, which would be too much to ask of any political party, whether Republican or Democratic. It just tells how the administration utilized them, with effusive praise for that operation.

Nowhere in the comprehensive report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers submitted to Congress will you find the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Nor, for another, that of the late Senator Carter Glass, a Virginia Democrat, who put through the banking laws which gave the Federal Government more of a free hand to devise flexible policies to check downward swings in the economy. Nor the name of Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve System for many years, who directed recovery efforts possible through credit policies. Nor the late Senator Robert F. Wagner, New York Democrat, sponsor of unemployment insurance and old-age-pension laws. Nor any other in the galaxy of New Deal reform figures.

Yet, anonymous though they remain in the President's report, they are highly complimented by proxy in the detailed story in the economic report. It relates how the 1953–54 recession was checked and recovery set in motion by infusion of unemployment benefits into the stream of purchasing power to bolster the economy; by farm-price supports; by the use of monetary policy and tax reductions, as well as other instrumentalities and methods to be found in the solid body of social and economic measures and policies enacted and instituted 20 years ago, and often after long, frustrating, and bitter battles.

One sentence in the President's report might be regarded as a sort of memorial to those men and measures, if somewhat restrained and reserved:

"It is well to recall that we have developed in our country a fiscal system that tends to cushion or offset a decline in private income."

The economists who drafted the economic report offer the forgotten men, against without credit, the flattery of imitation by advocating more of what they did—further improvement and extension of the Social Security System, increase of the statutory minimum wage, more public housing, all originally started in the 1930's.

The President's report takes the year from July 1953 to July 1954 to spell out the story. While production income declined $4.4 billion during that period, this was more than offset, it explained, by the payment to the public of $2.2 billion for unemployment insurance and other social security benefits, and by tax reductions amounting to $3 billion, so that "the income available to the public for spending and saving actually increased by nearly $1 billion."

The report insisted throughout that Government must operate actively to check economic recession, saying in fact that, among lessons learned by the experience of this setback, the first was "that wise and early action by Government can stave off serious difficulties later."

For years it was the fashion, and still is in some quarters, to condemn the New Deal economic and social reforms as weakening the fiber of our people and encouraging them to lean on the Government. This myth is exploded by the economic report. As for this recent experience, it says that, while Government helped, the recovery itself was brought about by the American people who, it said, have developed a mood of confidence in their economy. Though the report does not say so, it is suggested that such confidence grows, itself, from confidence built up among the people during the New Deal era that the Government will lend a hand when there is trouble, and now has means to do this effectively.

Mrs. Hobby Charged With Culpability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has stirred up a witches brew of uncertainty and confusion. Unfortunately Dr. Scheele, a good doctor, is cast in a bad role as her front. Mrs. Hobby has now suspended further distribution of the antipolio vaccine. She proclaims, however, that the vaccine is safe. Suppose the investigation reveals that the vaccine, as manufactured, is unsafe? Where does this leave the anxious parents of the 5 million children already inoculated? Why did not Mrs. Hobby insist upon proper inspection before and not after she gave the green light?

Why did the President recently assure the Nation that all was well? He is not without responsibility for the actions of his agent, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby. This lady is indeed very culpable.

Trinity Project in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, among many specious arguments now being leveled against the upper Colorado River storage project is one to the effect that atomic energy will replace the hydroelectric energy this project would develop.

In answer to those arguments I am submitting herewith excerpts from testimony of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. engineers dealing with hydro versus atomic power. The testimony was taken during House Interior Committee hearings on the Trinity project in California.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY ON THE TRINITY PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Utah, Mr. DAWSON.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Gerdes, on page 2 of your statement we find the words that by 1956 postwar additions in new hydro and steam power capacity of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will amount to nearly 3 million kilowatts, increasing the total system to 4.4 million, and your 11-year postwar construction program will represent an investment of $1.6 billion.

In addition to that investment I understand that you have plans beyond 1956 for the construction of steam plants and also hydro developments, have you not?

Mr. GERDES. Yes; we have plans for construction of additional powerplants, both steam and hydro. In our area the powerload is increased rapidly each year, and we have to keep building ahead to take care of those demands.

Mr. DAWSON. And that involves a good many millions of dollars, as you estimated?

Mr. GERDES. I could state it this way: Last year my company spent, if I recall the figure correctly, approximately $170 million. That includes distribution lines and transmission lines as well as generating facilities. It also includes some gas facilities. It is a very large sum of money we are speaking of.

Mr. DAWSON. Now, in view of the fact that some of those who would oppose future reclamation projects involving hydro development are claiming that the atomic age is upon us and is about to blossom forth, do you figure you are taking any chance with that kind of investment in hydro and steam plants?

Mr. GERDES. We are planning to build hydro plants and we are planning to build steam plants. We do not feel we are taking any risk in building them because of the development of atomic energy. As a matter of fact, we are participating with four other companies in a study of the development of atomic energy. We have recently made an offer to the Atomic Energy Commission which would involve the construction of a sizeable plant. We do not regard the development of atomic energy as a threat to our existing development of the plants that we intend to build.

Mr. DAWSON. That would include both hydro and steam?

Mr. GERDES. That includes both hydro and steam. On anything that we know today, atomic energy, at least in our area, is not competitive with the conventional plants. I am speaking as of this day. It may be that within a few years—and I would not predict how many—it may become competitive.

Mr. DAWSON. As of this day you do figure you are safe in projecting your future plans far enough ahead that you are willing to go ahead now and construct steam and hydro plants?

Mr. GERDES. In the first place we have to go ahead with our plans in order to meet prospective loads; and in the next place we think we are safe. Atomic energy, so far as electric power is concerned, is only another source of fuel to generate steam. If and when it becomes competitive—that is, when atomic energy can produce electric energy at a cost equal to or less than the conventional plants—it will just be another source of fuel. As a matter of fact, every year that we build a plant, that plant is more efficient than the one we built previously due to progress of the art.

Mr. DAWSON. But it would not render your hydroplants obsolete?

Mr. GERDES. It would not; no. The older plants are relegated to a point where you use them less. You use your most efficient plants at the base of the load curve. In other words, the most efficient plant is run 24 hours a day, or as much time as you can run it, and the less efficient, older plants are run to met the load peaks.

Act on Vaccine Control Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 10, 1955:

ACT ON VACCINE CONTROL NOW

Dr. Scheele has issued a lengthy report on the results of the study made of the Salk vaccine program by a panel of distinguished scientists which contains much that is encouraging, much that is confusing. Nowhere does he spell out precisely what the rechecking of manufacturing processes and of existing supplies by Government laboratories is intended to discover.

He reaffirms his confidence in the Salk vaccine as such—which is good. He says that it is actually being made more effective—which is better. But the heart of his statement, the delay in going forward with vaccination, can only be understood by inference, by collateral information.

It is clear that in the product of the Cutter Laboratories an as yet unexplained phenomenon has appeared—a definite association "between the administration of the Cutter vaccine and the few cases of poliomyelitis that have occurred after its administration." This association was not foreshadowed in the massive experimental vaccination last year (in which the Cutter Laboratories did not participate). It certainly justifies the suspension of production by that firm until the cause is found and eradicated. It might well warrant a revision of recent Government testing practices—which apparently were based on the assumption that, after the success of last year's program, production methods for the vaccine had been stabilized and only spot checks and reviews of "protocols" were sufficient to insure safety.

Since such a recheck would involve going back over laboratory samples of lots already distributed, it is wise to halt inoculations until they have been cleared. But if this chain of reasoning is correct, why did Dr. Scheele not make it plain in his report? If there are detectable differences between the Cutter vaccine and that of other companies, why did he not say so? If not, what is expected from the new tests?

The lack of clarity in recent statements by the Surgeon General is a strong argument for a form of national control which would provide for full, objective, carefully evaluated information by the Government. The delay in the program, which will mean greater pressure on vaccine supplies as the period of a higher incidence of polio draws nearer, makes an even more powerful case for compulsory allocation according to need and protection against a black market. At the same time, the pause in mass vaccination allows time for legislation and setting up the administration of a national law. It must be done now, when the opportunity offers and the need is more urgent than ever.

Bootlegging: It's a Big Problem Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when will the Nation learn. We certainly should have learned our lesson from prohibition. Now, we are having prohibition by taxation. The liquor taxes are so high that moonshiners and bootleggers are once again reaping a harvest. It is high time we took a new look at the liquor taxes with a view toward reducing them. Look magazine is to be complimented on its article entitled "Bootlegging: It's a Big Problem Again," by Jack Wilson, which appears in its current issue.

It reads as follows:

The hard facts of 1955 economics are reviving the lawlessness that was a byproduct of prohibition. Bootleggers are cashing in again.

The current rise of bootlegging doesn't involve any law against quaffing strong waters. It has come about simply because the price of legal liquor has been forced so high that many prospective customers can't pay and others won't. The inevitable result has been the opening up of a big market among consumers in the low-income brackets. The bootleggers are demonstrating that they're able and more than willing to fill the demand.

Large illicit distilleries, professional jobs producing 1,000 or 2,000 gallons a day, have been springing up in the eastern cities. Last fall, Federal agents raided a column still that occupied three full stories of a brick building in Philadelphia. The plant cost at least $75,000 and had a capacity of 1,000 gallons of alcohol per day. A similar still was seized near Hackettstown, N. J. In the past 2 years, 20 others, the same size or larger, have been uncovered in New York and its vicinity, including one giant in a Brooklyn warehouse leased from the city.

These big outfits, financed by big-time racketeers, turn out raw alcohol to supply the half-pint trade and the back-alley gin mills. And the little pot stills, built around a couple of barrels, a few feet of copper tubing and a good felt hat for a strainer, are still sprouting in the southern hills faster than the revenuers can smash them.

Licensed-liquor industry people estimate that 1 out of every 4 gallons of high-proof

liquor sold in this country today comes from unlicensed stills. The Federal Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division feels this estimate—for certain areas, at least—is high. Nevertheless, the number of outlaw stills seized by Federal agents has definitely increased every year since the end of the war. This year it will be the highest since 1942 when sugar rationing cut off the flow of illegal liquor. And today's stills produce far greater volume than did the prohibition bathtubs.

The bootleg trade hurts you, the American citizen, in many ways—indirectly and directly. Illicit distilleries cheat the State and Federal Governments out of nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in taxes every year. You have to pay the money instead. For the average four-person family, it amounts to an income-tax boost of about $19 a year, to make up for the revenue stamps bootleggers don't buy.

More important, in the last 4 years, 65 persons are known to have died from poisonous bootleg liquor—42 of them in a single week in Atlanta, Ga., where a peddler used wood alcohol to stretch his merchandise. Hundreds more were blinded and hospitalized.

The basic economics of bootlegging are about the same as they were during prohibition. A gallon of 180-proof alcohol from an unlicensed still costs a little over $1. When it has been cut to half strength, it makes 2 gallons of hootch that can be peddled at retail for around $3 a fifth. The corrosive product may loosen the drinker's fillings, but licensed dealers can't compete in price.

HERE'S WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES

The average price of a fifth of 86.8-proof blended whiskey in a legal liquor store is about $4.27. That includes $1.89 for producing, bottling, advertising, and distributing. The remaining $2.38 represents local, State, and Federal taxes. Put it another way: To buy $1.89 worth of whisky, you have to pay $4.27. A bootlegger can sell the same amount for $3 and still do very well.

All but 48 cents of that $2.38 tax goes to the Federal Government, most of it in the form of the $10.50 excise tax per proof gallon imposed in 1951 to help pay for the Korean war. Previously, liquor had been taxed $9 a gallon to help pay for World War II.

When the rate was increased to $10.50, the rise was billed as an emergency measure, and the law specified that it would revert to $9 on April 1, 1954. But before the expiration date, the $10.50 rate was extended a year, to April 1, 1955. It was done without debate on the floor of Congress. Congress doesn't like to talk about liquor taxes any more than necessary. Temperance organizations have sharp ears, long memories and a good many votes. A Congressman who rises up in favor of cutting liquor levies is running the risk of being tagged a seducer of American youth.

The legal-liquor industry regards this big excise tax as the principal cause of the bootlegging boom. Federal statistics show that between 1945 (when the tax went from $6 to $9) and the end of the last fiscal year, seizures of illicit stills increased 65 percent. And seizures of sour mash, an indication of the size of the stills, increased almost 170 percent.

"This multimillion-dollar racket can be curbed only by reducing the fabulous profit incentive given by the current record-breaking tax on liquor," said Thomas J. Donovan, vice president of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., a spokesman for the business.

Donovan believes that if the $10.50 tax were allowed to revert to $9, the loss to the Government in excise taxes would be nearly, or completely, offset by increased income and corporation taxes which would flow into the Treasury as a result of increased sales. He cites studies made by the Treasury Department and the University of Minnesota to back his claim that while the Federal Government would lose about $63,100,000 in excise taxes, it would gain at least $36,000,000 in increased corporation and personal income-tax payments. The States, in turn, would collect an additional $18,000,000. Also, he says, if the sales increased the full amount indicated by the studies, the Federal Treasury would show a net gain of $52,000,000 as a result of the tax cut, and the States a $35,000,000 profit.

The licensed industry, however, got a sad jolt this winter when President Eisenhower announced that he wanted all present levies extended. Some of the realists in the business admitted that they were not surprised. The only time Congress ever voted to lower the tax rate on liquor was shortly after the Civil War. It's been going up gradually ever since, with never a setback.

Federal officials believe that the answer to bootlegging lies in stricter enforcement of laws and sterner punishment. The Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division last year revamped its inspection system in the licensed distilleries and shook more than 100 agents loose for outside work. Nearly half of them were sent into the New York-New Jersey-Pennsylvania section to hunt the new crop of liquor racketeers. The rest were assigned to the Southeastern States. These two areas are the hot spots. There is little bootlegging on the west coast, in the Southwest or Midwest. One ATTD man says, "Things are so dull in Chicago that we're beginning to wonder. * * *"

An estimated 85 percent of the illegal whisky is cooked in the area south of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi. Moonshining is a southern tradition—there has always been a good supply of illegal corn back in the hills. Most of it is made in small backwoods pot stills. Lately, however, larger plants of modern design and considerable capacity have been found around some southern cities.

Seizure statistics indicate that at least one new moonshine pot starts bubbling for every one the revenuers knock out. Federal seizures in the 7 Southeastern States total between 700 and 800 a month. Similarly, seizures of moonshiners' automobiles and trucks in that area remain steady from month to month—between 80 and 115 automobiles, and from 30 to 40 trucks.

The operators seem to be little affected by the raids. Arrest records indicate that many moonshiners who are picked up stop off on their way home from the courthouse and collect apparatus for new stills. Many State courts are lenient with small-time moonshiners, punish them with a scolding and a suspended sentence.

The licensed-liquor interests, cooperating with other businessmen, have organized an Anti-Moonshine Association in Atlanta to combat the traditionally tolerant attitude toward manufacture of "white mule." This group is spreading the message that moonshining is a criminal matter, that it leads to such tragedies as the wood-alcohol plague in Atlanta, and that it adds to the taxpayers' woes.

Addressing a meeting of the association, Dwight E. Avis, director of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, said, "We are never going to be able to stamp out moonshining until we have an aroused public opinion which recognizes a criminal for what he is and makes its feelings felt by the courts and prosecutors."

Lately, there has been a trend toward stiffer penalties. Last November, an eight-man ring was convicted in a Federal district court in Virginia. Four of the defendants drew sentences of 2 and 3 years, 2 got 18 months, and the remaining 2 drew 1 year. Appeals are pending.

The operation of this gang was more or less typical of large-scale bootlegging in the South. Three of the leaders—Robert Orton, Hubert Hoffler, and Rubin Pierce—began by taking over an automobile business in Portsmouth, Va. They used this enterprise to acquire and service the trucks they needed for transporting moonshine. They built a 500-gallon still nearby, which was raided after running 3 weeks. Then they went into business in Ahoskie, N. C., and got by for 6 weeks before being caught. All told, they produced 6,976 gallons of country-style corn liquor, and they cheated the Federal Government out of $61,748 in taxes.

The new bootleggers are well heeled and ruthless; there are more of them getting into the racket every month. No one has found a solution to the problem. No one really doubts that as long as moonshine is cheaper than legal liquor, there'll be a demand for it. And there will always be bootleggers to fill the demand.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*, 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Buchanan, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Davidson, Bell, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, ———, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Fine, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Machrowicz, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Machrowicz, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Dingell, Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Harold M. Stephens, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 4-6420
	Circuit Judges	
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6207
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee, 3550 Springland Lane.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, 1500 Massachusetts Ave.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, Woodley Park Towers.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 4912 Brookway Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Paul W. Brosman
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss.*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn.*
Andrews, George W., *Ala.*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Beamer, John V., *Ind.*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*—1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, John J., *Tex.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.*—7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio.*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio.*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va.*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C.*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr.*
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa.*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio.*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y.*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*—The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg.*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn.*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*—4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn.*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis.*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William A., *Utah.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex.*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md.*
Dies, Martin, *Tex.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*—The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa.*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich.*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.*—The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa.*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex.*—200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y.*
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont.*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn.*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex.*
George, Myron V., *Kans.*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill.*
Granahan, William T., *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith, *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky.*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Hale, Robert, *Maine.*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J.*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind.*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark.*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.*—The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*—125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Heselton, John W., *Mass.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hill, William S., *Colo.*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif.*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.*—2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans.*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa.*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.*—The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif.*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala.*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.*—3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J.*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va.*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa.*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, Karl C., *Pa.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn.*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak.*—The Coronet

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—3130 Wisconsin Ave.

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*—3250 T St. SE.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4420 Dexter St.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*

Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.

Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill.*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—The Dorchester
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*

Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—The Senate Courts
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*

Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—3202 So. Stafford St., Arlington, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.

Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, it is contended that the power of two seats each for Hawaii and Alaska is sought only for the protection of their interests. Unfortunately, the voting powers of these Senators cannot be limited to measures which affect these Territories alone. The senatorial power proposed in this bill would, of necessity, include the power to decide upon, and to vote against, the interests of each of the 48 States.

It is a recognized maxim that power without corresponding accountability and responsibility invites abuse and maladministration.

For example: Alaska, with 2 Senators, would possess one-fiftieth of the power to pass on appropriations of $60 billion per year. That share of power to spend is $1,200,000,000. Yet Alaska's responsibility for the collection of taxes, as represented by her 1954 Federal taxes, is only $48 million or 1,000 times less than the total budget. Alaska's Senators would be accountable to only 128,000 people—27,000 voters—although the $1,200,000,000—her share of the spending power—is collected from more than 3 million people.

It is contended that Hawaii is entitled to statehood by reason of the fact that her population is greater than that of either Nevada, Wyoming, Vermont, or Delaware.

It should be noted that each of these States was admitted before the ratification of the 17th amendment. This amendment fundamentally altered the basis for the allotment of two Senators to each State. The change in the mode of selection of Senators, to that of popular suffrage, totally destroyed the justification for equal representation, that of two Senators for each State.

This 17th amendment recognized the trend toward a national government and away from the Federal union of sovereign States. No State has been admitted to the Union since the adoption of the 17th amendment. Thus, other States furnish no valid precedent for the admission, today, of territories on the basis of representation by two Senators in the United States Senate.

Mr. Chairman, the correct and the equitable principle for the distribution of power in a national legislative body, elected by direct popular suffrage, is that of representation proportional to population. The apportionment of Senators on any other basis violates the basic concepts of constitutional representative government.

There is ample authority in the deliberations at the Constitutional Convention for the adoption of a constitutional amendment which would admit States, hereafter, upon the basis of representation in the United States Senate in accordance with population.

At the time of the adoption of our Constitution, the largest State, Virginia, had a population of 747,000; the smallest State, Delaware, had 59,000; a ratio of about 12 to 1. Today, the ratio between the largest and the smallest State is about 100 to 1. The gentlemen of that Convention had the foresight to make our Constitution amendable to provide for this type of contingency.

The convention specifically deleted, by a vote of 9 to 2, a proposal that new States be admitted on the same terms with the original States. In fact, article V of the Constitution is one of the clauses which cannot be amended. It provides in part, that no State can be deprived of its power to consent to accept less than equal suffrage in the Senate.

This bill should be laid aside, until such time as Congress shall, have had an opportunity, to give consideration to a constitutional amendment that would either limit the senatorial representation of States to be admitted or one that would admit States by the same procedure as is required for the adoption of a constitutional amendment.

COMMUNISM

The Hawaiian statehood bill was last considered by this House on March 10, 1953. Since then, there have been startling disclosures of communistic controls in Hawaii. Although the Communists began their activities in 1937, the full force of their power did not become apparent until recent events.

In attempting to assess the extent of the influence of communism in Hawaii, we should keep in mind that Hawaii can be fairly compared in population and area to an average congressional district. I am sure that every Member of this House would view with greatest alarm the prospect of having the same degree of communistic power in their districts, as now exists in Hawaii.

In Hawaii, communistic power is centered in and its influence emanates from two unions, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—the ILWU—and the United Public Workers Union—the UPW.

The ILWU has a membership of 25,000. About 2,000 of them are stevedores and dock workers. The balance work on plantations and in various type industries. This union dominates and is the leader in union activities in Hawaii. The international president of the ILWU is Harry Bridges. He has been cited time after time as a Communist. Next to William Z. Foster, who heads the Communist Party in the United States, Harry Bridges is the most powerful figure in the party.

Jack Hall is the regional director of the ILWU in Hawaii. He is one of seven defendants convicted by Federal prosecution on June 19, 1953, for conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government. His photo is the first one on the left in the newspaper account on the blackboard.

These convicted Communists are on bail awaiting their appeal. Although it is almost 2 years since their conviction, they continue in the same communistic activities today, unhampered. A newspaper account on the blackboard quotes Jack Hall as taking credit for the sweeping political victory in last fall's Hawaii elections. In fact, one territorial senator went to Jack Hall's aid as a character witness during his trial and another senator furnished bail for him.

The UPW is another cloak to cover communistic activity in Hawaii. It has a membership of 2,000 government public workers. They include government employees in the jails, fire department, and the public works. This union is headed by known and publicly identified Communists. It collaborates 100 percent with the ILWU in the fields of labor, politics, and communistic education.

It is common knowledge in Hawaii that both unions are completely communistic controlled.

The CIO expelled both the ILWU and the UPW in 1950 on the ground that they were Communist controlled.

We can fairly judge the control of the Communists over the ILWU and the adherence and the sympathy of the membership for the communistic cause by referring to the dock strike on June 19, 1953. Within an hour after the jury had convicted Jack Hall and his coconspirators, 24,000 members of the ILWU went on strike. These strikers even refused to load military cargo for Korea. The Navy-Army personnel had to take over the work of loading ships when the ILWU strike paralyzed the docks, sugar, and pineapple plantations.

This strike was not called because of any legitimate labor dispute. It was a strike to demonstrate the power and to attempt to intimidate our governmental processes.

This board contains newspaper accounts of this strike in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and in the Honolulu Advertiser. They are the leading newspapers in Hawaii.

The Honolulu Advertiser refers to this strike of June 19, 1953, in its editorial as "one of the ugliest demonstrations of bad citizenship on record. Their defiance of due process of trial by jury constitutes a direct threat to the maintenance of law and order."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin uses the following language in its editorial on June 22, 1953, in reference to the strike:

The other, of course, is the determination of the ILWU leaders to mold the thinking as well as the actions of its members. That determination has carried the ILWU to the extent of taking union workers off the job within hours after the jury of 12 good American citizens had given its honest verdict. But even the shock of anger does not justify this walk-off action, which is in effect a rebellion against the American jury system.

The outstanding local Hawaiian newspapers, the Star-Bulletin and the Advertiser, each of them indict and convict both the leadership and the 25,000 members of the ILWU of knowing, willful, communistic, and rebellious defiance of lawful authority.

This was not the first Communist sympathy strike by the ILWU. In August 1950, this same ILWU staged a strike to protest the jailing of Harry Bridges, its international president, in connection with his conviction for perjury arising out of communistic charges. A newspaper account of this strike is on the blackboard.

The Commission on Subversive Activities for the Territory of Hawaii is composed of 4 Republicans and 3 Democrats. It submitted its report of 2 years of investigation, containing 300 pages, to the Hawaiian Legislature on February 28, 1955. This is a copy of the report.

On page 218 of this report, this Commission had this to say about the UPW:

It is the considered opinion of this Commission that this control (referring to control of public workers by the Communist Party) UPW presents a potentially grave security problem in case of a national emergency, and that this problem has been intensified by the coalition of the Communist leadership of the UPW with the Communist leadership of the ILWU.

Now this Commission is composed of men who know conditions in Hawaii. They are the best informed authority on the subject of communism there. They are telling us, in plain language, that one of our most strategic outposts is honeycombed with traitors and saboteurs. They are serving notice that in event of war, these Communists could and would paralyze the island's public works and her economy, and pose a serious threat to our military operations.

Let us look into the propaganda and the educational apparatus of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

The Communists publish three different newspapers in Hawaii. One is an ILWU publication, another is the Honolulu Record, and the third is a Filipino language newspaper.

A copy of the Honolulu Record is on the board. Five of the convicted Communists are associated with this newspaper as owners, editors, or employees. Both the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Territorial Subversive Commission have branded this newspaper as part of the worldwide Communist propaganda apparatus.

All of its writers are Communists. The record of their communistic affiliations are contained on the board.

Since the conviction of the 5 persons associated with this newspaper, the anniversary edition has grown from 48 pages in 1952 to 72 pages in 1954. The advertisements in the paper increased from 2,137 ads in one issue in 1953, to 2,586 ads in the one comparable issue in 1954. Ninety-eight percent of these advertisers, these 2,500 people, must be regarded as part of the hard core of the communistic reserve forces in Hawaii.

The increasing public acceptance of this paper and the recognition of the political power of the Communist Party can be judged from these figures:

In the 1952 elections, 38 candidates for public office advertised in the Honolulu Record. In the 1954 elections, 62 candidates—in elections for 76 public offices—placed ads in this publicly known Communist newspaper.

As part of its communistic educational program, the ILWU in July 1954 established 16 book-lending libraries in Hawaii. Their books have been examined by the Commission on Subversive Activities and are found to be uniformly subversive. They teach the classic doctrine of class conflict and revolution. An example is a book which is entitled "Strike Strategy." It is a handbook on mass strike techniques which apply military theory to the conduct of labor disputes.

The paid educational director of the ILWU is an identified Communist. Within the last year this director engineered a very clever arrangement with the Library of Hawaii, a public governmental library. He has placed with the library a series of communistic films. They became available there for public use and propaganda. In return the library is storing and shipping them on schedules furnished by the ILWU, maintaining records, and repairing the films. Under this scheme the taxpayers pay for serving this communistic propaganda cutlet.

This same educational director systematically bombards the teachers of the public schools with communistic literature. He recommends books and propaganda courses to be taught to the children by the teachers.

Four radio stations are regularly scheduled every day to hammer the current Moscow propaganda line to the people of Hawaii. These radio broadcasts are made in the English, Filipino, and Japanese languages daily and systematically. The daily schedules are contained on the blackboard.

The Commission on Subversive Activities reports that the Communist Party spends $200,000 annually for propaganda purposes. It has succeeded in inculcating a whole generation of Hawaiian people with communistic doctrines.

Let us see how far the Communist Party has progressed in their political objectives. Jack Hall, the convicted Communist, coordinated and directed the union support for his candidates in the last election of November 1954. In 7 senate contests, the ILWU endorsed 6 candidates; 5 of the ILWU-endorsed candidates won. With the holdover senators, the ILWU-endorsed senators constitute a majority in the senate.

In the Territorial house of representatives, 22 ILWU candidates were elected out of a total membership of 30. In the county elections, 32 ILWU candidates won in 38 contests.

It is an accepted fact in Hawaii that the ILWU and the Communist Party not only influence but also dominate the Territorial legislature. Only 2 weeks ago, Newton Miyagi, an identified Communist ILWU leader, stated publicly that more than one-third of both houses of the legislature committed themselves to the ILWU and UPW communistic legislative programs.

On March 4, the New York Daily Mirror printed an article by one of its writers, Lee Mortimer, who was making a study of conditions there. He wrote, in reference to the Territorial legislature:

In its first few days, the Red dominated majority disclosed that its program would be:

1. To destroy the present police commission and turn the department over to the ILWU.
2. To exempt the ILWU property from taxes.
3. To invalidate leases and force the sale of properties to the tenants.
4. To repeal the 1950 dock seizure law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the dock seizure law was enacted to prevent a prolonged Communist dock strike which could starve out the island.

A copy of this article is on the board.

A copy of the April 6, 1955, issue of the Peoples Daily Worker, a Communist newspaper published in California, is on the board. It prints the account of the present of a gavel from Charles Kauhane, Speaker of the Hawaiian House of Representatives, to Harry Bridges, the ILWU president.

In March 1955, the Territorial legislature passed a bill to exempt the ILWU Memorial Association from real estate taxes. This association is a real estate holding company for the ILWU. It houses the headquarters and offices of the ILWU. Seven out of 10 of its incorporators are identified Communists.

On April 24, 1955, the Communist ILWU publicly threatened the Hawaiian Legislature with a mass retaliation strike on the island if the elected legislators did not keep their political promises to the ILWU.

Here is what Senator Dillingham said on the floor of the Senate on Saturday, April 23, 1955:

It's time the people woke up and found out what we are dealing with. The people should know that the only thing that stands between ourselves and chaos is the position of the governor. If he were subject to the same pressures of the ILWU, we would be closer to a satellite of the Soviet Union than a territory of the United States and I'm not kidding.

On the same day Senator Tsukiyama said this on the senate floor:

The thing that I'm alarmed about is the fact, that there is a sense of fear. When legislators seem to be afraid of any particular group, we are going to run into a very

precarious situation. I feel that in order to make good legislation, we must free ourselves from this sense of fear.

The fear that this senator was referring to is the same fear that exists behind the Iron Curtain. The fear of an organized merciless, cold conspiracy that would resort to physical, economic and any other measure to retaliate against those who oppose it.

Gentlemen, the last session of the Hawaiian Legislature was a Communist holiday. They passed bill after bill on the orders of the Communist ILWU. Yet, not one anti-Communist or anti-subversion bill was reported out of any committee.

By reason of years of systematic undermining and propaganda, the Communists have made themselves and their doctrines acceptable to the people of Hawaii.

If this measure is enacted Hawaii will become entitled to 2 Members in this House and 2 Members in our Senate. Who will be electd by th citizens of Hawaii to represent them in Congress? The answer is obvious. The Members will, in all probability, come from the present Territorial Legislature. They have the political background and the support of the ILWU. This prospect is not a happy one. This bill will guarantee giving Harry Bridges 2 seats in this House and 2 seats in the United States Senate.

Statehood at this time would only serve to deliver the Hawaiian State government to the Communist Party on a silver platter. It would grant state sovereignty and free that Territory from Federal restraint. It would clothe the Communist power with the protection of the United States Constitution. It would completely turn over to the Communist Party the police force, the educational system and the public works of the island.

Our defeat of this bill will serve notice to the people of Hawaii that this Congress will not countenance a Communist police state anywhere within our boundaries. It will, also, serve to give encouragement to the very many good, loyal Americans in Hawaii who, up to now, have been fighting a courageous but losing fight against communism on the islands. Or defeat of this measure may electrify and arouse the citizenry there to make a supreme effort to free that Territory once and for all from the Communist octopus.

The Hawaiian Commission report of February 1955, states:

> The principal barrier to the Communists' efforts to create a revolutionary situation in the islands and seize power, is the presence here of large military forces.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is giving a very fine, able, and earnest report. I know he has strong convictions on the Communist infiltration not only in Hawaii but in this country. I hold in my hand a FBI report of March 30, 1951, showing the total number of Communists in the United States—43,217 at that time. In New York State, there are 20,575—more than half the number of Communists in the United States. Then, in Hawaii, it shows that Hawaii had 36 at that time. Does the gentleman not feel the fact that Hawaii moved promptly to convict the seven known Communists might very well be very much in their favor?

Mr. PILLION. You cannot determine the power and the influence of Communists by numbers. For instance, in Russia, when Lenin took over from the Kerenski government, the Communists only had 80,000 adherents and only 23,000 party members and candidates, and probably only 2,000 top flight Communists, but they, too, over 140 million people.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What is the gentleman's own State doing about the 22,575 known Communists in the State of New York? Have they convicted anyone?

Mr. PILLION. I regret that there is one Communist in New York. They have paseed legislation there and they are trying to do what they can to clean out the educational system. But it is difficult to fight whether it is in New York or Hawaii except that the difference is that they do not control the political machinery and the government in New York anywhere near to the extent that they control it in Hawaii where seizure is imminent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman complained about the foreign language broadcasts in Hawaii. Does the gentleman realize that in New York City there are 409 broadcasts, 39 of them in different foreign languages.

Mr. PILLION. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are you doing anything about that?

Mr. PILLION. Doctor, we are not complaining here about foreign language broadcasts, but I am complaining about these foreign language broadcasts in Hawaii which are completely Communistic. I am not complaining about foreign language broadcasts. In fact, I think culturally, they are very fine.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Three of these New York Communists just the other day were ordered by the so-called International Court of Justice to be reinstated in the United Nations or be paid $43,000.

Mr. PILLION. That is a shameful situation.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know how the State of New York can get rid of these Communists as long as they are protected by the United Nations and subsidiary organizations.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. I regret that I was unable to be present in the Chamber during the earlier part of the gentleman's remarks because I was in committee. I wonder if the gentleman has called attention to the evidence which was produced before our committee that the Territory of Hawaii is under a three-man police commissionership, and that the Communists have infiltrated to such an extent that one of these three commissioners was a known Communist.

Mr. PILLION. On top of that, they are trying now to take the police power out the commission's hands and place them in the islands where they have complete communistic control. They do not have quite enough control on the main island and they are attempting to split it up so that they will have complete control of these counties.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Will the gentleman tell the Members what the editorial position of the two Hawaiian newspapers is on the question of statehood? I think the gentleman referred to the Honolulu Star Bulletin and the Record.

Mr. PILLION. I think they are both for statehood, as everyone else, because they recognize the increased political power that statehood would give those people—the sugar interests and all the other interests. Of course, the Federal Government is the biggest business in Hawaii.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Will the gentleman state where are the headquarters of the ILWU?

Mr. PILLION. It is in California.

Mr. UDALL. As a Member who sat with the gentleman on the committee which heard these hearings, I have been particularly disturbed by this presentation, because I think it creates a feeling of alarm, perhaps designedly so. The main conclusion of the gentleman is that there is a growing influence of communism in Hawaii?

Mr. PILLION. That is a fact.

Mr. UDALL. Is it not a fact that the only facts before our committee, determined by the Department of Justice, the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. WALTER and Mr. VELDE, people who ought to know, is that the influence of communism is declining?

Mr. PILLION. The greatest specialists are right there. You do not find out about communism on Waikiki Beach or in the fine hotels. You find it out in the planting fields and in the shops. The greatest experts are the gentlemen appointed by the territorial legislature who are intimately acquainted with the problem and who have presented a 300-page report saying that communism is on the increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has again expired.

Oil Industry's Contribution to Los Angeles Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I in-

clude the following press release of the Air Pollution Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif., of April 28, 1955:

HITCHCOCK PLACES AIR POLLUTION OF OIL INDUSTRY AT 18 PERCENT

Estimating the local oil industry's contribution to Los Angeles air pollution at 18 percent, Dr. Lauren B. Hitchcock, president of the Air Pollution Foundation, told a meeting of the American Petroleum Institute at the Statler Hotel Thursday night that the industry "still has a great deal to do before it can claim to have adequately discharged its responsibilities for air pollution."

The scientist addressed the 28th annual spring meeting of the Pacific coast district of the institute's division of production.

Hitchcock said the foundation calculations indicate that the oil industry currently is emitting 600 tons of significant pollutants into the air each day, or approximately 18 percent of a daily 3,300 tons total.

The balance of daily emissions is made up of about 45 percent by automobile, truck, and diesel operations; 20 percent by domestic use of natural gas and incinerator burning; 10 percent by miscellaneous industrial operations; and 7 percent by evaporation at service stations and gasoline losses in automobiles.

At the same time that Hitchcock announced the foundation's estimates of responsibility, he also gave the petroleum men a pat on the back.

"Your industry may have gotten off to a bad start a few years ago in connection with air pollution," he declared, "but today it is providing leadership in smog control which others in this community should match or shut up.

"In speaking thus forthrightly, I fully realize that I shall be condemned as an oil partisan by those few implacable of single-mindedness who do not give credit where credit is due. That is one of the hazards of my job, which I accept with a certain amount of equanimity, knowing I can do nothing about it.

"Fortunately I am strongly fortified by the knowledge that no strings whatever are attached to the Foundation's research efforts. Our findings have been, and in the future will be released without fear or favor or bias.

"The oil industry is an indispensable and major factor in the growth and existence of this country, in war and peace, and especially in the West. As far as its contribution to smog goes, it was originally indicted by an aroused public—with apparent reason, according to the county air pollution control district and Stanford Research Institute data—for contaminating Los Angeles air with over 1,300 tons per day of assorted hydrocarbons and stack gases. It has freely admitted its responsibilities in this connection, and reduced this total by more than half."

Not counting its eye-irritating smog, Los Angeles has as much actual dirt in the air as most American cities, and in addition the highest content of sulfates and nitrates among 30 cities in the Nation, Dr. Hitchcock told the oilmen.

"New measurements made during the past year by research workers of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department of the Federal Government indicate Chicago and Detroit have more air pollution than Los Angeles, and New York less," he said.

"Although clean air costs money, unclean air in Los Angeles well may cost more money. The extra costs of living and working in a polluted environment are still largely hidden. Noxious gases, dirt, and reduced visibility combine to form an unattractive environment in which man's welfare and productivity are undoubtedly reduced."

Picturing the Los Angeles smog problem from an engineering standpoint, Dr. Hitchcock said:

"Take a box 1,600 square miles in cross section, and 1 mile high. It holds 10 billion tons of air. Put 5 million people in it, with a couple of million chimneys, perhaps 10,000 assorted industrial stacks, 1½ million incinerators, and 2½ million motor vehicles.

"Burn in these combustion devices about 60,000 tons per day of fuel oil, gasoline, gas, and rubbish, and you've got an idea of the air-pollution situation in the Los Angeles Basin.

"In our high-school chemistry we were taught that these fuels consist largely of carbon and hydrogen, which burn to form harmless carbon dioxide and water. That this was an ideal far removed from practice, was not made clear. And it is exactly this difference between theory and fact that gives rise to man's modern urban air-pollution problem."

Dr. Hitchcock told the American Petroleum Institute delegates that it is up to the residents of the Los Angeles Basin how long it will take to eliminate smog.

"Every man, woman, and child in this Los Angeles Basin has on the average his box of air, one-fifth of an acre on the ground, and up to a mile high or less if the inversion is down. With a 1,000-foot inversion, our individual per capita share of air amounts to about 400 tons.

"Each factory, each homeowner, each business should look at his own box of air and resolve to reduce contamination in it to the best of its ability, taking full advantage of all existing knowledge and experience.

"So long as each of us waits for his neighbor, there can be no progress."

Calumet-Sag Channel Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby submitting a statement made by me in connection with the hearings asking for an appropriation to improve the Calumet-Sag Channel in the Chicago-northwest Indiana area.

The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Hon. FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, of the Appropriations Committee, have been holding hearings on this important question for several days.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT TO THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUBMITTED BY HON. RAY J. MADDEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT, INDIANA

THE CALUMET-SAG NAVIGATION PROJECT, ILLINOIS AND INDIANA

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend your subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for holding hearings in behalf of the Calumet-Sag Channel project, which when completed will aid the industrial development of the Chicago area and the industrial region in northwest Indiana.

I also wish to commend the Chicago area congressional delegation who, through their chairman, Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, is unanimously supporting the Calumet-Sag development.

In the last session of Congress, legislation was passed which inaugurated the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. This will be the beginning of the expansion of the Great Lakes waterway system from the Chicago area to the Mississippi River and on down to the Gulf of Mexico. United States Army engineers, through extended studies during recent years on the development of the Calumet-Sag waterway have estimated that inland shipping can be increased about 20 times the present capacity through deepening and widening this natural water transportation highway. The Chicago congressional delegation has amply outlined the benefits of this water transportation improvement to the Chicago area as well as advantages to Midwestern shipping in general.

The Calumet-Sag Channel project will also bring about tremendous industrial expansion to the Calumet region in northwestern Indiana, of which I have the honor to represent in Congress. This development would bring about the influx of industries in the Chicago-Calumet area. Industrial expansion can go in but one direction as far as the Chicago area is concerned. The residential section on the north side of Chicago, the lake on the east dictates that industry must go south along the Indiana shores of Lake Michigan, if water transportation expansion is made available. If the Chicago-Calumet area will take advantage of the increased water transportation which would be brought about by reason of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the next 25 years would give northwest Indiana an industrial metropolitan area extending from the Indiana-Illinois State line along the shores of Lake Michigan for a distance of 50 miles.

The development of water transportation inland through the Mississippi Valley, New Orleans and through the Gulf of Mexico will give the Calumet area immediate shipping facilities to Mexico, South America, and other world seaports.

If this development is carried out to its logical goal, it will be the main cause to bring about employment for thousands of families in the northwestern Indiana area. It would lower the cost of sugar from Louisiana and the West Indies, coffee from South and Central Americas, iron ore from Venezeula and Cuba, to the Chicago-Calumet region and also the numerous products we receive from our southern neighbors. It would reduce the cost of shipping grain and for transshipping to vessels from central States to the ports of the world. It would reduce the cost and expedite the shipment of steel and steel products from the mills and factories of our area into the great Middle West and South, and to the rest of the world through the Gulf of Mexico. Scrap iron could be brought more cheaper to the steel mills in the Calumet and Chicago areas and transported from our mills to world markets. Industries in the Calumet region would benefit from lower shipping costs. More new industries would be attracted by the availability of more industrial sites along the southern shores of Lake Michigan.

The development of the Calumet Sag Channel project would be merely a step forward in the modern 20th century campaign to provide employment for millions of young folks who will enter the labor market as time passes.

Another great reason for the necessity of this inland waterway development is the critical traffic situation which year by year becomes more critical in the Chicago-Calumet area. Water transportation out of this area to the South will eventually relieve our traffic problem to the extent of the construction of two large highway arteries in this congested area. An inland water highway from the Chicago-Calumet area would also prove to be a great asset and necessity in defense transportation in case of another world war. In addition to the facts that have already been presented by other witnesses before your committee, I submit that

this modest appropriation of $4 million to improve the Calumet Sag transportation arteries is but a necessary preliminary start for the great program which must be inaugurated by the people of the Midwest to take advantage of the tremendous influx of industry in the Chicago-Calumet area which is annually expanding far beyond our transportation facilities.

When the Congress, during the last session, approved the St. Lawrence Waterway, it inaugurated a new era in transportation which will affect every major industrial area located on the shores of our Great Lakes. The various metropolitan areas which would benefit by reason of the St. Lawrence project must immediately take steps to keep pace with this modern improved transportation trend. The ultimate effect will create a multiplication of our transportation problems and the time to lay the foundation to solve these future needs is now.

Agriculture Secretary Sees Halt in Farm Income Drop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert the following article written by Clif Stratton:

AGRICULTURE SECRETARY SEES HALT IN FARM INCOME DROP

(By Clif Stratton)

Today this observer has taken on a guest writer. Sometimes this is done because the columnist is lazy. Sometimes because the guest writer not only knows more about his subject, but can express it better. Should add also that your guest writer today in the opinion of this observer—and he has been covering Washington affairs 27 years—not only knows his subject, but has intellectual and moral integrity, and courage, and principles which he follows.

In other words, if Diogenes and his lantern in their combined search for an honest man had run into Ezra T. Benson, of Utah, Secretary of Agriculture, Diogenes could have thrown away his lantern. Or at least, kept it only for ordinary uses.

Secretary Benson told the House Committee on Agriculture the other day that, true, the farmer needs and is entitled to price supports, especially on those commodities which the Government has encouraged him to overproduce to meet war emergencies. But it is not helping the farmer, nor the country, to continue the war high-incentive prices to encourage continued and continuous overproduction.

And Benson's picture of the farmer and his overall position in the scheme of things is not as bad as it has been pictured by—well suppose we say by the "professional friends" of the farmer in the political field.

From here on it is Secretary Benson doing the talking:

The overall financial condition of agriculture has continued sound. Total estimated assets of $162 billion at the beginning of 1955 were slightly higher than a year earlier. Almost all of the increase is accounted for by a rise in the value of farm real estate.

On the liability side, farm debts showed only a slight increase in 1954. While farm-mortgage debt has been increasing steadily since 1946, influenced largely by the transfer of farms to new ownership, the level of mortgage debt at the beginning of 1955 was still low relative to the value of assets.

Non-real-estate indebtedness has increased sharply since the end of World War II, influenced by the large expansion in machinery investment, the higher level of livestock values, and the large value of crops under loan. At the beginning of 1955, however, non-real-estate debt was still less than 25 percent of the combined value of farmers' holdings of livestock, machinery, and motor vehicles.

FARM DEBT LOW

Farm debt on January 1, 1955, was only 10.6 percent of total agricultural assets. In 1940 farm debt was 18.6 percent of total assets, in 1930 it was 21.2 percent of assets. In terms of current assets the comparison is even more striking. Farm debt as a percent of current assets was 23.9 percent as of January 1, 1955, compared with 49.3 percent in 1940, and 70.4 percent in 1930.

We recognize, of course, and are deeply concerned, about the difficulties and debt problems being experienced by some groups of farmers, especially those who have begun farming recently with a heavy load of debt.

As indicated by the statistics, however, the overall farm-debt situation is good, and most farmers are in a favorable investment situation.

The slight changes that have occurred in the value of farm assets in recent years contrast strikingly with developments following World War I. Farmland values from their peak in 1920, decreased $12.3 billion, or nearly 20 percent in 2 years. Following World War II, farmland values declined only $3.4, billion or less than 4 percent, from their peak in January 1952 to January 1, 1955. With the sharp drop in farm income and in the values of both non-real-estate and real-estate assets following 1920, the burden of debt repayment for farmers was a difficult one. Country banks, particularly, felt this strain in the early twenties and later.

Today, the percentage of farms mortgaged is substantially lower than after World War I. With only a moderate drop in farm income, farmers are now making a good record in the repayment of their debts, both real estate and non-real estate.

A correct evaluation of the farm income situation obviously must take into consideration the total number of farm people sharing that income. While our net farm income was declining from 1947 to 1954 by some 25 percent, our farm population was falling off about 20 percent. And if account is taken of the income that farm people realize from all sources, the realized per capita income of farm people from all sources actually increased 6 percent during this 7-year period. It is also worth noting that realized per capita income from agriculture in 1954 was 17 percent higher than in 1950.

The inappropriateness of parity prices as a sole objective of farm programs is evidenced by this fact: Since 1910–14 farm prices have fallen 11 percent relative to nonfarm prices, but per capita net farm income has increased relative to per capita incomes of nonfarmers. Thus, since 1910–14 farmers have improved their net income position relative to nonfarmers. They did this by turning out greater volume, and by increasing their efficiency, and in spite of a relative decline in farm prices.

It is essential that we retain fluidity in our agricultural population. As we increase efficiency of our production of food and fiber, it is possible to do our production job with fewer workers on farms. This results in a higher standard of living for our farmers as well as for our urban people.

The present high state of efficiency on American farms is not because of price supports but largely because, historically, farmers have had a substantial degree of freedom in the management of their farms, and because the fruits of research and education have been made available to them.

On the basis of what we can now see ahead, net farm income for 1955 should approach that of 1954. In other words, the United States farm income has about stopped its postwar decline. Between 1947 and 1950 realized net farm income dropped by about one-fourth. The outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the resultant inflated demand brought about a rise in farm income in 1951, after that it declined again from 1952 through 1954.

Deepening of the Mystic River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the Mystic River to accommodate the growing commerce that utilizes that river and to provide resources for our national defense requires an immediate appropriation of $4,500,000.

I include as a part of my remarks the statement made by me before the House Appropriations Committee at the hearing held yesterday in connection with the matter.

It reads as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, I am TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the subcommittee for permitting me this privilege of making a brief statement relative to the Mystic River project.

I want to first state that I am vitally interested in this project because of its great value to my district, to the Port of Boston, to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and to our national defense.

The existing project, adopted in 1892 and supplemented by enactments in 1910, 1935, 1938, and 1950, provides for a channel 35 feet deep extending from the 35-foot channel of Boston Inner Harbor to the city playground at Charlestown, a channel 20 feet deep from the head of the 35-foot channel to a point 800 feet above the Malden Bridge with a turning basin above the bridge, a channel 6 feet deep from the Boston and Maine Railroad (western division) bridge to a point about 2,500 feet above Wellington Bridge, and thence 4 feet deep to Craddock Bridge.

All work on the existing project, with the exception of the 35-foot channel from Boston Harbor to the playgrounds at Charlestown, has been completed. The last work was done in 1938 when the section of the river between Island End River and the playground was dredged to 30 feet.

The dredging of the 35-foot channel, estimated to cost $4,500,000 is dependent upon the appropriation of funds as on May 17, 1950, Federal Law 516 authorized dredging the Mystic River from 30 feet to 35 feet at mean low water to within 100 feet of established United States bulkhead lines, generally from upper limit of 35 feet channel of Boston Harbor at Chelsea Bridge to the Charlestown playground and then narrowing to the downstream side of the Malden River. It was anticipated that this project

would be completed simultaneously with the construction of the new Mystic River bridge, which was built at a high level with added expense to our taxpayers so that vessels could come and go freely. However, deepening of the channel has not been done and shipping has not been able to capitalize on the benefit of the new high level bridge. Presently the inadequate depth of the river limits the passage of tankers and many seagoing vessels to a few hours each day at high tide.

I am sure you gentlemen will agree with me that this project is of vital importance to the waterborne commerce of the Port of Boston and the economic welfare of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. At the present time this portion of Boston Harbor has the greatest potential for development, depending, of course, on a deeper approach waterway. Most of the deep-draft vessels which ply within the area of the project cannot now safely navigate at all stages of the tide, and must wait the higher stages This results in costly delays to all concerned.

Since 1950 every effort has been made to have Congress appropriate the necessary funds for the accomplishment of this project, but to date these efforts have been unsuccessful. President Eisenhower's budget for fiscal year 1956 calls for an estimate of $500,000 to start the project. As I stated before the dredging of the 35-foot channel is estimated to cost $4,500,000. I appreciate very much that the President is interested in getting this project started but I sincerely feel that the President's estimate of $500,000 is inadequate. I think a larger appropriation should be granted because this is a major channel of one of our country's primary ports, and it is my understanding that almost without exception, all such channels in other harbors have been dredged to 35 feet, and many have 40-foot channels. The present channel limits the passage of tankers and many seagoing ships to a few hours each day during high tides. Deepening of the channel would allow the passage of seagoing ships under the new bridge on a 24-hour basis. And reduction in the cost of "terminalling" must eventually be reflected in New England economics. As you know, long-range ship construction contemplates ever-larger ships of greater drafts. At present tankers are built which cannot be accommodated at the docks of a major oil company which has its piers on the Mystic River. This refinery and terminal is an important factor in providing aviation gasoline, motor fuels, heating oils, and residual fuels to Everett, other cities surrounding Boston, and a major part of Massachusetts. In wartime, as the only large refinery in New England, its supplies are even more important.

Some of the industries located in Everett which are very essential to the national economy and national defense and which would benefit by completion of this project are: Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, Mystic Iron Co., Boston Edison Co., Esso Standard Oil Co., Monsanto Chemical Co., and General Electric Co.

In addition to Everett's industries, there are a large number of companies located on the Boston side of the Mystic River which would also benefit by the completion of this project. These include: Boston & Maine Railroad, Wiggins Terminal Co., United States Gypsum Co., Pocohontas Coal Co., and Revere Sugar (United Fruit Co.).

Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that by providing a channel of sufficient depth we will have greater opportunity for industry to employ our people, and this means more Federal tax revenue. If the funds are not appropriated for this project serious damage to the industry of the district will result. I respectfully urge the committee to report favorably legislation for an adequate amount that will enable this great improvement to be started at the earliest possible date.

Employment and Unemployment Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is vitally interested in the nature and volume of employment and unemployment. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has a Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, of which I am chairman, which has been urging the agencies in the executive branch of the Government to improve their concepts, their measures, and their information on employment and unemployment. Substantial progress has been made toward carrying out our recommendations in this respect. Much work is still in progress.

Mr. Speaker, I include a letter dated May 3, 1955, addressed to the Staff Director of the Joint Economic Committee from Raymond T. Bowman, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget for Statistical Standards. This letter outlines the steps that are currently being taken to improve employment and unemployment statistics:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

Mr. GROVER ENSLEY,
Staff Director of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report,
United States Senate Post Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENSLEY: You may find the following brief statement useful, following up the discussion in your office last Monday in which Miss Martin participated.

During the past year the Office of Statistical Standards has taken the following steps to improve employment and unemployment statistics:

1. Appointed and participated in the work of the Review of Concepts Committee.

(a) The committee is now drafting its recommendations covering changes in concepts, improvements in method, desirable tests, expansions of data or additional research which would make employment and unemployment statistics more useful in economic analysis.

(b) The recommendations are being reached after a survey of opinion of nongovernmental users of the data on needed improvements. The recommendations will require interagency discussion and approval before adoption.

(c) The Review of Concepts Committee reviewed proposals submitted by the Census Bureau for:

(1) Monthly information on voluntary and involuntary part-time workers (series will be started in may 1955).

(2) Employment status by marital status (as an approximation to employment status on heads of families).

2. Initiated the Combined Employment and Unemployment Release, and acted as chairman of the editorial committee which writes the Release each month.

3. Reopened discussion of seasonal adjustments of labor-force data in a subcommittee of the Labor Supply, Employment, and Unemployment Statistics Committee; encouraged developmental work on the part of several agencies. The Seasonal Adjustment Subcommittee approved the seasonally adjusted index of unemployment first published by the Census Bureau in January 1955.

4. Requested the Census Bureau to shift the Current Population Survey to the midmonth, for comparability with BLS and other establishment reports. This will be accomplished in July 1955.

5. Coordinated interagency review, on an ad hoc basis, of revisions in Current Population Survey estimates for 1953, during period of sample changeover.

These activities have been supplemented, of course, by our usual review of report forms, procedural improvements (Census reinterview techniques; BLS analysis of payroll periods, etc.), and our participation in program planning through the budget process.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND T. BOWMAN,
Assistant Director for Statistical Standards.

Mr. Speaker, soon after completion of these current studies, which are expected to be ready by late summer, the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics plans to hold hearings on the subject of employment and unemployment statistics.

Tribute to Andrew T. Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Joseph Silvestri in the Postal News which pays tribute to Andrew T. Walker, a fine old gent who has done more for the postal workers than anyone I know.

The occasion is the 75th birthday of Mr. Walker who was recently reelected as president of branch I of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks:

ANDREW T. WALKER

(By Joseph V. Silvestri, treasurer, branch 1)

No history of our time could be written relative to postal-employee legislation and of its congressional enactment into law without devoting a generous page to the half century of dedicated service by Andrew T. Walker. Andy, as a member and officer of branch I and then right up to the presidency of the association, has become through the years an outstanding symbol of what Unapocism stands for in the betterment of conditions for postal men and women.

However my purpose today in writing this tribute to Andy is that he is 75 years young on April 18, 1955, and that he is still contributing to the growth and well-being of our organization which is the oldest postal clerk association in the Nation. For other 35 years I have had the pleasure of knowing Andy intimately. I know him as a room companion on our many organization trips to various parts of the country; it was, and still is, and I know will be for some time, a pleasure to work with him as a team at these conventions. It is an experience to plan jointly and endeavor in behalf of a desirable resolution or against a motion on the floor of State and National conventions with Andy. I have often witnessed him in the midst of a very serious argumentative exchange but whatever the subject, or difference of opinion it was refreshing to note

that he was always the gentleman. If I were asked what his two most outstanding characteristics are I believe I would have to say they are his generous impulses and the friendship that he held for those with whom he labored in the association and those that he knows. We are at this very moment in the midst of the toughest legislative campaigns we have ever experienced. The pace getting rougher with each passing legislative maneuver. During our appearances in Washington we always find Andy out in front in the thickest of the fight. That is how it is in the 1st session and will be again in the 2d session of the 84th Congress on other bills.

With all of his energies committed to the problems at hand, he manages from time to time to devote some time to his two helpmates, his charming wife, Belle, and daughter, Edna. Sometime ago Mrs. Walker suffered a stroke which confined her to bed for some time but her courage and constant smiling personality has contributed to her improvement. It has been a sacrifice on the part of thes two ladies to give up for many evenings the companionship of husband and father.

Throughout his entire life, Andy has and still is dedicating himself to serving Unapovism and his fellow men. Through his untiring efforts I believe it can be truly said by all who have been in contact with him that their lives have been enriched by his personality, ideals, and friendliness. His constant willing hand to aid another, regardless of race, color, or creed well earns for him the title he has borne so well for many years, Mr. Unapoc.

May you celebrate this 75th birthday Andy with the good wishes of thousands of your friends from coast to coast and may you be with us to accept felicitations on your 100th birthday.

Foreign Service of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks about the Foreign Service and its role in our foreign affairs, in view of the amendment recently passed to the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

Although there are about 100,000 American civilians employed by our Government overseas, the Foreign Service is the only career service operating abroad. All the other Americans overseas are engaged in some kind of program activities, such as building bases, operating technical-assistance programs, and other relatively short-time activities. This fact, in itself, places the Foreign Service in a unique category. It is a profession of lifetime service abroad. As such, it requires people with training, integrity, and a sensitivity to human values and problems. Wherever they serve, the Foreign Service represents our people and our Government. They must possess those qualities that we as a people hold in the highest esteem and be able to impart them to peoples of different backgrounds. It was for that reason that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in 1946, laid emphasis upon a career concept. We expected that young men and women would enter the Service only after a rigorous examination and make it a lifetime pursuit.

I have been increasingly disturbed by the misrepresentations of life and work in the Foreign Service. Much of this misrepresentation has come from individuals who should know better or, at least, could have determined the facts rather easily. I am not defending those Foreign Service officers who may have departed from the high standards expected of them. The fact that there were some who did not measure up to expectations is no reason to condemn a whole group who are engaged in a vital activity for our Government. Contrary to popular belief, few of our Foreign Service officers find life glamorous. More frequently it is marked by hardships, personal sacrifice, and even dangers to their health and that of their families.

One requirement of a Foreign Service officer and, equally important, his family's adaptability to changed and changing environments. His "home" is never fixed. It changes every 2 or 3 years. He may move from Hungary to Indonesia to Brazil. Perhaps there is "romance" in this type of life. But there are more apt to be some hard problems. Take the simple matter of making daily food purchases. In a number of our posts abroad this constitutes almost a full-time operation. What about the education of the children? If they go to local schools, they must know the local language. If they are to receive an education in the English language, they must frequently be sent away to school. Certainly the content of education must be carefully considered. We do not want our children living behind the Iron Curtain to study Communist doctrine. I cite these two examples simply to show that a normal family life in the Foreign Service is difficult, if not impossible. The fact that individuals voluntarily enter the Foreign Service and stay in it is an indication that our Government does have devoted and loyal public servants abroad.

Many of the problems that beset the Foreign Service are inherent in the nature of work overseas. Legislation cannot correct that. But the Congress does have a responsibility to assure, in the words of Mr. Loy Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, of the Department of State, that the satisfaction of public service is not dimmed by undue personal financial worries.

This is particularly true when it is remembered that we not only want to recruit the best of American youth but, more important, keep him in the Service. Mr. Henderson put it this way:

> If it (the Foreign Service) is successfully to compete with private enterprise or with other governmental agencies for the highest types of American youth it must be in a position to assure those who enter it unparalleled opportunities for public service. A career in the Foreign Service by its very character entails certain sacrifices. There is no place in it for those who are looking for a soft life. Much can be done, nevertheless, to alleviate the hardships inherent in it.

At this point I want to pay tribute to Mr. Henderson. If there is one thing that the Foreign Service needs, it is an understanding and experienced administrator of its personnel. Mr. Henderson has more than 30 years of service over the world. Most recently he was our ambassador in India and then in Iran—both critical posts. He has filled every assignment with distinction. I know his colleagues in the Foreign Service and in the Department have the utmost confidence in his integrity and ability. Members of both parties in this body have expressed a similar confidence in him. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported to this House that it "is confident that he will administer wisely and effectively the provisions contained in the Foreign Service Act." That is my personal view too.

When this bill was before our committee, I was interested to learn that private American firms operating overseas branches gave more attention to inducements to retain employees overseas than in recruiting them for such service. I believe that the amendments that we recently passed to the Foreign Service Act will serve the same purpose. Those amendments do not increase the pay of the Foreign Service officers. But they do take account of the heavy extra costs that have to be met in serving abroad. They compensate in part for some of these expenses.

This new law is not, of course, the answer to all the problems of the Foreign Service. But it is a step in the right direction. I hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will keep under review the operations of the Foreign Service with a view to its continued improvement.

Aaron Frank: Distinguished Citizen and Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I this morning learned of the passing of a great public servant, a teacher, a brilliant lawyer, and a distinguished citizen of the State of New York. Prof. Aaron Frank died in his sleep on May 10, 1955. His passing will be noted with sorrow by the political and the legal fraternities as well as the philanthropic community in the city of New York.

Aaron Frank served with distinction as deputy police commissioner for many years. He was respected and honored for his brilliance, his integrity, and his kindly understanding by everyone of the thousands of policemen who were members of the Department. His legal attainments were widely recognized and respected, both in the field of teaching and the practice of law. He was professor of law at the New York Law School, who endeared himself to all of his pupils through the years. His ability as a lawyer's lawyer was recognized by the bar as well as the bench. He was active in

the field of philanthropy and served as chairman of the metropolitan New York advisory board of the antidefamation league of B'nai B'rith.

Above all, he was indeed as reported in the New York Times this morning, both "soft spoken and kindly," with a "reputation for fairness and compassion."

I know that I speak for literally thousands of grieving citizens in the city of New York when I extend heartfelt condolences to his wife, Mrs. Estelle Frank, his son, Julian, his daughter, Barbara, and his father, Philip.

The Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I wish to protest the apparent efforts of Director Oveta Culp Hobby and Dr. Leonard A. Scheele to delay and perhaps avoid committee questioning on the safety factor and the Public Health Department control of the Salk vaccine.

Except for the review of the so-called protocol on the drugs and tests on partial supplies of the vaccine, the Department of Health obviously did not extensively analyze the vaccine prior to approval and release for public use. The Department relied almost completely on the tests of the private producers. In failing to conduct tests on all vaccines prior to public approval and dissemination, the Department failed to do what it had the authority and the duty to do, particularly in view of the mass innoculations which were planned. In seeking to test all vaccines at this late hour, the Department is hopeful to repair the dike and control the damage already done.

There can be no voluntary control by the individual States. The American public in all of its promotional hysteria still relies on the stamp of approval of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health. The State and local authorities rely upon the advice and the counsel of the Federal authorities—and if the Federal authorities have failed to act or if they have acted irresponsibly, this confidence in the Department of Public Health may have been misplaced. If the Secretary of Health was hasty in licensing, she should be held to account. If the Department has taken this matter too lightly, its attitude should be explained.

It is a congressional function and duty to determine the extent and effectiveness of the Federal testing of biologicals before they are distributed on public markets. Certainly prior to a mass innoculation, it is the duty of the Department of Health to conduct its independent tests to determine the safety of the vaccine rather than rely solely upon the tests of the independent producers. In the production of defense material, the Government never relied fully upon the producer's warranty but always conducted its own testing process. This same principle must apply to the fight against disease.

The American public had a right to assume that the vaccine administered to their children in a mass innoculation was 100 percent safe. If the degree of safety in the use of the vaccine was any less, they should have been so advised. They took the Department of Health's approval to mean the vaccine was safe. If the American public has a misconception of the Public Health Department's functions on these points, it should be so advised. If the laws relating to biological control should be redefined, a congressional committee hearing is the place to begin. If the Department of Health is commencing at this late hour to check into the safety factor of a vaccine which it has already approved, the public has a right to know that.

Statements after statements are pouring out to the public from the Department of Health. No satisfactory explanation is given for reversals. The officials seem to prefer the security of making news releases rather than expose their statements to committee scrutiny and cross-examination. It looks like a coverup for possible public dereliction.

If the Secretary of Health can take the time to tell political gatherings of the developments in this matter and if the Surgeon General can take the time to participate on Ed Murrow's TV program, they should both be available for immediate congressional interrogation. Congress should not be compelled to get its answers second-hand.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, there are two prime consequences of this bill which deserve our serious attention.

The first result of the enactment of this bill would be the transfer to Hawaii and Alaska of an excessive and disproportionate power in the United States Senate at the expense of the people of the 48 States.

The second effect of this bill is that we will be giving aid and encouragement to the strongest, most militant, and best disciplined single organization in Hawaii, the Communist Party.

Reduced to its fundamentals, statehood would grant to Hawaii and Alaska 4 Senate seats out of a prospective 100 seats in the United States Senate. The 1950 census states the population of Hawaii to be 499,000 and that of Alaska 128,000. The combined population is 628,000. The average representation will be 1 Senator for each 157,000 inhabitants. The people of the 48 States, on the other hand, only possess the average representation of 1 Senator for each 1,589,000 persons.

Statehood will entitle Hawaii and Alaska one twenty-fifth of the total membership in our United States Senate. Yet their combined population is only one two-hundred-and-forty-second of the United States. Thus, the inhabitants of Hawaii and Alaska will enjoy representation in the United States Senate more than 10 times greater than the average representation of the people of the 48 States.

To equal the voting power of 1 voter of these Territories in the election of a United States Senator will require the votes of 33 voters in California, 6 voters in Connecticut, 27 voters in Illinois, 15 voters in New Jersey, and 11 voters in Missouri.

This excessive representation is acquired by these Territories only by the corresponding reduction of the powers of the people of the 48 States.

The disproportionate advantage of Hawaii and Alaska would also apply in the presidential elections. Upon admission these States would have a total of 7 electoral votes, an average of 1 vote for each 89,000 residents. This compares with 1 electoral vote in the 48 States for each 287,000 citizens. The average voting power will be 3.2 times greater for every voter in Hawaii and Alaska than in the 48 States.

To equal the voting power of 1 voter in these Territories, in the election of a President, will require the votes of 3 voters in Alabama, 3½ voters in Indiana, 3½ voters in Michigan, 3 voters in Wisconsin, and 3 voters in Oklahoma.

Again, this power can be transferred, only by the reduction of the voting rights of the citizens of the 48 States.

If Consumers' Purchasing Power Does Not Keep Pace With Production, Boom Will Come to Quick and Disastrous End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks I call attention to a remarkable final paragraph in a column by Carroll Kilpatrick in the Washington Post and Times Herald. This paragraph, after the column reviews the economic progress of America, says that the one "great problem now is to make sure that consumers have the income to purchase goods the factories can produce. If pur-

chasing power does not keep pace the boom will come to a quick and disastrous end."

Mr. Speaker, we heard a good deal about fiscal irresponsibility when the Democrats in this House passed a tax measure that would have bolstered purchasing power among the great bulk of families in the low-income and middle-income brackets.

Now we hear soft and tinkling suggestions from spokesmen of the administration that next year maybe—an election year—it might be just possible for us to have some tax cuts.

The businessmen with whom the administration spokesmen foregather seem to have little interest, however, in tax cuts to bolster purchasing power among the bulk of families. They want tax cuts for themselves—tax cuts giving the cream of the relief to those who already have most of the luxuries as well as the necessaries of life.

We are going to have a fight about tax cutting next year, obviously, and some of us are going to feel that the cuts should be applied one way, others will feel they should be applied another.

To me it is the height of fiscal responsibility to say that continued prosperity depends on spreading purchasing power, that relief should go to those to whom $100 saved in taxes means $100 more to be spent from a modest sum on food, shelter, clothing, education, and health.

Our factories are marvels of productive efficiency, but they will grind to a limping pace unless the consuming power of ordinary millions of Americans is steadily broadened.

I offer for the RECORD the entire column which I mentioned, and call particular attention again to its final paragraph:

UNITED STATES AT NEW STAGE IN WEALTH PRODUCTION

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

A big book of more than 1,100 pages weighing as much as the Federal budget came out last week with the conclusion that this great bastion of capitalism has drawn nearer the socialist goal of abundance for all in a classless society than any other country. In the last quarter century we have experienced a fantastic increase in the capacity to produce and a significant trend toward equalization of living standards.

Millions of Americans now in middle life have seen a greater change in the patterns of life and material standards of living than all the previous centuries of Western civilization, according to the book, America's Needs and Resources, published by the Twentieth Century Fund under the direction of J. Frederic Dewhurst.

The volume is full of tables on industrial production and capacity and on the problems of an expanding population and rapidly developing technology. It says that technology is our primary resource. For example, the same labor force in 1939 could mine 47 percent more coal than it could in 1929. And every ton of coal we burn for power today yields about six times as much energy as it would have in 1900.

More astounding is the fact that in 1939 the same number of persons employed with the same degree of utilization of equipment could have produced 22 percent more goods than in 1929. In 1900, an average farm worker produced enough for himself and 7 others whereas now he produces enough for himself and 14 others.

Yet in all these years of high production except the war years nearly every industry has operated below capacity. Even in 1929 only the steel and machine tool industries were producing at near capacity; the transportation industry in that boom year could have doubled the tonnage it carried. Without much effort the automobile industry today could double or even triple its output of cars and trucks.

These figures help us to understand the significance of the big news from the steel industry. Eugene G. Grace, chairman of Bethlehem Steel, announced that his company would have to add 8 million tons of capacity in the next decade merely to hold its position in the industry.

Benjamin F. Fairless, retiring chairman of United States Steel, announced that "if our corporation is to continue to hold its present position of leadership in the industry, at the peak of the prospective demand, we shall have to create the equivalent of 1 new Fairless Works about every 2 years throughout the next 2 decades." That would mean adding 1.1 million tons of ingot capacity every 2 years.

Contrast those optimistic statements with the gloomy report of a United States Steel official in 1946, who then predicted that in the long run the industry would operate at about two-thirds of capacity. The next year the president of another large steel company told a Senate committee that the demand for steel in 1955 would be about 78 million tons.

Actually, the demand this year will be about 40 million tons more than he predicted. If his prediction had come true we would have at least three times as many unemployed as we have today. Steel is a basic commodity that provides in its production index an excellent barometer of business conditions.

If the industry should fall much behind in meeting its orders it would itself generate stoppages in other industries and cause serious unemployment. Mr. Fairless reported that in recent months the demand for steel had exceeded capacity by a "considerable percentage." This is not a healthy situation although the backlog of orders is not yet seriously retarding any other industry. But if the steel industry failed to expand it soon would drag American business down into a new depression.

The greatest increase in basic producing capacity has taken place in the last decade. Hence, the social and economic problems that the new technology produces are now on our doorstep to a larger extent than ever before. Capacity in basic manufacturing industries increased at an average rate of 3.9 percent in the prosperous twenties, 1.8 percent in the depressed thirties, and 9 percent in the spectacular forties. Except in steel and 1 or 2 other industries there is no longer any impressive shortage of producing capacity; there is adequate capacity or the means for building it.

The great problem now is to make sure that consumers have the income to purchase goods the factories can produce in ever-expanding amounts. If purchasing power does not keep pace the boom will come to a quick and disastrous end.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body a resolution adopted just recently by the City Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would increase the minimum wage standards in industries now covered to $1.25 per hour.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am particularly interested in seeing that early action may be taken thereon. As in the past, I shall continue to urge that hearings be held on this proposal as promptly as possible, in order that this House may be in a position to act on this vital legislation before the end of the current session.

It is my sincere hope that the following resolution will merit thorough consideration from the membership of this body:

Resolution on higher legal minimum wage

Whereas the national minimum wage is meant to provide a minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers; and

Whereas the national minimum wage should protect the employer who pays a living wage against substandard wage competition; and

Whereas the national minimum wage should discourage employers from leaving decent wage areas to seek cheap labor in substandard wage areas; and

Whereas an adequate national minimum wage is essential to local merchants to maintain their local market and to farmers to maintain and bolster a strong market for agricultural commodities; and

Whereas an adequate national minimum wage is essential to local governments to prevent "run-away" industries, localized unemployment and mounting relief rolls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Milwaukee in the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to increase the national minimum wage in industries now covered to $1.25 per hour; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY and to Congressmen CLEMENT ZABLOCKI and HENRY REUSS.

Barron County REA Opposes Hoover Task Force Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a resolution sent to me by the Barron County Electric Cooperative. The resolution states clearly the cooperative's opposition to certain proposals made by a Hoover Commission task force with respect to REA.

I am in full agreement with the sentiments expressed in the resolution, the full text of which follows:

Whereas the study of the task force report to the Hoover Commission on lending agencies and particularly the part that concerns the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural electric cooperatives has been carefully studied. This study indicates that there is an antagonistic feeling in this report

toward the REA program and the recommendations made appear to be designed to retard growth of the rural electric cooperatives which could result in them being crippled to the extent that they could not operate efficiently and might eventually result in their failure; and

Whereas when one looks over the history of the program tremendous good has resulted from it, and the benefits which have been brought to the rural people and to the Nation are far beyond any dollar value that could be put on it. Private utilities had the opportunity to serve as large an area and as many people as they desired, but were interested only in urban service and a few residential areas that could be easily served with the greatest possible return from their investment. The REA cooperatives have only brought service to areas which did not have central station service and up to the date of their origin could not get electric service without paying exorbitant construction costs. Many of the cooperatives have in their system marginal areas which can only be served through long term loans and low interest rates; and

Whereas the use of electric service in the rural area has gone far beyond the most optimistic estimates, and that the investment in additional facilities to maintain service are going to need additional loans to increase capacities and that having the funds available at moderate interest costs is going to be very necessary to the success of the REA cooperatives; and

Whereas we understand that to date the cost of money to the Government has been less than the 2 percent being paid by the cooperatives, and these earnings have very nearly taken care of the cost of the administration: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Barron County Electric Cooperative, That we respectfully petition our two United States Senators and our Congressman to do everything in their power to prevent any action taken by Congress which might be detrimental to the present rural electrification program; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be made part of the minutes of the board of directors meeting of April 13, 1955.

BARRON COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
WILLIS JEROME, *President.*

Research Can Open Doors to Wider Farm Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent article entitled "Incentives and Surpluses—A New Approach," by Dr. K. Starr Chester, vice president and chairman, research committee, National Farm Chemurgic Council. This article suggests a new approach in the way of encouraging increased use of agricultural commodities for industrial purposes. It seems to me that the incentive approach as suggested by Dr. Chester should be given consideration at this time when we are confronted with serious surplus problems in agriculture.

I include also an editorial from the May issue of Better Farming entitled "Research Can Open Doors to Wider Farm Markets." This article comments upon and endorses Dr. Chester's program.

INCENTIVES AND SURPLUSES—A NEW APPROACH

(By K. Starr Chester, vice president, and chairman, research committee, National Farm Chemurgic Council)

There is a growing trend for industry to use substitute raw materials for the agricultural raw materials formerly used. As a few examples of this:

Butanol and acetone, basic industrial chemicals, were formerly made from corn. Today the plants that made these chemicals from corn are idle, and the chemicals are being manufactured from petroleum or natural gas.

Glycerol, another basic industrial chemical, was formerly made from tallow, and to some extent from cottonseed oil and soybean oil. Now synthetic glycerol is dominating the market.

There is an extensive market for proteins in paper coatings. Either soybean protein or casein from milk can be used for this. This market is supplied with casein purchased from Argentina, which is cheaper than either domestic casein or soy protein.

Furfural, which could have a major outlet in nylon manufacture, is made from grain residues, the use of which aids the economics of grain marketing. Yet cyclohexane from petroleum is used to great extent, rather than furfural in nylon manufacture.

Synthetic raw materials are replacing linseed oil in the drying-oil field, in numerous applications.

Synthetic textiles are supplanting cotton for a number of uses including tire cords, carpeting, window curtains, and shower curtains as well as clothing.

Alpha cellulose is now being made of wood pulp instead of cotton linters, as formerly.

Synthetic detergents are replacing soaps which are made from natural oils and fats.

Carboxymethylcellulose, which in part has its origin in petroleum, is replacing starch as a thickening agent.

The reasons for this shift away from agricultural raw materials are chiefly economic ones, which might be overcome if industry had incentives to use the agricultural raw materials. Synthetic raw materials are used because they are cheaper to buy and use, and are in constant supply at relatively constant cost from year to year. In some cases, they are more uniform and of higher quality, but these advantages generally have less significance than cost and supply.

A great many agricultural raw materials are at a disadvantage because their cost is abnormally high; they have priced themselves out of the industrial market. Industry has no prejudice against agricultural raw materials; it simply cannot afford to use them. There is no lack of technology for producing industrial products based on such agricultural raw materials. In the files of the Department of Agriculture, of industry, and of the Patent Office are many hundreds of processes for converting the surplus farm commodities into industrial products. These processes are scientifically sound, practical, and workable, but they lie gathering dust because their economics are not favorable. There is no economic incentive to use them.

A leading industrial user of grain has put it this way: "There is no surplus. There is only lack of incentives for industry to use the farm products that have piled up."

There is well-established precedent for providing industry with incentives in situations comparable to this. This principle is not new. There are many precedents for Government to provide industry with incentives; (1) in emergencies, (2) when it is to the national interest, or (3) when the needed industrial activity involves risk.

1. In wartime, the need for military materiel is an emergency. At such times, Government provides industry with incentives to convert to military manufacture, in the form of cost-plus contracts and quick depreciation of capital investment. The agricultural surplus problem is an emergency. It contains the seeds of civil unrest, or antagonism against the farmer on the part of the nonagricultural population, and antagonism by the farmer against controls.

2. When it is in the national interest, Government provides incentives for industry to expand or divert production. An example, at present, is the incentive being offered to industry to increase the production of ammonia, which is vital to the national economy, the incentives taking the form of fast depreciation of capital investment and Government loans. It is certainly in the national interest to work down the surpluses, considering their drain both on public funds and on the temper of the public.

3. There is also precedent for Government to provide incentives to industry when the desired undertaking involves risk. Drilling for oil necessitates a high factor of risk taking and was made sufficiently attractive to private investment by Government's granting concession to the petroleum industry through liberal depletion deductions for tax purposes. Similar depletion deductions of varying percentages are applicable to production of most minerals, and the recently revised revenue bill has given healthy boosts to many of these depletion-deduction incentives. Industries based on surplus commodities also involve risk. The excessive supply of farm products will not last indefinitely, nor will their price remain constant. Industry is loath to erect plants for processing farm commodities with the knowledge that they may become unprofitable if the supply of raw material decreases or if its price becomes too high.

To ask industry to make greater use of the surpluses, which it is able to do technologically but not economically, is to ask industry to undertake operations that are economically hazardous, yet are in the national interest, and, indeed, are in the nature of an emergency. The precedents for providing industry with economic incentives, in such cases, are well established.

Incentives for industry to make greater use of the surplus commodities might take several forms. These include tax relief for operations based on the surplus products, rapid amortization of capital investment in cases where new plant or unamortized plant is required, or purchase of the surplus raw materials at less than the supported market price. All three, and possibly others, should be considered. All three forms of incentives involve complex and controversial factors that must be carefully analyzed and appraised.

Certain problems in applying incentives are recognized and would have to be worked out. It would have to be shown that this procedure would, indeed, substantially reduce the surpluses, and that the cost of doing this would be justified in light of present costs relative to the surpluses. If the incentives include any tax abatement, this might have to clear through Congress. It must be assured that if incentives are given to the chemurgic industries, this will not have a vital unfavorable effect on other industries that are significant to the national economy. Charges of partiality to certain industries must be avoided. Decisions would have to be made respecting the duration of this aid to the chemurgic industries. Questions on which further information must be secured before decision can be reached in this matter, are mentioned in the following section.

It is desirable that a thorough economic and technological study be made of the feasibility of relieving the surplus problem through providing such incentives to industry. This study should point out the industrial processes in which surplus agricultural commodities could be used to greater extent than at present, provided the economics were more favorable, and the extent to which this would relieve the surplus problem. The nature and amount of incentives that could stimulate such utilization must be determined. The cost of these must be calculated, and compared with existing costs related to the surplus problem. The study should consider the impact which such a shift in raw materials would have on other industries, and its economic and social consequences. It should include analysis of existing legislation and point out such amendments of legislation as would be necessary to permit the exercise of this principle. The best possible analysis would have to be made respecting the probable duration of this aid to industry, action to be taken if and when there no longer are huge surpluses, and, in the latter case, the question whether the stimulated industries would then convert to use of other raw materials or work out methods for maintaining their supply of farm raw materials, perhaps by contracting in advance for the production from given acreages, as is now done by canners.

The study would involve frank consultation with numerous industrial concerns to obtain a realistic picture of what they may be able to do in increasing the use of farm raw materials in a more favorable economic environment. It would also require a review of accomplished research, including that done by the Division of Utilization Research of the USDA, to bring to light processes based on farm raw materials that are not being exploited because of unfavorable economics. Such an undertaking as the suggested analysis would be new and would not be encompassed within past or present economic research programs.

The research committee of the National Farm Chemurgic Council urges that those branches of government that are most vitally concerned with the surplus problem give serious consideration to thoroughly investigating this suggested new approach for dealing with the problem.

RESEARCH CAN OPEN DOORS TO WIDER FARM MARKETS

The greatest need of farming is for more markets. This is the substance of numerous thoughtful letters from farmers received by Better Farming. The point was well summed up by a Mart, Tex., farm woman, who wrote:

"We on the farms in these United States can produce efficiently and abundantly—we have proved that. From the standpoint of supply there is little to complain about. But supply alone will solve nothing. The door must be opened to wider markets if we are to have a stable and solvent agriculture and a steady consumer demand."

Where are the wider markets to be found? Farmers, who have seen the tremendous gains in production caused by research, ask why a comparable emphasis has not been put on research to develop new uses and markets for farm products. This kind of research hasn't got much attention and, judging by USDA appropriations, it isn't going to soon.

But that isn't the only place to look for it. A different approach has been suggested by Dr. K. Starr Chester, of the Battelle Memorial Institute, of Columbus, Ohio, one of the leading private research institutions. It is by providing industry with the necessary incentives to undertake the job of developing new uses and wider markets for farm products, particularly those in surplus. Dr. Chester feels that such incentives would be justified on the basis that the farm-surplus problem is an emergency, that it is in the national interest that these surpluses be used and that industry can be induced in this way to assume the economic risks that are involved.

A number of such incentives, in familiar use, could be offered. Among them are Government loans, tax concessions, rapid amortization of capital investment and a liberal depletion allowance such as the oil industry enjoys.

Certainly there seems as much warrant for using these incentives in behalf of agriculture as in the other cases. The packing industry, with 140 different byproducts from the livestock it buys, has demonstrated what can be done by research. Better Farming believes that a positive research program along these lines is well worth consideration in Washington.

Resolution Memorializing the President and Congress To Issue Commemorative Postage Stamps in Honor of the Golden Anniversary of the State of Oklahoma's Admission to the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following Resolution No. 531, as passed by the Oklahoma State Legislature on April 7, 1955, with which I thoroughly concur:

House Concurrent Resolution 531

House concurrent resolution memoralizing the President and Congress of the United States to issue special commemorative postage stamps in honor of the golden anniversary of the State of Oklahoma's admission into the Union

Whereas the great State of Oklahoma will celebrate the Golden Anniversary of her admission to the Union in 1957; and

Whereas the United States Post Office has in the past recognized such an event by issuing special commemorative postage stamps in honor of such statehood anniversaries; and

Whereas such recognition will be greatly appreciated and highly regarded by the people of the State of Oklahoma: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 25th Oklahoma legislature (the Honorable Senate concurring herein, That the President and Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take the necessary steps to authorize the United States Post Office Department to issue commemorative postage stamps during the year 1957, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the admission of the State of Oklahoma into the Union; be it further

Resolved, That authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Oklahoma congressional delegation in Washington, D. C.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 7th day of April, 1955.

B. E. HARKEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 12th day of April, 1955.

PINK WILLIAMS,
President of the Senate.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. ELIZABETH P. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Delegate from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON] is recognized.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for 57 years the issue of statehood for Hawaii has been before the Congress of the United States in some form or other. For 35 years, during my entire adult life, I have been closely associated with the fight for statehood. Today I find myself, as the duly elected spokesman for the people of Hawaii, facing my colleagues in a debate upon this issue. I make no apology for the fact that I am a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, that this is my first experience in debate on the floor of this distinguished body. I hope that my mind, rather than my heart that is deeply involved, will control what I have to say today.

A bill for Hawaiian statehood has passed the House of Representatives three times; in the 80th, the 81st, and the 83d Congresses. Today there would be no necessity for me to repeat the many arguments supporting it except for the benefit of the new Members of the 84th Congress; and that is important. The overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives today, I believe, are in favor of Hawaiian statehood. But the problem confronting both Alaska and Hawaii is a joint bill that was reported out of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Hawaii owes that committee a great debt of gratitude.

Then the bill went to the Rules Committee. At this point I would like to thank the members of the Rules Committee and particularly the chairman for the consideration of the measure. In spite of the opposition of a majority of the members they listened patiently over a period of three weeks to the arguments presented by the friends and foes of statehood. At the conclusion of these hearings, in spite of the objections of every Member who appeared before the committee, whether he was for or against the issue of statehood, the Rules Committee voted a closed rule. The friends of statehood asked for an open rule or no rule at all. The foes of statehood asked for no rule.

Despite these protestations, the Rules Committee voted a closed rule, which the House has now adopted, so we are faced with a very unusual parliamentary procedure established for consideration of H. R. 2535.

Time and again in the hearings before the Rules Committee we were reminded

that one of the most solemn, irrevocable, and nonrecallable actions which our parliamentary body could perform is that which enables a United States Territory to achieve its full maturity by becoming a State. I agree that this is so, as do all my colleagues.

But now that the closed rule has been adopted, and I am glad that it has been under the circumstances, this body is called upon to perform its duties under the most restrictive and narrowest procedure it is possible for the Rules Committee to establish.

Never in the history of this Government has a new State been taken into the Union without the full membership of the House of Representatives being allowed to contribute their thinking to perfect an enabling act.

On the basis of the best advice I have been able to obtain, not one of the enabling acts came into being without the full advice of both the House and the Senate. Not one of those acts went into the statute books without every Member's having an opportunity to express his views and to propose amendments if desirable.

But today the full membership of the House of Representatives has been denied that right. But in spite of that fact, I am here today to plead with you to vote for the measure, Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood. My sole concern is that this bill reach the President's desk in a form acceptable to him.

A few weeks ago when this bill was being considered by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, as we proceeded to consider the language and the thought of the 39 sections contained in H. R. 2535 the members of the committee had honest and reasoned differences of opinion as to the form and substance of the bill.

The committee in the 84th Congress has a membership of 29 voting members plus the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii, a total of 32 people, less than 10 percent of the whole House membership. While many of these 32 people have participated in committee consideration of the several bills acted upon in the past 8 years, for reasons not entirely clear the House Rules Committee, which in a real sense lays out the road this body must follow if the legislative destinies are to be reached, did not reflect in the resolution reported the sentiments expressed by the members of the Rules Committee on the nature of this legislation.

If Alaska and Hawaii are admitted, the acts are irrevocable—no return, no reconsideration, no subsequent act of Congress. On that, the members of the Rules Committee and I are in complete agreement. But the road laid out by this resolution which you have adopted, and I agree that it should have been adopted, as there was no alternative, is a narrow one. The 406 Members who did not participate in the committee consideration of H. R. 2535 are by this resolution denied the right to consider any procedure other than that contained in the bill as introduced or as that procedure is proposed to be modified by the committee by recommended amendment. As to the other obvious alternative procedure, 29 Members are required to speak for 435, if judgment is to be rendered. Twenty-nine, if a voice is to be heard at all, must speak for 435. Therefore, the House of Representatives today is faced with this situation. A voice, which we have listened to from the Rules Committee, has said to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, "Here is your bicycle. We have removed the pedals—now ride it to your destination."

Mr. Chairman, the resolution which this House has adopted is the narrowest possible parliamentary procedure which could be established by the Rules Committee. It should have been broadened to its maximum, but that was not possible for this House to do without killing the bill yesterday. Therefore, I plead with you so that Alaska and Hawaii might enjoy the full counsel of this body and that the Members put the pedals back on the bicycle by voting for this joint bill. Then, it can go to the Senate where the debate will not be restricted and returned to this body for further consideration. I will now proceed to summarize for you, as briefly as I can, a few of the arguments raised in the matter of Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood. I will not take your time to have you listen to a long recitation of the history of this legislation or the history of Hawaii. Many other speakers can present the subject to you and the many specific issues involved more eloquently than I. But, I would like to point out that in general there are three arguments applicable to both Territories, which are always offered by the proponents and opponents of Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood. First, there is the argument over noncontiguity which, in my opinion, is an exceedingly fallacious one. When I can leave my home here in Washington, D. C., at 2:30 p. m. and have breakfast in my other home in Honolulu at 6 a. m. the next morning, which is actually 11 a. m. in Washington, D. C., I believe those who argue against statehood on that basis are as antiquated as a surrey with a fringe on top. Hawaii and Alaska are more contiguous to the continental United States than to any other land area. In this atomic age of ours, there is nothing more contiguous than the air in which we live and travel. The second argument regarding Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood is usually that of disproportionate representation in the United States Senate. To those who argue in that fashion, I suggest that legislation be introduced in the Congress of the United States, and be passed by two-thirds of the Members, and ratified by the three-fourths of the States. That is the only way to resolve the issue. That is the only way it can be resolved. To penalize the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska in this manner is really an admission that the gentlemen who favor proportionate representation in the Senate know full well that their issue is not a popular one nationally, but their arguments go home for consumption to the districts from which they come. The third argument relative to Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood is the issue of national defense.

In this instance the argument for the two Territories is somewhat inconsistent, because when it comes to Hawaii it is normally argued that the defense of Hawaii would be better served by statehood, whereas with regard to Alaska the same gentleman argued that the national defense would be better served by Territorial status. The fact of the matter is that Territory or State status has nothing whatsoever to do with defense. Anyone who has experienced a war on American soil knows that. The difficulty in this situation is that some of our distinguished and able military leaders have never experienced an attack or a war on American soil. Their experience has been in dealing with foreign allies on foreign soil, and their thinking has not been directed to leading a war on American soil where loyal American citizens would be their bulwark in carrying their campaign forward to victory. Their conception, because of their kind of experience is one with foreign allies, purportedly loyal to us, who naturally have caused our military leaders when on foreign soil, concern from time to time.

We all agree that Alaska is our front line of defense today, but let us suppose that tomorrow, by a turn of circumstances, our front line of defense should suddenly change to the great State of New York. What then would our military leaders do? It goes without saying that the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, would delineate military zones of national defense in that State. In Alaska today I do know that our military advisers are deeply concerned with the defense problem, but that is no reason why they should be asked at this particular and delicate time to make withdrawals and reveal our defense plan to enemies. But there is every reason to support them if they wish to have Congress spell out in legislation a certain area for withdrawals, if and when they choose to make them. Although the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to do so at any time, whether Alaska is a State or a Territory, it stands to reason that the President may like to have this particular point defined in the bill, in order that, if it is necessary to make such withdrawals, he will have the complete support of the Congress of the United States, and therefore the people of this country, including the citizens of Alaska.

It was not necessary for the President to go to the Congress to ask support in the matter of the Formosan issue, but there was every reason for the Congress to give our President this reassurance. So it is in the case of Alaskan statehood. The bill, as it is written today, includes a committee amendment in defining a line for future defense withdrawals that, in my opinion, would not be satisfactory to the President of the United States. But that is no reason for defeating the bill. On the contrary, there is every reason, in my opinion, to support the bill and send it to the Senate where this particular amendment can be resolved.

As other spokesmen for the bill have pointed out, we do have the language of the amendment, and a line that we have every reason to believe would be

acceptable to the President. But, by the rule which has been adopted, we are denied the privilege of offering this amendment on the floor. Since this is so, I urge you again to vote for this bill so that we can send it to the Senate and achieve this purpose.

With reference to the specific arguments brought into any debate on statehood, there are two of them. One is the issue of communism. We have just listened to my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. PILLION] plead his case. I was delighted to hear him speak today. Mr. PILLION, who has never stepped foot in the Territory of Hawaii, by his own admission before the Committee on Rules, stated at that time that he would not go to Hawaii for fear he might change his mind. I admire him for that honest statement, for I do believe he was sincere and correct in what he said. If I had never stepped foot into the congressional district of New York, from which my distinguished colleague comes, if I did not know the local personalities and the local issues involved, I would not try to evaluate an election in that district on the basis of cold statistics on paper.

Today when he brought here that horrendous exhibit of newspapers and pamphlets, and spoke as he did I hardly recognized myself, because there I learned about the editorial policy of my own two newspapers; I learned why we were supporting statehood; for the first time I learned about dives down in the part of town where communism breeds.

Now, seriously, let us get down to the points my colleague made. On May 6, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], by letter addressed himself to Members of the House on charges of communism in Hawaii. Those charges were made from this floor today, but again none of his allegations were supported by documentary evidence of Communist infiltration into the territorial government of Hawaii, its educational system, the political parties, the newspapers, or radio. On the contrary, the documentary evidence that he produced showed that the newspapers of Hawaii are fighting communism, that the people of Hawaii have convicted our leading Communists, and the exhibit in person is the delegate from Hawaii, and if there was any fight by the ILWU it was for this office.

On Tuesday, April 19, 1955, just this last month, I appeared before the Rules Committee to reply to these very extravagant and unsupported charges. Evidently the committee, after exhaustive hearings, agreed with me; they granted a rule which sent the statehood legislation to the floor of the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], says Communist power is centered in and emanates from the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union with a membership of 25,000, and the United Public Workers' Union, with a membership of 2,000. We admit that the issue of communism in Hawaii centers about the leadership of the ILWU, but the fact is that the people of Hawaii through their elected representatives were the first to call attention to the fact that the ILWU in Hawaii, an extension of Harry Bridges' west coast longshoremen's union, might be Communist-dominated.

At the petition of the Territorial Legislature a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities went to Hawaii in 1950 to conduct an investigation of Communist activity. The chairman of the subcommittee was the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and the ranking minority member was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE]. They reported that they found no cause whatever for withholding statehood from the Territory.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. First of all I want to compliment the gentlewoman on the very fine statement she is making on behalf of statehood for Hawaii. I may say further that she is a very worthy successor to our very dear friend, the late Honorable Joe Farrington.

I believe some of the Members to whom I have listened in debate here are deliberately attempting to exaggerate the influence of communism in Hawaii in order to defeat statehood for Hawaii.

I cannot disagree with my good friend from New York [Mr. PILLION], in some of the statements, practically all of the statements that he made about the influence of communism in Hawaii, but let me remind the gentleman from New York that the influence that the Communist Party in Hawaii has at the present time stems from the mainland. Further than that, it stems from the great State of California where the headquarters for the 13th district of the Communist Party is and has been located for a good many years. The 13th district of the Communist Party is comprised of California, Nevada, and the Territory of Hawaii.

During my experience as an FBI agent stationed at San Francisco during the war years and since I have been a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities I have watched with increasing concern Communists being sent from the mainland by such men as Harry Bridges and Bill Schneidermann to Hawaii deliberately to cause strikes, foment trouble, and to organize the Communist Party in Hawaii. I say we cannot cut off the influence of the Communist Party in Hawaii without first destroying the Communist Party in the United States, on the mainland, and the influence that it has, not only upon our territories but upon our own internal security. We have tried three times to get rid of the influence of Harry Bridges by court action to deport him but each time we have been unsuccessful.

I believe that we should consider cleaning up the influence that emanates from the mainland before we start worrying about the influence on the Territory of Hawaii. Furthermore, I am of the opinion, and I was of this opinion 5 years ago and 3 years ago when I voted for admission of Hawaii into the Union, that the State of Hawaii would be better able and more inclined to fight the influence of communism as a State than as a Territory for the reason that I believe the good people, the great majority of the patriotic citizens in the Territory of Hawaii would upon their admission to the Union gain a new sense of loyalty and would carry on a cause that would completely eliminate the influence of Communist traitors who have been sent from the mainland. In that way it would destroy communism more effectively in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was hoping that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] would be on the floor. When he returned in 1953 from Hawaii as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities he made a report, from which I quote the following:

> At no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii. My guess as of today, February 15, 1953, it does not exceed over 60. The people of Hawaii understand that communism is a worldwide conspiracy and given the opportunity they would put their own houses in order.

I think that answers the questions of the communistic influence. There are Communists in Hawaii, there are Communists in Nebraska. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] understands that New York State has more than half of the Communists in the United States within its own borders.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Is it not true that Senator Cordon and Senator Butler made intensive investigations of this charge of communism in Hawaii?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. That is true. There have been several on-the-spot investigations into Hawaii's readiness for statehood.

Mr. ENGLE. Is it not also true that both of those distinguished gentlemen came back and said they did not find communism to be a serious menace? I would like to read what Senator Cordon's subcommittee reported. This is a statement from their official report:

"No evidence was presented to the subcommittee of communism in the Territorial legislature or other elective bodies or offices. Hawaii's political life has been traditionally sound and free from radical leadership in the government."

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman from California. His statement is exactly correct. There has never been any evidence found of communism in the Territorial legislature.

Now, Mr. PILLION offers the fact that Harry Bridges is president of the ILWU; that Jack Hall is the Hawaiian regional director of the ILWU; that in 1950 the CIO expelled both the ILWU and the UPW as Communist dominated, and that on June 19 Jack Hall and six others were convicted by a Federal jury in Hawaii of violation of the Smith Act as indi-

cations of growing influence of communism in Hawaii. The contrary is true. These facts are an indication of the decrease of Communist influence in Hawaii. It was an all-Hawaiian jury that convicted Jack Hall and six others. It was after a lengthy Federal trial which was presided over by a Federal judge long a resident of Hawaii who was appointed by the President of the United States that these defendants were convicted. They are now on bail, the case having been appealed to the 9th Circuit Court of San Francisco. Hawaii has nothing to do with the case now. The people of Hawaii generally are chafing at the delay.

Mr. PILLION states that on June 19, 1953, 24,000 ILWU members went on strike to protest the conviction of the seven and refused to load military cargo for Korea. The fact is that the ILWU membership was ordered by its leadership to walk out, which is totally different procedure from voting to strike, and the fact also is that within 24 hours, when the membership learned the true cause of the walkout, they went back to work. They learned the truth through the Honolulu newspapers, which, instead of supporting the Communist cause, as Mr. PILLION would have you believe, used every means at their command by news stories, editorials, and radio broadcasts to inform the rank and file of the membership of the ILWU in order that they, loyal Americans, might evaluate the situation.

Mr. PILLION says the Honolulu Record is a newspaper front for the Communist Party and that individual and business ads increased from 2,137 in 1953 to 2,586 in 1954. The Honolulu Record may be a front for the Communist Party. The fact is that it also is a labor organ, and during the campaign the candidates who advertised in this paper may have done so in the belief that they were reaching the organized labor vote. If these candidates failed to evaluate the significance of advertising in a paper that may be Communist dominated, they likewise failed to evaluate the fact that their ads were wasted because the Record only has a circulation of approximately 3,000, which Mr. PILLION neglected to tell you, in contrast to the other dailies with a total circulation of 175,000.

Also I would like to ask you, if the Communists are so powerful in Hawaii through this particular medium, the Honolulu Record, why is it that they cannot even force their own membership of 25,000 to subscribe to the paper? The truth of the matter is that those ads you saw up here on the board are put in at 50 cents a throw from the boys when they go out and collect from the labor unions.

Now, Mr. PILLION says that the ILWU elected 58 candidates out of 71 endorsed in the November 1954 elections. There is one thing I have in common with my distinguished colleague from New York. We are both Republicans. But we disagree on this point. I am generous enough to give the credit of that election to the Democrats in Hawaii. The fact is that the people of Hawaii elected the candidates. The ILWU can claim anything it wants to. The Democrats for the first time in the history of the territory won control of the territorial legislature. The Republicans won the delegateship and the two largest mayoralties in the territory. Now, the largest of these mayoralties is particularly significant because the ILWU sustained a resounding defeat. John H. Wilson, a veteran Democrat and seven times mayor of Honolulu, whom the ILWU was out to reelect in 1954, could not even be nominated. After 50 years in public life in Honolulu he lost the nomination to a young Democrat, Frank Fasi, who has been a resident of Hawaii only since 1946. Furthermore, if more truth is needed for the refutation of Mr. PILLION's allegation, the ILWU threw the weight of its leadership's support to the candidacy of John A. Burns for the delegateship, and he was defeated by the incumbent.

Mr. PILLION also has neglected to tell you that of the membership of the ILWU of 25,000, possibly only one-third of those are citizens. Most of them are alien contract laborers and are not eligible to vote.

Mr. PILLION says that on April 6, 1955, the Communist Daily Worker printed an article concerning the gift of a gavel by Speaker of the House of Representatives Charles Kauhane to Harry Bridges, president of ILWU.

The "People's Daily Worker" can print anything it chooses. Charles Kauhane, speaker of the Territorial house of representatives, had denied publicly that he made a gift of a gavel to Harry Bridges.

Mr. PILLION states that the Hawaiian House of Representatives passed a bill last March to exempt the ILWU Memorial Association from taxes by a vote of 27 to 1 and 7 of the 10 incorporators of this association are publicly identified Communists.

What Mr. PILLION neglected to tell you also was that a month later, after it was revealed that 7 of the 10 incorporators of this association are publicly identified Communists, the measure was vetoed by Hawaii's governor, Samuel Wilder King, partly on charges that Communist activity in Hawaii appears centered around the ILWU. This we have never denied or minimized.

Mr. PILLION wrote that on April 24, 1955, the ILWU publicly threatened the Hawaiian Legislature with a mass retaliation strike if their endorsed elected representatives and senators did not keep their political promises to the ILWU.

Mr. PILLION neglected to tell you that an ILWU spokesman has publicly denounced the legislature for its refusal to adopt tax legislation favorable to the union. Furthermore, no mass retaliation ever came about.

Mr. PILLION writes that the ILWU uses four radio stations to daily preach the Communist line in the English, Filipino, and Japanese languages.

There are 407 of the nation's 2,800 radio stations which broadcast a daily fare of 36 languages and dialects, ranging from Arabic to Zuni and including the Russian languages.

I do not intend to defend the activities of the ILWU leadership or its radio commentators in Hawaii. However, I can assure you that these programs contain no more Kremlin propaganda than do those coming from some of our mainland labor reporters. This 15-minute-a-day fare from the ILWU commentators is offset by some 250 hours of typically American radio and television programs over 14 stations throughout Hawaii, all of them certificated by the Federal Communications Commission.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is absolutely incorrect when he tells you that since the Hawaiian statehood bill was last voted on, March 10, 1953, "there have been startling disclosures of Communist controls in Hawaii."

Do you think for a minute that the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General would recommend statehood for Hawaii if a situation existed there such as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] claims?

None other than the Attorney General of the United States, in a letter dated January 13, 1954, stated emphatically that communism was on the decline in Hawaii. He said:

> The facts known to me concerning communism in Hawaii do not indicate any reason to believe that communism is a greater menace in Hawaii at the present time than it was in 1950. As a matter of fact, the known members of the Communist Party in Hawaii appear to be fewer in number at present than they were in 1950. Undoubtedly the recent conviction of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii has contributed to this decline in Communist Party membership. I believe it inevitable that this conviction will have a weakening effect on the strength of communism in Hawaii.
>
> The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.

Now I should like to tell you a little bit about the second argument regarding Hawaii, and it is made on the basis of race. It is argued that we are a group of many racial extractions and therefore not qualified to be a State. I am proud to say that we are of many racial extractions and that in most of us the blood of several races flows. We are proud of that.

There is no race prejudice in Hawaii, but there is much race consciousness. We take pride in the American descendents of the many peoples who came from many foreign lands. They have contributed greatly to our American civilization and culture in Hawaii.

The first to go to the shores of Hawaii from foreign lands were the people from New England who went out to Hawaii in 1820 and there founded an American community. In 1820, when Honolulu was a typically going American community, there was not a single settlement west of the Mississippi. To be sure there were a few friars breaking their way through the mustard cane in California. By 1840 the people of Hawaii had a constitution based upon the theocracy of the great State of Massachusetts, and a compulsory free public

school system patterned after the State of New York. As a result, Hawaii has no illiteracy. Today every registered voter has to fill in a long printed questionnaire to determine that he is acquainted not only with reading and writing but also with the principles of government, and to this day no voter has ever questioned that requirement. As a result, 87 percent of our registered voters vote, and 65 percent of our eligible voters vote, which I think challenges the record of any State in the Union.

These same foreigners that went to our shores gave the people of Hawaii a written language—the English language. They gave them Christianity, a stable economy, and racial tolerance, and as the result of those American principles, Hawaii for many years has enjoyed four of the basic five principles of American freedom. Those principles are Christianity and religious freedom, racial tolerance, free education for all, and economic stability. The fifth principle of American freedom, complete self-government, is the one we seek today.

The privilege and responsibility not only for voting presence in the Senate and House of Representatives, for voting for the President and Vice President of the United States, and our own Governor and other officials, but the privilege and responsibility of contributing our thinking to the framing of legislation for these United States, is what we seek. Not only do we think that we would benefit by voting representation in the Congress, but we believe that we have a great contribution to make. Particularly do we feel that contribution could be given in the field of foreign affairs, because we live in the Pacific area and are more closely associated with the thought of the people of the Pacific than are any of those in this body elected from the continental United States. We would be the first to vote for legislation to support the freedom-loving peoples of the world in their struggle against communism, because we in Hawaii as a Territory have done as much if not more than any State in the Union about communism.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. May I ask the gentlewoman whether or not she referred in her remarks to the letter of January 13, 1954, by Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, in which he discussed the charges of communism in Hawaii?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I have the date right here.

Mr. ENGLE. If not, at the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I propose to ask to include this letter following the remarks of the gentlewoman. I again call the attention of the committee to the fact that not only has the President of the Uinted States endorsed statehood for Hawaii, which he would not think of doing in the face of any significant threat from communism, but in addition he has been backed up in that statement by his own Attorney General.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. That is the January 13 letter.

I have heard it said time and again during the debate on this bill that it matters not what the Communists think because they will twist the argument to their own purposes. I am concerned not about what the Communists think, but what the freedom-loving peoples think. We could also contribute much to the concept of freedom in the Congress, by helping to frame legislation from our great experience for more than 100 years where we have lived in a test of democracy, where all creeds and all colors are accepted exactly as our Founding Fathers intended that the phrase should be interpreted, where we have a living example of what the world is striving to find today.

Several in this debate have mentioned the issue of taxation without representation and pointed out that this issue is similar to that in colonial days. I would like to mention one difference—in the days of the colonies there was a difference of opinion among the American settlers. Some and many preferred to stay with the Crown without a vote in the Parliament, without breaking their bonds with the British Empire. The majority preferred independence and so we had a revolution, thus founding the United States of America.

But in Hawaii, although we have taxation without representation there is not a soul that would choose independence rather than staying with the United States even without a vote in the Congress. We are first and last irrevocably Americans, and whatever your decision may be in the matter of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, you may be sure that the decision will be accepted in the spirit of true Americanism. You may also be sure that if that decision should be unfavorable, we will continue to fight on until we have achieved our rightful destiny.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of American foreign policy, delivered by me at Peoria, Ill., last night before the Peoria Association of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE PEORIA ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE ANNUAL DINNER MEETING, PEORIA, ILL., MAY 10, 1955

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, I am pleased to be here with my friend and colleague, EVERETT DIRKSEN, who so ably represents Illinois in the Senate of the United States.

American foreign policy is the people's business. There is no American man, woman, or child who will not be affected directly or indirectly by the present and future aspects of our foreign policy.

Our basic foreign policy is and should be peace with honor. This is far different from a policy of peace at any price.

As an example of our ultimate objective, I would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north where for a long period of our history neither that country nor ours has found it necessary to have a single fort or military establishment for the purpose of defending one country against the other along the entire international frontier of 3,000 miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We certainly hope that in our lifetime or the lifetime of our children other nations not only in the Western Hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, might live together as good neighbors as we do with Canada.

If we are half as prudent as the men who gave us this Republic and who helped to win and develop the great West, we will continue to hope and pray for peace but we will keep our powder dry.

Today the White House announced that Secretary of State Dulles was authorized to make arrangements for a meeting of the heads of government of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

All Americans will join in a prayer and a hope that this proposed meeting will rise above the gatherings of Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Geneva which gave substantial victories to the Communist world. Those meetings all had a friendly press and a massive propaganda buildup. It was not until months and sometimes years later that the full price paid became known.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, to Yalta and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China, and to Geneva and its impact upon Vietnam.

The heads of the free governments will be accountable and responsible to their people and to their parliaments or congress.

To whom will Bulganin be accountable? To the presidium or to Khrushchev? If Bulganin is indeed himself "at the summit" today will he be there when the big four meet in June or July?

Are our Western allies prepared to stand against a condemnation to perpetual slavery behind the Iron Curtain of the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary? Or will we be outvoted 3 to 1?

Are we to insist on previous agreements being honored before we take the Soviet's word on a new scrap of paper?

Will plans for the Republic of Germany's part in a Western defense be scrapped to placate the Russian bear?

We might recall Kipling's the Truce of the Bear. While this was written concerning the imperial Russia of the Czar it is even more applicable to Soviet Russia today.

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;
When he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise,
When he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes;
When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril—the time of the truce of the bear."

Will we insist on the Soviet Union withdrawing, as pledged, their troops from Rumania and Hungary when the Austrian

treaty is signed? Their only excuse for being in those two countries was to keep open lines of communication to their troops in Austria. Or will this promise also be overlooked in order not to offend the Muscovites.

There is no reliable evidence to date that would warrant a prudent person in believing that the Soviet Union or international communism have changed their basic long term strategy for the destruction of human freedom. In discussing American foreign policy before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D. C. on April 22, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor said:

"The Communist enemy, regardless of any momentary change of tactics, regardless of any treaty the Kremlin may sign, is bent on conquering the entire world—the United States not excluded—and remolding it in the form of the totalitarian dictatorship and slave economy imposed on the people behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia, Rumania, outer Mongolia, and on the Chinese mainland. American labor never can be and never will be submissive or neutral towards such a total menace."

Certainly American businessmen and the public generally should be no less alert to the dangers of communism than is the American Federation of Labor as so ably and courageously expressed by the president of that great organization.

Our foreign policy should be based on human freedom. What advances it we should support and what retards it we should oppose.

The age of colonialism in Asia is dead. The people in that part of the world want no part of it. Any American policy in that part of the world will suffer a handicap if it is tied directly or indirectly to European colonialism.

Nowhere in the long history of Russia under the Czars or under the commissars is there anything equal to the United States establishing the free and independent Philippine Republic nor for that matter is there anything equal to Great Britain setting up a free and independent India, Pakistan, and Burma.

To the contrary, during the same period the Soviet Union was destroying the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia though they had signed treaties of friendship and nonaggression with all 3 of those Baltic Republics.

We have many friends in Asia and we should call upon those nations with whom we have mutual defense pacts and agreements for their advice and continued assistance in dealing with problems arising in that area of the world. I refer particularly to the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China, the Republic of the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and Japan, all of which are independent Asian nations, and together with Australia and New Zealand, have demonstrated on numerous occasions their friendship and willingness to stand up and be counted when the going gets tough.

Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam are 3 new countries that have gained their independence from colonial rule but now find themselves threatened by the nearness of a more dangerous type of colonialism which is communism.

In Vietnam, Premier Diem is faced with tremendous problems. He has had the support of this country in meeting the difficult problems confronting him.

It is up to the people of free Vietnam to make their own decision as to the type of government structure that will best suit them. If their choice is a republic and the cutting of ties with an absent ruler their decision should have the support of their Asian neighbors as well as the United States and our western allies. If their choice should be for a constitutional monarchy without the present ruler they should likewise be supported. There must be no pressure of any kind to retain Emperor Bao Dai if the Vietnamese prefer some more acceptable alternative.

Americans must never lose sight of the fact that ours at the time and today is the authentic revolution. It not only freed us from colonial rule, but it developed a charter of liberty which established a constitutional form of government to serve us for all time to come.

Other nations have had their revolutions, but either immediately or in the not-distant future the people found they had supplanted one ruler for an even more despotic one.

We should be proud of our revolutionary past and help to encourage in the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain the revolutionary zeal for freedom which won us a nation.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the aggressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen; 11 of these have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

How can our associates even consider compromising principle and honor to that extent? What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

How long is the United Nations going to pussyfoot on this question of American prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice? Of the 15 the Chinese Communists admit holding, 11 have been sentenced to terms of from 4 to 10 years.

These men were shot down in January of 1953. Last fall it was suggested in Government quarters that public discussion be held down until Mr. Hammarskjold had completed his mission to Peiping.

He came back in January and held a press conference in New York on January 14 in which he admitted that the prisoners had not been released nor did he have any firm commitment as to when they would be released.

It was suggested again in Government quarters that the American Congress and the American people be patient and that perhaps Chou En-Lai would release them prior to the Bandung conference.

The Bandung Conference has now come and gone and the prisoners have not been released.

Are we to wait until these prisoners have been completely brain washed and then released to serve the Communist propaganda purposes as has been the case of some of the civilians?

It is time for Mr. Hammarskjold to make his report to the United Nations and to the people of America.

What is intended to be done about Communist failure to comply with the terms of the Korean armistice?

If the United Nations as an organization is paralyzed from taking action, then the Government of the United States has an obligation to men wearing the uniform of this country to take some effective steps in getting our men released.

Yet voices of appeasement, abroad and at home continue to urge the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

This despite the fact that Communist China was the aggressor in Korea where we suffered 140,000 casualties including 35,000 dead.

This despite the fact that Communist China has been and is now in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice agreement.

Have we forgotten the Biblical injunction in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Communist Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

There will never be peace in our time in any real sense until the people of Russia and China have thrown out their Communist masters and established justice in their political system, freed their economy from the dead hand of statism concentrated on armament production and, more important than all, reopened their churches so that the guidance of the Father of us all may replace the godless teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

The crucifix is a more potent force than the clenched fist of communism.

When the people of Russia and China gain their freedom from the tyranny which temporarily rules them we should make it known that our friendship and our assistance will be available for the establishment of peace with honor in a truly free world of free men.

We seek not one foot of their territory nor control over a solitary one of their people.

We only want for them the cherished freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience; to have in the hands of a truly free people the right of self-determination on who shall constitute their government and the right to change it by the decision of 200 million people rather than a cabal of less than a dozen power-mad men in the Kremlin who threaten the peace of the world; and to be able to enjoy the

fruits of their labor and a rising standard of living.

We should look upon the people within the Iron Curtain as our friends and allies. Indeed, should their totalitarian masters embark upon further aggression the temporarily enslaved people may turn out to be among our stoutest allies.

Such a policy does not contemplate aggression on the part of the free world. But it does require that we never by word or deed give our moral or legal blessing to the enslavement of the 800 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Such a policy does contemplate the application of moral, economic, and diplomatic sanctions against the international Communist conspiracy against the free way of life. Human freedom is a God-given right beyond the power of dictatorships to permanently destroy.

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa Straits.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou En-lai.

I cannot help but believe that we have a better chance of maintaining the peace of the world by showing strength and firmness now than by vacillation or weakness.

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist nation' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This I believe: Under the divine guidance that made us and kept us a free nation this generation of Americans will not sacrifice principle for expedience; nor cringe in the face of brutal naked aggression and we will not barter friends and allies in the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, Africa or Asia, in a dishonorable appeasement at a Far Eastern Munich or a second Yalta.

Coexistence, Containment, and Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very illuminating address by Louis Waldman made recently at Temple Beth Zion in Buffalo, N. Y. This address will surely serve as a source of valuable information to all Members of Congress and to all those who have occasion to read the RECORD. The subject matter discussed is of paramount importance in the world today.

Mr. Waldman is a well-known attorney in New York. He is the president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, chairman of the New York State Bar Association's committee on civil rights, a former vice president of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and former chairman of the committee on American citizenship of the American Bar Association.

His address is as follows:

The World Today is a very broad subject. It would be hard indeed to cover so wide a field in a single address and be intelligible. But when my friend Leonard Finkelstein, the distinguished assistant district attorney of your county wrote to me many months ago, asking me to speak here tonight he also asked me to name a subject. I knew that I could not go wrong in naming it "The World Today," because, whatever the day or whatever the year when I would speak, that subject would be timely and appropriate. Actually, my subject for tonight is a good deal more modest. I will speak to you on three matters embraced in the topic of "The World Today." I shall talk to you on Peaceful Coexistence, Containment, and Liberation.

Now, it is a poor speech that begins with an apology, but I am going to make an explanation for selecting this subject. First of all I recognize that the subject is controversial, that men and women may differ on both the analysis of the facts and on the conclusions to be drawn from the facts. But I think it is foolhardy for mature men and women, in times of world crisis, to run away from a subject dealing with the heart of that crisis simply because it is controversial. We should not constantly take refuge in escapist topics.

There is still another reason for having selected the subject that I did select. I have a profound conviction that unless people who are sincerely devoted to the cause of human freedom, to the cause of—to use a very much abused term—liberalism, unless people candidly face controversial questions, such as I have selected for tonight, questions which are sometimes unpleasant to face, then a vacuum will be created, and indeed has already been created, into which other people will step, and these other people are not always the most suitable by temperament or conviction to deal with those issues.

I don't have to tell you that the question of peaceful coexistence is now squarely before us. The State Department and the President are face to face with it. The Republican leader in the Senate has frequently been heard on it. But I am sure these leaders of Government will readily agree that this subject is not the special property of any particular Senator, or of the State Department or even of the President himself. I think the subject is one in which all Americans are interested and with which they should be concerned.

What is the meaning of each of these doctrines, peaceful coexistence, containment and liberation, and why are they important today?

The concept of containment is not new. It has existed in our diplomacy ever since the cold war came to be recognized by the American people as a fact of our daily life. All the billons of dollars that we have poured into Europe under the Marshall or Truman plans, or under the other foreign-aid plans we have had and all of the efforts that we have exerted from the time when Americans first became aware of the cold war in the late forties until the present administration took office, is to be described both historically and analytically as the policy of containment. It was so proclaimed to the world, and honestly so proclaimed. Its avowed purpose, aside from the humanitarian motives that America had in alleviating suffering among the people of our allied countries was to help rebuild their economies, their lives and their institutions so that they could rely on their own resources in the fight to prevent their countries from falling into the Communist orbit and becoming a part of the Communist empire. That was and is the philosophy of containment.

With the advent of this administration however, there was supposed to have been a change. There had been a great deal of discontent with and much criticism of the policy of containment. The 1952 Republican platform denounced this policy in most emphatic terms and pledged that the party, if given power, would go far beyond that policy. The Republicans proclaimed, instead, the policy of liberation.

Now, what does that policy mean?

That policy includes containment, but it goes further: It calls for policies, and for conduct implementing those policies, which would help liberate those countries which were seized and incorporated by the Soviet Union into its orbit in the postwar period. Such countries as Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Czechoslovakia were to be so liberated.

Under the theory of liberation the United States must make clear to Russia and the world that we do not recognize the annexation of those countries with their 80 to 90 million people as part of the Soviet empire. This problem of making clear that we shall not recognize Soviet annexation or forcible affiliation of other countries applies also to Austria, China, Korea and other parts of the world. It is partly because of this policy that it is necessary to maintain the fiction that Nationalist China is still the legitimate government over all of China, although the Nationalist Government exercises effective control only in Formosa.

In his first message to Congress, President Eisenhower sought to state and spell out the philosophy of liberation. At the same time, matters were going from bad to worse for us both in Europe and in Asia. It was in this context that the Soviet Union sprang on the world, as part of its propaganda, the proposal for a program of peaceful coexistence, as an alternative both to the policy of containment and to the policy of liberation.

Now all students of history know that we in the United States for more than a century have lived peacefully with countries with whose governments we did not always agree and with the policies of whose governments we could not possibly be reconciled. We coexisted with Czarist Russia. We coexisted with the Kaiser's Germany. We coexisted

with the militaristic Japanese Government. And we coexisted with many other governments whose policies were in fact abhorrent to us. No one even raised a question as to such coexistence. It was simply taken for granted because it was most politic.

What then is the difference between our historic position and the problem posed today by Russia's proposal?

The difference is this: When we coexicted, and still coexist, with governments the world over, with whose principles or policies we did not or do not agree, those governments were not working overtime to conquer the United States. And we, of course, had not sought to conquer them. With the Soviet Union, however, this is entirely different. Some countries may have had imperialistic ambitions along traditional imperialistic lines, but they did not establish their own vest-pocket political parties in our midst to infiltrate our Government, to corrupt our institutions, to capture our unions, our churches, our schools, all with the view ultimately to take over the United States, as has been done by the Soviet Union in the United States. Nor did those countries adopt such policy of infiltration toward the other countries of the world.

For more than a century Western civilization has been marching slowly but surely in the direction of the libertarian way of life. Our own philosophy of liberty is embodied in 3 historic documents: The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. And in the life of our Nation for over 150 years we have tried at every step to improve and bring to fruition that philosophy of life. We have never been perfect. No democracy ever is. No human institution ever is. But basically we are striving for a free life. During all of this time no Czar, no Kaiser, no potentate, no dictator attempted to conquer us by fraud, by deception, by sabotage and at the appropriate time perhaps by military power. That became a 20th century disease, commencing with the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. It was also tried by Hitler with disastrous results to him and the German people, but not without great tragedy and loss to us and the rest of the world.

I would like everybody to understand this proposition. I draw a distinction between the historic role of our Government and people in coexisting with governments with whose policies we do not agree, and sometimes even detest, and our difficulty in acquiescing readily to what appears to be the inocuous proposal of peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union and its satellites.

Now, coming to peaceful coalition with the Soviet Union. We are, as all of you know, except those who have blinded themselves and will not see the facts, in the midst of a world-wide, bitter cold war. I do not mean that we alone are in it. We are in it together with the democratic countries who are broadly described as part of our Western civilization. We are in it with the countries who share with us a common philosophy of life, such countries as England, France, the Scandinavian countries, all the countries in the world who have a freedom-loving tradition. We are all together in the same boat. And opposing us in that cold war is the Soviet Union and its satellites. It therefore is of the utmost importance that each proposal by or concerning the Soviet Union, whether it be the admission of Communist China to the United Nations or a program a peaceful coexistence, be judged not only in terms of what the words mean to us, but above all in terms of (a) history; (b) the meaning of those words to our enemies; and (c) the context of that cold war. We must always ask ourselves what do the Communist leaders have in mind when they propose this kind of agreement. I think it was Holmes who made the oft-quoted statement that one page of history is worth a volume of logic. Nowhere, it seems to me, is this as true as in trying to evaluate and understand the proposals made to us and to the Western World, by the leaders in the Kremlin.

What is the page of history which is significant in this discussion? In answering that question please forgive me for the injection of a personal note. Usually it is not a good thing to be too personal when discussing ideas, politics, government, or law. In this case, however, there is justification for speaking of my own experience—if for no other reason—to qualify my opinions as having validity.

In dealing with Soviet leaders and actions, conventional training of the diplomat is not enough. Much more necessary is a thoroughly grounded, first-hand knowledge of Communist history, Communist philosophy, Commnist theory, Communist practice and even Communist personalities and their mental bag of tricks. Only with such a background can one intelligently evaluate the concepts of the leaders of the Kremlin, understand the slogans, the programs, and the propaganda these leaders let loose on the world.

Now, for over 30 years I have had something to do with the business of knowing Communists, and consequently with the understanding of Communist theory, history, and programs. At the very threshhold of their power in 1917 I knew some of their leaders who were then in the United States, either as exiles, as visitors, or as emigres. Such men as Leon Trotsky, Nicholai Bucharin and many lesser lights were well-known to me. I became fairly familiar with their temperaments and outlook. Not one of them, of course, is alive today because old age in old Bolsheviks is not acceptable doctrine in the Kremlin. Old Bolsheviks are not what life insurance people call insurable risks.

Also known to me were a large number of old-time Americans who belonged to the Socialist Labor Party, disciples of Daniel De Leon, many of whom left the United States, the country of their birth or adoption, and proceeded in haste to the Communist heaven immediately after the revolution in 1917. Boris Reinstein of your own city, Buffalo, was one of those men. This may be news to you, for few Americans know that among the architects of the Communist Frankenstein were those theoreticians of the De Leon School who exported their doctrine from America to Russia. These people were well known to me. I knew their literature, their philosophy, their intellectual approach to social problems, their revolutionary concepts that antedate 1917, and all showing the clear indication of what was to come, long before the Russian Revolution. With such knowledge and the knowledge that modern communism in the Russian sense did not begin with the Revolution in 1917 but had its intellectual roots generations before that date, we can begin to understand in the fullest sense of that word what makes the Russian communism what it is today.

Only by knowing that the apostles of terrorism, of violence, and of force, as an instrument of life, who so tragically plague the world today, have plagued the labor movement for almost a century before the Russian Revolution; only by knowing George Sorel's Reflections on Violence, or Robert Hunter's Violence and the Labor Movement, or the literature mirroring the struggle for almost half a century within the Socialist movement between those who believed in evolutionary change brought about by education, law, and order, and those who believed in shortcuts, in sabotage, in direct action, in the political strike, in syndicalism; only by absorbing and understanding the emotional drives, the intellectual twists and turns of mind of the fathers of modern communism—only with such knowledge can the diplomat of today get some idea of the concepts, the statements, the slogans and propaganda delivered by men like Molotov, the late Vishinski, the late Stalin, Malenkov, and other Red leaders.

Another basic proposition I should like to drive home to you tonight is this: communism in spirit and in philosophy is not a pacifist movement. It must not be confused with the pacifism and idealism of radical and liberal movements of our time. The great tragedy in many people's failure to understand the evil and the menace of communism is that they confuse the Communist with the radicals or liberals about whom they read or know.

I underscore for all of you to remember that Communists are not against war and violence.

On the contrary, they are in every sense advocates, and have been such for generations, of what the Germans called the "taat," the deed. They believe in direct action within the labor movement, of a given country, and in worldwide war between countries. They have elevated violence and propaganda of the deed to an instrument of policy, to a way of life on a world scale. I need not tell you that there is a great literature on this subject which we Americans can ignore at our peril. If we are too lazy to learn, we will pay dearly for that ignorance. Already, failure to understand this fact has been responsible for many of the tragic mistakes made by our statesmen and politicians.

No, Communists are not pacifists. They no more believe in peace than did Hitler. When Communists oppose a war between their nation and another they do not do so because they are pacifists; they do so as a tactic. Their sole desire in such opposition is to convert the natural hostility and unhappiness of a people at war into a civil war against their own government to seize power in that nation. It is old Lenin doctrine that every international war must be turned into a civil war because, according to him, every national crisis must be turned into a revolutionary crisis; and in the revolutionary crisis a tightly organized minority of Communists can seize power whether or not a majority of the people of the nation support their action.

If you read the history of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, if you study the pattern by which they seized power there and if you study the pattern by which they seized power in any other country, including China and the freedom-loving land of Czechoslovakia, you will find that the story is the same. It is a story of a compact minority exploiting the anxiety of a national crisis and seizing power by the processes of deceit, infiltration and violence.

To understand the problems raised by the seemingly innocuous slogan of peaceful coexistence I will ask you to read the story of the past 36 years on how a small, compact Communist group seized and broke up political parties, powerful trade unions, vital social institutions, not only in our country, but in every civilized country in the world.

Peaceful coexistence is not a new formula or slogan launched by the Kremlin. It is another way of describing what these leaders of communism used to call the united front and the popular front, two well-known and well-defined Communist concepts.

What is the united front or popular front?

The united front is a slogan and a program wrapped into one, enunciated as a tactical maneuver by the Communists from time to time over the past 35 years, and designed and used by them to beat down their political, social, and cultural enemies. Simply stated, the united front is the technique and the method of Communist minority control. The united front or the popular front is not what you think it is when you judge it from a purely semantic standpoint.

It is not a partnership of equal parties. Now, if you understand this page of history of the united front or popular front, you will understand that the Communists mean their current slogan "Peaceful coexistence," to be a synonym to the earlier slogans.

But most people are lazy, I mean mentally lazy, in the face of a reality which they find too unpleasant or intellectually inconvenient. I say to you that in my opinion had the people of the world paid attention to Hitler's Mein Kampf and to the speeches made by him they would have seen what he was driving at, what he aimed to do. And taking at face value what Hitler said they could have saved millions of lives and incalculable losses to our civilization and the world, sustained in the bloody holocaust of World War II. But they refused to take Hitler at his face value.

I now implore you and all Americans to read what the Communists have written and said and done. I ask you to read it and study it in order to save the Western World from the holocaust of a third world war. Let us benefit by our experience in the recent past, within our own lifetime.

Returning to the question of the united front, let me say that the example of the events in the Socialist Party as well as in many labor unions—internationals, locals, joint boards and other subdivisions—show us with true clarity the true meaning and purposes of the united front as far as the Communists are concerned. Some unions, for example, which regarded themselves as impregnable, and indeed they were impregnable and strong, just as the United States regards itself as impregnable and strong—some of these unions were suddenly confronted with the problem of the united front, apparently an innocuous doctrine, but one which the Communists exploited to the nth degree. The leadership of those unions who had the intelligence to reject it were branded by the Communist propaganda apparatus as the enemy of the working class in general and the betrayers of their members in particular. Frequently, the united front was offered for the sole purpose of having it rejected so that a fire could be built by the Communist propagandists under the leaders of the union, thus seeking to undermine the faith the members had in those leaders. On the other hand, where the leadership, though not themselves Communists, was either weak or downright simple, and permitted the establishment of a united front by consent, then their organizations were soon either split, captured, or destroyed. The history of our time is strewn with the wreckage of labor unions, political parties, and other social institutions brought about through the slogans and programs of the united front.

And what applies to political parties, trade unions, and other social institutions within a community or nation, applies with equal force as far as Communist strategy and outlook is concerned to the relationships of nations. Calling it united front in one situation and peaceful coexistence in another does not change the character of the doctrine.

Another fundamental proposition I wish to lay before you in connection with a discussion of this subject is that the Communists and their leaders, unlike people in the underworld who deny law and order and truth, do not regard themselves as evil men. That proposition must be understood, too, by those who would deal with Communists. In their own eyes Communists do not believe themselves evil. The reason for this is that they believe that communism, as interpreted from time to time by their recognized fuehrers—Lenin, Stalin, Malenkov, Mao Tse-tung—contains, first of all, the conclusive answers to all the social, economic, spiritual, and cultural problems of our time. They believe, secondly, that communism possesses the key to the mystery of life itself. They hold to the view, thirdly, that other people who do not accept their beliefs are either scoundrels or fools unworthy of survival. These things they believe with the ardor and fervor of a secular religion.

It is a further part of the Communist creed that to withhold from the world their so-called correct answer to mankind's problems would be a great disservice to the human race. And they hold on the basis of their mumbo-jumbo of so-called scientific socialism and Marxism that history has decreed that communism must ultimately succeed. They are, therefore, in their own eyes, not without moral justification to do what they can to accelerate the process of history. They are ready to remove the obstacles to the inevitable, to destroy their opponents, to obliterate all those who do not accept the Communists' conclusive and final answer. And it is part of their secular religion that the enemies of the human race are those who do not accept communism, and such enemies are not entitled to be treated on equal terms with themselves. You do not have to tell enemies the truth. You can lie to them, deceive them, sell them out, doublecross them.

This evil pholosophy, which I have tried to summarize for you so briefly and which is tantamount to a deep religion, has been the justification used by many people in our land and in other lands for doing acts which otherwise are inexplicable. How else explain an Alger Hiss? How explain a Judith Coplon? How else explain many people with long backgrounds of American tradition who are ready to sell out the land of their birth—not only here but in each of the countries of the world?

My friends, there is a great deal to this Communist religion that cannot be met by jails or the atomic bomb. We must reach the hearts and minds of people to prevent them from becoming infected by this evil, and we must try to cure those who have already been subjected to the disease. I do not mean to suggest that Communist lawbreakers should not be sent to jail or that the Soviet military threat should not be met promptly with military power. I do mean to suggest that to win the cold war more is involved than mere force. It must be met with an appeal to the heart and mind, to the intellect and spirit, based on a positive faith, the faith in democracy.

Now let me come back to the point I wish to make. On the basis of our experience and knowledge of what the united front and the popular front are, and the periods of history when communism sprang from these slogans upon their opponents, we must weigh and judge the reasons why its present synonym, peaceful coexistence, is being sprung on the world today. How explain the timing of it? What is going through the minds of the men in the Kremlin at the present time?

The first answer, it seems to me, is that if the men in the Kremlin believed that we, the United States and our allies, were weak they would not propose a united front or peaceful coexistence. By launching this proposal now the men in the Kremlin must regard our position as stronger than they would like it to be.

This view is supported by the known facts. At the present time the Western World seems to be gaining the ascendency, in propaganda, in organization, and in military strength. The proposal of a united front or peaceful coexistence by the Soviet regime is obviously one further step in the drive, sometimes by threat and sometimes by propaganda, to stop NATO or its substitute, the London agreement. They are seeking to prevent at all costs the buildup of the strength of our country by the alliance with our allies. So they now propose a united front, peaceful coexistence.

Now, as I see it, there are two ways of having a united front. One is by infiltration against your will. The other is penetration by consent. Communists have been penetrating against our will the governments and the institutions of every country of the western part of the world. Whenever they want to accelerate the process, they come out with the united front. If you accept the united front, you consent to having the Communists sit down with you, having them run your political party, run your temple, your university, your faculty organization, your Nation, or the world. In such manner you engage in a united front; you coexist by consent; you abdicate in favor of Communist control.

As a matter of experience what has come with the acceptance of the united front? This question is important because at long last the American people have been aroused to the danger of treating the Communist Party as if it were a political party in the accepted sense of the term, when in fact it is nothing less than a criminal conspiracy.

For more than a quarter of a century following the Communist revolution in Russia, the American people were thoroughly asleep and totally indifferent to the Communist menace. During that quarter of a century we, within a segment of the labor movement, fought incessantly against Communist infiltration. But nobody outside in public or private life cared a hoot about that fight. They regarded it as a private fight. This indifference proved tragic to our country and for that matter to the world. What we were engaged in was a private fight all right, but it was private only in the sense that we had no support where support should have been given.

And yet the fight we have waged during those 25 years was a prelude to the wider battle that is now being waged on a national and international scale. On this much broader scale, what does the so-called peaceful-coexistence concept mean when applied on this broad level? Great confusion on this question can be seen on all sides. Some of it is studied confusion, spread by those whose political task it is to breed it among us. But in the widest area it is confusion based on ignorance and false illusion.

Typical of the innocent confusion and perhaps summarizing it was a recent letter, more than a column long, published in the New York Times of December 27, 1954, from Ralph Barton Perry, professor emeritus of philosophy at Harvard University. If you have access to it, please reread that letter in the light of our discussion tonight. Although Professor Perry sounds quite plausible in that letter, his position could not be more wrong, his reasoning more faulty, and his conclusions more unsound. And, of course, Professor Perry is a perfectly honest and high-minded man, as are undoubtedly many of those who think with him. Here is the heart of what Professor Perry says:

"Two contradictory ideologies such as communism and western democracy are not capable of being simultaneously realized: this is what is meant by their being contradictory. But two contradictory ideologies are quite capable of being simultaneously pursued; which is precisely what is now going on under the name of the cold war. All that is necessary to transform this into a condition of peaceful coexistence is to postpone the date of their realization by an explicit agreement which will diminish apprehension and substitute a peace psychology and a peace economy for the expectation of war.

"In such a condition the realization of the aspirations of the free world and those of a communistic imperialism would be incompatible as ever. But the occasion of their incompatibility would be postponed, and the triumph of one over the other would be left to persuasion and social experiment rather than to settlement by force."

How can anything be more plausible than a call to Americans to coexist with Russia so that the two ideologies—communism and Western democracy—may compete and in the long run let whichever ideology proves to be superior and more acceptable to the world survive and win out? If that were all to the issue, as Professor Perry and his kind seem to think, then western democracy, indeed, should hang its head in shame for not wishing to enter into this noble contest and test the soundness of its ideology in the marketplace of ideas. But, what are the facts?

The Soviet Union, as of this date, exercises suzerainty, sovereignty, or power over close to 800 million people in the world. It exercises complete domination over some 200 million unhappy Russians in the Soviet Union itself. It exercises dictatorial power over its satellite countries in Europe and in Asia. The concept of free competition of ideas for these nations is an idle dream, a horrible delusion. The ideology of the western democracies cannot compete with communism in this vast Communist empire. This captive part of the world is not available for such competition, which would require, as a minimum, that those people possess freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of political organization, freedom of education, and freedom of trade unions. But such freedoms are completely blacked out in the Soviet empire. And any person or group who would attempt to advance the ideologies, the principles of government and the way of life of the western democracies would find himself before a firing squad or in the less merciful slave-labor camp.

Where then is this competition of ideas envisaged by Professor Perry to take place? Only in the western democracies and, of course, in our own country will that competition take place. In other words, from the very nature of our two respective civilizations, the Russian empire is protected, shielded from competition by the police state. The western democracies thus become the battlegrounds.

But even that is only half the story. The other half of the story must be gleaned from the nature of the Communist totalitarian method of competition as based on its entire 36 years of history. Our Western democracies are pretty well divided among themselves, each with its own tradition, background, and culture. And within each of those democracies are vast divisions of opinion, such as the philosophies of the Labor Party and the Conservative Party in England. In France and Italy there is even more of a division. The same is true in other countries such as Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, etc. In our own country the two major parties, though presenting a common front to an enemy in time of danger, fight over domestic and even foreign policy like cats and dogs. And that does not take into account splinter political groups and parties and the vast divergence of opinion within the Democratic and Republican Parties themselves on virtually all issues.

In each of the western countries of the world the competition for ideological supremacy of communism is directed by a central authority, a general staff of the revolution, so to speak, acting with a single will, for a single purpose, which is acquisition of power. It carries on its battle for mastery not merely on the level of argument and persuasion in the sense in which we of the Western democracies understand those terms, but, as I have already pointed out, on the basis of deceit, penetration, and the big lie, resorting even to the use of sabotage and disorganization of the economic and social stability of the country. The battle is carried on at all levels but particularly by setting up a fifth column operating under the guise of a political party. By means of this manner of competing for ideological supremacy, Russia, a foreign power, may enter the political and intellectual arenas of the western democracies in the same way as if they landed an army in civilian uniform to interfere in our domestic affairs in the interest of that foreign power. For bear in mind that whether dealing with political or educational action, communism in America, France, Italy, England, or any other country, respond the same way. Their unswerving loyalty is not to the country of which they are citizens but to the Kremlin.

Thus it is a pure delusion to talk of the concept of peaceful coexistence as does Professor Perry and his kind, as if it were a proposal for a contest in the market place of ideas of two contradictory ideologies striving for supremacy under accepted rules of civilized competition whereby, as Professor Perry so naively believes, "the triumph of one over the other would be left to persuasion and social experiment rather than to settlement by force."

Under this doctrine of the meaning of peaceful coexistence there is also this great moral problem: Can the free United States of America, the last hope of the hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people behind the Iron Curtain, agree with their oppressor the Soviet Union and supinely accept what it has done to the part of the world now dominated by it. This is the clear implication of an agreement with Communists on peaceful coexistence. Such a pact between us and the Kremlin would be the death of the hopes of these millions of oppressed peoples. Such a pact would mean suicide for us on the moral level.

What then is the alternative to an agreement with the Kremlin for peaceful coexistence? Here I again appeal to the valuable lessons of history. It would be well for our people and our statesmen to restudy the history of the 20-year period preceding our own Civil War. Three choices were then presented to the American people. One was a policy of containment—the Missouri Compromise. Another was a policy of liberation—the doctrine of the Abolitionists. The third was the policy of peaceful coexistence—the program of the party of which Stephen Douglas was the spokesman. So that you can better see the conflict between these policies, let me read to you two paragraphs from the great Lincoln-Douglas debates. Those three principles were presented with great ardor and conviction before the American people. Stephen Douglas, in one of his great speeches, presented the doctrine of peaceful coexistence, although not by that name:

"Let each state mind its own business and let its neighbors alone. * * * If we stand by that principle, then Mr. Lincoln will find that this Republic can exist forever divided into free and slave States. * * * Stand by that great principle and we can go on as we have done, increasing in wealth, in population, in power, and in all the elements of greatness, until we shall be the admiration and terror of the world. * * * until we make this continent one ocean-bound Republic."

As you can clearly see, that was the philosophy of coexistence. The Abolitionists demanding liberation, obviously did not agree. Lincoln, who stood somewhere between the ardent Abolitionists and the apostles of peaceful coexistence, answered Douglas thusly:

"You say it [slavery] is wrong; but don't you constantly * * * argue that this is not the right place to oppose it? You say it must not be opposed in the free States, because slavery is not here; it must not be opposed in the slave States, because it is there; it must not be opposed in the pulpit, because it is not religion. Then where is the place to oppose it? There is no suitable place to oppose it."

As you know, throughout his term of office, the Great Emancipator did not wish to fight the Civil War. But neither did he favor the philosophy of peaceful coexistence with slavery. He did favor containment as a policy dictated by necessity and liberation as an ideal toward which the Nation would aspire. Lincoln wanted the slaves freed, but he was willing to accept containment for the time being. However, the slave States began the Civil War by firing on Fort Sumter, forcing armed conflict upon the Nation, and frustrating the middleground policy of Lincoln. I believe we can learn a great deal from this lesson in our own history.

I know that there are some differences between the situation that existed in our country in 1861 and the situation that exists in the world today. We were one nation under a single constitution, whereas the world consists of independent, sovereign nations. Actually, however, separate countries are far more interdependent at the present time than were the States in the 1858–61 period. Supersonic airplanes, speedy ships, radio, and television have all shrunk the world into a unit more compact than the pre-Civil War United States.

Lincoln, the great statesman and dreamer, was also the practical politician par excellence. He saw the difference between a vital interest of a nation and the ideal of a nation. The same, of course, is true of individual citizens. On their level they distinguish between their vital interests and their ideals. Abraham Lincoln felt that containment was a vital interest of the United States. Extension of slavery would have meant ultimately a slave United States. Therefore, he followed the policy of containment by directing a boundary line above which slavery would not be permitted to be extended as the absolute minimum which the United States could afford as a price for union. But although he set up containment as the absolute minimum, he nevertheless held aloft for the Nation and its people the ideal of liberation, never giving moral sanction to slavery in the slave States and never giving moral sanction to slavery in the free States. He saw that issue as one to be fought on moral and educational grounds which would be the foundation of political discussions within the slave States, within the churches, within the schools, within the free States, and wherever people could directly or indirectly exercise peaceful influence and power to instill the ideal of antislavery in the entire country. And yet he would not resort to war to fight for the ideal. He was willing to allow other forces, those of education and evolution, to work out the problem. He felt that if we could only keep the peace, time would solve the slavery problem.

These precepts of Abraham Lincoln could well be applied by the statesmen of our time. There is no real division, and there ought to be none, between the Democratic policy of containment and the Republican policy of liberation. From the standpoint of the welfare and future of our country, there cannot and ought not to be that division. It is unfortunate that we do not seem to be able to work out a synthesis of the two.

In my opinion containment is the minimum policy on which our country can rely. To abandon containment is to abandon a vital interest. Our security depends upon a policy of containment. Much as we hate war, we have got to serve notice that when it comes to the extension of the slave police state of communism to the free western world, we will have to take a stand against it as affecting our own safety and security. Liberation of those peoples who are now in the Communist empire should be maintained as an ideal. We cannot afford to say to 800 million people that we have accepted and agreed to a moral philosophy under which we close our eyes to slave labor camps, to oppression, to tyranny, to the blackout of a free

life. That ideal we must always keep. Hope in the hearts of millions of people must be kept burning and fresh. Yet it must be made clear even to them that we are not ready to throw the world into a bloody horror to accomplish liberation by war.

For that reason I believe it is a mistake for some of our citizens, whether they be military men or civilians, to talk and to write about a preventive war. Even if war, as it would be waged today, did not involve the possibility of ending all life on the earth, history has taught us amply that wars do not solve anything. They certainly do not accomplish their ostensible purpose. I make that broad and comprehensive statement because within our own lifetime we have waged two tragic wars, neither of which left us much better off than before. The best you get from a war is survival. But the problems created by war are always far worse and far more complicated than the problems settled by it. For that reason and for the great moral reason that war is wrong, whether it be described as preventive war or by some other alluring adjective, war should never be made an instrument of policy of our United States.

The most eloquent and best-reasoned voice in our country against the folly of a preventive war is that of my good friend and very able editor, William R. Matthews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star. Mr. Matthews is one of the best-informed editors in our country, a hard-headed realist and a great patriot. He has lifted his pen, not only in his own paper, but in a brilliant article in the Atlantic Monthly magazine of November 1954, exposing the folly of those who directly or by implication consider the possibility of a preventive war.

The American people must understand the underlying issues of our foreign policy and the Government must at all times be responsive to the will of the people. I know the argument for preventive war and I know that some citizens, whose devotion to our country cannot be questioned, have reluctantly come to the conclusion that a preventive war may be necessary for our survival. But I think it is morally wrong and as a practical matter most dangerous to our deepest interests. We should not give the impression abroad that we are seriously contemplating preventive war as an alternative to coexistence. It is not an alternative.

In the actualities of life we do coexist with Russia and with its satellites and we will continue to coexist with them. Let the Communists show that they are capable of peaceful coexistence by observing, on the theory of peaceful coexistence, the commitments that they have already made with us. The United Nations was certainly organized and established on the theory of peaceful coexistence and yet the Soviet Union has turned the U. N. into nothing better than a sounding board from which they can carry on propaganda against the United States and its associated powers. The Kremlin has the power to demonstrate to the world that it wishes peacefully to coexist by abandoning its acts of aggression which fill the air with uneasiness and tension, as it carries on the cold war against us. And let it sheath its fangs for a sufficiently long time as to really evidence a change of heart.

Yet we cannot, even as a propaganda measure, turn down requests for conferences. We cannot turn down proposed meetings even if they are called with ulterior motives. We can, of course, prevent those meetings from being ill-timed from the standpoint of deterring a buildup of our strength or our alliances.

But when we do go to such meetings or conferences, we must make two things abundantly clear, not only to the governments but to the peoples of the world: first, that we do not have too much hope that conferences with the Kremlin will bear fruit so that we do not establish illusions of hope that agreements with the Kremlin are of any real or lasting value; secondly that we shall never deviate from our minimum program of preservation of the fundamental values of Western civilization and the Anglo-Saxon heritage of freedom. We must make it equally clear that we shall not seek to extend our civilization or our freedom by force and at the same time that we shall never agree to the moral validity of the Communist philosophy of government based on terror, lawlessness, and tyranny. We must hold aloft before the peoples of the world the assurance that our own great tradition will be adhered to and defended and will not be sacrificed by either secret or public agreements. We must assure oppressed mankind everywhere that whenever it knocks at our door seeking asylum, whenever the victims of tyranny hope to find a new home and live in peace and freedom, our door, as in the past, will remain open to them. Many of us came here through that door, as did many of our ancestors and the pioneers and founders of our Nation. And that is the way it will have to continue if we are to be true to ourselves and remain the inspiration of the world, whether the rulers of Russia like it or not. We are going to stay loyal and steadfast and live by our Constitution and Bill of Rights. Any proposal for peaceful coexistence, united front, or whatever the name, with the apostles of dictatorship, will not be allowed to undermine and destroy those foundations of freedom which make life worth living. We are not going to meet tyranny halfway.

That is the best way I can put it to you. That is the way I feel our statesmen ought to speak to Communist representatives and to the people of the world, in the name of our free society.

Human liberty has been our greatest asset ever since the Soviet power came into existence and as long as it continues to exist. We cannot afford to fritter away that asset. Once lost, it cannot be recaptured. Once we give it up, we are morally, intellectually, and socially bankrupt and we have lost weapons in the fight against communism.

You cannot accept tyranny in Czechoslovakia as morally valid and fight it in Buffalo, in Chicago, in New York, or in Los Angeles. Dictatorship is wrong, but we do not have to go to war to free the victims of dictatorship. However, we must always realize the evil of dictatorship and we must have the courage to denounce it at all times and in all places.

Here again I turn for inspiration to Abraham Lincoln's fight against slavery. To him it was wrong in the States where it existed. It was wrong in the States where it did not exist. It was wrong in the church. It was wrong in the temples. It was wrong everywhere. We can only remain true to the conception of America if we keep alive the great fire which kindled the hearts of our people for freedom. We must always keep bright the light of liberty, which has cast so much glory on our Nation.

The Rights of the Individual, and the United States Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on April 30 I delivered an address before the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, at the organization's freedom forums, in New York City, on the subject the Rights of the Individual, and the United States Security Program. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNITED STATES SECURITY PROGRAM

(Address of Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS before the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith at the organization's freedom forum at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, April 30)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, 300 years ago 23 Jewish refugees from persecution landed from the bark *St. Charles* at New Amsterdam to seek freedom and opportunity. The 300th anniversary of that event is now being celebrated by the Jewish people of this country. In these 300 years many who shared the faith of these 23 refugees have since come to these shores.

Their gratitude for the freedom they found here has been demonstrated in the great contributions they have made to every phase of unparalleled American progress. In my opinion, however, the greatest contribution has been the Hebraic Bible and the Judeo-Christian heritage which grew out of it.

We should never forget that in the last analysis our American form of government is rooted in that same Judaic-Christian ideology.

Our Founding Fathers were strongly influenced by the noblest teachings in the Bible expressed in the great truth that man is a child of God and only in an atmosphere of liberty and freedom can he achieve the destiny a Divine Father has made possible.

In the address delivered at the American-Jewish tercentenary dinner last October, President Eisenhower said:

"Of all religious concepts, this belief in the infinite worth of the individual is beyond doubt among the most important. On this faith our forefathers constructed the framework of our Republic.

"In this faith in human dignity is the major difference between our own concept of life and that of enemies of freedom. The chief among these enemies a decade or more ago were Nazi and Fascist forces, which destroyed so many of our fellow men.

"Today the Communist conspiracy is the principal influence which derides the truth of human worth and atheistic ruthlessness seeks to destroy the free institutions established on the foundation of that truth."

The order of the B'nai B'rith has stood in the forefront of our efforts to maintain this liberty. For more than 112 years this association has provided effective leadership in this continuous battle for democracy and the enlightened concept of Americanism.

We agree with you that "it has been an around-the-clock job to be carried on 365 days a year."

It is a job you have performed so well in so many fields of human activities. I am sure all enlightened Americans are aware of your great contributions.

In these times when our basic concepts of our way of life are being threatened by an international conspiracy that seeks world domination, your efforts and your cooperation are more sorely needed than at any time since the establishment of your order.

THREAT TO OUR SECURITY

The security of this country is being threatened by the most powerful enemy ever to confront us. This threat is posed primarily by the advocates of a political and economic system that is a direct opposite of our basic beliefs. It operates through a worldwide conspiracy which has already

demonstrated strength in other countries and which reveals an ominous capacity to spread its poison through the system of democratic governments, leading to their downfall and the eventual enslavement of their people.

ATTORNEY GENERAL QUOTED

As the Attorney General has said, "The Communist conspiracy is a worldwide plot directed by scheming ruthless men who would bend the whole world to their selfish will. They cannot rest * * * until they have enslaved all the world. When repulsed in one area they try another. When one plot is exposed they hatch another. * * * They are willing to devote their lives to destroy in this country the very freedoms which allow them to speak and write and act."

I fully realize that loyal Americans cannot effectively support the Government's program to combat the effort to Communist infiltration unless they have an understanding of both the problem and the means by which we see to meet it.

ATTACK ON SECURITY PROGRAM

Today we are in the midst of a widespread attack on our security program, which could be dismissed lightly if it were confined to those sympathetic to the Communist cause. We can expect attacks on any effective program we might devise.

But when this attack is made by well-intentioned people who abhor the principles of communism as earnestly as this administration does, then it becomes necessary to set the record straight.

I do not believe there is one among you who would not agree that a security program is a vital necessity if our Government is to survive.

No one denies the need for removing from the Government or refusing a Government position to members or potential members of a fifth column.

I believe all of us would agree that it is the duty of the Government to remove from its ranks those whose personal habits or activities make them sources of vital information to our enemies.

It would appear, therefore, that the criticism which has been leveled recently at the Government's security program is not directed toward the objectives of the program but toward the methods used to put them into execution.

Under pressure of the 80th Congress, which had before it a wealth of testimony regarding Communist methods of infiltration and subversion, there was established in 1947 a loyalty program for Federal employees.

That program was so loaded down with technicalities that it soon became apparent it could not prove effectual. It was necessary under this program to prove present disloyalty to the United States.

WEAKNESS OF 1947 PROGRAM

This means that, under that program, a man might be found completely loyal when a week or a month earlier he had been an admitted Communist. Again, loyalty being the principal test of whether or not he was a good security risk, the question as to whether he was a man of good judgment or was one who could not, because of his personal habits or for other reasons, be trusted with vital confidential matters, would not be given the consideration such matters deserved.

Consequently, even before Inauguration Day, President Eisenhower charged his new Attorney General with the task of drafting a new program which would provide for the removal of security risks from Government.

This included not only those of doubtful loyalty, but those who would be indiscreet under the influence of liquor or whose personal habits would render them liable to blackmail or pressure.

Other factors determining whether an employee shall be hired or shall continue in Government service include membership in Fascist or extreme rightwing organizations such as the Silver Shirts and the Ku Klux Klan.

No claim is made that every person discharged from Government employment under the Eisenhower security program is a Communist or a Communist sympathizer. And there should not be a public conclusion that dismissal implies that they are Communists or even Communist sympathizers.

In establishing this security program, the administration did not neglect the traditional concepts of our democracy and the rights of individuals.

The administration realized fully that the security program must not be used to create friction between minority groups or to provide an opportunity for action based on prejudice.

We must particularly guard against the inference of prejudice in any security case, for if the breath of prejudice is ever so lightly blown on any facet of any security case, then not only is that case immeasurably weakened but the whole program is in danger of losing the faith and confidence of the people. In fact, democracy itself is weakened.

Let no one think for a moment that this administration is not fighting with all its strength the insiduous attempt to make the word "Jew" synonymous with the word "Communist."

The Federal employee security program is based on the premise fundamental in our law that Government employment is a privilege and not a right. That principle is an implied part of every instrument of appointment.

Until 1912, any Federal employee could be summarily dismissed without cause or hearing.

Since that time certain procedural safeguards for the dismissal of employees have been provided by statute.

But the present Federal employee security program actually affords our Government worker more rights and opportunities for notice and hearing than has ever been known in our civil-service practice heretofore. This is something the critics of the program do not tell you about. It has been a sound program and has worked well.

There have been a few cases—and a very few out of the tens of thousands of cases processed in this program—which have received widespread publicity, but I think you will find in examining any one of these cases that if an error was committed it was administrative and not in the program itself.

Any program, it must be remembered, is manned by human beings and subject therefore to human frailty.

To reduce these possible human errors to the barest minimum the Federal employee-security program is and will continue to be under constant review by the Government and, as you know, proposals have already been submitted to the President which are designed to keep to an absolute minimum any errors in administration.

Every effort is made to protect the Federal employee's rights. He has a written statement of charges and an opportunity for a hearing, at which time he is given every chance to refute the charges.

He has at his disposal the advisory opinion of a security hearing board composed of men of high integrity and intelligence who are not employees in his own department or agency and thus under no pressure or fear of disciplinary action.

Finally, he has the right of appeal to the head of his department or agency who under this program has the sole responsibility for making a final determination.

Decisions are not based on irresponsible statements from snoopers or prejudiced individuals and wherever possible the employee does have the opportunity to face any person who has furnished derogatory information and to subject him to the most searching cross-examination.

Despite all the protections the security program provides for the Government employee, the Communists have centered their attacks on the refusal of the Government to disclose its confidential informants.

It is known from the prosecution of Smith Act cases and espionage cases that the Communists always raise this issue. They know that to require the disclosure of confidential information or informants would either make it impossible for the Government to get rid of security risks or would destroy the infiltration of the Communist Party by the FBI.

Nothing would serve the interests of both the extreme left and extreme right better than the weakening or destruction of the FBI's informant system. It is the great bulwark of protection against the fifth-column activities of both the right and the left.

The effectiveness of the program can be measured by the outcries of the Communists. It must be good, because they are screaming louder than ever.

When you remember that it took only one spy to turn over the most important secrets of the atom bomb, and when you realize that atomic weapons can be carried or brought into this country secretly and by stealth, you appreciate how thin is the thread upon which the security of the Nation rests. You realize how vital it is to provide the strongest possible tests to protect our country against the very real threat of espionage, sabotage, and subversion with which we are faced in this era of cold war.

It is for this reason that I believe it is so necessary for the public to have a real understanding of the Government's security program.

The Communist attack against the security program also centers upon the use of informants as witnesses.

Those critics of the security program who say the use of these witnesses is a novel practice and a sharp departure from the American tradition of law just don't know what they are talking about. Such testimony has been recognized by the courts throughout English common law and American constitutional history. The ancient informer suit has in a sense survived even to the present day, and is reflected in the fact that certain Federal statutes contain provisions for awarding informers a share of fines imposed. Judge Learned Hand's opinion upholding the first Smith Act conspiracy case, the celebrated Dennis case, tried before Judge Medina in 1949, contained this statement by Judge Hand:

"Courts have countenanced the use of informers from time immemorial; in cases of conspiracy or in other cases when the crime consists of preparing for another crime it is usually necessary to rely upon informers or accomplices because the criminals will almost certainly proceed covertly."

Now let us examine for a moment some of the former Government witnesses who have been subjected to the most severe attack. Most of the former Communists who have appeared as expert witnesses have at one time or another held party positions. Each of them has spent long years in the party being trained in the treacherous and deadly principles of Marxism-Leninism. Some of them were sent to Moscow to attend the Lenin school for specialized training. Some have served as official Communist Party instructors at training schools here in the United States.

Now, this you should know: All Government witnesses are subjected to the most intensive and careful interrogation in preparation for their testimony.

Government attorneys spend literally weeks with them reviewing their past activity and, most important, every effort is made to corroborate each item of testimony.

In each instance, their testimony has been subjected to extended cross-examination by able counsel. This cross-examination itself covers long periods, not only days but weeks, and the testimony has been weighed by numerous American juries and found to be credible.

I cannot emphasize too much the secrecy under which the Communists operate. The job of ferreting them out, of exposing them for what they are, and of prosecuting them successfully is made extremely difficult.

They resort to disguises, to the use of aliases, to secret meetings, and fictitious passports. They use codes to communicate in secret and have a security program of their own which is extremely harsh and strict.

As you know, the FBI has undercover agents in the Communist Party to report to the Government on Communist activities.

Incidentally, so the current story goes, the Communist leaders are so red-faced over FBI activities that they now open their meetings with this greeting: Welcome comrades and all FBI agents present.

Many of these persons who have infiltrated the Communist Party have spent and are spending long bitter years masquerading as Communists. The experiences of these patriotic citizens have in some measure been revealed through testimony.

They have suffered all types of personal indignities from fellow citizens because of their presumed Communist activities. One informant, for example, had to discontinue attending church because of the antagonism shown him because of what were believed to be his Communist activities.

In almost every instance these witnesses have been publicly acclaimed for the service they have performed.

Because of the tactics employed by the Communist Party in its effort to smear Government witnesses, a great deal of courage is required by a former Communist or confidential informant who testified against Communists.

Any person who is familiar with the workings and methods of the party is fully aware that if he ever testifies against Communists he will be branded in the Communist press as a stool pigeon and a spy.

He has heard the party officials on innumerable occasions refer to this country as a "Fascist dictatorship," to Government officials and prosecutors as "tools of the imperialist warmongers," to the FBI as the "Gestapo police," and to religion as the "opium of the people."

We cannot lose sight of the fact, however, that the Communists are continuing their fight against the use of informants.

Their attack on Government witnesses is devious but unrelenting.

One such witness, Harvey Matusow, has achieved considerable notoriety in the past few months. He now claims he lied in his testimony to the Government.

Yet, before being used as a witness, he underwent exactly the same procedure as I have described, and as of this day, despite his protestations, there is no evidence that Matusow lied regarding those matters in which he testified for the Government as a witness. In an action before the Subversive Activities Control Board to establish that a certain organization was a Communist-front organization, his testimony was amply corroborated by independent evidence.

In the case where he figured most prominently—the Jencks case—the Federal court upon a hearing of the matter was convinced that his testimony was the truth and in sentencing him for contempt made this statement: "It is my firm conviction moreover that this hearing was deliberately brought on for the purpose of attacking the judgment of this court, attacking the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department, in a carefully thought-out scheme to generally discredit by these means the testimony of undercover agents and former Communist Party members who give evidence against the Communist Party of the United States and its adherents."

As a member of the Internal Security Committee of the Senate, I participated in a hearing in Salt Lake City, Utah, which had for its purpose the investigation of any possible infiltration of Communists into the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union.

Harvey Matusow was a witness at that hearing.

His statement before that committee was to the effect that he knew Mr. Jencks, one of the high officials in the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union; that sometime previously he had met Mr. Jencks at a ranch in New Mexico, which the witness observed was owned by a person who was a Communist and where secret Communist meetings were held. He stated that a conference at this ranch was attended by Mr. Jencks and Matusow and others. The witness said Jencks told those present that strikes were to be ordered in the copper mines in the West, the effect of which would be to slow down the United States war effort in Korea.

I was impressed that Matusow was telling the truth. There was corroborative evidence in the record supporting his story. Mr. Jencks was given the opportunity to affirm or deny the Matusow testimony. He refused to do so, claiming protection of the fifth amendment. There was no indication that Matusow was not telling the truth. Later I read Matusow's book, False Witness. I also heard him testify recently before the Internal Security Committee of the Senate. There was no repudiation so far as I recall of his testimony that he met Jencks at the New Mexico ranch; that he had a conference with him and others; that a strike was called in the Kennecott open cut mine in Utah and other places in the West; that the International Mine, Mill, and Smelter organization was the union which represented the copper miners in this strike.

The only thing, as I recall, which was denied was the statement that Jencks had discussed a plan for calling a strike in the copper mines to slow down the war effort in Korea. So I feel that I can add my personal testimony to the statement made by the Federal district judge of Texas that Matusow's testimony in the Jencks' case, as well as in the hearing at Salt Lake City, was true.

Much has been made of the Matusow change of position. I submit in all fairness that, considering all the circumstances, the Government and the committee of the Senate were not negligent in these instances.

I am firmly convinced that his change of position, his denial of his previous testimony came about as the result of inducements held out to Matusow which would be to his financial advantage. Just who brought about this change and the circumstances surrounding it are matters still under investigation.

I cannot tell you a surer way to do irreparable harm to our Communist prosecutions and to our security program as a whole than to be lulled into aiding the campaign of the Communists, their adherents, and the world assortment of leftwingers who fawn upon them. Never forget that the security program is designed to protect the Government—your Government, and that means you—against the boring-from-within tactics of the Communists and the extreme right elements. We must prevent them from infiltrating into the ranks of Government. You would not want these same kind of people in your own business.

And I would add that in cases where there is a reasonable doubt that the employee under investigation is a safe security risk, then that doubt should be resolved in favor of the Government and the people of the United States. That person would then be removed from the ranks. It will be in his own interest as well as all of the people in the United States. We cannot in these tragic and dangerous times gamble with the liberties and lives of the people of this country including the life of a citizen who may be determined to be a security risk.

I say particularly to this audience to avoid the whispered campaign of the pro-Communist and the pro-Fascist that the security program is directed against any certain minority or group. That is a typical Communist tactic, to throw dust in the eyes of its opponents and to obfuscate the issue by raising a false and collateral one. When you hear such whisperings, remember that of all the great powers in the world today it is the Soviet Union that is being charged in our newspapers with anti-Semitism and of all the countries from which Jews wish to emigrate to Israel it is the Soviet Union and its satellites which create the greatest and most rigid barrier.

In the book of Passover or Haggadah, which is read at the Seder services, your sages say, "In every age, each Jew should feel as if he himself was emancipated from Egypt." This is good counsel to all people at all times, for freedom can never be taken for granted. Ten years ago the Nazi threat was terminated through blood, sweat, and tears. Today freedom is threatened by the Soviet conspiracy and, as the Israelites of old struggled to be unshackled from the chains of slavery of a Pharaoh, so must all freedom-loving men today do everything they can to prevent the tentacles of communism from shackling each and every one of us to everlasting slavery. In the battle we are waging today we must strive with all our might to halt the inroads of tyranny and dictatorship. In the spirit of the Passover holiday we must resolve to sacrifice to make men free to protect the dignity of man, to enable all men to live in peace and security.

At the same time we must have faith and confidence in our ability as freemen to achieve the peace and security which we all seek. We must have full confidence in the ability of a democracy such as ours to solve its difficult problems and to meet, as it has before, the challenge to its continuance. B'nai B'rith is a vehicle which enables man to join in the battle for democracy being waged today. Your organization can and does provide the tools by which the sinews of this battle can be further strengthened and utilized. I take this opportunity, then, to congratulate you on your past achievements, to wish you success in your present deliberations, and to extend to you my sincerest hopes for all success in your future patriotic endeavors.

A Salute to REA on Its Twentieth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A SALUTE TO REA ON ITS TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT CREATES REA

One of the momentous acts of our great and distinguished former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration in Executive Order 7037 on May 11, 1935. Now,

neatly ensconced in a bound volume of Executive orders of 20 years ago, it turns out to be one of the greatest achievements of his distinguished administration.

It is of historic interest to note that this Executive order was issued during the dark depression days of 1935, not under a regular act of Congress, but pursuant to the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, which was approved on April 8, 1935, under Public Resolution No. 11 of the 74th Congress. Note how closely the creation of the REA by Executive order followed the passage of the Emergency Relief Act, namely by 1 month and 3 days.

Here are the momentous words of President Roosevelt in that now famous Executive order:

"I hereby establish an agency within the Government to be known as the Rural Electrification Administration, the head thereof to be known as the Administrator."

In the following pithy language of this Executive order President Roosevelt gave the REA broad power to really do a job whether it was the generation, transmission, or the distribution of that electric energy:

"I hereby prescribe the following duties and functions of the said Rural Electrification Administration to be exercised and performed by the Administrator * * *.

"To initiate, formulate, administer, and supervise a program of approved projects with respect to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy in rural areas."

What a contrast this is with the so-called partnership policies today which shy away completely from having the Government aid in establishing standards and providing assistance that permits the people back home to really do a job.

Likewise, it is of historic interest to note that this famous order was basically concerned with providing jobs for the vast army of unemployed at that time, as the following language of the Executive order discloses in providing first preference for those on relief:

"*Provided*, That insofar as practicable, the persons employed under the outlines of this Executive order should be selected from those receiving relief."

As a closing note to this historic Executive order which has done so much to start rural America on its way to equality with the comforts and the opportunities and the good life of our city neighbors, a pitiful sum was made available to launch this now famous program on its way, for the Executive order only allocated $75,000 for administrative expenses:

"For the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration there is hereby allotted to the administration from the appropriation made by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 the sum of $75,000. Allocations will be made hereafter for authorized projects."

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is fitting that we now pause and pay the highest personal tribute to this great American, this distinguished statesman, who by this famous Executive Order 7037, made REA possible.

THE INSPIRING LEADERSHIP OF SPEAKER SAMUEL RAYBURN

Mr. Speaker, after paying this well-earned historic tribute to our former great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, let us recognize the obvious fact that it is one thing for the President to draft an Executive order, and it is quite another for the Congress to pass legislation which will make such temporary actions possible.

It is, therefore, proper that we now turn to our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAMUEL RAYBURN, and pay to him the just tribute that he personally and historically has so well earned in the establishment of this national vital organization, the REA.

After the President created the REA by Executive Order 7037 on May 11, 1935, the long, difficult job remained of providing suitable legislation in Congress. Those of you who are personally familiar with this congressional area know the difficulties under which such legislation was created. Far from being an easy task, it challenged the finest leadership of the late, distinguished Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, and our present Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAMUEL RAYBURN. It is a long story. Abbreviated time only permits us to condense into a few short conclusions.

Nevertheless, under the distinguished leadership of our Speaker, the Honorable SAMUEL RAYBURN, on May 20, 1936, a temporary emergency relief program sponsored by REA was made into a permanent, independent agency of the Government known as the Rural Electrification Administration. It was Speaker RAYBURN'S vigorous leadership that made possible the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, long after the dust has settled on many temporary activities of Congress which caused much shouting and tumult at the time, your splendid leadership in helping to create a permanent REA will be remembered as long as people live in America. I proposed that the Members of this body pay a rising tribute to you on this memorable occasion.

WHAT THE REA HAS DONE

Mr. Speaker, volumes and volumes of statistics have been compiled upon the accomplishments of REA. I am afraid if I presented them to this body only in part, that after I had proceeded for only a few moments all of us would have rural electrification statistics indigestion. So I propose to give you only the highlights—a few things that show what a tremendous program the REA is and how vast and significant are those accomplishments.

Take, first of all, the basic question of how much has REA really accomplished in electrifying rural America. Mr. Speaker, let us recall that back in 1934, before the REA was established, less than 11 percent of all the farms in the United States had central station electric service. Keep that figure in mind—11 percent in 1934.

And what is the picture today? Mr. Speaker, I am happy to tell you that this tiny figure of 11 percent has now climbed to 94 percent. Let me repeat that figure—94 percent.

I believe everyone will agree that an increase in rural electrification from less than 11 percent to 94 percent is a tremendous accomplishment. How was this remarkable accomplishment made possible? Very simply. The people received the genuine aid of your Federal Government through a real partnership, not a phony one. They were given the necessary technical and financial aid to help them do the job, and largely through independent private corporations of their own choosing. As a result, the costs were brought down to a price that people could afford to pay.

In the olden days, retail rates of 10, 12, and 15 cents and more a kilowatt-hour were not uncommon. And what do the REA users pay for their electricity today? Mr. Speaker, you will be interested in knowing, that in 1954, the average rates paid by REA consumers of electricity was around 3 cents a kilowatt hour. This is getting electricity down to a price that the common folks use it in large quantities.

As a result, the amount of energy purchased by the REA consumers increased, from some 402 million kilowatt-hours in 1940, to over 14 billion kilowatt-hours today.

Just look how the membership of this splendid organization of private REA borrowers has grown. Back in 1935 they had some 6,000 miles of lines which served about 26,000 persons. Now, they have over 1,365,000 miles of line serving over 4,250,000. At an average of 5 to the farmer consumer, this means that some 20 million persons in rural America are receiving the blessings of this marvelous program.

Our time is short, Mr. Speaker, and I merely want to close with these salient remarks. The REA has become a vital part of the bones and sinews of rural America, which means all of America. It is doing a magnificient job. We, in Congress, who are its friends, are determined that this splendid job shall continue, and we will not tolerate any political interference with its administration which seeks to curb the forward march of rural electrification in America under the brilliant banner of the REA cooperatives.

Waste in Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the April 19 edition of the New York Herald Tribune entitled, "Waste in Surplus Property."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 19, 1955]

WASTE IN SURPLUS PROPERTY

The Hoover Commission report on surplus property is unanimous. None of the members had reservations or made dissents to any of the recommendations. This may stem in part from the fact that in dealing with the problem of Government property in excess of requirements, the Commission made virtually no policy proposals; its suggestions were directed, rather, at improving the administration of procurement and disposal. However, these recommendations are of very great importance. As the Commission points out, an additional cent received on each dollar cost of property sold would yield an additional $20 million yearly.

This saving could come merely from improvements in selling surplus stocks. The Commission recommends a number of such improvements—better advertising methods, for example; provisions for adequate display of samples and for sufficient time to allow inspection; consultation with civilian merchandising experts.

Much larger economies would result, the Commission asserts, "from more efficient property management throughout the Government and particularly within the Military Establishment, which accounts for about 99 percent of all goods bought and stocked by the Government." To a very large extent, such management requires greater care in stockpiling and purchasing for consumption. The accumulation of 128 years' supply of gear drives is an extreme instance of the need for such qualities.

The United States will be disposing of surplus property at the rate of about $2 billion a year for several years to come. The first requirement is to insure that it is really surplus—that no Government agency will be

buying more of the same goods in ignorance of what is on hand. The second is to make certain that the Government can sell its surplus in the best market. The third is to guard against the future acquisition of large, useless stocks which in their turn must be given away for nothing or sold at a fraction of their cost. For this whole process, essential to the economical functioning of Government, the Hoover Commission has given sound and detailed blueprints.

Behind the Iron Curtain—How the Russians Look at Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, in the past few weeks I have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD several articles written by May Craig, Washington columnist for the Guy Gannett newspapers in Maine, which were written during May's recent trip to Russia. These articles have given us a much clearer picture of life behind the Iron Curtain. Usually visitors to the Soviet countries see little concrete evidence of anti-Americanism on their carefully guided tours. May visited a Museum of Religions in Leningrad which she has described in a column entitled "How the Russians Look at Religion," which was printed in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald on May 4, 1955.

I ask unanimous consent that this column, which describes the violent propaganda attack against the United States and the Catholic Church in the Museum of Religions in Leningrad, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of May 4, 1955]

BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—HOW THE RUSSIANS LOOK AT RELIGION

(By May Craig)

LENINGRAD.—Communism has always condemned religion and tried to destroy it, short of absolute forceful abolition. Communism tolerates no individualism, no other allegiance, no deviation in thought, therefore religion must be destroyed. While some churches are open for services (including a Baptist church in Moscow), many of them have been turned into museums and libraries.

In Leningrad the ancient and handsome Cathedral of Notre Dame of Kazan has been turned into a Museum of Religions. A guide for the museum, interpreted by a very poor interpreter, said that the aim of the museum is to show the development of various religions, as a scientific study, the evolution of religions. Only two were open yet, Christianity and the Greek, they said; the others are under construction, and we saw, behind curtains, the scaffoldings. Most attention was paid to Christianity; the Greek exhibit consisted mostly of plaster reproductions of famous Greek gods and a colored plaster model of the Oracle of Adelphi.

There was a sketchy Judaic collection, laying foundation for the Christian exhibit which was obviously the major effort. The guide said that exhibits of Islam, Buddhism and others were in preparation. The Christian exhibit was extensive, beginning with the doctrine of the Virgin birth. There were charts explaining the doctrine of the Trinity. Nature of the exhibit was indicated in a large painting showing a hideous, slave-driving fat man in top hat and fine clothes, obviously the "millionaire landlord" type, leaning over a large cross and wielding a whip on the bending, tortured bodies of black, brown and yellow people, while in the foreground, Jesus is departing. This the guide said, illustrates Christianity and colonial policies.

The interpreter seemed so halting in her translation that I got the idea that she was trying to soften some of the words spoken by the guide, the printed captions on statutes and pictures, though her English was not good at any time.

The exhibit included a running story of Christianity in its most unlovely aspects, the torture of heretics, the fat monk and the starving peasant, the grinning plotting Jesuit, the persecution of scientists—Bruno at the stake for maintaining that stars and earth rotate. There were fearsome presentations of cult of witches and Satanism, and a chamber of an alchemist, the scientists of the Middle Ages who were banned for research.

There was the massacre of St. Bartholomew when French Catholics slaughtered Protestants. There were horrific presentations of the inquisition, and the biggest single piece is a torture chamber, with priests on a dias presiding, the torturer producing his brazier, instruments of torture all around and a dying victim on a rack. This is a large exhibit in a glass case.

There were representations of the crusades, "force used to kill ideas." The exhibits led up to modern times. The index of forbidden books by the Vatican; cartoons ridiculing church and saints. All the way through the plain purpose was to show that there are many religions, all claiming to be the right one. Since all cannot be, the implication is that none has any validity. Once the guide used the words "Christian mythology," thus lumping them all together. All through the exhibit, religion was made a welter of ridiculous fairy tale, enforced by torture and suppression of thought. This inescapably led to the Communist doctrine of atheism, the destruction of religious belief, which leaves the way open for communism to become the only religion, to reign supreme, the state on the altar.

Virulent attack was made on the Pope, in cartoon and poster. Then the exhibit got to the United States, a prime objective. A hand and arm labeled U. S. A. was shown pouring coins into the head-mitre of the Pope, and out of the Pope's mouth comes the word "Anathema." The attack on the Catholic Church and the United States together demonstrated the fear of the strong resistance of catholicism to communism; the fear of the power of freedom as embodied in the United States form of government. The Catholic Church and the United States must be destroyed—that is the aim. The museum was full of Russians, looking at the exhibits—this is a powerful piece of propaganda, the stronger because there is truth in the sins of Christianity, from the burning at the stake by the Catholics to the witches who were burned in Salem; propaganda against the democracy of the United States. In one place there were large bronze statues of young men kicking over a bronze block labeled U. S. A.—this was part of an exhibit showing young Russia marching toward freedom and light and education through revolution and communism. This is a very clever effort to destroy religion and get faster hold on the people of this country. It should not be underestimated.

Nor had they forgotten propaganda against lynching of Negroes in the United States, with some genuine photographs of real lynchings that I had seen in our own newspapers at home. And pictures of Ku Klux Klan. They exploit every incident that can be used to our disadvantage—because the United States is presented as the prime enemy among nations.

Address by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, Before Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] before the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Washington, D. C., on April 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 21, 1955

To me, as a Texan, there is a particular significance in addressing this great body on this historic anniversary.

It was just 119 years ago that a small group of Texans stormed the camp of Santa Anna at the junction of the San Jacinto River and Buffalo Bayou.

By ordinary standards, it was a desperate gamble. The Texans were outnumbered 2 to 1. They were torn and haggard from an unbroken string of defeats—San Antonio, Agua Dulce, Goliad, Refugio, and Victoria.

Santa Anna was in a position that he thought impregnable. His troops were flushed with an unbroken string of victories and had been strengthened by the addition of 400 battle-hardened soldiers under General Cos.

So confident was he that his afternoon siesta was well under way when the charge began. His slumbers were suddenly interrupted by 800 Texans who burst into the camp singing "Will You Come to the Bower" and shouting the immortal battle cry: "Remember the Alamo; remember Goliad."

Scarcely had Santa Anna blinked the sleep from his eyes when the battle was over. His entire force—consisting of 1,600 men—had been killed, captured, or wounded. The successful campaign of a tyrant had turned suddenly into a triumph for liberty.

Once again free men, united under a great leader, Sam Houston, had proved the superiority of the ideas under which we all live. The immediate result was freedom—freedom and independence for the Republic of Texas.

In my native State the memory of San Jacinto will always remain as fresh and as real as the eternal promise of spring. It will hold forth forever the Divine pledge of victory for those whose hearts are courageous and who march under the banner of liberty.

But in a large sense the meaning of San Jacinto is not confined within the borders of Texas. It is true that it led to independence and the Republic. But beyond the

Republic—just across the waters of the Sabine River—was the United States of America, beckoning with the hand of brotherhood.

The Texans who fought at San Jacinto were Americans—led by one of the giants of American history. Sam Houston was a man who never faltered in his allegiance to the ideals of Valley Forge and Bunker Hill. He died as he had lived all his life—dedicated to the spirit of the Constitution.

It is for these reasons that I address you tonight with a heightened sense of the solemnity of this occasion.

I have never shared the feeling of those who look upon history with scorn. I have never agreed with the contention that the symbols of bygone days have no value in the present.

A people who ignore the past will never survive to meet the future. A people who are contemptuous of their ancestors can never inspire their posterity.

History demonstrates one fact conclusively. It is that every nation which has lost its sense of patriotism—its sense of historical continuity—has perished. Should we lose those values our country would be no exception.

For the tremendous work you have done in preserving the ideals of America, my congratulations. We are stronger because you—the Daughters of the American Revolution—have labored to keep before us the inspiring deeds of our great men.

Paging through your manual on the objectives of the DAR, I was greatly struck by one phrase in particular. It described the work of your historical department as "preservation of the deeds of the past, holding fast to ideals which make the present, and helping to build a future America."

I was struck by that phrase because it describes so perfectly the major task which should be before all Americans. The past has led to the present and, unless we understand both and act upon the understanding, there will be no future.

We are living in a time that is usually called the atomic age.

In reality the phrase is used loosely. Thus far the overwhelming mass of our knowledge of nuclear physics has been used solely for weapons of destruction. The atom is still a long way from active participation in our peacetime pursuits.

Nevertheless, it has become a key fact in our foreign relations and in our national defense.

The atom dominates our preparedness program. It is a compelling reality at every international conference. It dominates the thinking of our people beyond any other event of the 20th century.

One of the outstanding features of the "cold war" has been the atomic race between the East and the West. Our top experts assure us that we are ahead in that race—not only in the development of the atom but in the even more dreaded hydrogen weapons.

There is every reason to believe that those assurances are correct.

However, we confront another danger—one which I would like to discuss with you tonight. It is that we—the people of the United States— can become too emotionally dependent on atomic weapons and leave ourselves vulnerable on other fronts.

I am not raising this point in any spirit of contention. I am not arguing that our defense planners have missed some boat. I am not claiming that a wrong turns has been taken which will lead us down the road to disaster.

My sole objective is to bring before your organization—which has never faltered from its devotion to national defense—a point which has not had sufficient public discussion.

In the years that lie ahead, our Nation will devote a large—possibly an increasing—share of its national budget to atomic and hydrogen weapons. We can not escape this grim necessity. It flows from the very nature of the modern world.

We will stockpile every type of nuclear weapon. We will develop every type of atomic carrier that can bring those weapons to a potential enemy. We will remain in a position of atomic readiness—on the alert to retaliate against aggression.

But it is possible to foresee a situation in which we could go to war without unleashing the atomic power that is at our command. It is possible to foresee a situation in which it would be against our interests to conduct hostilities on the atomic level.

Should that happen, the impact upon our people would be deeply disturbing. They would be unprepared for the realities and an unprepared people unite against an enemy only with difficulty.

The difficulty arises from a simple fact that is too often overlooked. It is that an atomic weapon is very much like a sledge hammer—a mighty poor instrument for swatting flies in a greenhouse.

It cannot be used to defend our troops when they are fighting at close quarters. It cannot be used effectively against an enemy whose methods of organization are primitive and who depends little upon massed centers of supply.

The strides in the development of atomic weapons have been enormous. Every stride has meant a solid building block in the wall of our security. But we would be sadly—tragically—mistaken if we thought that the atomic wall alone was enough.

There is no patented medicine that will assure our survival—not even if it bears an atomic label. Nothing could lead to our destruction more quickly than to delude ourselves into believing that there is a cheap, easy solution to our preparedness problem.

There are far too many instances in the history of the world where reliance upon one type of strength has led to no strength at all.

Before World War II, the French placed their reliance in the infantry and Maginot line. Both quickly crumbled before the combined onslaught of the Nazi Panzer divisions and Stuka dive bombers.

The Nazis, in turn, had placed far too much reliance upon tactical air weapons. In the final showdown, they were incapable of defending Germany from the strategic bombing developed by the Allied Powers.

"Gadget thinking" in military matters has led to the destruction of many great nations. We must not make the same mistake.

We must realize that the ground forces still occupy a fundamental position in modern defense. We must realize that the Navy is still essential to modern warfare.

All of the services must be modernized and streamlined. But that does not mean that they should be weakened in the hope that some miracle weapon will compensate for the loss of strength.

We are, of course, fully justified in using atomic weapons where they will save American lives and shorten the fighting. But there are too many situations in which weapons of mass destruction will not achieve those goals.

There is also the frightening prospect that some day these weapons will become capable of worldwide devastation. They may become so powerful that they cannot be used under any circumstances.

On that day, atomic weapons could be another Maginot line—costly but useless. The Nation that had maintained defenses we now consider conventional would be triumphant. The Nation that had placed its trust solely in atomic weapons would bow to an alien yoke.

This is not an appeal to abandon atomic weapons—far from it! We must push ahead with all possible research into that field as though our lives depended upon it—for indeed they do.

This is a plea for balance—for public understanding of the tasks that lie before us as Americans. Without that balance, we will not be truly strong as a Nation.

We cannot build our defensive strength solely upon the atom any more than we can build our diplomatic strength solely upon the atom. I do not believe that our military leaders have any illusions upon that score. But there will be little strength of any kind unless our people as a whole are informed of the facts.

No nation can be any stronger than the will of its people. Since ours is a democratic form of Government, the will can exist only when it is informed.

We are entering a stage of this Congress where the questions I am discussing today will assume paramount importance.

The appropriation bills that determine the size of our Army, Navy, and Air Force are grinding through the committees. Manpower legislation cannot much longer be deferred. Money for our atomic programs will become a "must" by the end of this fiscal year—only a little more than 2 months away.

These are not routine questions. They involve two fundamental issues that are dear to the hearts of all Americans—the survival of our institutions and the defeat of communism.

I know of no organization more dedicated to those goals than the Daughters of the American Revolution. I know of no group which has followed its course more faithfully—refusing to be turned aside by any opposition, no matter how strong and no matter how vehement.

You are meeting in our Nation's Capital where some of the great decisions of our history are being made. Those decisions will determine the shape of our future—and whether we have a future.

Soon, you will be returning to your homes and your communities. You will be back among your friends and neighbors—among the people who look to you as individuals for leadership.

Your words will carry great weight because in a unique sense you are the custodians of the Nation's great traditions.

I know your guidance will follow the spirit of the Founders of our Republic. I know you will walk in the footsteps of those great men who combined prudent deliberation with bold action; patriotic courage with grim determination.

Our country is threatened as it has not been since its foundation. The forces of communism are on the march. They have swallowed up already hundreds of millions of the world's people. They are reaching out greedily for more slaves.

The ultimate objective of the Communist assault on liberty is the United States. The Kremlin will not feel secure as long as our free institutions stand.

Our people have the will and the courage to safeguard our liberties from the Communist attack. They need only the unity that comes from informed guidance and frank discussion of the problems before us.

With that understanding, they will bear any burden, no matter how heavy, and freedom and the way of life for which our ancestors fought will triumph on this earth.

Local Financing and Control of School Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "School Problems Best Met by Local Financing, Control," published in the Ohio State Journal of April 6, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL PROBLEMS BEST MET BY LOCAL FINANCING, CONTROL

The quality of the public schools of the United States is suffering because of overcrowded classrooms, financial neglect, and poor teacher morale, according to a voluminous report compiled by a group of educators and presented at a regional convention of the American Association of School Administrators in Cleveland.

CROWDED CLASSES

High quality education, the report declares, cannot be produced under such conditions as overcrowded classrooms, long hours and inadequate salaries for teachers and administrators. It adds that a great deal of improvement in working conditions has taken place in the public schools, but much of it has been in building construction, lighting, heating, ventilation, sanitation, and instructional material.

Meanwhile, it is observed, teachers still work long hours, carry armloads of paper home for night and weekend work, coach plays, sponsor clubs, police lunchrooms, and perform many tasks outside the hours of the instruction room and the regular school day.

OUTSIDE DEMANDS

It was commented that teachers spend 4 or more years preparing to do a good job of teaching, but on the first job discover that a large part of the teaching day and a lot of home time must be devoted to work that calls for no professional training.

To many citizens it probably seems that they have been most generous to the schools. In election after election they vote for bond issues for new school buildings and modernization of old ones and to renew and increase school operating levies primarily so the salaries of teachers can be increased. Yet it appears that what has been done is not enough.

CONTINUING INCREASES

The fact is that the needs of the education of our young are never-ending, always increasing. For one thing, the general population increases and the increasing size of families have increased the need of classrooms and that means new or expanded school buildings. It means buildings in new residential areas and modernization of facilities in the older sections. And from all indications this need will continue to climb through the years of the immediate future. The problem is nationwide but in some localities, as in rapidly growing Columbus, it is greater than the average.

And in a competitive employment field, the shortage of teachers is not to be wondered at. The shortage is not entirely due to lack of professionally trained persons. Many who are qualified for teaching have been attracted from the profession by higher salaries offered in the business and industrial world. The report made to the school administrators meeting in Cleveland stressed that higher salaries would keep teachers in the profession.

In the Columbus School District, teachers' salaries have been raised several times in recent years, but they are not yet commensurate with the importance of the task with which the teachers are entrusted.

SHORTAGE ALARMING

"Schools play a more important role in today's society than in any period of our history," said the report. "Yet pupil enrollments are excessively large. The teacher shortage is alarming. In many places school-building facilities are out of date and overcrowded. And money with which to provide top grade public school education is inadequate."

What are we to do about it? How can the money be raised to provide the best that can be obtained for the young people who are to be our future citizens, our social, business and political leaders?

Naturally the money must be raised by taxation. We shall have to keep voting for school levies and school bond issues, or else relax our present limitations on tax levies so as to permit higher taxes without so many special levies having to be submitted to the voters.

BURDEN OF TAXATION

But with Federal taxes taking such a large part of our earnings and incomes, plus the local taxes necessary for our schools and local governments, how can we stand any stiffer taxes?

One answer is for the people of the United States, right down into each and every community, to insist upon, work toward and accept the results of reduced Federal spending. With reduced Federal spending will come lower Federal taxes and then a larger part of the total tax dollar would become available by local approval at the polls for spending on our local public schools and our local governments in general.

UNITED STATES CONTROL NOT ANSWER

The problem cannot be met adequately economically or properly in any sense by turning over any part of the school financing problem to the Federal Government as some people propose. Such a move would only increase the cost of the Federal Government, increase Federal taxes without bringing about any local reduction and lead to bureaucratic inefficiency waste and inequality of distribution and, worst of all, Federal regulation of the schools.

The school financing problem can best be solved by keeping school financing and school control close to home, through a shift in the tax dollar from Federal bureaucracy to local, home rule budgeting, and administration by locally elected boards of education, responsible directly to the voters of the various communities.

The Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the Army has come in for some critical examination by the Members of this body, and it is a great pleasure to bring to your attention a new activity of the Army which merits close and sympathetic consideration. I am referring to the Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va.

It was my privilege, at the invitation of one of the students, Col. John C. Lackas, Assistant Comptroller for International Affairs, Office of the Comptroller of the Army, to spend an afternoon and evening participating in this farsighted and, at the same time, intensely practicable program. Fort Belvoir is, of course, the Army's Engineer Center and, under the able leadership of Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss and his chief of staff, Brig. Gen. Max S. Johnson, has maintained and enlarged the glorious tradition of the Corps of Engineers. Being the home of the Engineer School, the oldest service school in the United States Army, and the Engineer Research and Development Laboratories, it is fitting that the Army's newest school be in such illustrious company.

Under the operational control of the commanding general of the Continental Army Command, Gen. John E. Dahlquist, with the invaluable assistance and technical guidance of Lt. Gen. Laurin L. Williams, comptroller of the Army, and the continuing support of Maj. Gen. John H. Stokes, Sr., commanding general of the military district of Washington, the Department of the Army has established this school for the intensive and advanced managerial training of senior officers from all of the various branches of the Army. I am happy to say that the Command Management School has recently become a permanent activity and will be a continuing source for the improvement of management skills of commanders. These capable and experienced officers, guided by a carefully selected staff and faculty headed by Col. Frank Kowalski, Jr., commandant, contribute, and thereby enlarge, their knowledge and comprehension of the tremendous and complex nontactical management problems that must be met and solved if our Army is to maintain and increase its essential combat effectiveness. The enthusiasm and keen interest with which the class members and faculty attack the problems of expenditures, efficiency, coordination, and productivity described in their case studies bodes much good for the Army's future relations with this body. These are men who clearly understand their responsibilities as custodians of our Nation's resources as entrusted to them by the Congress for our defense.

Every 4 weeks a group of about 50 senior officers and key Army civilian officials, with a few from the Navy and Air Force, become students again for a period of 3 weeks. Included in the five classes which have completed this course of instruction were 2 major generals and 10 brigadier generals. Let me state emphatically that this is no snap course. The all-day sessions which are scheduled to 10 p. m. are days of intense application, making the final diploma a much valued and respected document. The materials considered, the problems analyzed are fundamentally pragmatic and concern the day-by-day, week-by-week, and budget-by-budget workings of the Army. The solutions arrived at are equally realistic and valid.

We, the Congress of the United States, are in effect the great board of directors of the United States Army; we make the the allocations, we periodically examine its functioning, we check its balance sheets, but we cannot be the actual administrators. We now have a new ally, a new support, the Command Management School. Quietly working and spreading its influence throughout our Armed Forces, it will, I am convinced, justify the confidence expressed in it by Hon. Charles C. Finucane, the Under Secretary of the Army, who said of this

school: "I think the Army has done a superb job, and this school is a tool that can be used to pass on the new techniques that have been developed to those who have actual operating responsibilities."

As a former enlisted man, I was very impressed with the work done and the interest generated by this group of officers. I enthusiastically commend the Command Management School to the Congress and suggest a personal visit while the course is in progress. You will find it, I am sure, a most refreshing and stimulating experience, and through this informal contact we may all gain a clearer perspective. The motto of this important addition to our arsenal of skills might well serve for us all: "From knowledge the power of decision."

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, yesterday, May 10, was Rumanian Independence Day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement commemorating this significant day in the history of these gallant people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER, COMMEMORATING RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, MAY 10, 1955

May 10 is a significant day in the history of the Rumanian people. On this day in 1866, the Rumanian dynasty under Charles, Prince of Hohensollern-Signaringen, had its glorious beginning. Also, on May 10, 1877, Rumania declared its independence from the Ottoman Empire and thenceforth flowered into one of the leading nations of Europe—the home of people who cherish liberty and independence and whose culture has added immeasurably to the heritage of western civilization.

Despite their strong will for freedom and long struggle against the forces of oppression, the Rumanian people this year again awoke on the anniversary of their independence to view their land in the grips of an oppressive, dictatorial force bent upon reducing them to spineless slaves. The Rumanian people and their millions of friends cannot foretell the day when their country will again take its rightful place among the free nations of the world. Yet, with faith in God and with knowledge of the Rumanian people's indomitable will, their courage and love of liberty, freedom loving people everywhere are confident that this eventful day will come. The future remains the source of our hopes.

Meanwhile, these gallant people who love freedom, but are not free, keep the fine traditions of their country alive and the flame of Rumanian independence burning in their hearts. On this anniversary of independence, the American people reaffirm our past pledges of friendship and support and join in prayer that the day of liberation from the Communist yoke is not far off.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 8 our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who also is the senior Member of the Senate, delivered a most thoughtful address before the Polish-American Congress, at a rally held at Town Hall in New York City. His address dealt with some of the issues which should concern all of us here in the Senate—issues which are of special interest to Americans of Polish descent. The occasion of the rally was the observance of Polish Constitution Day.

The Senator's speech, which included extensive reference to the need for revising the Refugee Relief Act and the McCarran-Walter Act, deserves to be widely read. I ask unanimous consent that this fine address by our beloved colleague be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AT POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS RALLY, AT TOWN HALL, INC., NEW YORK CITY, ON MAY 8, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the Polish-American Congress:

I thank you heartily for the invitation to address you here on Polish Constitution Day. It is, of course, always a pleasure to meet with you of the American Polonia. Over the years, I have attended many gatherings organized by Polish-American organizations. The warmth of feeling and high level of discussion which have always characterized such meetings, have, each time renewedly been a fresh source of gratification to me.

Added to my pleasure today at being invited to speak at this rally in Town Hall is my realization of the importance of this occasion. Our purpose in meeting here now is to stage a demonstration which will remind everyone of the cause of Polish independence, and which will reawaken the conscience of all Americans to the suffering of the Polish people who are striving to maintain their national life in the face of ruthless Communist oppression. We are here to serve notice that we have had enough of empty words and hollow promises. We are here to state that we will not be satisfied with fantasies about a nonexistent policy of "liberation" fantasies which mock the hopes of the enslaved Poles for an end to the terrible reality of their oppression. We are here to demand action.

I am especially aware of the importance of our task now, because I was involved in the work of bringing independence to Poland almost 40 years ago. At that time I was working with a President of the United States who was not content just to issue statements about "liberation"—but who also worked with all his energies to accomplish what he felt to be his sacred duty, namely, to bring freedom to the Polish nation. Some of you may yourselves have participated in the work which went on then here in America on behalf of Polish independence: Others of you have heard about it from your fathers. You know that President Woodrow Wilson's idea about "self-determination" was not only a campaign promise. It was also a living principle which guided his policies and his actions. President Wilson dedicated his life to the idea that men have the right to choose their own national identity and form of government. He never allowed our country's allies to forget that Poles had been illegally deprived of that right. He fought tirelessly at the international conference tables to have that right restored. Polish independence was one of President Wilson's Fourteen Points. He made it a prerequisite of world peace.

I had the great privilege of seeing personally the results of President Wilson's efforts, when the President of Poland invited me to visit that country on the 10th anniversary of Polish independence. I stayed in Poland for several months, traveling through the country and meeting the people. Everywhere I went, from the official receptions in Warsaw and the Wawel Palace in Cracow, to the small villages and the countryside, I was impressed by a sense of unity and of progress. The same industry, the same devotion to democratic principles, the same selfless dedication to the common good, which I had observed here at home among Americans of Polish descent, I found clearly in evidence in Poland itself. Everywhere I went, I found a feeling of friendship and gratitude to America. To the people of Poland, America had become the country of Woodrow Wilson, the adopted land of their friends and relatives—the nation which had kept them in mind when they were enslaved.

You and I are thinking of Poles, again living under a foreign tyranny. Perhaps I should better say existing instead of living. We wish that those Poles were still comforted by the thought that America has not forgotten them, that America will not rest until they are free. But, I am afraid that there are moments in which they cannot help but wonder if this is so. Certainly the Soviets have not failed to inform them that the United States, the country which they had always thought was a haven for the oppressed, has now reduced by statute Americans of foreign birth to the rank of second-class citizens. Word must have reached reached them that many of their countrymen who managed to escape from communism are living in displaced persons' camps in Germany, because America refuses to admit them. They must wonder why the United States, which they know is rich, cannot let them hear more of the Voice of America broadcasts which might be comforting to them. They have heard blusterings about liberation, which seemed to call for new sacrifices on their part in the fight against communism, but did not mention one specific thing which we would do to bring the day of liberation nearer.

We Americans are aware of even more disquieting facts, and we are wondering what our administration's policies add up to in this critical period.

More than 4 years ago, the United Nations passed the Genocide Convention, an international law intended to protect the people of Poland and other enslaved nations from the brutality of the Soviets. This law still remains unratified by the United States. Why? Because just a few weeks after the inauguration of President Eisenhower, his Secretary of State declared that the new administration would not press for the ratification of the convention.

We have also known for sometime that something has been terribly wrong about the way in which the present administration has been handling the refugee-relief program, which President Truman had launched in order to enable refugees from communism to come to the United States and here resume useful lives again. Everyone in our country, and perhaps all newspaper readers, radio listeners and TV viewers around the globe, should now be fully aware, following

the explosive firing of Edward Corsi from the State Department, that the highly-touted refugee program of this administration has been a dismal failure. The obvious reason is directly traceable to the lack of genuine sympathy on the part of this administration, and especially among the very personnel charged with putting the Refugee Relief Act into effect. We now know that the administration has actually sabotaged the relief program. There are about 50,000 Polish refugees living in Germany alone. Among them are many veterans and children of veterans of the Polish Armed Forces, who fought for us in Africa, Salerno, Monto Cassino and almost every other battlefield of World War II. They are living under very bad conditions, many suffering deprivation and disease. But, our administration has not only failed to come up with a program that would help our friends there, it has also actually frustrated the expressed wishes of the American people and their Congress by refusing to admit these refugees to America.

The question logically arises, since this heavy criticism is leveled at the Republican administration—What are responsible Democrats doing about the situation?

I am happy to answer that question by calling attention to the bill recently introduced by the senior Senator from New York, Mr. LEHMAN, to revise thoroughly the Refugee Relief Act. Cosponsors with him were Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; and Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Although he voted for the original refugee-relief bill because he believed in its expressed purposes, Senator LEHMAN warned at the time of passage that there would probably be a day of rude awakening. We have now seen that day. The act contains provisions robbing it of its truly humanitarian features and turns it into a prescription for delay, disappointment and disillusionment. Unsympathetic, and downright obstructionist administration of the act under Scott McLeod, the Security Chief in the State Department, compounded the shortcomings of the faulty law. One of the first things the Lehman amendments would do is remove the program from the State Department Security Bureau, where it does not belong, and place it under a full-time administrator, who would be free from all other duties.

Of especial interest to you, also, should be the Lehman proposal to eliminate technical distinctions between so-called refugees and so-called escapees, and to establish only one category to include those who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and those refugees from the aftermath of World War II. In addition, the opprobrious term "ethnic" is struck from the act. Other improvements are in line with returning the program to its avowed humanitarian purposes.

But, although the refugee program is presently holding the attention of the public, we must not lose sight of our fundamental national immigration policy. Our policy today, of course, is unfortunately expressed on the statute books in the terms of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. How have the Republican leaders stood on that act? Here, again, we have examples of broken campaign promises.

During his 1952 campaign, candidate Eisenhower repeatedly attacked the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act and demanded that "a better law must be written." He also stated that "getting rid of second-class American citizenship * * * includes rewriting the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act." After his election, President Eisenhower renewed his general promises to the people and suggested to Congress some generally innocuous improvements in the law. But, I would be less than candid if I did not add that these suggestions were not backed with determination and enthusiasm of the sort he displayed in his fight over the tax program or other administration measures.

Again, in the light of the failures and broken promises of the Republican leaders, what have responsible Democrats done about this matter?

The answer is that we have proposed amendments to bring a spirit of humanity back into the law under the outstanding leadership of HERBERT LEHMAN. I am very happy to be a co-sponsor, with him and 11 other colleagues in the United States Senate, of an omnibus bill to replace the harsh McCarran-Walter Act. We have called for early public hearings on this and other pending bills.

We would preserve, naturally, the technical improvements made by the McCarran Act over previous laws, and the 2 or 3 advances made—such as according husbands and wives equality before the law—but in a real sense we propose a new law, consistent with the finest traditions of the United States of America as a haven for the oppressed of the world, and consistent with our legitimate concerns for national security and economy, and consistent also with our very great responsibility as a world force for good, especially when evil is rampant.

Our bill conforms to recommendations of scores of religious and nonsectarian organizations interested in a sound immigration and citizenship policy. As a point of approach, we have chosen to call our bill "the Immigration and Citizenship Act" to stress this difference from the present Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Our bill recognizes that a regulated amount of immigration, with intelligent regard for legitimate selection, resettlement, and integration, is not a threat to American institutions, but is a decided benefit to us in every way. We are working hard to have early action taken on this measure.

Many of our fellow Americans are now deeply disturbed about the administration's Asian policy, a policy which seems to consist of talking about the liberation of China while so weakening our alliances that we may have difficulty in preventing the Communists from taking over additional territories. We, who have followed the administration's policies regarding Poland, have become hardened to the liberation talk, and know that as far as this administration is concerned, this is a word which has lost all meaning. But the policies which are weakening the moral and physical position of the United States are something we can never become hardened to.

Modern history has taught us that we can only deal with dictatorships if we are strong. It would seem that this lesson should have been impressed upon everyone by the catastrophic events of the 1930's and the war that followed. Evidently these tragic events were not dramatic enough to impress our present leaders. The administration has failed to carry on President Truman's policy of building up our military strength. It has cut our Air Force, reduced our Armed Forces, and instituted a program of economy in civil defense. It is difficult to estimate to what degree our own security has been imperiled by this program. One thing is certain—with each day the United States has failed to build up its strength, one day has been added to the period of suffering and terror in the lives of the people behind the Iron Curtain. For the Soviets will never give up the territories they rule until our strength leaves them no choice but to retreat.

What conclusion should we draw from the facts to which I have drawn your attention? Our immigration and citizenship policies are so much a part of our American life, determining how we live with each other in our communities, how we deal with other people abroad—and even how we appear to people in other parts of the world, that we can no longer continue to preach freedom and brotherly love on certain holidays, such as this Polish Constitution Day, unless we insist that our daily actions and our laws substantially carry out these sentiments. We would do well to take heed of the action taken by Polish patriots 164 years ago, when the Polish Diet adopted the great May constitution. At that time Poland was facing its certain partition at the hands of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. It was a period of crisis, yet the Poles chose that moment in their history to institute drastic internal reforms and strike a bold blow for democracy. They could have adopted a course of inaction, written a constitution filled with vague generalities. They could have listened to the voices of weak and fearful men. They did not do so then. We Americans, especially you of Polish descent, facing another critical period, will not do so now.

Anti-Defamation League Freedom Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Robert E. Sherwood, the eminent Pulitzer prize playwright, at the Anti-Defamation League Freedom Forum sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on April 28, 1955.

Mr. Sherwood is a man well acquainted with the great traditions of liberty and freedom for which our country has so long stood as a beacon light to all the world. As the author of the great play, Abe Lincoln in Illinois, he has helped to characterize the personality, views, and achievements of one of the noblest Americans.

I think that Mr. Sherwood's analysis of some of the current and prevailing threats to civil liberties in our country should be made available to Members of the Congress and to the public as a whole.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM AND NATIONAL SECURITY

I am greatly honored to be asked to give the first talk at this freedom forum of the Anti-Defamation League on the subject of "Individual Freedom and National Security."

There are no subjects more important to American citizens today.

We all know of many, far too many, instances in recent years where individual freedom has been threatened—and worse than threatened—in the arbitrary name of national security. But I should like to remind you of just one of these instances: The case of John Paton Davies, a member of our Foreign Service, of long experience and unassailable integrity, who was attacked by Senator MCCARTHY and because of this attack was fired last fall by Secretary John Foster Dulles.

Please forgive me if I dwell at some length on this particular case.

I knew Davies slightly when I was in Government service during the war. He was closely associated with General Stilwell in

China. I learned more about him after the war when I was working on the papers of the late Harry Hopkins and I read reports that Davies had sent back to Washington.

After Davies was fired, it appeared—perhaps unfortunately for Mr. Dulles—that he had once been on an airplane flight with Eric Sevareid—a flight over the infamous "hump," over the Himalayan range between India and China which our aircraft had to cross and where many young American lives were lost delivering aid to the Chinese.

I quote from the broadcast Mr. Sevareid made over CBS describing this flight:

"There came a terrifying moment when the passengers, mostly GI's, stood near the door, trying to summon the courage to bail out of the crippled plane. Precious moments passed. Then 1 of the 3 civilians aboard, the diplomat who clutched a dispatch case to his chest, gave us a wry smile and leaped out. His action broke the paralysis; we all followed; and all of us, but one, survived.

"In the weeks that followed we were never entirely sure we would get out of those jungle mountains; in such circumstances men learn truly to know one another; who is weak, who is afraid, who is impetuous, and who is strong, and calm, and prudent. As time passed the GI's and I began to recognize the civilian with the carefully guarded dispatch case as one among us with a calm, natural courage, as one who would never panic, who never complained.

"I thought then, as I think now, that if ever again I were in deep trouble the man I would want to be with would be this particular man. I have known a great number of men around the world, under all manner of circumstance. I have known none who seemed more the whole man; none more finished a civilized product, in all that a man should be—in modesty and thoughtfulness, in resourcefulness, and steady strength of character.

"The name of this man is John Paton Davies. He is the man Secretary of State Dulles, on the recommendation of a five-man board, has just broken on the wheel of official disgrace. The Foreign Service officer dismissed, 3 years short of retirement and pension, after giving 23 years of his life—and almost life itself—in the arduous service of his Government. Eight times he was investigated; eight times he was cleared. One by one the politically inspired charges of communism or disloyalty or perjury were dropped; the ninth board came up with something new, called defects of character. Mr. Davies is not, concluded the board and Mr. Dulles, of sufficient judgment, discretion, and reliability.

"Sufficient, one may ask, unto what? Their test can only have been of supernatural design. I saw their victim measured against the most severe tests that mortal man can design. Those, he passed. At the head of the class."

That concludes the testimony of Eric Sevareid on John Paton Davies, whom he encountered by chance.

The basis for the charges against Mr. Davies—that he had lacked "sufficient judgment, discretion, and reliability"—was not revealed, although Mr. Davies asked and asked again that the State Department publish the full record.

Mr. Dulles was content to say, pursing his lips, that the continued employment of Mr. Davies "is not clearly consistent with the interest of the national security."

As you will remember, Mr. Dulles said the same thing about the publication of the Yalta papers. That was said one day last month, but 2 days later the Yalta papers were deliberately leaked to the New York Times.

Peter Edson, writing in the Scripps-Howard newspapers—of which the Daily Worker is not one—Mr. Edson said:

"Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' firing of John Paton Davies, after 23 years as a career diplomat, spotlights again the fact that the State Department 'cleanup' is still going on.

"As a matter of fact, it will never be ended. No State Department employee can have any assurance that he has been investigated and cleared for the last time.

"In the case of John Davies, he was investigated and cleared eight times. The ninth time they fired him—not for disloyalty—but for 'lack of judgment, discretion, and reliability.' That is the pattern for the future."

And, if I may say so, that is a pretty terrifying pattern for a great democracy which relies to a large extent upon its Foreign Service in the cold war or a hot war against communism.

In the Washington Post, Malvina Lindsay wrote that, as a result of the firing of Davies, and similar actions, "both Uncle Sam and the business world face a falling market in human skill."

Miss Lindsay went on to say:

"The armed services are failing to attract enough officer material to give adequate leadership to the defense forces that must be maintained.

"Both Government and industry are up against a dwindling supply of scientists and technicians, while the Soviet Union threatens to gain supremacy in this commodity.

"If the present trend continues, the half trained and the mediocre will take over most of the important jobs. They will largely run the Government, direct defense, handle foreign relations, determine the production of goods."

As a comment on that, I would quote a lady who has gone far in the business world. Miss Dorothy Shaver, the president of Lord & Taylor. Miss Shaver said:

"In industry, among both executives and staff, I see a growing unwillingness to exercise independent judgment, to question company dogma. Fewer people are willing to voice original ideas which contradict accepted policy. In short, fewer people will risk their judgment in support of what they believe. Yet what, if not personal initiative, has sparked the whole growth of American industry?"

A Untarian minister in Washington said that the firing of John Paton Davies was "an act of cowardice," and he asked, "How are we to defeat communism with cowardice? What a long way we have departed from our former great traditions. How ominously our moral strength has ebbed away."

Only the other day you and I read of the dismissal, again by John Foster Dulles, of Edward Corsi, a liberal Republican, who was appointed to carry out President Eisenhower's program to make this country a haven for a pitifully small number of refugees from Europe.

And, incidentally, I have visited some of these refugee camps in Europe—camps filled with people from behind the Iron Curtain—men, women, and children who listened to our propaganda broadcasts over the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe, and who risked their lives to escape past the machine guns of the Communist frontier police, and through the mined fields and the barbed wire—to escape to freedom.

And what hope have they of achieving freedom?

At this moment, practically none.

Mr. Corsi saw their predicament—he understood their shocking predicament—and he wanted to do something about it, in accordance with the President's pledges. So Mr. Corsi is out.

You and I read that one of the prime reasons for Mr. Corsi's dismissal was that he is a "freewheeler."

Let me read you a quotation from a speech made last year by Richard L. Bowditch, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Reminding his associates of certain essential truths which some of them may have forgotten, Mr. Bowditch said:

"This Nation was conceived and rose to world leadership on the ideas of nonconformists and freewheelers, of individuals with bold, far-reaching minds who insisted on crossing the frontiers of the unknown. • • • They dared to disagree on many things, but our country and our culture are infinitely richer and stronger for their challenge."

Now, Secretary Dulles can and does attempt to dismiss the firing of Mr. Corsi and Mr. Davies and others, by snide remarks implying their incompetence, despite the fact of their record in service to previous administrations, both Republican and Democratic.

All that Mr. Dulles needs to know, evidently, is that one of his trusted and faithful aides—in the case of Mr. Corsi, one of his old friends and supporters, is under fire from Capitol Hill, and then the dread blade of the guillotine comes crashing down—and a few gratuitous insults are spat at the dismembered corpse.

It seems to me that the most ominous apologia for the firing of John Paton Davies was written in an editorial in that deservedly respected newspaper, the New York Herald Tribune.

Admitting that the record of investigations—nine investigations—of Mr. Davies revealed no evidences of any disloyalty to our country—they revealed no evidences however remote of any affiliation by Mr. Davies for the Communist Party or any Communist cause or any Communist-front organization, or, indeed, for anything in any way subversive—the Herald Tribune went on to say editorially:

"The regulations under which Mr. Davies was dismissed reflect the realities of the cold war. To provide maximum safeguards against infiltration, subversion and error, doubts of the reliability of a Government servant are to be resolved in favor of national security, rather than of the individual concerned. This is a stern test and one that can work hardship to loyal citizens. It is a test, however, that the American people have resolved must be imposed for their own protection. The administration is applying it in full consciousness of the complex factors which are involved, but with the safety of the Nation as the primary consideration."

Thus spake the New York Herald Tribune, whose partisan heart sometimes rules its temperate head.

I think that we, the American people—the taxpayers, who pay the salaries of John Foster Dulles and Scott McLeod—I think that we would like to know; just when did we resolve that the rights of the individual American citizen should be subordinated and indeed destroyed by some undocumented interpretation of what some official tells us is national security?

When did we authorize our paid servants to apply this "stern test" which, according to the Herald Tribune "can work hardship to loyal citizens?"

At what point in our history did the American people resolve that they must be protected by such unconstitutional, undemocratic, unrepublican, star-chamber procedures?

And I would say further—in reply to the Herald Tribune's sanctimonious defense of Mr. Dulles—I would say that if our national security is to be rated above the security, the civil liberties, the dignity of every individual American, then our national security is not worth defending.

It is certainly not worth the honored and treasured paper on which our Declaration

of Independence and our Constitution were written.

If our constitutional system is to be superseded by an acceptance of the kind of heartless, soulless, callous tyranny against which our ancestors have fought for centuries—on this continent and in the Old World from whence we all came—then we had better yield to the Russian and Chinese Communists, whose methods we often seem to be imitating so sedulously, and who are so much more efficient at this kind of oppression than we are.

The other day I read an article by Mark Ethridge in The Saturday Review. As the distinguished publisher of the Louisville Courier Journal, he criticized the American press for its failure to say, and loudly, to politicians of both parties, "Quit playing politics with our freedoms. They are too hard-won to be kicked about in your cheap and silly game."

Mr. Ethridge quoted Edward Livingston who wrote, in 1789—the year when our Constitution went into effect—"If we are to violate the Constitution * * * the country will swarm with informers, spies, and all the odious reptile tribe that breed in the sunshine of despotic power to convey your words distorted by calumny to the secret tribunal where fear officiates as accuser and suspicion is the only evidence that is heard."

It is an ironic fact that whenever you study the motives and objectives of some so-called patriotic organization, or group—which wraps itself in the Constitution and urges a "return to our constitutional form of government"—you will observe that this organization seeks to preserve our Constitution by amending it, distorting it, disembowelling it.

In the 83d Congress, dominated by Republicans who rode into power on General Eisenhower's coattails, there were proposed about a hundred amendments to the Constitution, including the Bricker amendment, which was firmly opposed by the President and his administration and was defeated in the Senate only by the majority of Democratic votes.

If I seem to be too partisan in these remarks, let me add that the sacking of Mr. Corsi was due to the pressure brought to bear on the State Department by a Democrat, Congressman WALTER, cosponsor with another Democrat of the infamous McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

The evil that we confront in our body politics crosses party lines. It crosses sectional boundaries—economic strata.

There is an article that I should like to call to your attention. It is called The Pseudo-Conservative Revolt and it was written by Richard Hofstadter, professor of history at Columbia University. It was published in a recent issue of The American Scholar and is being given wider circulation, which it deserves, by The Fund for The Republic of the Ford Foundation.

As Professor Hofstadter points out, quoting Adlai Stevenson, the true conservative is "dedicated to conserving all that is best, and building solidly and safely on these foundations."

And I believe it may be said that the best, the most far-reaching statesmen in both of our great parties adhere to this principle of true conservatism.

But—the pseudoconservative—by Professor Hofstadter's definition is another matter.

One of them was the lady who, when General Eisenhower won the Republican nomination over Senator Taft at the convention in 1952, stalked out of the Chicago Hilton Hotel declaiming, "This means 8 more years of socialism."

The pseudoconservative believes—and I am still quoting Professor Hofstadter—"that we had no business to be fighting communism in Korea, but that the war should now be extended to an Asia-wide crusade against communism * * *.

"He believes himself to be living in a world in which he is spied upon, plotted against, betrayed, and very likely destined for total ruin * * *

"He is opposed to almost everything that has happened in American politics in the past 20 years. He hates the very thought of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"He is distrubed deeply by American participation in the United Nations, which he can see only as a sinister organization.

"He sees his own country as being so weak that it is constantly about to fall victim to subversion; and yet he feels that it is so all-powerful that any failure it may experience in getting its way in the world—for instance, in the Orient—cannot possibly be due to its limitations but must be attributed to its having been betrayed * * *.

"He would much rather concern himself with the domestic scene, where communism is weak, than with those areas of the world where it is strong and threatening.

"He wants to have nothing to do with the democratic nations of Western Europe, which seem to draw more of his ire than the Soviet Communists, and he is opposed to all 'give-away programs' designed to aid and strengthen these nations."

It is hardly necessary to add that such a pseudo-American would be, by fundamental nature, anti-Semitic.

He would be in the mob burning a fiery cross in front of a house occupied by Negroes in a new real-estate development.

He certainly does not care for the sentiments expressed by Emma Lazarus in the verse that is engraved on the Statue of Liberty * * * and as Edward Corsi sought to interpret them.

Perhaps the ultimate absurdity of pseudo-conservatism was achieved by officials of the American Legion who denied to Paul Hoffman the use of their auditorium in Indianapolis. Mr. Hoffman, of course, is an eminently respectable Indiana industrialist and an ardent supporter and intimate adviser of President Eisenhower, but the Legion authorities denied his right to speak because he was appearing as an advocate of the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Indianapolis Times published an editorial on this incident under the heading, "How Silly Can You Get?"

But, as we have seen, such silliness can be compounded into mania, and such mania can be compounded into totalitarian tyranny—the very destruction of our constitutional system.

It seems to me that the primary question for consideration by this forum is whether our country can afford to purchase national security at the cost of individual freedom. I believe that we cannot.

We are free to admit—we have always been free to admit—that in time of war, of national emergency, we may be drafted for service in the Armed Forces—and, in my opinion, we should also be liable to draft for national service in war—in factories, on farms, in hospitals, or in any other capacity where we may be able to serve our country's cause.

But—we have the right to ask: What is that cause?

And we don't have to ask our Government for the answer. We can provide our own answer, each of us, individually.

Throughout our history, we Americans have served, we have worked, we have fought for one thing: Freedom. As long as our country deserves its name, we shall continue to serve, and to work, and to fight, and to die for one thing: Freedom.

It is on that principle—and only that principle—that our national security is based.

Today, as we all know, there are internal as well as external threats to our individual freedom. The internal threats have been handled, with admirable efficiency and with justice, by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And, having had an opportunity to see something of the operations of the FBI, I can testify that this is no work for amateurs—particularly those whose chief motivating force is hysteria.

I would quote my friend and former associate, Elmer Davis: "This Nation was not built by cowards; it will not be preserved by cowards."

And I would say, this Nation will be preserved, as it always has been, by Americans who know that they represent, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "The last, best hope of earth."

And I would express my profound conviction that such Americans, such pure Americans—regardless of their racial or religious or social backgrounds—such pure Americans are in the overwhelming majority in our country, and their principles and their common decency will prevail.

Address by Hon. Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa, Before Republican Women Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an outstanding speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], which I think is worthy of general attention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR THOMAS E. MARTIN, OF IOWA, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN WOMEN VOLUNTEERS, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 20, 1935.

Thank you, Madam Chairman. It is a real privilege to come back to the Middle West and a great honor to be asked to speak to the Republican Women Volunteers of Chicagoland. I know of the excellent work this great group has done in the past. I know that a large measure of the credit for any political victory in any State must be accorded the hardworking and diligent women. That was true in my case last year. Their dedication to the Republican Party and the work and energy they contributed in our behalf cannot be over estimated. I also know that the Republican Women Volunteers of Chicago assume that same important position in the Illinois scheme of politics. I commend you most heartily on your past efforts and wish you all good luck and success in your coming ventures.

I must make my position clear immediately. I'm extremely happy to be here, but at the same time I'm sorry that your original speaker couldn't make it. STYLES BRIDGES has compiled a record second to none in the United States Senate. The record of leadership he has compiled fills the political slate. You could have chosen no more competent speaker nor any better Republican spokesman than STYLES BRIDGES. He was extremely sorry that the virus bug caught him at exactly the wrong time. When I last talked to him yesterday morning he was still determined to get out of bed and make this trip, but his doctor forbade it. His final words to me were "Tell them how sorry I am that illness cancelled my appearance. Give them my very best."

I am fully aware of the great Republican traditions and leaders that are represented here this noon. One of the most pleasant and inspiring byproducts of holding office as I do is the chance to meet and talk with people like yourselves—people that are tied inexorably together by the great principles of the Republican Party. Many of us have loved this party of our for many years. Like every other institution of modern times it has experienced its ups and downs. I know that you feel as I do—that despite the dire predictions of the impending crumbling of the Republican Party, made by partisan critics who whistle in political darkness, I sincerely believe that we are entering a period of great Republican ascendancy—and loyal Republicans like yourself will make it so.

As you know, we are today starting to draw the lines of the 1956 campaign. If we expect to win the political victory we need and deserve we must have a story to tell the American people. We must have a reasonable, accurate, compelling political "pitch" to make. We must give the American people a reason to vote Republican. We must tell them why.

As our political parties begin to shape up for the coming campaign and election, there is a crying need that once again we draw the lines of distinction between the Republican and Democrat Parties. The future of our country depends on our ability—on yours and mine—to draw that line of separation. We must ask ourselves and our neighbors—Where will the Democrats take us if they again assume the reins of government? What are the fundamental differences between their philosophy and ours? What does a Republican vote mean?

Search as you will, you cannot find this difference in the general aims of the two parties. Both stand for peace and prosperity. Both want to improve the welfare of the people at home and to safeguard their security and existence by adept and astute handling of international problems. This similarity in goals is not surprising. Both parties depend on attracting votes for their existence. These generalities are aimed at this broad target.

But political parties don't live on generalities. In the course of political action they make records. Through their devotion to certain causes and their suport of individual issues and their opposition to others, they make their stand. They point the path they will travel to the generalized goals of peace and general welfare. That's the way you discover the real differences between parties. That story tells the tale. And that story also tells the why—the reason—the importance of a Republican vote.

One of the obvious differences between the two major parties of today lies in the field of allocation of governmental power. The Founding Fathers of our country were acutely aware of the dangers of government that concentrated most of its power at one source. They fought a Revolutionary War to escape the terrible and arbitrary power exercised over helpless subjects by kings, tyrants, dictators, and bureaucrats. Carefully and diligently they constructed a Constitution that established a government of laws, not of men. One hundred and sixty years of political developments in the most trying period of history's long pages have proven the wisdom of their philosophy. We have been a haven from the scourges of tyranny. We must continue to be so.

Perhaps the most significant contribution to the field of political science made by our country is the establishment of a Federal system—a government wherein the power is divided between the National and State government. The Constitution apportions certain powers to the National Government and reserves the residue of powers to the State and local levels.

My friends, the Republican Party still believes in the Federal system. We still believe that the National Government should do those things which the Nation requires and which cannot be done by States, localities, or individuals. We still do not believe the best interests of the most people can be solved by piling bureau upon bureau in Washington. We still do not believe that all knowledge and wisdom stems from Washington. We do not believe that Washington has a monopoly on all ideas, on all answers, on all intelligence. A man's I. Q. doesn't triple by crossing the Potomac. The Republican Party does not believe in centralizing all power in the Nation's Capital.

The brave men who wrote our Constitution 167 years ago knew that too much power concentrated in any one place holds great danger to human freedoms. But the Democrat Party of today seems to have forgotten that truth. Starting in 1933, a frightening trend began to appear in Washington. The National Government, like Topsy, "jes growed." It began to chip away in some of the fields previously reserved to the States. It began to glut itself on the diet of powers that had belonged to the States. That trend continued and blossomed for 20 years. The sphere of power of the National Government swelled and bloated, and the residue of State powers shrunk and diminished. It wasn't until the election in 1952 that the road blocks along the trail to centralization were built.

We Republicans have been in power in times of crisis. We realize that changing times demand changing methods of government. We met change as it came. But never did we consider any crisis so critical that we had to change our basic philosophy to meet it. Never did we match the exigency of the moment against our Constitution—and find our Constitution wanting.

My friends, make no mistake. Should we return the New Deal Democrat Party to power, we will return to the trail of centralization. The real Democrats of today—the Adlai Stevensons, Walter Reuthers, Hubert Humphreys—the Neubergers—yes, and the Douglases—these, and all the other ADA apostles—they scorn States' rights. They advocate an all-powerful centralized Federal Government. They advocate Government planning on a huge scale for all our people. They follow the theory that pursued to its logical end would mean our people would be dependent for their lives, their property, their enterprises, and their very freedoms on a bureaucratic government in Washington.

That's one reason why—that's one importance of a Republican ballot—a vote for the freedom of self-governing people and a vote against the downright slavery that accompanies an all powerful, centralized government.

That same pattern of increased power was demonstrated in the relationship that existed between the executive and legislative branches of government. Again, the basic structure of relationship between these two branches of government is spelled out in the United States Constitution. Again, the underlying philosophy has been disturbed and distorted by the attitudes of the last two Democrat Presidents.

I well remember the shock I received when I first became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1939. I watched aghast while a major portion of the legislation we were to consider was written in the executive branch of government. I was stunned to learn that so many of these important measures were written, not by individuals in Congress, but by members of the President's staff or advisers. All too often such proposed legislation received the rubber stamp of approval of the Democrat-controlled House and Senate. Sometimes I think the Congresses of the middle and late 1930's were the highest paid choruses in the world. They nodded approval and the executive's program became a reality.

This is not the way we Republicans believe. This usurpation of legislative authority by the executive was a trade-mark of Democrat administrations. But it is not ours. Our Republican President has never asked Congress to be sleepwalkers. Contrast the New Deal rubber-stamp procedure with the procedure followed in tax revision by the Republican administration and the Republican 83d Congress. I know because I served on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in the 83d Congress. DAN REED as chairman of that great committee proved to be one of the greatest legislators of all time.

President Eisenhower received an exceptionally high percent of passage of his program. But his success was due to the quality of the program. The Members of the 83d Congress passed it because they knew it was best for the country. Under Republican leadership in the White House we are asked, consulted, and advised. But we are not told. I repeat, my friends, we are not told. The previous Democrat administrations took us on a long trip into the never, never land of executive domination of Congress and of the State governments. Now we are back from that jaunt into fantasy. And personally, I'm glad to be back home.

There is another basic difference between the two major political parties in the United States. This refers to the type of economic system under which we shall operate. The Democrat Party obviously believes that a centralized Federal Government holds no threat to the freedoms of the individual. It obviously believes also that the National Government should extend its sphere of influence and control into the fields of national economy. During the past 20 years we've watched a constantly growing trend to substituting a government-controlled economy for the free-enterprise, competitive system that gave this country the highest standard of living in the history of the world. You and I have watched that substitution being made—and I, for one, don't like it. I say to you, let's keep the first team in the game. A Republican vote next year means a pat on the back for the Republican leadership that made Paul Bunyan strides toward returning us to the philosophy on which we were founded.

The extent to which the Federal Government had entered the domain of private business would be far too cumbersome and time-consuming to annotate in this brief statement. But let me list a few instances to prove my point.

In 1953, the Department of Commerce sold the Government's Inland Waterways Corporation. This agency had lost more than $15 million of the taxpayers money. It owned 20 towboats and 273 barges on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. It is with us no more.

The last Congress set up a special Commission to handle the sale of the Federal Government's $555 million synthetic rubber industry to private industry. They are with us no more.

Congress passed and the President approved legislation giving the States rather than the Federal Government control over 85 million acres of submerged tidelands off the coast of the United States. This was a major defeat to Democrat advocates of centralized ownership and Federal control of land. The Federal control of tidelands is with us no more.

I might add, parenthetically, that this program was characterized as a great "giveaway" program by Democrat leftwingers. The latest estimate is that the Federal Government will receive $6 billion in revenue from

the off-the-shore oil land. If this is a give-away I'd like a little more of the same.

Under Republican leadership the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, one of the most unsavory of the Democrat agencies, was stripped of its lending powers. It is with us no more.

Congress suspended a $60 million plan for Federal development of the Coosa River in northeast Alabama. It never was with us, but only because we Republicans stopped it. A Republican Congress authorized private power companies to take over the work of constructing dams for hydroelectric power.

The Interior Department closed down a Federal Government plant making synthetic gas from coal in Louisiana, Mo. That saved the taxpayers $10,000 a day. This operation was turned over to private industry and it's no longer with us.

On and on the list goes. Back in my home State of Iowa we received the 24-carat treatment. The previous Democrat administrations took a long look at the farmers of the Nation and they decided that they, too, should take their place in line and become a part of this nationally planned economy. They tried to control and point his life. They tried to tell him what to plant, where to plant it, and how much of it to plant. They tried to tell him where to sell his products, at what time to bring them to market and at what price to sell them. They tried to smother him with the Brannan plan. With this Alice in Wonderland scheme they envisioned the fixing of the farmer's income through subsidies and complete income guaranties. The traditionally independent farmer was offered the traditional Democrat plan of government controlled economy. And he wouldn't buy it. He didn't want the pig or the poke.

My friends, the difference between the two parties in this field boils down to this: The Republican Party believes the economic strength of the Nation is based on the freedom of each individual to work and live as he chooses. We believe the Federal Government should be a partner with the States, the localities and the individuals. We believe Government should permit the people to stand on their own feet and walk around.

The Democratic Party believes the Federal Government should be a crutch upon which all other levels of government and the people themselves will lean. But crutches are used only by unfortunate people who are incapacitated. The Republican Party does not believe that the States, the localities, or the people themselves are crippled. We have too much confidence in them. We will not subscribe to the wedge-driving theory of Government entrance into private lives or private businesses. As far as we are concerned, the door to such Government entrance will never be opened.

There are many more differences that we might point up. For example, I believe there is a basic difference between the two parties on internal security. We Republicans know that the avowed aim of Communist leaders is to conquer the world. Time after time, in place after place, they have subscribed to the doctrine of world domination. We have watched country after country disappear behind the Iron Curtain. We know that the United States is the prize country. We know that our subjugation would be the signal cry for their complete success.

And we know also that countries can fall without a single shot nor an isolated battle. We know the importance of internal security. We know that the entrance of a Communist into a policymaking job in our State Department is not a red herring; it's a tragedy. We know these things, and we have done something about it. Between January 1953 and June 1954 some 2,400 security risks were weeded out of Federal employment. The Justice Department has deported 105 alien subversives and ordered the deportation of another 329 aliens with records of subversive activity or affiliation. Since we Republicans took over, 41 Communist leaders have been convicted and another 35 have been indicted under the Smith Act. We did not ignore the danger from within. We did not blithely turn our head when the snake-like head of communism appeared in our own Government. We did something about it. This, too, is a sharp contrast and difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties.

I could go on and on, reciting the constructive achievements that form the Republican record. We have reduced our appropriations and spending. We have reduced our taxes and at the same time acted to spur our business and economy into the greatest peacetime prosperity in history. We halted inflation and we stabilized the dollar. We needed price, wage, and rent controls. In short, my friends, we have done what the American people wanted us to do.

This is the record, the past—a past of which we are proud. What about the future? What's in store for us, the Republican Party? What is our challenge? What should we do?

Let me first interpose one word of warning. No Democrat horses will be spared in the 1956 campaign. Although I hesitate to make political forecasts I will stick my political neck out far enough to make this prediction. In the coming year and a half you will witness many surprising political attacks. You will see how badly the 1952 defeats hurt the Democratic Party—and how much they want to win the elections next year. They will pull every stop toward that end. They have already started.

President Eisenhower himself has not been immune to attack by the Democrats. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN, termed the President "inept." Former Democrat National Chairman Stephen Mitchell accused the President last year of having made an "unholy alliance with Senator MCCARTHY for the purpose of the next election." Of course, this same Mr. Mitchell implied that the President was trying to steer some unethical profits into the pockets of his friend, Bobby Jones, through the Dixon-Yates contract. It is interesting to note that not a thread of proof of the charge was advanced when the blast was made—nor has any proof been offered since the charge to indicate that Ike has taken a page from Harry Truman's book to make deals with his friends. The proof is lacking because the charge is false. But that's the pattern of things to come. And then last month the absolute high in incredible criticism and the absolute low in political decency came when President Eisenhower was berated for going to church. One of the moot questions of political history is "How frantic and panicky can a political party get?" I think I know the answer now.

I might add in passing that these attacks come on the heels of the pious statement of Democrat leaders that they will support the President. If I may have a moment of your time to analyze these statements I would like to read these statements and then give you my translation. Following the lead of the New York Times political writer, Arthur Krock, who compiled a glossary of a few Democrat statements and annotated them with the real meaning, it would sound like this:

Democrat statement: "We will support the President when he is right and oppose him when he is wrong."

Translation: That means that the President is right whenever he agrees with the Democrats and he is wrong when he doesn't. Of course, the Democrats reserve the right to determine what the President is supposed to agree with.

Democrat statement: "We will not oppose just for opposition's sake."

Translation: That means that this is the smog-generator technique. It means that this is exactly what they will do but they will never admit they are doing it.

Democrat statement: "On certain matters we differ with the President, but only on details."

Translation: This means that on vitally important matters there will be only differences of opinion. Of course those insignificant differences include such things as the basic structure and allocation of national defense, the whole nature and administrative system of foreign economic aid, the fundamental grounds for the tax program, and, in fact, the entire domestic political philosophy of the President.

Democrat statement: "We only want fairness to the farmer and the consumer."

Translation: This fairness implies fixed, interoperating high subsidies for both the farmer and the consumer. It also means the cost will be covered by higher taxes and by increasing deficit financing.

In short, my friends, the general platitudes of the Democrat leaders about Presidential support as supplemented by their proposals and their opposition to administrative measures could be translated into one simple phrase: "Politics above all else."

It seems to me that a victory in any political contest comes as a result of combining three factors: a sound program, good candidates, and devoted workers. I have already referred to our program. I think without question it is a record of achievement. I know it can be sold to the American people because it is right.

It is very difficult to succinctly describe a program with many phases and various ramifications. But it is natural that the leader of the program, the man who was intricately concerned with its development should come the closest to putting on paper the philosophy behind the Republican Party. At a press conference on the 27th of January last year, President Dwight Eisenhower was asked to describe the Republican philosophy. May I quote you his answer.

"When it comes down to dealing with the relationships between the human in this country and his Government, the people of this administration believe in being what I think we would normally call liberal; and when we deal with the economic affairs of this country, we believe in being conservative."

This comes the closest to it. I have just finished an annual questionnaire that I conduct in Iowa. Each year since 1950 I have polled my district on the significant problems that face Congress. Until this year I had confined that poll to my own district. This year, for the first time, I polled the entire State since I now represent all Iowa. Although the answers to the 36 questions are far too time-consuming to analyze here, one conclusion is inescapable. The people of Iowa are impressed—they are impressed most favorably by the Republican Party and they are impressed most favorably by the Eisenhower administration. A good illustration is given in the 80-percent approval of President Eisenhower's foreign policy.

If I may be entirely personal for a moment, last fall I conducted a campaign over the whole State of Iowa. I went into almost every village and hamlet of Iowa. To each person I met, in each meeting I addressed, in every press interview I had, I told the same story. "This is what we Republicans have done," I said. "I'm willing to stand or fall on that record." I staked my political future on that record because I believed it was right. The fact that I am, today, privileged to serve in the United States Senate is graphic proof of what Iowa thought of the Republican administration.

We have the program. We need outstanding candidates. I'm more than happy to be in Chicago for several reasons. One of the most compelling is that this is the home

State of one of my closest friends. EVERETT DIRKSEN and I have been friends for a long time. I knew him as a real leader in the House of Representatives. I'm honored to be associated with him in the Senate, where again he is an outstanding leader. Further, Senator DIRKSEN had an effect on my political life that perhaps even he doesn't know. I watched with great interest his campaign in 1950. I knew that he had challenged one of the stalwarts of the Democratic Party. It took great courage to take on the Democratic majority leader of the Senate. I watched the way he conducted his campaign. I watched the energy and enthusiasm he showed. I witnessed the careful planning and the long months of hard work. I saw him hit the opposition hard and often. This was no casual campaign—no one speech a day, with many days off. This was the east-to-west and north-to-south fight that appealed to me.

I would not be so presumptous as to compare my victory in 1954 with Senator DIRKSEN's in 1950. But this similarity does exist. Each of us had a tought fight in unseating a well-established opponent.

That admiration for Senator DIRKSEN, the man, the statesman, and the campaigner, has not diminished during the years. During my service in the House of Representatives, in more instances than I can count, I asked him to come to my First Iowa District. He never failed. It was natural that when I was running over the whole State I should call on him again. And again he did not fail.

That same devotion to Republican causes that marked his 1950 campaign was put to national use last year. He was selected to fill one of the most important and one of the really vital spots in Republican Party circles. He was the national senatorial campaign director. I met him on both coasts, with several stops between. His work was evident everywhere. He was valuable beyond description.

One of the trade-marks of Senator DIRKSEN—and a real compliment, I believe—is that they ask for him to come back. When he addresses a meeting, they ask for a return engagement. The people of my own district—the people of the entire State of Iowa—say to me: Get Senator DIRKSEN back. And he does not fail.

My friends, now we are making the same request of you. Next year Senator DIRKSEN comes up for reelection. We want him back. I refuse to contemplate the loss we would suffer were he not reelected. His record, his qualifications, his leadership is not expendable. We want him back. And you will give him to us.

I have spoken at some length on the type of campaign that Senator DIRKSEN waged and the way I tried to emulate it. But it has one restriction. No matter how energetic the candidate is—no matter how many hours a day he works—no matter how many miles he travels, it is a physical impossibility for him to see every voter. We must depend on the spider web-like organization. I can promise you that EVERETT DIRKSEN will see as many people as humanly possible. But those people must see others. The web must grow in all directions.

I mentioned that a political victory is the result of three factors: a sound program, good candidates and devoted workers. The Republican Party has all three. Our program stands the test of inspection. Like a suit made of the finest goods, it wears well, it stands up. We can take it to the people of America with no hesitancy. We must build our campaign on it.

We have candidates that will carry our banner well. You know how I feel about Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN. I know you will return this great leader to the Senate.

I find it impossible to conclude this afternoon without referring to the greatest achievement of all—the thing that has been most impressive to the citizens of Iowa as well as those of 47 other States. The war in Korea has ended. Certainly this is a tribute to the President of the United States.

I have known President Eisenhower well throughout my entire service in Congress because I served on the Committee on Military Affairs of Congress from 1939 to 1947. I was the only civilian present when Ike was notified he was to be promoted to Brigadier General. I saw him assigned to London and destined to go to the top command of the Allied Forces. He earned that assignment by his thorough preparation and comprehension of the situation confronting us there and by his great devotion to duty. He had fortitude, courage, ability and determination. Drugstore quarterbacks who had never commanded a squad told him, "You can't cross the English Channel. You'll have to go through Spain and the Pyrenees Mountains. You can't cross the Channel. You'd better come up through the soft underbelly side of Europe. You can't cross the channel." But Ike crossed the channel and held the Normandy beachhead against the powerful German military forces.

When Ike became President, the Russians remembered all this and in my opinion, the end of the Korean war was not without significance. So also is our continued peace in the wartorn world of today.

Red China and Red Russia respect Ike's qualities and they have also observed closely America's unity in support of him today in facing our postwar problems. They know full well that in America we can disagree with him openly on some issues and yet support him vigorously. They also know that Ike is not a name-calling, face-making, fist-shaking, letter-writing piano player.

Let's stand united in support of our great President and move forward to continued peace, prosperity, and progress.

We have the program—we have the candidates—and we have devoted workers—people like yourselves. People who believe in the Republican philosophy and are willing to work for it. Let's each one of us here and now pledge ourselves to be a one-person committee for vigilance. There is no magic formula, no "open sesame" for political victory. It comes as a result of dedicated, energetic work. That is your job. Good luck to you all.

United States Tariff Policy Hurts West Virginia Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a factual article entitled "United States Tariff Policy Hurts West Virginia Towns," from the May 9, 1955, issue of the Charleston Daily Mail. Incidentally, the Charleston Daily Mail is one of the principal Republican newspapers of West Virginia. This article, of course, is concerned with only one aspect of the damage to the economy of my State which is caused by the present tariff policy. It does not discuss the damage to the coal industry of the State, which is in an even more depressed condition.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TARIFF POLICY HURTS WEST VIRGINIA TOWNS

PADEN CITY, W. VA.—The vital, complex fight over the Nation's tariff laws gets down to bread and butter terms in two different kinds of signs you see along the Ohio River these days.

Along the river highway outside of Paden City, there's a sign advertising 80,000 square feet of factory space for sale or lease. This is the epitaph of a 40-year-old glass company which gave up 4 years ago because of low-wage Japanese competition in table glassware. About 450 of the town's 2,500 people lost their jobs.

Now, follow the same river west, around the southern bulge of Ohio, until you reach Evansville, Ind. Here you see help wanted signs. Here, the town is booming practically because of foreign trade.

The two kinds of signs reflect many of the grassroots stakes in the fight just now ending in Washington. Last week, the Senate passed the bill empowering President Eisenhower to cut United States tariffs to spur world commerce.

POTTERIES ALSO HIT

In Paden City, the sign for the defunct glass works is symptomatic of the troubles plaguing many of the glassware and pottery factories in this northernmost corner of West Virginia. Some have shut down completely. Others are working part-time. Unemployment has been running from 8 to 14 percent in this part of the State.

Representative ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, who represents the area and voted against the administration bill authorizing a gradual, 3-year lowering of tariffs, says the bill could mean that glass and pottery will be practically wiped out as a domestic industry.

Next to the dark-glass works is the Paden City Pottery Co., the town's sole surviving employer of any importance. "Before Japan," as they put it here, the pottery firm employed 850 men and women. Now it employees 475, 2 or 3 days a week.

M. C. Sondles, president of the firm, held up a plate, saying:

"Pretend this represents $1 of production cost. This third is materials, the other two-thirds is labor cost. Out of our cost-dollar, 66⅔ cents is labor. In Japan labor would amount to less than 7 cents.

"So if they paid exactly what we do for materials, it costs them 40 cents to make what costs us a dollar."

MANY ON RELIEF

What became of the glassworkers and laid-off pottery employees?

"A few of them go in the new chemical plants up and down the river," Sondles said, "but most of the people learned their trade here and grew up in the business. They were too old to move."

In town, the tradespeople report that the laid-off workers draw unemployment compensation while it lasts.

The United States Potters Association once had 43 members. Now it has 31, of which 23 make earthenware, the rest, china. The 23 earned a total of $4,150,000 in 1947. Last year, largely because of foreign competition, they had a combined loss of $1,100,000.

This was reported by Joseph M. Wells, secretary-treasurer of the Homer Laughlin Co., at Newell, one of the world's largest producers of fine table earthenware. His own firm, he said, once employed 2,800; now it is "25 to 30 percent down in production and jobs, and about 80 percent in earnings."

In the chinaware trade, Wells estimated, foreign producers now command about four-fifths of the United States market.

And then there is the marbles industry. Six of the seven United States companies which make marbles—Vitro Agate, Marble King, and the other brands familiar to schoolboys—are in West Virginia.

Roger W. Howdyshell of St. Mary's told the House Ways and Means Committee the Japanese will soon put the United States marbles industry out of business unless Congress helps.

The Essentiality of the Jeweled Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between nine Senators and Secretary of Defense Wilson concerning the essentiality of the jeweled-watch industry. Mr. Wilson's letter is in reply to a letter signed by Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, EDWARD MARTIN, MILTON R. YOUNG, CARL T. CURTIS, STYLES BRIDGES, WILLIAM LANGER, W. A. PURTELL, and ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A transcript of your press conference of last week indicates that an inquiry was made concerning the declassification of a report which purports to show that the jeweled-watch industry is not essential to the national defense and that in your reply you did not attach much importance to the report.

We are certain that since that time you have noticed the vitriolic attacks by newspapers and others on the President for his watch decision, most of which label the decision as one of political expediency. Inasmuch as both you and Assistant Secretary Pike have appeared before congressional committees to testify that the jeweled-watch industry is essential to our security, the release of this limited report, which has never been officially discredited, has resulted in great confusion.

We understand that at the same time the report was published, your Department issued a release covering part of Mr. Pike's testimony to the Senate committee, but the press release stated that this report supplemented Mr. Pike's testimony so that the report seemed to be a later or more important expression of the Department of Defense view.

The fact is, Mr. Secretary, that the report cannot be reconciled with Mr. Pike's testimony. The release should have stated that it was superseded by Mr. Pike's views, which indeed was the case. The continued effort of the authors of the report to preserve an appearance of validity for it cannot result in anything except prolonged confusion in the press and embarrassment to the people who have supported the decision.

The declassified report does not appear to take into account many of the facets of the problem. Some of the omissions which were brought out in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee are: (1) It does not mention at all the jewel-bearing problem and the importance of the jeweled-watch industry in that field, notwithstanding that the WPB report on the jewel-bearing problem in World War II says, in so many words, that the jeweled-watch industry saved the day with respect to crises in the supply of jewel bearings for both instruments and timepieces; (2) it does not mention the role of the jeweled-watch industry in research and development, which has been a critical one; (3) in some of the material still classified, the figures reveal that proper consideration was not given to the research and development—and in some cases actual production—of electromechanical fuses, magnetic-influence fuses, miniaturization of fuses for rockets, timers for unattended Arctic weather stations, certain essential components for all types of guided missiles, new types of mines and torpedoes, and special timing devices for gyroscopes in guided missile systems. (The report inexplicably omitted entirely any mention of the important role of the industry in the guided missile program, notwithstanding the fact that General Bradley and others clearly informed the authors of the report that an essential mechanism for one of the prominent missiles was made only by a jeweled-watch company and that no suppliers outside the industry could make it because it contained a jeweled-watch movement; (4) it comes up with the conclusion that the Defense Department will need only 244,845 jeweled watches in the event of another war, notwithstanding that requirements were over 6 million in World War II, over 5 million in direct procurement, and the balance by requisition of imports.

If these are not the facts, we would like to know. But if they are, we believe it would be a service to the country and to the people who fought to preserve an essential industry if you would issue a prompt statement clarifying the situation.

Sincerely yours,

STYLES BRIDGES, WILLIAM LANGER, W. A. PURTELL, ROMAN L. HRUSKA, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, EDWARD MARTIN, MILTON R. YOUNG, CARL T. CURTIS.

APRIL 27, 1955.

GENTLEMEN: I am sending the original of my reply to your letter of March 30, 1955, to Senator SALTONSTALL simply because of his continued and early interest in the subject of the essentiality of the jeweled watch industry. A copy is being delivered at the same time to each Senator who signed the letter.

I wish to emphasize that the release of the declassified Department of Defense report on the essentiality of the jeweled watch industry on February 28, 1955, was a routine matter and did not in any sense change the position that the Department of Defense took with regard to the horological industry last summer.

The Department of Defense endorsed the tariff increase by letter on July 1, 1954, to the Director of the Budget, Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, a copy of which is attached. You will note this endorsement supported the essentiality of both the jeweled and nonjeweled watch industries. This letter, and the testimony of Mr. T. P. Pike, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), on June 30, 1954, before Preparedness Subcommittee No. 6, represents the authoritative statement of the Department of Defense on the essentiality of the horological industry.

The conclusions of the Department of Defense report of April 26, 1954, on the Essentiality of the Jeweled Watch Industry are apparently misunderstood and perhaps not clearly stated. In the course of the study it became apparent that the entire horological industry (the nonjeweled watch and clock producers as well as the jeweled watch manufacturers) was essential to the mobilization base. In order to express this conclusion forcefully, it now appears that the emphasis placed on not recommending special or preferential treatment to any one company of or segment of the horological industry, has been interpreted as not recognizing the essentiality of the jeweled watch industry. I regret this inference and trust that this clarifies any misunderstanding.

The mobilization requirements of the Department of Defense for jeweled watches are exceedingly low. This is the result of a sound policy to issue jeweled watches only in cases where there is an operational need for a jeweled watch. In addition, the Department of Defense, as a further means of economy, has encouraged the use of nonjeweled watches and will continue to encourage this practice. These are produced by the nonjeweled watch (or pin lever) manufacturing segment of the horological industry.

The Department of Defense does not expect jeweled watches to be the jeweled watch industry's only basis of essentiality. It expects the jeweled watch industry, together with the balance of the horological industry and other capable manufacturers, to the degree that they are able, to continue to design and produce very complex timing mechanisms, control devices, gyroscopes, and similar items which must be miniaturized and ruggedized if they are to be used in modern military equipment (items 1, 2, and 3 in paragraph 5 of your letter).

Certain additional information should be understood. The Department of Defense has supported the increase in tariff for watches only because this appeared to be an exceptional case and it did not appear to be at the expense of any other industry essential to the mobilization base. In general, the Department of Defense feels that the tariff policy covered by the extension of the Trade Agreements Act as represented by H. R. 1 is necessary for the greater good of the national and industrial economy, including the defense economy. No action or statement of the Department of Defense should be construed or quoted in any manner as opposition to the policy of extending the Trade Agreements Act.

I hope this reply is satisfactory and that it will clarify the Department of Defense policy as conveyed in the Department of Defense report, Mr. Pike's testimony as to the essentiality of the horological industry, and my own testimony on this subject in connection with the hearings on H. R. 1 before the House Ways and Means Committee.

At your suggestion, I am making public, through a press release, this exchange of correspondence.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

Attachment: Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Hon. EDWARD MARTIN, Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, Hon. CARL T. CURTIS, Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, Hon. W. A. PURTELL, Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1954.

Hon. ROWLAND R. HUGHES,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: Reference is made to the letter dated June 1, 1954, from the Bureau of the Budget requesting the views of the Department of Defense on a proposed Presidential Proclamation entitled "Modification of Trade Agreement Concessions and Adjust-

ment in Rates of Duty With Respect to Certain Watch Movements."

A majority of four Commissioners find that watches and watch movements are being imported into the United States in such quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry and recommend that the President increase the scale of duties by 50 percent. A minority of two Commissioners fail to find such injury and recommend no change in duty.

The Department of Defense is vitally concerned with the production capacity of the jeweled and non-jeweled watch industry to meet military mobilization requirements. This industry produces such products as jeweled watches and movements, mechanical time fuses, and other special timing devices which are essential to the conduct of successful military operations. In view of the findings of the Tariff Commission and because of the fact that the higher rates of duties should tend to arrest the decline in domestic production this Department favors the proposed Presidential Proclamation.

With respect to any evaluation of possible adverse impacts of the proposed increase in duties upon our international relations and trade, this Department defers to the opinion of other agencies having the primary responsibility in these matters.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS,
For the Assistant Secretary.

The Honorable Gracie Pfost Crusades for Dam at Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in a nationally circulated newspaper the following article on the activities of Representative GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho. Those of us who entered the Congress with the energetic and attractive Mrs. PFOST, were made quickly aware of her persuasiveness and ability. Her district should be proud of her. The following news story does simple justice to our charming colleague, and I must say Uncle Sam wears his petticoats well:

PETTICOATS IN OUR GOVERNMENT—REPRESENTATIVE GRACIE PFOST TAGGED "HELL'S BELLE" AS SHE FIGHTS FOR DAM AT HELLS CANYON

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Public power's red-haired darling and defender is busy this month generating thousands of kilowatt-hours of her own.

Representative GRACIE PFOST (pronounced "Post") is using her private kilowatt-hours in the crusade for a great Federal dam at Hells Canyon on the Idaho-Oregon border.

Idaho's Democratic Congresswoman—sometimes referred to as "Hell's Belle"—is only 5 feet 2 inches tall and weighs 127 pounds. She is, truly, a bundle of energy—much of it dedicated to damming the Snake River.

"This river, winding through my State into Oregon, holds one of the keys to the development of the Northwest," Mrs. PFOST explains.

She was the first of four House Members to introduce a bill authorizing the United States Government to build a single multiple-purpose dam across the Snake. Private power wants to see the river harnessed, too—but it wants to do it by building three separate dams. Thereby hangs the hassle going on today.

Tireless GRACIE has flown 6,000 miles to Idaho and Oregon and back in recent days with two congressional committees to listen to on-the-spot arguments of both sides—public and private.

Though born 49 years ago in a log cabin in the Arkansas Ozarks, GRACIE typifies the State she now helps represent in Congress. When you see her handsome, healthy, freckled face you think of the sunshine on mountaintops, green forests, and clear, frolicking streams.

"At the age of 2, I was perched behind my mother on horseback," she says, "and by the time I was 5, I was following my brother up trees. And at 10 I was driving a team of horses down the road."

An admitted tomboy, GRACIE was certainly not without femininity. She was married at 17 to John Walter Pfost, a master mechanic.

But that old tomboy streak is still there, especially at campaign time. She has found herself in a birling (log rolling) contest at a lumber camp and got a dunking in an icy stream. She's taken part in gold-panning contests and ridden a silver palomino, decked out in her cowgirl finery, in a round-up parade.

It was an obvious understatement when she remarked, "I thoroughly enjoy campaigning."

The road to the National Capital led from the county courthouse. In 1939 she was deputy county clerk for Canyon County and she served later for 10 years as county treasurer. She tasted the national political pudding as delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1944. She ran first for Congress in 1950 and was defeated. Undaunted, GRACIE tried again and won, beating the GOP incumbent. This is her second term.

Representative PFOST does think of other things sometimes besides Hells Canyon. She looks out for the lead, zinc, and gold-mining industries and keeps her eye on the farm situation. Recently she took a much-needed action that will benefit all House Members and persons who visit the House Chamber.

When visitors ask their Congressmen for cards of admission to the House gallery they will from now on find printed on the reverse side of the blue card rules of gallery etiquette.

"How were people to know that they were not allowed to take packages or cameras into the galleries or to take notes?" GRACIE had wondered. "Now with the rules before them, they will not be embarrassed by a tap on the shoulder."

To GRACIE PFOST can go the credit for suggesting to the proper authorities that the rules be printed on the cards.

Mrs. PFOST is a businesswoman as well as a politician. She has owned and operated a real-estate business back home. But the real estate she's most interested in right now is a project she wants Uncle Sam to take over—the building of a great superdam at Hells Canyon. And she looks like a girl who will never say die.

Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include remarks I made before the 10th annual meeting of the National Tool & Die Manufacturers Association on May 10, 1955, in Washington, D. C.:

Mr. President, our country's industry and commerce has been brought to its present strength by a lot of small businesses growing into large businesses. The hope of every person or group upon entering business is to make their business grow and prosper. We in the Congress of the United States are trying to help keep these incentives alive. We are trying to keep the door of opportunity open and to foster the basic principle of the American way; namely, to continue an equal opportunity for all who are willing to risk their time and money in a business venture. Once we depart from this premise or permit ourselves to drift into a position where only a few may have business opportunities we shall have indeed lost our way.

Equal opportunity for all is the touchstone of our greatness, not only in the business world but in every single aspect of our national life.

It was with these thoughts in mind that I introduced a bill in the 83d Congress to create the first peacetime small-business agency in our history. As you know, we were successful, and the Small Business Administration was created as an independent agency.

May I point out briefly that the Small Business Act of 1953 provided for 4 principle programs of assistance to small business.

1. To counsel with small firms on their financial problems and to assist them in obtaining needed credit, if private credit is not available on reasonable terms, to participate in loans by private lending institutions, or to make direct Government loans to the firms;

2. To make loans for rehabilitation of small businesses and homes damaged or destroyed by natural disasters, such as hurricane and floods;

3. To help small businesses obtain a fair share of Government contracts for supplies and services; and

4. To assist small firms in solving their management and production problems.

Without going into detail, I can assure you that the Small Business Administration has made great progress in each of the four main fields of its endeavors. It is not an easy task to set up an organization of such major importance as the Small Business Administration and have it running with the precision of a fine machine in the first very complicated year of its existence. It is somewhat like building a machine, plans need to be made and translated into blueprints. A staff of good workmen must be assembled to take those blueprints and start work on what will be in the end a fine finished product. This has been the course of the Small Business Administration. Its plans have been well laid and have been carried into effect with precision, aggressiveness, and a high degree of skill. Small-business men and small-business organizations throughout the United States have applauded the efforts of the Small Business Administration and are urging its continuance as a permanent agency of the Government.

We must recognize that there is opposition to any form of agency designed to assist small business in its dealings with the Government. Most of this opposition ignores the facts of small business operation. It ignores the fact that small business cannot maintain representatives in Washington, and dozens of other points throughout the United States, to take care of their interests. The opposition ignores the fact that when there is no other source of working capital or long-term capital available that it is right and proper for small business institutions to turn to their Government for aid and counsel in financing operations. To say this does not mean money loaned to small businessmen through a Goverment lending agency is to be disbursed on an unsound or unrealistic

basis. The money the Government lends to small and independent business must be disbursed with every expectation, both on the part of the borrower and the Government, that the money will be returned to the Treasury with a fair rate of interest.

The work of the Small Business Administration in the field of Government procurement is gradually and surely producing results. When you consider the ramifications of the purchases of its needs by the Government and the enormous but necessary sums of money required to pay for these purchases, the problem of the Small Business Administration is easily recognized. In its efforts to secure a fair share of the purchases of the Government for small business, the Small Business Administration must necessarily intrude into the affairs of other departments and agencies and particularly the Department of Defense. Those charged with the responsibility of purchasing supplies and equipment for the Government could not be expected to welcome this intrusion with enthusiasm. But in spite of these natural human feelings about having others, even Government agencies, interfering or intruding in our affairs, the Small Business Administration has been successful in securing a high degree of cooperation from every Government agency. This to me, and I am sure it will to you, bespeaks well of the character, ability and resourcefulness not only of SBA officials but the officials of all the departments and agencies with whom the SBA must deal in carrying out the mandate of the Congress.

In the field of management and production problems the Small Business Administration has found a welcome which is as surprising as it is gratifying. This is not to say that officials of SBA in charge of these programs know all the answers to management or production problems. But they do have access to sources of information which have been gathered together that supply many of the answers to problems troubling management and production of small-business men.

The response, as I have indicated, to the management aids and the recently launched production assistance programs has demonstrated the value of both programs. In some reepects, as we have all learned in life, it is as important to know where to look for information as it is to have the information. The principal job is to get the information broadcast far and wide in order that all may have access to it. In the small-business field this is just exactly what the SBA is doing and doing successfully.

There is little doubt but that the Congress will continue the SBA, perhaps indefinitely, beyond its date of expiration of June 30, 1955. It has proven its worth in the short time of its existence. As the years roll on the SBA will become a major factor in keeping the door of equal opportunity open and strengthening the small-business institutions of our country in order that they too may grow and prosper.

As you well know the antitrust laws were designed by the Congress to do the very thing the word antitrust indicates. In other words back in the eighties and nineties the Congress decided that trusts as such were not good for American business or the American people, and so was born the first of a series of antitrust laws now on the statute books.

We have antitrust laws not only dealing with monopolies but with unfair trade practices of every type and description. Over the past 75 years we have come to accept the body of our antitrust laws as an integral part of the American business scene. However, there has always been a vast difference of opinion on the laws themselves, the application of the laws, the enforcement of the laws, and the judicial opinion which have confirmed certain aspects of the antitrust laws.

In view of the importance of the antitrust laws on our business life, it is desirable to stop occasionally and take a look at the laws themselves and the enforcement of the laws. I am sure it was with this in mind that Attorney General Brownell appointed, August 27, 1953, a national committee to study the antitrust laws. After 19 months of work the distinguished group of some sixty persons composed of lawyers, teachers, and Government officials reported to the Attorney General on March 31, 1955.

The report has provoked much discussion and considerable controversy. This is good because by free and open discussion and the expression of opinion from all walks of business and professional life, this report will come to occupy an important place in our continued struggle to improve and evaluate our opportunities.

Undoubtedly there will eventually be legislation based on the findings of this particular antitrust report. In speaking of the report it does not necessarily mean that I agree with every finding of the report. As a matter of fact, Assistant Attorney General Barnes, who is in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, recently testified at a Senate hearing, that neither he nor Attorney General Brownell agree with all of the findings of the report. That in itself bespeaks to my mind of the honesty of effort and the fair consideration which each recommendation of the report will receive at the hands of the administration.

There are many other aspects and ramifications of the SBA and its relationship to our economy that might be discussed, but time does not permit.

It is always nice to meet with your excellent organization of small-business operators, and Mrs. Hill and I have enjoyed this pleasant occasion.

A Bill To Amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer today for the consideration of the House a bill designed to completely revise the so-called Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

When President Eisenhower signed this law 2 years ago, he pointed out that its purpose was to welcome to our shores and give asylum to over 200,000 victims of Nazi and Communist oppression. These political refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain were to be permitted to come to the American haven during a 3-year period ending in 1956.

President Eisenhower said pridefully in August 1953:

It—

This law—

demonstrates again America's concern for the homeless, the persecuted, and the less fortunate of other lands.

This is "a great humanitarian act."

Nothing could have been further from the truth. This law is an immoral deception and a fraud. It is unworkable and unworthy. It belies the promise and frustrates the hope which our beloved country holds out to the world. It is a deceptive fake which decency demands we rectify.

Today, with virtually one-half of the statutes term having passed, some 563 refugees have been able to clear the mountainous hurdles and traps set for them before reaching these shores. You ask, "What hurdles?" "What traps?" Let us set them forth for you.

Suppose you wanted to sponsor the relocation of a refugee family in this country. What would the procedure entail? You would not be confronted with red tape alone, you would run smack into legal barbed wire.

First, you would have to execute a binding agreement with the government personally guaranteeing that the alien and his family will not become public charges. Please produce supporting affidavits as to your own employment and income, your bank credit and a copy of your last income tax return.

Second, supply proof that your alien has a job waiting for him; a particular job with a named employer and at a stated wage. This job must not displace any other jobholder. Have these facts certified by the local United States Employment Service and then by the Department of Labor in Washington. And, be sure to see to it that the job is held open for him until the refugee gets here—8 months from now—if at all.

Third, produce information that you have provided housing for him—give street address, description of accommodations, and the name and address of the landlord.

Getting tired? All right, mail all these documents to the Refugee Relief Administration at the Department of State in Washington, but, do not sit back with a sigh of relief. Your refugee is having his own heartaches on the other side of the ocean.

First, he must get the O. K. from some government to emigrate, along with a guaranty from that government that they will readmit him, if at any time and under any circumstances his residence in the United States is terminated.

Second, the alien applicant must prove that for the last 2 years he has been politically and ideologically pure of heart. He must get security clearance. This is far from easy, but it is his job.

Cabell Phillips, writing for Harper's Magazine, April issue, after an exhaustive study, characterized this as a "phony refugee law" which stands on our books as a national disgrace.

The present law is not alone a vicious fraud, its very administration compounds the deception.

In offering this bill, I join forces with a great humanitarian Senator, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, who has made the extirpation of this calculated piece of legislative hypocrisy and administrative chicanery one of the prime objectives of his distinguished career.

Our bill provides the following major changes in the refugee relief law:

First. Place the administration of the refugee-relief program in a new office of Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, with the present Administrator having this responsibility taken from him.

Second. Provide for sponsorship and assurances for refugees by recognized welfare agencies.

Third. Increase the number of visas available by 15,000.

Fourth. Extend the termination date of the act to December 31, 1960.

Fifth. The definition of the word "refugee" is broadened.

Sixth. The 2-year documented history provision of the present act is repealed; while the more than adequate security requirements of this act and of the basic immigration law remain in force.

Seventh. Certificates of readmission to country of departure would no longer be needed.

Eighth. The term "ethnic" is stricken from the act.

Ninth. The maximum age for orphans eligible to be admitted under section 5 of the act is raised from 10 to 14.

Tenth. The provision for adjustment of status of aliens presently residing in the United States is broadened and liberalized.

Eleventh. The visa priority system, having proved unworkable and meaningless in practice, is repealed.

Mr. Speaker, an honest, yes, and Americanized refugee relief act can mean much to us all. This country is loved by those of us who are fortunate enough to have been born here. It will be cherished and enriched, as it was in the past, no less by those who pray daily to enter it as the land of their choice.

Let us now so act as to give meaning to those immortal words which grace the symbol of our ideology, the Statue of Liberty, which proclaims to the world:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Let us unlock the golden door.

Profile of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned at the virtual banning of the book Profile of America by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

This book has received the highest praise from everyone who has read and studied it. Of course, I am well aware that the subcommittee has not had the time to do either with the tremendous volume of work before them.

Some of us have said so often, and so loudly, that we disapproved of book burning, censorship, and all other evils that would shackle the human mind and spirit. Now we are taking a history of our country, carefully edited, taking all facets of that history from the beginning to the present, and because it is not a Pollyanna primer for backward children, because it mentions duststorms and includes an excerpt from Thoreau, one of our acknowledged classics, we say it cannot be sent abroad. This would be funny, if it were not tragic.

Here is a rare book that shows America as she is. All her greatness, her strength, and above all, her freedom. All that has made her powerful today. The saga of the free individual and of free enterprise. That such a book should be banned is, at worst, great comfort to our enemies and will be food for their propaganda specialists. At best, it shows that we are not yet adult in our thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a letter from Father Davis, S. J., of America, and some excerpts from reviews from leading newspapers all over the country:

AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., April 29, 1955.

DEAR MISS DAVIE: It was disconcerting to learn that overseas distribution of your fine book, Profile of America, is running into difficulties. I certainly hope that the problems can be solved.

In my review of Profile (America, December 25, 1054, p. 343) I wrote: "Builders of home libraries can go out confidently and buy this book for their collections." I feel sure the USIA must have agreed with this judgment when they chose your volume for use in their information program in other countries.

Your book gives a good, rounded presentation of American life. In the hands of those who are hungry to know about America and its life your Profile of America should do immense good. Too often people in other lands know only what hostile propagandists choose to tell them about us. I have seen how this works in France. Your book, on the other hand, will give foreigners a glimpse of the complex reality of America as we Americans know it—its diversity, its challenge, its tradition and its hopes. Even those who can't read will learn about us through your well-chosen and magnificent pictures.

Cordially,
REV. THURSTON N. DAVIS, S. J.

EXCERPTS OF REVIEWS FROM NEWSPAPERS

Maine: "No more valuable and fascinating gift book can well be imagined than the Profile. It is assuredly the ideal book of information for a friend abroad, eager to know all about this country. We know of no other single volume which tells the story of America so comprehensively nor so vividly presented. It is a rare, well-balanced book of knowledge, documentary in every detail, in which virtually every aspect of America is touched upon." (The Lewiston Daily Sun, Lewiston-Auburn, Maine, January 8, 1955.)

Massachusetts: "A stunning volume about our country * * * With claims to immortality * * * The actual words of hundreds of people who have said something worth recording at some particular time or about an important issue, fill this book. The huge gallery of pictures is a delight and an education in itself * * * Every family in America should have a copy, to own with pride." (The Boston Post, December 5, 1954.)

Ohio: "In this magnificent volume American life and history are truly mirrored. Historic documents are recorded * * * Every facet and aspect of American life finds its place in these pages. This volume does, indeed, present an absorbing profile of America." (Cincinnati Enquirer, December 17, 1954.)

Kentucky: "This is one instance in which the buyer receives more in quality than he bargains for * * * Not only is it good reading for the entire family but it is something of a literary wonder drug to be taken freely at the first sign of pessimism about the American way of life." (Lexington Herald.)

Texas: "This book is a treasure. It should have wide circulation abroad and should be in every school as well as public library." (Wichita Times, Wichita Falls, Tex.)

Louisiana: "No review does justice to this book which does not mention the large quota of breathtaking illustrations * * * They give the book an additional visual dimension." (The Picayune, New Orleans, December 19, 1954.)

Florida: "If you have friends in Europe who want to know what our country is really like, Profile of America answers as nearly as one book can, the question, 'What is the United States?'" (The Miami Herald, November 21, 1954.)

Tennessee: "One of the most vivid and interesting documents of America I have ever seen. It is originally conceived and beautifully executed. It will be of the greatest use. I can commend the volume without hesitation." (Dr. Harvie Branscomb, dean, Vanderbilt University.)

National: "A highly effective and in the best sense a patriotic book." (Time magazine, December 6, 1954.)

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] before the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Washington, D. C., on April 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, BEFORE THE 64TH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 21, 1955

In the 10 years since the Yalta Conference of February 4–11, 1945, great advances have been made by the Communist world.

At that time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of free men largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic world of freemen largely depends upon the Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact,

and mutual-defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate during this session of Congress.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals, and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the Formosa resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

As a Republican I wish to pay tribute to Senator GEORGE, Senator JOHNSON, Congressman RICHARDS, and Speaker RAYBURN for their cooperation in helping to make such overwhelming majorities possible.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific and lay the groundwork for a conference which would have all the unfortunate results of a Munich, a Yalta, or a Geneva wherein the aggressor gains his objectives at the conference table.

Let us examine the record of the United Nations as an agency for effective collective security as envisioned by some or as a basis for a world government as contemplated by others.

World War II had not yet terminated in 1945 when the United Nations Conference was held in San Francisco. The people of the world did not know that we were on the threshold of the atomic age though those high in Government had reason to believe a vast new power that ultimately could be used for destructive or constructive purposes was soon to be unveiled.

Hopes were high everywhere that the Soviet Union, though a dictatorship, had learned the folly of aggression and of war and because of the vast help given by the free world to them they would be willing to help establish a system of international law and order to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

Unfortunately both during the San Francisco conference and in the 10 years that have followed a vast propaganda effort has taken place to build the United Nations into something which its charter provisions could not or did not permit it to become. In the United Nations different people envisioned different things.

Some envisioned it as a mighty force of collective security that would rally most of the nations of the world to resist aggression and preserve the peace. In moments of oratorical fancy some even suggested that the fact the United Nations was in being would warrant free nations to scrap most, if not all, of their armed forces and place their reliance upon the police power of the United Nations and the collective moral persuasion of that organization. On June 25, 1950, this concept was shattered.

When the Communist forces crossed the 38th parallel, the United Nations Security Council promptly acted and first called upon the Communist aggressor to cease the aggression. The Communists, of course, forthwith showed they were not impressed by a United Nations resolution or the adverse moral reaction of that organization. The Security Council next called on the 60 members of that organization to give aid and support to the victim of the aggression, the Republic of Korea.

What is the record on this? After 3 years of the Korean war, of the 60 members of the United Nations only 17 contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression. Outside of the United States of America, the other 16 contributed armed forces in the amount of 45,000. The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000, and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Korean theater of war. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, supplied over 600,000.

This means that of the United Nations members the United States of America supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources.

When the forces of the Republic of Korea, not being a member of the United Nations (having been kept out by a Soviet veto), are added to those of the United States, it means that our two nations alone supplied better than 95 percent of the manpower.

Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

Our associates in the United Nations so tied us down that a stalemate was all that could be gained after 3 years of struggle in Korea.

We were denied the right of hot pursuit and the enemy was protected in his sanctuary across the Yalu.

With that example are you prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer likewise must be in the negative.

There are some who have envisioned the United Nations as a world state to which openly or clandestinely, individual nations would surrender their sovereignty. Some of the more enthusiastic proponents of this type of superstate compared the San Francisco meeting with that of our own Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. Of course, the two gatherings are not comparable when one considers the building of a government upon which man might depend for the protection of his life and his religious, economic, and intellectual freedom.

In the first place, those who met at Philadelphia spoke a common language and had a common heritage. True, they had come from different areas of the world, but they or their predecessors had come seeking a new way of life, freedom from Old-World tyranny or a desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

They had fought a common battle against the mightiest empire of that time. They had carried over from the old country the background of the Magna Carta and of representative government. They had had experience as an independent nation, much of it unsatisfactory, under the Articles of Confederation.

With that background, under what I believe was divine inspiration, drafted the greatest document produced by the mind and hand of man for his self-government and protection of his natural rights.

A little more realistic understanding of the history of the nations gathered in San Francisco should have made it clear that such an organization could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government.

There is no common language or common heritage. Nations which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience. Nations of less than 1 million have equal representation with those of over 300 million. The Soviet Union, which is perhaps the most tyrannical government since western civilization entered the modern era, sits as an equal partner with nations with long-established constitutions of law, order, and a respect of the rights of man.

Now, there are those who urge the admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean war. This, together with the other Communist states, give that system of tyranny over 800 million people.

As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guaranties of freedom under our Constitution being modified directly or indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions.

I am opposed to any form of world government wherein American freedom guaranteed by our Constitution and Bill of Rights is compromised or diluted in the slightest by comembership with Communist tyranny.

It is one thing for the American people by deliberate choice, after thorough debate, to amend our Constitution to meet changing conditions. To allow it to happen by default would be a betrayal of our responsibilities.

We must not permit court decisions of executive agreements to raise such to the status of treaties. Nor will we long preserve our Constitution, drafted at Philadelphia under the chairmanship of George Washington, if we fail to challenge any effort to amend our Constitution by use of a loophole which may provide a treaty or executive agreement shortcut to what was intended to be a difficult process.

Lest we be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late wherein we have been taken, I believe that every candidate for public office—executive, legislative or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue. It is later than you think.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American peope and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

I am strongly opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

Despite the lessons of history, the voices of appeasement appear to be growing at home and abroad. Some suggest that Quemoy and Matsu be allowed to pass into Communist hands. It is my strong belief that such an event will be looked upon as a great Communist victory in Asia and will undermine the remaining confidence the free anti-Communist nations of Asia have in the Government and the people of the United States.

Why is it that the voices of appeasement always urge that our friends and allies be the ones to give up territory or to yield up more people to communism? Why do they not suggest that it is time for the Iron Curtain to move backward rather than forward? The fact of the matter is that Quemoy and Matsu are as important to free China as Western Berlin is to Free Germany.

What military or civilian official would try to maintain that Western Berlin, a metropolitan island completely surrounded by Soviet territory, is defensible in and of itself? The fact of the matter is that our garrison in Berlin, the wives and children who accompany them, are hostages to potential Soviet aggression.

We have felt it important, however, to maintain this island of freedom in the heart of Soviet territory despite the fact that it is aggravating to the Communists of the Soviet Union and of Eastern Germany, because it is important to the morale of the free German Republic and it is a beacon of hope to the Germans behind the Iron Curtain that some day they too may be free.

The reason that Western Berlin has not passed behind the Iron Curtain is the fact that the Soviet Union knows that any attempt to take over the area by force would immediately involve the western allies in military action.

Though we took some grave risks, we broke the 1948 blockade of Berlin by the airlift. There are now indications that the Communists are again attempting to strangle the economic life of the island of freedom.

Have they been encouraged in this new action by the voices of appeasement here and abroad which have indicated that we must placate communism when they get aggravated, for otherwise we may be risking armed conflict.

Does history teach us that this is the way to a lasting peace? The answer, of course, is "No."

At Munich, Chamberlain and Daladier succumbed to the threats and pleadings of Hitler that if they would but agree to turn over the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia to him that he would have "no further territorial demands in Europe."

Without the consent of the Government of Czechoslovakia this sordid deal was made. To salve their conscience, Great Britain and France agreed to guarantee the frontier of the reduced Czechoslovakian State.

Seven months later, Hitler's legions took over the balance of Czechoslovakia. The conscience of the two guarantors was disturbed and several speeches were made as to the immorality of such aggression. But the guarantee given 7 months before did not save the people of Czechoslovakia, for by then they had lost their will to fight, largely because they had lost their faith in the western allies to do anything more than to talk and to appease.

What deadly parallel does this furnish to the situation in the Formosa Straits today?

Quemoy and Matsu have never been Chinese Communist territory and they are not today.

That these outposts have a military value, no man can deny, for they certainly make more difficult the launching of an amphibious assault out of Amoy and Foochow as long as the Free Chinese control these islands.

But equally important as their military value is their psychological value. Their loss by appeasement will bring as much despair to Free China as the deal at Munich for the Sudetenland caused despair to the free people of Czechoslovakia.

It will also shake the confidence of our friends in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, and elsewhere where people understand the brutal and aggressive nature of communism.

I again want to emphasize that in my opinion the morale value of Quemoy and Matsu is as high for Free China as is that of Western Berlin for Free Germany.

There are some who believe that you can distinguish between a Communist assault on Quemoy and Matsu in and of themselves and Quemoy and Matsu as stepping stones toward Formosa and the Pescadores. What nonsense is this? When the assault is underway, are we to inquire through the good offices of Mr. Hammarskjold, of Mao Tse Tung and Chou En-Lai in Peiping as to whether their assault is only for the possession of these outer ramparts?

If at such a time, with tongue in cheek, the Communist leaders believe that it would be to their advantage to prevent American support going to our ally, the Republic of China, and they reply that their temporary objective is only Quemoy and Matsu will we ask them to reinforce their statement by saying: "Do you guarantee this with a cross-your-heart-and-hope-to-die asurance?"

In the light of the bald-faced violation of the Korean armistice and the Geneva agreement what would such an assurance be worth?

I wish to share with you two letters, one from Pilot and one from Bataan death-march veteran. (Letters read.)

This Nation was not born nor did it grow to its position of greatness based on a policy of fear, but rather one of faith and courage.

As an American citizen and as a Senator of the United States, I am convinced that if we will only use the same faith and courage that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe to have been divine guidance, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Sumner Pike, Maine, and the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, every State is naturally proud of its distinguished sons, and the State of Maine is particularly proud of Sumner Pike. After a successful career in business, Sumner Pike entered Government service. In 1939–1940 he served as business adviser to the Secretary of Commerce; from 1940 to 1946 he was a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission; and from 1942 to 1946 he also served as director of the Fuel Price Division of the Office of Price Administration.

When the Atomic Energy Commission was created in 1946, Sumner Pike became one of the five original commissioners. He served as a member of the Commission, and for several months was Acting Chairman before he retired to go home to Maine in 1951. Home for Sumner Pike is the town of Lubec, which is on one of the most eastern points of land in the United States.

Sumner Pike has had one of the most active retirements of any man I have ever known. The people of Maine were naturally anxious to take advantage of his experience and ability, and he was prevailed upon to become Chairman of the Maine Public Utilities Commission. He is currently scheduled to take over the newly created job as Maine's coordinator of atomic energy, which will be the first post of its kind in the Nation.

It has been one of the great privileges of my life to know Sumner Pike and count him as a friend. His boundless energy and straightforward frankness are a welcome contrast to the pussy-footing attitude of some public officials.

On May 5, 1955, an article by Richard H. Cunningham entitled "Sumner Pike, Maine, and the Atom" was printed in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE HUMAN DYNAMO"—SUMNER PIKE, MAINE, AND THE ATOM

(By Richard H. Cunningham)

Maine's biggest natural resource in atomic energy is not uranium, but 64-year-old Sumner T. Pike, 1 of the 5 original members of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for some months its Chairman.

With Pike as chairman of the State's public utilities commission, Maine has already moved swiftly to take full advantage of atomic power possibilities. Maine is looking toward atomic power as a natural complement to its vast hydropowerplants which Pike also wants developed.

Governor Muskie told me he hopes to persuade Sumner Pike to become Maine's coordinator of atomic energy, the first job of that type in New England. Mr. Pike was not surprised when I later passed along the governor's remark to him. He is obviously ready to step into the post, a natural for him.

Maine has become the first New England State to adopt its own baby atomic energy law. Mr. Pike could be excused for his pride in noting that one section of Maine's laws had to be rewritten so that he, as chief of public utilities, could accept the post of atomic coordinator when it is offered.

"They're been more strict about their public utilities officials up here than they were about the activities of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission down in Washington," laughed Mr. Pike. "It used to be that I couldn't be anything other than a justice of the peace or a notary public while serving in this job. The legislature changed that, however."

HAPPY MAN

Sumner Pike is as happy in his Augusta job as Maine is obviously happy about having such a distinguished and experienced man to guide its power program. A Maine native, he fits into the State scene as comfortably as an old shoe. The fact that he's "leftist, as Republicans go," doesn't bother him a whit in his Maine government job.

Mr. Pike was persuaded to take the Maine post after he suddenly resigned in 1951 from the Atomic Energy Commission. "I just figured I had run my string out," he said then. He had planned on retirement, a period of fishing and loafing back home in Maine. His native State insisted on putting him to work.

"I like the direct personal contacts up here," said Mr. Pike, when I suggested he must miss the hurly-burly of Washington. "It's fun to have such direct relationships with people, and to have your office on an open-house basis most of the time."

Mr. Pike has lost none of the fiery spark that helped make him a controversial figure on the national scene. Wealthy in his own right as a result of fortunes made in oil and stocks, the onetime Boston utilities office clerk has the kind of rugged independence that Maine Yankees most admire. "Oh, that's a lot of hogwash," he told a telephone caller who interrupted our conversation.

ATOMS FOR PEACE

It was of atomic energy for peace that Mr. Pike most wanted to talk. He proved to be conservative in his predictions about the atom, but there was no mistaking a note of liberalism in his thinking when he said that New England has been throttling itself worshipping its own ideologies while other sections have been developing vast powerplants—including public power.

He added quickly, however, that he considered himself one of the "private power group." He praised the private public utilities for being anxious to get going on atomic power for New England. He cited the progress made by the Yankee Atomic Electric Co.

"No, I don't believe Maine should go off galloping by itself on this atomic power business. But it is a sign of Maine's intense interest that she has already passed an atomic energy law."

This law asks that the State adapt laws and regulations to meet new conditions to help the "healthy development" of industries producing or utilizing atomic power. It calls upon the State to initiate continuing studies of atomic power, and to name an atomic coordinator to keep the State informed fully of developments in the field.

"Frankly, I don't believe that atomic energy will radically change the whole industrial face of New England," he said. "It will be 10 years before atomic power reaches a stage of even small general use, and after that, it will grow rapidly." He said he disagreed with Admiral Strauss' view that atomic power will be so cheap, it won't even have to be metered. He said he thought it might be even more expensive than hydroelectric power, "because it will take more skilled men to operate an atomic plant."

"The big value of atomic power to New England," he said, "will be in the fact it will make us that much less dependent on the fossil fuels—coal and oil—for power. Maine's hydroplants aren't sufficient in midsummer, when the streams and rivers are at low level. For each hydroplant, Maine now must have a coal- or oil-fueled one to serve during water droughts."

THE FUTURE

"Within 15 years," Mr. Pike said, "I expect serious shortages of the fossil fuels, whether from local economic causes or from disturbances internationally. Only a few months ago, we almost lost all of the Persian Gulf oil. And down in Pennsylvania, thousands of men are leaving the coalfields. In 15 years, atomic power will really begin to prove its value to New England."

Meanwhile, the main contribution of the atomic age to this region will be in what Mr. Pike called the atomic byproducts. He said that if he reads politics right, Kittery, Maine, will build the next atomic submarine. The Maine paper and textile mills are already finding important uses for an atomic-powered thickness indicator. Research Row in Cambridge is expanding so rapidly, he said, that "it must expand right across all of the New England States." He cited the work on atomic energy being conducted at the Pratt & Whitney aircraft laboratories at East Hartford.

Mr. Pike said he was "deeply disappointed that our New England colleges and universities are not taking seriously enough their responsibilities in atomic research.

"There are too many dear old souls in our New England colleges, and they don't seem to understand yet the importance of the atomic age. Brookhaven (atomic center) hasn't been doing the job it should be doing in spreading the gospel of the atom among the colleges. The little University of Connecticut, down in Storrs, is doing far more, for instance, in the field of atomic energy than Yale University, which should be doing a major job in this field."

POLITICALLY STRONG

Mr. Pike has strong political backing for his atomic energy ideas. Governor Muskie emphasized the State's good fortune in having Mr. Pike there.

Senator James L. Reid, the senate Republican leader, has made an intensive study of the atom. "I did it as a hobby," he says. "But it is beginning to pay off now." Senator Reid, probably the only legislator who can diagram atomic energy to illustrate his senate speeches, said he had read the original Smythe report on atomic energy "some 17 times."

Senator Reid has called for a $75,000 appropriation to launch the Maine Development Commission on atomic research in relation to industrial possibilities. And Denis O'Brien, industrial agent for the Maine Development Commission, says the State considers Sumner Pike as the "human dynamo" of its atomic program.

Tribute to the Late General Peyton Conway March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, General Peyton Conway March, a distinguished soldier of World War I, passed away in Washington, D. C., April 13, 1955, at the age of 90. One of my constituents, Pfc. Wilbur M. Hargreaves, of Holyoke, Colo., was one of the general's attendants during his last illness. The words of condolence and comfort which he addressed to the widow of General March are among the most eloquent that I have ever been privileged to read. She has most graciously consented to their publication. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Also, at the request of Mrs. March, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a message of condolence which she received from His Excellency, Monsieur Maurice Couve De Murville, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from the Republic of France to the United States.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE FROM PFC. WILBUR M. HARGREAVES, HOLYOKE, COLO., TO THE WIDOW OF GEN. PEYTON CONWAY MARCH

DEAR MRS. MARCH: No matter when or how death comes, it is always a shock. I returned to the suite Wednesday evening about 7:30 p. m. to see how the general was getting along, and of course, was told the news. He was still in the room when I arrived, so I saw him before he was taken away. It was hard for me to reconcile myself to his passing; he looked so well at 3:30 p. m., when I left. His color was good and he was restful. All the next day I could only think of the general, and I felt as though I was lost without him to care for. My heart went out to you, Mrs. March, for I remembered you saying that he was all you had left in this world. Friday evening, as my friend and I knelt in his little room for prayer to welcome God's Holy Sabbath hours, I prayer so earnestly that Jesus would comfort and strengthen you during this hour of deep sorrow, for I knew what you were going through. Only God knows the emptiness left in the soul when a loved one has departed from us, for "surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." (Isiah 53:4.)

But it should give us great comfort to know that the general didn't suffer, as so many do, with agony just before they die, or perhaps years, until they die. The general had been greatly blessed of God with a long and eventful life in the service of his country and his fellow men. Not many are privileged to live 20 years beyond the allotted "3-score years and 10." And he had been blessed with good health, being free from the diseases which plague mankind and cause so many untimely deaths. He was strong until the last, and then he slipped away so quickly and quietly. And now he rests. He sleeps in the grave, awaiting the resurrection. What a comforting truth to know. And one thing is certain; his eternal destiny is in the hands of our gracious Heavenly Father who is infinitely loving in His justice and His mercy.

I am thankful, Mrs. March, that God so ordered my steps that in His providence I had the honor and the privilege of serving the general during the closing twilight hours of his life. He had many admirable qualities which I respected very highly. Needless to say, I became attached to him. My only regret is that I didn't do more and do better. May God forgive me for this. I also want to thank you for every kindness which you extended to us boys while we attended the general. We all appreciated these expressions from you. You showed us every courtesy becoming of the wife of a man of such high rank. You made us feel like "one of the family."

Mrs. March, may it give you comfort to know that the general may not sleep very long. The signs of the times and the fulfillment of Bible prophecies in connection with the second advent of our Lord to this earth tell us that His coming is most certain to be in our day. Let us get our lives in readiness that we may be prepared for His glorious appearing in the clouds of heaven with all His angel host, so that we may be reunited with our loved ones whom death has separated from us. Oh, how tragic it will be, if we are unready when He comes, and thus be separated from loved ones forever. May God help us that this may not be.

If there is anything at all that I can ever do to help you, Mrs. March, please do not hesitate to let me know.

PFC. HARGREAVES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 14, 1955.*

Mrs. PEYTON MARCH,
1870 Wyoming Avenue NW.:

Please accept my heartfelt condolences and be assured of my deepest sympathy in your great sorrow. The prominent part which General March played in the First World War and in our common victory will always be remembered with deep appreciation by my countrymen.

MAURICE COUVE DE MURVILLE,
French Ambassador.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The committee discussed this very, very carefully. I wanted to ask the

chairman of the committee a question about the bill and the procedure. We are on the last amendment. A motion to recommit will come from this side. I have notified my colleagues to vote against the motion for recommittal and vote for the bill. I hope the gentleman will also make that clear as far as his position is concerned.

Mr. ENGLE. I certainly concur in that. We will never get this bill to the Senate by recommitting it. I hope this House will vote down the motion to recommit and vote the bill favorably to the other side.

France Pirates From United States Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a steadily increasing amount of pirating of United States industrial ideas is being done by France. This is contrary to our international agreements with that country and contrary to basic business ethics.

I have requested the State Department to make a full investigation of the facts and circumstances set forth by the following United States victim of this practice, as set forth in a letter to me:

HAMER VALVES, INC.,
April 28, 1955.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOSMER: May I refer to my letter of June 25, 1954, to the Department of State, a copy of which was sent to your office, as well as to Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL.

We certainly do appreciate the assistance you gave us last year. I regret now to report that our attempts to deal with the French have failed. SAPAG is a copyist; we negotiated with them for months and months but all they seemed to do was stall. They appeared to want a legal license to manufacture our products in France, but they wanted us to give it to them at practically no charge. We have a very successful license arrangement with an English concern which pays this company a royalty fee on the earnings from the sales of English-made Hamer products; of course, we want the same type of royalty agreement with the French.

Now that the negotiations have collapsed SAPAG is proceding to manufacture and sell Hamer products under their name without permission from us. We may or may not be able to take them into court, as it remains for us to determine whether or not our patent applications will bear a test in French courts. We feel, however, that this is more than a matter of legality—this is a breach of of moral conduct.

I am enclosing copies I have made of pictures and literature sent us from France which shows the SAPAG valve. Compare it with the Hamer literature enclosed; of course, it is a direct copy.

At a recent meeting of the Nomads, a group of men representing local industrial manufacturers, the speaker of the evening reported on his recent travels abroad, including France. He stated that American industry was facing a serious problem as the French are making a business of copying American products. Do you remember many years ago how we used to speak of the Japanese of copyists? They were pikers compared to modern France.

The purpose of this letter is to ask if you will urge the State Department to make formal protest on behalf of United States manufacturers. Should we not inform France through the proper channels that this is a serious matter to the American businessman and that the reputation of the French is sinking.

Mr. HOSMER, I can assure you that this opinion is not ours alone. We can back this up with the voice of other reputable people.

It hardly seems fair that the French people would stoop to such methods after the American people spent so many lives and so much money for their defense. We wonder if it may be possible to bring them to their senses with diplomatic protests.

It happens that the United States Navy at Port Hueneme has done business with SAPAG. We are also advised in the Department of Commerce World Trade Report dated July 27, 1954, that the American forces in France have purchased from them. Under the circumstances we feel that it would be unfair for any agency of our Government to continue support of a foreign firm that is copying American goods. I believe that such firms should be removed from the list of approved manufacturers. If official action is taken and SAPAG is advised of it by their Government I believe they may seriously reconsider their relationship with us.

May we again have your assistance on this matter?

Thank you.

Yours very truly,
HAMER VALVES, INC.,
MAURICE E. HOLLADAY,
Vice President.

False Witness Against Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it appears unmistakable that one of America's most widely circulated magazines, the Reader's Digest, has opened its pages to special pleading, or, perhaps more properly, has become public-relations agent for the new Hoover Commission.

In recent weeks it has been necessary for two of my colleagues—Senator GORE and Representative ROGERS of Colorado—to challenge the accuracy of material published in this magazine, and it has now become my duty to follow in their path and to make known certain falsehoods and half-truths that appeared in the May issue of Reader's Digest. I refer to the article Dollars Into Dust, a slashing, reckless attack on reclamation in general and the Upper Colorado and central Arizona projects in particular.

The prejudice behind this article and its distortion about the "almost unbelievable Government extravagance" in Bureau of Reclamation projects should shame the editor of any honest, impartial magazine. One is tolerant of those who mislead through want of information. But, on the other hand, it is hard not to be indignant when reporters go into the field and glean the truth only to ignore it when it hurts their purposes.

The damage done by the misinformation in this article can never be completely undone, but I submit for those who read our RECORD the following statement and editorial which shed the light of truth on the Digest's latest example of shabby journalism. The statement was made late last month in Phoenix, Ariz., by Mr. David Brinegar, executive secretary of the Central Arizona Project Association. The editorial, printed soon after Mr. Brinegar's statement, was written by the respected editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, Mr. William R. Mathews. The statement and editorial follow:

STATEMENT OF MR. DAVID BRINEGAR, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT ASSOCIATION

Mr. Harvey had answers to every one of those false statements, but chose not to use them.

When he was here I gave him the facts about the Central Arizona project. Late in September 1954 he asked not only for facts on the Central Arizona project, but assistance in obtaining information about the upper basin project. Through John Geoffrey Will, of Denver, then executive secretary of the Upper Basin Commission, I obtained the upper basin material Mr. Harvey wanted.

The article published in Readers' Digest under the names of Mr. Miller and Mr. Harvey presented none of this material. It repeated a large assortment of propaganda statements almost verbatim out of California-published literature, with the implication that these statements were factual and could not be effectively answered.

For instance, the Digest article says that populous States would have to pay most of the bill for the Central Arizona project. That is false. The Central Arizona project would fully repay all its costs to the Federal Treasury and return an additional three to seven billion dollars of direct tax revenues to the Federal Government besides. This is not our estimate—this is the estimate of one of the most conservative agricutural economists in the United States, True D. Morse, formerly head of Doane's Agricultural Service at St. Louis and now Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The Digest article says that the Central Arizona project would irrigate only 226,000 acres. That is false. It would provide water for three-quarters of a million acres of the most valuable farming productionwise in America.

The Digest article says that the Central Arizona project construction cost would be $1,991 per acre. That is false. The cost of agricultural works never went beyond $400 per acre and several times was estimated lower. I suggest that in this instance the Digest was rather moderate. However, some Californians have used a figure as high as $5,000 an acre.

The Digest charges that there is a "concealed subsidy" to Arizona farmers of $9,200 an acre in the Central Arizona project. The Digest then lists, out of a California propaganda leaflet, figures indicating that New York State would pay $256 million of the project cost, and that other States would pay other large sums. These statements are false; all Arizona at any time asked was an opportunity to borrow the money from the Federal Treasury on a 70-year loan, cut to the same sound pattern as other large, multipurpose reclamation projects which have paid out, or are paying out, dollar for dollar.

The Digest uses other figures with an intentional shocking effect, whereas an analysis of the figures reveals there is no reason

for shock. The pump lift out of the Colorado River is stated at 1,000 feet and the length of the major canals as 300 miles. Does the Digest know that within southern California there is a pump lift of 1,615 feet out of the Colorado River, feeding a major aqueduct system totaling more than the mileage involved in the Central Arizona project aqueducts, and involving transportation of very nearly the same amount of Colorado River water? The Arizona pump lift would be 985 feet.

It astounds me to have people seriously ask, "Is the Central Arizona project feasible?" when all they have to do is look around on any trip to southern California and see completely demonstrated the feasibility of transporting a million acre-feet of water anually through 300 or more miles of aqueducts, with a 985-foot or higher pump lift.

The Digest repeats the old canard that the Central Arizona project would unduly enrich 420 large landowners. The Digest says that this is one surprising aspect of the Central Arizona project which has escaped notice. Either the Digest writers and editors are ignorant or deliberately deceptive. This is a propaganda statement made for 8 years by the Colorado River Association of California in virtually every piece of that California group's literature, and totally refuted by Arizona and the Bureau of Reclamation in testimony before Congress. More than 30,000 farms of all sizes would benefit, not one of them in any disproportionate amount.

The Digest, in the Leslie Miller-Holman Harvey article, has picked up a long list of old, widely disseminated, but quite answerable statements made by California propagandists in an effort to frustrate use of Colorado river water by Arizona. The facts concerning these things were available to Mr. Harvey and presumably also to Mr. Miller. Certainly, in any publication office as large and as important as the Digest's some research checking should be performed to avoid carelessly reproducing outright misstatements of fact.

I have written Dewitt Wallace, editor of the Digest, suggesting to him that if the Digest has an honest intention of thoroughly discussing reclamation, there are several outstanding writers capable of handling the stories factually. I wish every person who knows reclamation's true story of benefits would also write him.

The Digest has done a disservice to the entire nation, and particularly to the business of reputable gathering, checking, and publishing of factual information.

[From the Arizona Daily Star of April 11, 1955]

A DISTORTED STORY

The Reader's Digest, with its multimillion circulation, wields powerful editorial influence in the United States. When this power is used to promote a special-interest group it can become a telling weapon.

In the May issue, we see the unfortunate spectacle of the Digest not only promoting a special-interest group, but doing so with a disregard for facts which is surprising in a publication with the reputation the Digest enjoys.

In an article entitled "Dollars Into Dust" the Digest launches an attack on reclamation in the United States, and therein devotes several paragraphs to the central Arizona project.

The article is carried under the bylines of Lselie A. Miller and Holman Harvey. Mr. Miller is a former Governor of Wyoming, and Chairman of the Hoover Commission Task Group on Reclamation and Water Supply, and as such his name will carry great weight with those who read the article.

Unfortunately, it was Mr. Harvey, and not Mr. Miller, who visited Arizona gathering data for this report.

At the time he was here, Mr. Harvey was supplied with the facts about the central Arizona project. None of these appeared in the article.

To the contrary, the paragraphs devoted to the central Arizona project are based almost completely on distortions created by California interests who are battling the Arizona project with every means at their disposal.

And it is to the credit of these California interests, as propagandists, that they have been able to sell their distortions to a magazine with the circulation, influence, and reputation of the Digest. The article will mean much to the campaign they are waging.

The central Arizona project Association realizes how much this article can hurt Arizona, and answered the allegations in an article carried in yesterday's Star quoting David Brinegar, its executive secretary.

Unfortunately, such an article published in Arizona can do almost nothing to remedy the damage done by the Digest article, and with that realization, the association has written the Digest asking whether it is interested in publishing a fair appraisal of reclamation, and the central Arizona project, or whether this biased and inaccurate report is to go unanswered in its pages.

Whether through careless reporting and editing, or through intentional distortion, the Digest stands now in the position of pulling southern California's chestnuts out of the fire, and using the half-truths and untruths from California's own battle guide.

Whether the Digest is going to remedy the damage it has unfairly done to Arizona, and at the same time to its own reputation for accuracy and fairness, remains to be seen.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes, and I do that for the purpose of summing up very briefly some of the arguments that have been made. I think it should be remembered that the Gallup polls taken in the last several years have shown that the people of the United States are for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska by about 70 percent.

The debate here today has been honest and sincere and hard, just as it was in the days when they were trying to admit California and Nebraska and Mississippi. Honest, sincere men then made the same arguments that today have been made against Hawaii and Alaska, that those Territories ought not to come in as States. They did come in, and of course time has proved those men wrong.

May I point out also that the governors of 11 Western States in their conference at Albuquerque in 1953 went on record unanimously for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. The President of the United States and former President Truman also favor it. The last three congressional committees that have been to Hawaii have come back recommending statehood for Hawaii. Both political parties time and time again have placed this plank in their platforms.

The bill before us is not a perfect bill. Under the rule under which we are working it is not even possible to change a comma or a couple of semicolons that ought to be changed in the bill. The Rules Committee reported out a rule that would not permit that. For the information of my colleagues, there are more than 50 committee amendments to this bill. I do not believe they should be considered en bloc. I do not know how long the House wants to stay here, for the Members have been here more than 7 hours debating this bill in an earnest and sincere manner. I do want some time upon these committee amendments. Under the rules of the House 5 minutes can be had on each side on each amendment, the fifty-some-odd amendments might well take considerable time. I suggest that the Members are getting a little tired. I am not part of the leadership, but there is another day coming. If the Members want to stay here until midnight, I am quite capable of doing it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my very able colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Loyalty to Home State May Have Cost Trio Chance at Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article published in the Knoxville Journal of April 24, which was written by one of Tennessee's most distinguished historians, Mr. E. E. Patton:

LOYALTY TO HOME STATE MAY HAVE COST TRIO CHANCE AT PRESIDENCY

(By E. E. Patton)

If, one of the shortest words in the English language has an extensive definition: supposing that; on condition that; in case that; whether; although; even though; condition; supposition.

In May of 1860, the Republican National Convention nominated Abraham Lincoln of Illinois as their candidate for high office of President of the United States and named Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine as his runningmate.

Briefly, Hamlin was born in 1809; served in Congress from 1843 to 1847 and in the United States Senate from 1848 to 1856. During this service he was listed as a Democrat and supported the administration of Franklin Pierce with ability and fidelity. He was elected Governor of Maine in 1856 as a Republican. He changed political affiliation because of his attitude toward the slavery issue. After his term of service as Vice President he was again elected to the Senate and served from 1869 to 1881 when he was appointed American minister to Spain.

He was capable and loyal to Lincoln and his administration, but there was a war on at that time, "testing whether this Nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated could long endure." From December 1860, to June 1861, 11 Southern States went through the formality of passing ordinances of secession, declaring themselves out of the old Union and then members of the Southern Confederacy.

WAR CHANGES ATTITUDE

But sometimes a war will change the attitude of men and states and nations. Some of the border States sent thousands of men into the Confederate armies and some of them were represented in the Confederate Congress and Senate. Tennessee was the last State to pass an ordinance of secession. The middle and western sections of the State were overwhelmingly secessionist, while east Tennessee voted and fought 9 to 1 for the old Federal Union. In the early part of 1862, the Union forces under General Grant captured Fort Henry and Fort Donelson and this left the road open for the Federal forces to move on to Nashville and surrounding territory. In 1862, President Lincoln persuaded Andrew Johnson, a Senator from Tennessee, to resign his seat in the Senate and become the military governor of Tennessee with the rank in the army of major general.

When the Nation was approaching the election of 1864, Lincoln was of the firm opinion that it would be beneficial for the Union forces if a border State man, of even one from one of the seceding States, could be nominated as his running mate. He held no doubt about the ability or loyalty of Hamlin. It was merely circumstances that controlled the situation. Now let's take a look at 3 other men and see if 1 of them could have, would have, been nominated instead of Johnson.

THREE COLLEGE MEN

It will be remembered that Johnson never went to school a day in his life, yet he was well read and used good and correct language. But the other three whom we might have in mind, but for that ubiquitous "if," were college men; in fact, one of them was a graduate of West Point, and that meant scholarship.

The first of those three men was General Robert Edward Lee of the Commonwealth of Virginia. He was of prominent lineage; was a graduate, second in his class, of West Point; married to the great granddaughter of Mrs. George Washington. As far as the record shows General Lee was never accused or even suspected of anything criminal, illegal, unlawful, unethical, immoral in military, civil, and public life.

When the war—the Confederate War—came on, General Lee was stationed in Washington and had the confidence and support of President Lincoln and Gen. Winfield Scott, head of the Armed Forces of the Nation. It has been told, and there is no doubt of its authenticity, that President Lincoln had General Scott send a man to the home of General Lee and offer him the supreme command of all the armies of the Nation. He declined because his conscience told him that his first loyalty was to his native Virginia.

Had he accepted the generalship of all the armies the war would not have lasted so long and then General Lee would have been named as Lincoln's running mate—if.

John Bell was born 1797. He served in Congress from 1827 to 1841. He was elected Speaker of the House in 1834, defeated his colleague from Tennessee, James K. Polk. In 1835 and 1837, Polk defeated Bell for this high office. Nothing like this has ever happened to two men from the same State. It is known that Jackson was instrumental in Polk's defeat of Bell and this caused Bell to hate Jackson and scorn Polk. Bell was a Member of the Senate from 1847 to 1859. He was the candidate of the Constitutional-Union Party for the Presidency in 1860. When Tennessee seceded he went with his State. Had he remained loyal, he could have been elected in 1864—if.

NATIVE OF KENTUCKY

John Cabell Breckinridge is the last man of the if trio and he is one of the most outstanding characters in American history. He was a native of Kentucky, born in 1821. He had a classical education, was admitted to the bar when a very young man; was an orator of ability and one of the handsomest men that American ever produced.

He was elected to Congress when he was only 29 years of age and served with credit and distinction. The constitutional age for a Vice President is 35 and Breckinridge was a little over 36 when inaugurated. He presided over the Senate with fairness, ability, and courtesy to all Members. He was elected to the United States Senate for the term beginning March 4, 1861. Within 5 minutes after he laid down the Vice President's gavel, he was sworn in as a Senator. Lincoln called the Congress into extraordinary session on July 4, 1831, and Breckinridge attended this session. He was bitterly opposed to Lincoln's war plans for saving the Union. When the Congress adjourned, he went back to Kentucky, and failing to get the Commonwealth to endorse the Southern Confederacy, he joined the Confederate Army and remained in the army until the close of the war. He was expelled from the Senate in December of 1861. During the last few months of the Confederacy, Breckinridge was Secretary of War under Jefferson Davis.

Kentucky was a border Commonwealth; did not secede but had members in both house and senate of the Confederacy. Had Breckinridge remained loyal to the Union he would have been held in high esteem by Lincoln and would have had precedence over Johnson because of his superior education and his former experience in the Vice Presidency.

But there emerges that ubiquitous if.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition on this amendment.

I do this to reassure my colleagues that the question of a constitution for the new State of Alaska is in the hands of Congress, because, on page 44, lines 3 and 4, it says:

The Congress shall within 60 legislative days after receipt thereof approve or disapprove said constitution.

This makes it an important part of the bill, because the Congress will be given an opportunity to have a look at the constitution that they may adopt in Alaska and thereby allay some of the fears of individuals who feel that something will be put in the constitution adopted that might be contrary to some of our philosophy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. And Congress will vote the constitution up or down without authority to amend either one of the constitutions that might be sent up?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Congress will have a chance to approve or disapprove the constitution.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by amendments? Congress will have the right to amend the constitutions that are sent up to us?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Congress will have the right to approve or disapprove.

Mr. GROSS. To amend or just to approve or disapprove?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. To approve or disapprove.

Mr. GROSS. Without the right to amend?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. I think that is under the same conditions adopted for all new States.

Fact and Fantasy on Ukraine and Byelorussia in the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a scholarly testimony submitted last week to the Senate Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, concluded his remarks on recommended measures of revision with the statement that—

This may not be peaceful in the sense of letting things be as they are, but things as they are cannot contribute to true peace.

In contrast to the hollow and pious utterances made about the presently constituted U. N. before this congressional committee, this logically integrated testimony demonstrates the complete truth of this statement and urges the expulsion of all Communist delegations from the U. N.

This recommendation fully supports House Concurrent Resolution 89 which I have submitted, calling for the same action by our Government. Moral leadership in world affairs demands such action. The analysis provided by this testimony shows how the United States can defeat Communist propaganda on such issues as imperialism and colonialism, by concentrating especially on the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. It instructively points out some fantastic notions still entertained by several people, some even in high places, with respect to Ukraine, Byelorussia and the other non-Russian na-

tions in the U. S. S. R.—this, despite the solid and remarkable disclosures of our own Select House Committee on Communist Aggression.

For further public enlightenment on these crucial captive nations in the U. S. S. R., especially among journalists and commentators who are notorious for their errors in equating the Soviet Union with Russia, in referring to these nations as "national minorities," in speaking of 200 million Russians, I insert Dr. Dobriansky's lucid statement into the RECORD:

FACT AND FANTASY ON UKRAINE AND BYELORUSSIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

(Statement of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

I am most grateful for this opportunity to submit certain factually founded views bearing on several proposals related to the revision of the United Nations Charter. In this respect it is my dutiful privilege to represent the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which is a uniquely united national organization representing one and a half million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry whose resources of knowledge and understanding of problems pertaining to the Soviet Union are steadfastly devoted to the essential and primary interests of our Nation. In a real, interrelated sense this testimony enjoys the propitious occasion not only of the studious proceedings of this distinguished committee but also of the current Bandung Conference where deliberations on imperialism, colonialism and the natural struggle for national independence are of prime moment. For, in short, should a certain proposal be approved by this committee, it would certainly serve well the predatory interests of Moscow in contaminating further the minds of many members now attending this conference with the patent untruths that the United States is the "imperialist aggressor" at large in the world and that the U. S. S. R. is the great proponent of national sovereignty, freedom and independence.

The somewhat fantastic, explicit or implicit proposal to recommend the elimination of Ukraine and Byelorussia from membership in the United Nations indubitably points to this undesired result and to a total absolute disadvantage for our country in the cold war, not to speak of a hot one. It is my special purpose here to analyze this proposal in the limited time available and to demonstrate in the most succinct manner possible its glaring invalidity and falsity from the viewpoints of historical fact, international law and general, interpretative, political judgment. When one begins to reflect soberly on the crucial importance of Ukraine in the complex of world relations and to understand the economic, political and military strategical significance of this largest non-Russian nation, not only in the Soviet Union but in Eastern Europe generally, then it becomes obvious that an ill-advised proposal of this sort might cause considerable damage to our position in relation to the Communist imperial challenge.

RANDOM SOURCES OF THE PROPOSAL

In order to assume a full perspective on this issue and simultaneously to afford complete ground for the critical analysis developed here, I wish to reproduce for the benefit of the committee members what may properly be construed as random sources of the proposal. It is evident that these sources, extracted almost exclusively from the staff studies of this committee, run conspicuously short of elaborating with justification in historical fact and law on any of their closely relevant statements. Indeed, they appear to evince conceptions of thought that stand in striking disharmony with known realities in the Soviet Union. This reproduction will enable us to reduce in essential terms the criteria that seem to underlie the proposal:

1. In Staff Study No. 3 on the Problem of Membership in the United Nations, it is stated:

"The membership of the Ukrainian S. S. R. and the Byelorussian S. S. R., for example, might be considered a precedent for the admission of territorial entities of questionable sovereignty" (p. 12).

(a) Briefly, an appreciative understanding of the histories of Ukraine and Byelorussia, as so well shown in the Special Reports No. 4 and 9 (Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine—Byelorussia) of Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, could scarcely regard these large non-Russian nations as mere "territorial entities of questionable sovereignty." Moreover, it should be recalled here that India was admitted into the U. N. before it attained to the status of a Dominion in the British Commonwealth. Nor should the fact be overlooked that Canada exercised sovereignty and enjoyed the right of legation long before the British Empire was transformed into a union of entirely independent nations.

2. In Staff Study No. 4 on Representation and Voting in the United Nations General Assembly, it is stated with reference to one-State one-vote principle:

"The only exception to this principle is to be found in the privileged position of the Soviet Union. At the San Francisco Conference, in accordance with an arrangement made at the Yalta Conference, Byelorussia and the Ukraine—which are constituent republics of the U. S. S. R. and do not qualify as 'states' in the strict sense of that term—were admitted as U. N. members. They each have 1 vote which, combined with that of the Soviet Union, make a total of 3 votes for 1 country.

"Actually, this arrangement involves far more than two additional votes for the Soviet Union. She is also entitled to two additional delegations. This not only triples her voting power, it triples her speaking power as well" (p. 3).

(a) Here, too, if we are to speak in the strict sense of terms, a sound knowledge of the Soviet Union and east European history compels us to view the U. S. S. R. itself as an empire, built on the imperialist foundations of the old czarist Russian empire, and not as a state, in the strict sense of that term. Amply supported by history and the major criteria of international law, Ukraine and Byelorussia possess in the fullest degree the same basic qualifications of a state as do Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the free delegations of whom we continue to recognize, or Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and others which today find themselves in the expanded confinements of this empire. The term Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should not blind us in regard to the substantially identical histories, plights and enslavement of all these countries and national states in recent times. This nomer refers to an empire nucleus upon which Moscow seeks to erect some day the World Union of Soviet Republics.

(b) Furthermore, the apparent stress placed on the matters of two additional votes and triple speaking power becomes, in the light of the full facts of the case, an emphasis upon the superficial. First, it is well known by students of the subject, as well as attested to by Senator Vandenberg, Mr. Stettinius and others, that Stalin pressed for the admission of Ukraine and Byelorussia into the U. N. not for the mere reason of gaining 2 more votes but primarily and chiefly to appease the intense patriotic nationalism raging in these 2 countries at the time. Second, accounting for the other nations in the U. S. S. R. as well, Stalin, with typical Communist foresight, urged their admission in order to impress upon all colonial nations, such as those now attending the Bandung Conference, that Moscow metes out equal treatment to all the nations in the Soviet Union, the non-Russian and the Russian one. Third, it should be observed that with 2, 3 or more votes Moscow still falls far short of any majority in the U. N. Assembly, and with its possession of the veto it didn't even require the 2 additional votes to accomplish its undermining work. And lastly, speaking power is ultimately and soundly measured not by the number that speak but by the productive ideas, the telling facts, the dedicated passion by which only one need courageously make his stand. There is in Congress today a resolution submitted by Congressman MADDEN of Indiana, and fully supported by all the members of the former Select House Committee on Communist Aggression that provides infinite speaking power for our delegates in the U. N. if they would only, with forthright purpose, use the abundance of material accumulated by this unique committee on the endless crimes committed by Moscow against humanity.

3. Again, in Staff Study No. 4 on Representation and Voting in the United Nations General Assembly it is stated:

"The principle of 1-state 1-vote results in glaring ineqaulities in the General Assembly. Only 9 states can boast a population of 40 million or more. Some 26 states have a population of 5 million or under, including Iceland with 146,000 and Luxembourg with 300,000. Three countries—China, India, and the Soviet Union—contain more than half the total U. N. population of roughly 1,800 million" (pp. 4–5).

(a) Although from a scholarly viewpoint the statistics provided on the populations of the U. S. S. R., Ukraine and Byelorussia, on pages 20–21 of this study, are subject to rather severe criticism, it is evident again, in the above passage, tha the nature of the Soviet Union is not accurately understood. This inevitably reflects on one's understanding of the problem at hand. China and India, despite various regional differences in each, are national units with distinctive individual national consciousness animating a territorial embodiment known as a country. If we accept the sound definition of a country as "the territory of nation that has a distinct existence as to name, language, customs, government, and the like" (the Winston Dictionary, p. 223), then to characterize the Soviet Union as a country, in the same vein as China and India, leads us far astray. In truth, as an empire the Soviet Union embraces many countries in which reside different nations that speak different languages, that nurture different customs, that maintain separate governments, and the like. Ukraine, with roughly a population of 40 million, and Byelorussia with about 10 million are such countries, native lands to its respective peoples, as our country is to us.

4. In Staff Study No. 6 on Budgetary and Financial Problems of the United Nations it is stated:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY reports that on one day in 1952, for example, he listened to a member of the Ukrainian delegation in one committee of the General Assembly speak with great pride of the remarkable economic progress his country has made since the war. The Senator then went to another committee where he heard a second member of the Ukrainian delegation explain with equal fervor why his government was unable to increase its contribution to the U. N. budget" (p. 8).

4a. In Staff Study No. 4 on Representation and Voting in the United Nations General Assembly, in the preface written by Senator WILEY, it is stated:

"The General Assembly is based upon the idea of sovereign equality of states and the principle of one-state-one-vote prevails. The only exception to this principle is the Soviet Union which, under the agreement reached at Yalta, obtained the admission of

Byelorussia and the Ukraine as full members of the United Nations. This concession not only gave the Soviet Union three times the voting power she deserves; what is even worse, it tripled her speaking power in the General Assembly.

"Like many other delegates to the General Assembly, I have had to sit by the hour and listen to the repetitive tirades of the Soviet Union, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine. When the time comes to consider the revision of the charter we should protest this arrangement. Byelorussia and the Ukraine are constituent states of the Soviet Union—somewhat like Texas and New York are constituent States of our own Federal Republic. If they deserve separate representation, then we should seek additional votes for Texas, New York, Wisconsin, and the other States of the Union" (p. III).

(a) Immediately, in the first passage quoted above and with specific relation to our preceding critical observations, it will be noted that in reference to the delegates from Ukraine proper and accurate usage is employed in such terms as "his country" and "his government." This obvious contrast to the previous accounts indicates the degree of confusion that permeates these studies on this particular subject.

(b) Moreover, it is clearly evident from the first and second passages that Senator WILEY'S immediate experience with the behavior of the Ukrainian delegates, for which the people of Ukraine are hardly blameworthy, was not exactly a pleasant one. However, I am certain that the distinguished Senator, for whom I have great respect, will agree with me that disturbed feelings and subjective discomposure are scarcely acceptable bases for a proposal as serious as the one now under consideration. Also, one cannot but feel reasonably certain that the Communist delegates from Poland and Czechoslovakia contribute equally to the vitriolic tirades that cause mental disquietude for some of the other delegates. This is the nature of Communist tactics which, again, can be easily thwarted by the incessant and persistent use of the weapons of truth, fact and conviction which have been so remarkably fashioned by the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression and which, for the first time in our Government, penetrate deep into the heart of the empire within an empire, namely the Soviet Union.

(c) In these passages, too, the other points have been adequately treated above except one, namely the fallacious comparison made between Ukraine and Byelorussia and Texas and New York. When Senator WILEY first began publicly to draw this comparison last year, I felt compelled to write a detailed letter to him, pointing out the utter fallacy of this unfortunate comparison. I request the inclusion of a copy of this letter, dated November 23, 1954, in the record of these hearings. Furthermore, in all intellectual honesty, I cannot at this point refrain from stating that in full view of all the knowledge and data on Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. which have been made accessible here these past 5 years, it is most disappointing to witness utterances contravening the most elementary matters of fact. In this regard, whatever else might be thought of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill at Yalta, to their intellectual credit it must be admitted that they understood the basic structural distinctions between the United States and the Soviet Union and clearly recognized the essential facts that the latter is not a nation and a Federal republic like the former and that the position of Ukraine in the U. S. S. R. cannot be likened to that of Texas or any other State in the United States of America. In part of President Roosevelt's words, "the U. S. S. R. has a different national structure. The United States has one language and one foreign minister." (Yalta Conference records, New York Times, March 17, 1955.)

Before even delving into the reasons explaining the fallacy of this comparison, one could logically dwell on this significant point engendered by the comparison and draw his safe and sound conclusions. Are we to construe now that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, which suffered the same forced incorporation into the Soviet Union as Ukraine, Byelorussia and the other non-Russian nations had in the 1920's, are State counterparts of Idaho, Utah and Arizona? If Poland should nominally be included in the empire within an empire, although functionally its position now is the same in every basic respect as those of Ukraine and Byelorussia, would it be rational to regard it as a State counterpart of Nevada or Oregon? These pointed questions hinge on a historical projection of Russian Communist imperialism since the early 1920's, but aside from this they obviously would be answered logically in the negative. The instant span of historical time between the experiences of these nations with Russian Communist imperialism commencing in the 1940's and those of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia and Turkestan starting in the 1920's surely does not, therefore, transform the latter into States like Texas, Wisconsin, New York, Massachusetts or any of the others in our Republic.

If in a sound, scientific manner any parallel is to be drawn, it is between the United States and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, for the two are integrated, federal structures. There can be no accurate analogy in constitutional or internation law, nor in history, between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As shown in this memorandum on membership of the Ukrainian S. S. R. in the United Nations and the forthcoming U. N. Charter amendment, which was prepared for the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America by Roman Olesnicki, an author and close observer of East European affairs, and which I request be incorporated in the record of these hearings, the closest analogy to the Soviet Union is the British Commonwealth of Nations. In this connection it should be noted that the Crown, the Imperial Council, and Parliament in London exercise influence on the affairs of the Commonwealth's member nations, but this in no way detracts from their recognition as sovereign states.

Bearing this analogy in mind, then, one can now view the reasons as to why the comparison of Ukraine and Byelorussia with Texas and New York rests on completely spurious grounds:

1. The United States is a nation: the Soviet Union is an empire of nations with different languages, separate histories, diverse cultures, many native lands;

2. The inhabitants of Texas, Wisconsin, New York, etc., are conscious integral parts of a single nation: those of Ukraine and Byelorussia, as well as of other non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R., are conscious, integral national units in themselves;

3. A Texan visiting or residing in Wisconsin or New York is in every basic respect "at home"; a Ukrainian or Byelorussian in Georgia, Turkestan, or the Russian S. F. S. R. is in a foreign land with a different language, customs, traditions, etc.;

4. True, Texas and others have their defined territories, flags, and seals, a State constitution, budget, administration, and judiciary: as any national state, Ukraine and Byelorussia possess all of this as well as additional major attributes of a sovereign state, including population with its own citizenship, separate ministries of foreign affairs and defense, individual national anthems, and the right to maintain foreign relations and own armed forces. Our Constitution in article I, section 10, denies to the States of the Union any participation in foreign affairs: the Soviet Constitution, in chapter II, article 18a, acknowledges the unqualified right of Union Republics to enter into direct relations with foreign states, and this right has been amply exercised by Ukraine and Byelorussia;

5. Neither Texas nor Wisconsin nor New York has the right of secession: Ukraine, Byelorussia, and other national states in the Soviet Union have this right.

The paramount fact of legal distinction is that in the one the source of all internal and external power is the Ukrainian nation, whereas in the case of Texas, etc., no such separate and independent source exists.

5. In an interview reported by the U. S. News & World Report of November 25, 1954, Ambassador Lodge stated:

"If they've got the Ukraine and Byelorussia, then we certainly ought to have Texas and I would add Massachusetts."

(a) Quite plainly, what was said in connection with Texas, Wisconsin, and New York applies equally and wholly to Massachusetts as well. This unthinking quoted statement is, as some of the previous ones, simply a product of a void of historical understanding concerning Ukraine Byelorussia, the several other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, and the very formation and development of the Soviet Union itself. As in numerous other fields of human knowledge, one cannot begin to grasp the meaningful significance of this considered proposal, as well as other political problems and issues regarding this important area, without the broad perspective and intellectual perception that history furnishes. Perhaps nowhere in official public print can one find the true, sequential historical presentation of the origin and development of Russian Communist imperialism, beginning with the destruction of the independent non-Russian states of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, and others in 1917–20, than in the innovating Summary Report of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression (pp. 11–28).

The dominant, significant fact is that Ukraine, despite many political restrictions, was regarded as a sovereign state long before its admission into the U. N. It is little wonder that hardly a ripple of doubt or opposition was manifested at the time of its admission as a charter member. Even in the expansive framework of the imperial Russian Empire its sovereignty was recognized. When the non-Russian revolution of national independence swept the Empire in 1917–18, this sovereignty was completely asserted and crystallized in the form of the independent Ukrainian National Republic which in democratic, pluralistic terms of institutional authority was, therefore, not a new sovereign state but one delivered from relative captivity. This independent state of an always sovereign nation was quickly recognized by the government of Soviet Russia on December 17, 1917, followed soon thereafter by France and others. It was a signatory power in the Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in 1918 and entered into treaties with Poland and other sovereign nations. Following its early victimization by Russian Communist imperialism, Ukraine, now in the form of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, was a signatory to the 1921 Treaty of Riga, along with Poland and the Russian S. F. S. R. Its entrance in 1923 into the so-called voluntary union of equal republics, known as the U. S. S. R., was on the basis of a sovereign state which has been observed constitutionally ever since. These are only a few of the essential facts that cannot be ignored, and for a more detailed account of this phase of the issue I wish to submit into the record of this proceeding a memorandum written by Dr. S. Wytwycky, president of the Ukrainian National Council, an emigre body in Western Germany.

(b) From the viewpoint of international law Ukraine possesses all the attributes of

a sovereign state, although its general political position is no different from that of Poland or Czechoslovakia. In its foreign relations it has signed a number of bilateral acts under international law, as, for example, the UNRRA treaty on relief, a treaty with Poland on minorities, and peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. It is a member of numerous international organizations, like the Universal Postal Union, International Organization of Telecommunications, etc. In its being it meets with the criteria of a state as a person of international law as set forth, for example, in the Inter-American Convention of Rights and Duties of States at Montevideo in 1933, providing qualifications of a permanent population, a defined territory, government and capacity to enter into relations with other states. The majority of the original member states of the U. N. recognize this convention. Here, too, for a more detailed exposition of this issue in the light of international law and the complications and contradictions into which we would plunge ourselves with the Wiley-Lodge proposal, I ask for submission into the record the scholarly articles by Dr. Matthew Stachiw on U. N. Membership of Nations Dominated by Communists and by Dr. Bohdan Halaichuk on Has the United States Recognized Ukraine? both of which appear in the winter issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, a listed scholarly journal devoted to East European affairs.

MAJOR POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSAL

The contemporary complex of world relations and affairs renders it clearly axiomatic that whatever we propose and do in whatever sphere of our foreign activities, precipitates repercussions in other quarters of the globe. Consideration and official action on this proposal will certainly not be without its major political consequences. The reasoned analysis pursued here leads to the following logical consequences of a character definitely unfavorable and adverse to the position of our country in the present struggle:

1. Based on a gross misconception of modern East European history and unfamiliarity with concrete data, the proposal will be viewed by the Ukrainian nation and people as another obstacle thrown in its path toward the achievement of genuine national independence. They remember the obstacles, born of ignorance, that were created by some Western democracies in the years following World War I, which contributed to the undermining of their independent Republic and the entrenchment of Russian communism that, ironically enough, threatens our very existence as an independent nation today.

2. Being tantamount to a negation of the distinctive national and cultural substances of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples, which in any democratic analysis of sovereignty is its ultimate source and repository, the proposal stands to alienate rather than befriend the minds and hearts of these nations. In World War II the German Nazis alienated them and lost the war on the Eastern Front. Are we to incur such losses in the cold war and be ill-prepared for an ever possible hot one?

3. The proposal represents an irrational denial of the aspirations, untold sufferings, and heroic resistance of these two large Slavic nations against the foreign yoke of Moscow, and cannot but produce an unfavorable reflection on our own moral stature in world leadership.

4. This revisionist proposal, even if seriously considered, no less passed and officially submitted, provides Moscow with a powerful political weapon in its current efforts of consolidation in Ukraine and Byelorussia. In the past year it has gone to considerable lengths in pretending to be the guardian of the freedom and independence of these nations, as shown in the enumeration of events in this editorial in the Ukrainian Bulletin on Ukraine—the Unused Weapon in the War Against Communism (March 15, 1955), which I request be included in the record. Now Moscow would be able to point to "imperialist America" as the power denying these two nations recognition and membership in the world council of nations.

5. The proposal will unquestionably provide Soviet spokesmen in the U. N. with abundant propaganda ammunition against our country in their defense of the sovereignty of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian nations. In the eyes of the colonial and dependent nations of the world they will assume in some degree the role of the great defender of the cause of equal national sovereignty.

6. The proposal is doubtlessly no source of hope and encouragement to resistance groups in these countries, notably the Ukrainian insurgent army, whose political underground systems extend in activity and effect to distant places like Vorkuta and have contributed heavily to the grain and food crisis in the Soviet Union. On the contrary, it can only breed discouragement and disillusion.

7. This proposal to eliminate the Ukrainian and Byelorussian nations from membership in the U. N. constitutes a stamp of approval of imperialism and colonialism at the very moment when, as Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH declared the other day before the Overseas Press Club, we should seize the initiative and show the Asian-African conference at Bandung that "we are the opponents of colonialism; that the Communists are the present-day advocates of colonialism." No better examples of Communist colonialism can be found than among the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. We should advance their national sovereignty, not deny it.

RECOMMENDED MEASURES ON REVISION

In conclusion, we are in total accord with the administration's decision favoring the convening of a conference on revision. We seek and favor in preparation for this event the following steps and recommended measures on revision of the U. N. Charter:

1. Complete rejection by this committee of any explicit or implicit proposal aimed at the elimination of Ukraine and Byelorussia as member states in the U. N.

2. Use and employment of every technical device to render clear and distinct expression and interpretation to our determination not to allow any legal encroachments upon the processes of law afforded by our Constitution as the supreme law of the land and any suggestion bearing on an imputed evolution of world government.

3. The moral and forthright ejection of the Communist delegations from the U. N. on the basis of a clear distinction between the sound recognition of nations and their peace-loving peoples and the incongruous recognition of hand-picked representatives who are parties to a criminal world conspiracy under the centralized direction of the Communist Party dictatorship in Moscow which behind its necessary Iron Curtain is planning for our destruction as a nation in these very moments.

4. On the basis of precedent set in the League of Nations, the concrete provision of vacant seats in the U. N. for the sovereign nations of federated Russia, Poland, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Czechio, Hungary, Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Turkestan, as the sound formative groundwork of a universality of membership of nations and the truthful acceptance of representatives accredited by the free will of the individual nations.

Pious utterances about the ideals and objectives of the U. N. cannot obscure the criminal deeds and aggressions of Moscow against nations and peoples. They will surely remain hollow utterances until the truths of such crimes and aggressions are faced squarely, morally, and courageously. These recommendations are founded on fact and moral and political principle. They are based on the wealth of evidence and findings of the unique Select House Committee on Communist aggression. They rest on the knowledge of the long agonies and struggles of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples who have exacted from their foreign oppressor observances which it is proposed that we deny to them. They put forth an investment in the future when all these sovereign nations could completely assert themselves in states independent of the Communist Party dictatorship in Moscow. They lay the ground for a tremendous show of initiative in demonstrating to the member nations now at the Bandung Conference that the United States is the true defender of the sovereignty of nations and that the Soviet Union itself is the empire of the worst kind of colonialism and imperialism. This may not be peaceful in the sense of letting things be as they are, but things as they are cannot contribute to true peace.

Report by Chief of Police Robert V. Murray on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report made by the Chief of Police of the District of Columbia, Robert V. Murray, as chairman of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, in connection with the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Murray has compiled a thoughtful report, which includes the composite attitude of a number of chiefs of police. While there may be some parts of the report which I, as Chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate the Problems of Juvenile Delinquency, do not agree with, nevertheless, in view of the great interest in the problem, I believe it should be printed in the RECORD for the information of all who are interested in the problem of juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY COMMITTEE, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, 1954

Compiled by: Chief Robert V. Murray, Washington, D. C., chairman.

Papers submitted: Chief H. J. Lawrence, Seattle, Wash.; Commissioner Beverly Ober, Baltimore, Md.; Commissioner Timothy J. O'Connor, Chicago, Ill.; Superintendent Edward W. Fallon, Boston, Mass.; Commissioner Thomas J. Gibbons, Philadelphia, Pa.; Deputy Chief Thad F. Brown, Los Angeles, Calif.; Chief Constable John Chisholm, Toronto, Canada; Superintendent Edwin Morgan, Detroit, Mich.

Other committee members: Commissioner Harold P. Caldwell, Omaha, Nebr.; Chief H. T. Jenkins, Atlanta, Ga.

This final report of the juvenile delinquency committee has been approved unanimously by the members of the committee.

The report represents a consolidation in summary form of material taken from the papers submitted by members of the committee. In addition to these papers, the report also contains material from other sources properly credited.

While all papers have been submitted for inclusion in the Police Year Book so that individual views will be reproduced as submitted to the committee, it would be too time-consuming and impractical at this time to present each in its entirety, although they well deserve such recognition; therefore, we shall endeavor to present no more than a brief review of the highlights of the material without indicating the various papers from which taken.

To all of the police executives who submitted material for the preparation of this report I wish to express my deepest appreciation; the papers were indicative of careful preparation and thorough exploration of the subject matter.

Everyone engaged in law enforcement recognizes that the problem of the juvenile offender is one of increasing significance. Without any elaborate compilation of statistics, we can agree that more serious offenses are being committeed by persons in the juvenile age groups, and that the age at which juveniles come into conflict with the law is gradually lowering. I believe we can further agree that the general citizenry of our country, particularly in our larger cities, have become increasingly conscious of the juvenile problem, sometimes almost to the point of hysteria. Citizen concern has been indicated through the establishment and expansion of youth programs throughout the country, the creation of a special juvenile delinquency project under the supervision of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the comprehensive investigation of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, under the chairmanship of Senator Hendrickson.

Law-enforcement officers also recognize, however, that the juvenile problem must be viewed in its proper perspective as just one of the many complex activities confronting enforcement officials; that juvenile delinquency is the product of many factors in the community not within the scope of control of law enforcement; and that the role of the police in prevention and control of juvenile delinquency must be carefully delineated and defined in order to fulfill our responsibilities to the public and develop the proper working relationships with other community services.

There are those who have questioned, and justly so, the role of the police department in handling such juvenile cases as truancy, minor mischievous acts, and related juvenile actions. With all the organizations, programs, and activities designed for, staffed and equipped for, the handling of these juvenile actions, we find this problem together with other similar functions, assigned to us. Also, there is a question as to whether the use of large numbers of police officers in specialized activities such as boys' clubs, schoolboy patrols, and other delinquency preventive activities justifies itself. Could not other civilian agencies or groups just as effectively handle these programs?

On the other hand, when a serious crime is committed and we are called to investigate, there is no mistaking the role of the police department. Yet, although we rarely ever know whether it was committed by a juvenile or an adult until the individual is taken into custody, there are those who feel that the police should immediately, upon finding a juvenile involved, turn the case over to some other agency to handle. We cannot agree with this contention, although, of course, the first offender should be given every consideration if the crime is not too serious. But, when one serious crime after another is committed, the hardened young criminal should know that he is going to be dealt with accordingly. Many of these juveniles are juvenile in age only, but have the intelligence, physical appearance, and ability to commit some of the most heinous crimes known to man.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover in the December 1953 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin stated in part the following: "The juvenile crime problem has reached a point where it calls for a clear and unsentimental analysis of the offenses being committed by minors. The large number of children just beginning to reach the minimum delinquency age foreshadows a dangerous situation within a few years unless something is done to reduce the high crime rate prevalent in this segment of our society. The offenses being committed by minors are serious crimes, not the pranks of adolescent children. The gravity of most of them is obvious if the observer simply places himself or a member of his own family in the position of the victim."

At this point we should note that no one in the law-enforcement profession feels that corporal punishment is a sure and certain cure-all for every phase of delinquency, but many of us do not agree with the manner in which the conduct of repeated juvenile offenders is often condoned. There certainly must exist some rational middle course that can be followed.

Truancy and petty theft committed by underprivileged youths can to some extent be understood, but the wanton and malicious damage to public and private property is hard to explain. Yet, there is no evidence that there is any wave of malicious damage by youthful vandals wantonly smashing the property of their own parents and guardians. This would rather indicate that these delinquents do recognize some line of demarcation, otherwise such acts would be committed in their own homes, but we know how long that would be permitted.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover further says: "Juvenile crime is partially a police problem, and one of the finest law enforcement developments of this century is the preventive work sponsored by city police departments and sheriffs' offices all over the country. The problem is not one for police officers alone, however. My personal belief is that the forces which compound this problem spring from sources deep within the social, political and economic structure of our society. They are to be found in the general state of public morals, the relative respect or lack of respect for person and property in an age convulsed by war and revolution, the overcrowding of schools and playgrounds in congested urban areas, the inadequacy—for whatever the cause—of parental supervision, and numerous other factors. If this is true, responsible action against the problem must be taken not only by the police but by the courts, schools, parents, newspapers, radio and television and every other segment of our society which bears either a private or a general responsibility to the children of this complex age in which we live."

We realize that juvenile delinquency is universal, and, in one sense, it is the most important problem confronting police, since over half of the inmates in penal institutions have been juvenile delinquents. This means that if we are to control crime we must begin our efforts in the field of juvenile delinquency. As stated before, it is not only a police problem but a responsibility of every community. Anything that affects the community affects the juvenile problem. Parents and community must expect behavior disorders in children, for misbehavior is a natural result of growing up and learning.

It is not to be wondered in these troubled times, with its attendant insecurity, that juveniles should react to these tensions with an increase of anti-social behavior. This increase presents a challenge to the home, school, church, and the community, and when these fail to function, the unadjusted child comes to the attention of the police. The most significant single influence on the character and personality of a child is his family life. Training a child to become a useful member of society is one of the greatest responsibilities of parenthood. The child is expected to acquire such values as respect for the rights of others, respect for property, neighborliness, good sportsmanship, self-control, truthfulness, and consideration of others. This must be done early in life. For the child to learn these values, they must be exemplified and taught in the family circle. When parental protection is either lacking or inadequate, the social resources of the community must be extended to the child in need.

Allowing for exceptions, we do, however, recognize that delinquents are generally the product of bad homes where contributory factors are:

(a) Broken homes—parents separated or divorced.

(b) Bad family atmosphere with lack of cooperation between parents.

(c) No church or Sunday school association.

(d) Absence of guidance in methods of general behavior and sense of responsibility and respect for rights of others.

(e) Failure to teach children how to become socially normal and acceptable to community life.

(f) Bad example in living. Poor house management often resultant from alcoholism.

Here are some of the conclusions arrived at as the causes of juvenile delinquency and I think they further point out to us that this problem must be a matter for the entire community, not for any one group or agency:

1. Bad companionship: This means in most cases being forced into companionship with older children who have known tendencies toward delinquency.

2. Declining respect for all authority: In the majority of these cases the child is but aping adult persons with whom he lives or associates.

3. Lack of home supervision: This is due to death, separation, desertion, or divorce of either or both parents.

4. Lack of religious training and education: This has been greatly alleviated lately by reason of a resurgence of religious faith brought on by world conditions.

5. Lack of adequate punishment: There is often a lack of cooperation between the police and juvenile court authorities to see that the punishment for the juvenile offender is commensurate with the act committed. The results are a decline in respect by juveniles for both the court and the police.

6. Employment of mother and father: This leaves the child to its own devices during the day and in a number of cases also nightly.

7. Newspaper publicity of crime news: Through no intention on the part of the newspapers the juvenile is made aware of various crimes that have been committed by adults and other juveniles and the resultant court adjudications that stimulate desires.

8. Radio, television, and movie programs: A number of these programs tend to educate the young minds in criminal techniques. To these could be added the so-called crime comic books.

9. Money madness: This is called vividly to mind upon the full realization that all activities of our modern civilization have a dollar sign as the motivating factor.

10. Court procedure: The cooperation of police and prosecutors in preventing unnecessary delays in court procedures will do much toward bolstering the public's con-

fidence in our court system and in law enforcement.

11. Hangouts: Those questionable places of rendezvous frequented by youths and teen-aged girls in each community.

12. Responsibilities of youth: The sad lack of any real responsibilities or duties that are usually associated with family life.

13. Recreational facilities: The urgent need of more and better recreational facilities for the growing children of the community to allow for the expending of youthful energy in proper channels.

14. Housing-project problem: These modern urban housing units tend to place hundreds of families into a tight area wherein a serious problem has arisen as to schooling, shopping, and, most important of all, recreational facilities for the young. These are nonexistent in many cases, and the young are forced to seek their companions and recreation under undesirable conditions.

Now there are several of these points that should be forcibly brought to your attention because they have become a matter of national concern. One is the steady diet of violent crime in the form of television and radio programs, motion pictures, novels, magazines, and so-called comic books which is fed to our young people today.

The glorification of gangsters, gunmen, and hoodlums has amounted to, not hero worship, but hoodlum worship in recent years. A reporter kept a tally on television shows in the early evening when young children ordinarily watch television, and there were 18 assorted violent crimes portrayed against the person, including murders by shooting, stabbing, strangling, and poisoning, several assaults on the person, and other miscellaneous crimes. This in one evening.

Maj. Gen. William F. Dean, after his release from a Communist prison camp and over 3 years away from this country, stated in a press interview that he was disturbed upon his return to the United States by the crime programs on radio and television, by the comic strips and comic books at every newsstand, and by the emphasis on sex—suggestive pictures and stories. He felt that it wasn't good for the coming generations, and I am sure we all agree that it is bound to have a bad effect on the young people of this country by making crime commonplace and lowering the moral standards of our youth.

With reference to the sale and distribution of immoral literature, there has been much agitation in this field and the publishers who are profiting from the sale of this literature exert power to influence again censorship. There has been developed the attitude that what should be suppressed is merely a matter of personal opinion. However, in nearly every instance where groups of young outlaws or delinquents have been apprehended, quantities of such salacious literature have been found in their possession. Certainly the reading of this filth tends to deteriorate character and morals. A letter received by one police department on this subject is quoted:

"DEAR SIR: I am a boy attending high school. I am sending you this letter asking you to do something about the sale of filthy magazines and comics. These books aren't doing us young folk any good. Suppose you were the father of a boy or girl who reads these books. What would you do? In 10 or 15 years this country will be in the hands of us youngsters. If we are all 'sex crazy,' what good can we do for our country? If you will please read the article I have attached to this letter, I am sure you will be inspired as I. You have the right contacts. Couldn't you set up a bill prohibiting the sale of this filthy literature? Remember the future of our city and our country depends upon us young boys and girls and maybe on your decision."

This is very thought-provoking coming from one of our own youngsters. Surely some restriction or censorship can be instituted in this matter, possibly by the publishers themselves, in order to make better reading material for our youth. There are more than 120 million "comic books" published each month; think of the vast amount of good that could be realized if this form of reading material were dedicated to educational topics rather than the trashy subjects the majority of it now embraces.

The radio and television shows, many of which are a blueprint for the commission of crime, should bear closer study. Who can estimate the damage that may result from millions of youngsters listening to the dramatization of a revolting crime by radio or by the medium of television? The release of facts attending a crime and its solution necessitates revealing methods employed in police practice—matters decidedly helpful to the criminal but which should not be of particular interest to the average law-abiding citizen. For the most part, youths are by nature adventurous and daring, and many of them are quick-witted and analytical. These points are made to stress the possibility of an irresistible urge by juveniles to execute a "perfect crime"—the plot and objectives having been acquired by listening to a crime broadcast or the portrayal of a crime by television. Nationwide broadcasting of such stories glorifies the gangster and undoubtedly gives the impression to the inexperienced that crime is rampant throughout the country.

Why couldn't all the various forms of entertainment be utilized so as to exercise a constructive influence rather than the destructive pattern they are now following? It is certain that publishers and producers through their various media of entertainment and by reaching millions daily, can do so much more to mold the youth of our Nation into better future citizens than we in the law enforcement profession could hope to accomplish.

In conclusion, the committee, although touching only on certain phases of the juvenile delinquency problem, agrees on the following:

First, there is a definite question as to just how far police departments should engage in crime prevention activities which usurp the functions of such other agencies as recreation, social, and welfare, to mention a few. This problem must be decided by the individual departments on a local basis depending upon whether such facilities are lacking and whether responsible agencies are fulfilling the demands made upon them.

Second, that juvenile delinquency is partially a police problem but mainly a problem for the entire community including home, school, church, welfare agencies, recreation agencies, and a multitude of others.

Third, the character and morals of our youth are being deteriorated by the immoral and pornographic literature being published for their consumption and by violent crime being made commonplace through the mediums of television, radio, motion pictures, novels, magazines, and so-called comic books.

Fourth, the hardened, habitual juvenile offender must be dealt with in a manner so that he realizes his punishment will be commensurate with the act he commits.

I wish to again thank all of the police executives who contributed to the preparation of this report.

The Natural Gas Field Price Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Denver Chamber of Commerce, Denver, Colo., and a report by the subcommittee for considering Federal Power Commission control of the field price of natural gas. This subcommittee is a part of the chamber's oil and gas committee. The subject of its report is Control by the Federal Power Commission of the Price of Natural Gas at the Well.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Denver, Colo., April 20, 1955.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: The purpose of this letter is respectfully to inform you and the other Members of the United States Congress from Colorado of the position of the Denver Chamber of Commerce on the natural-gas field price issue. Enclosed herein is set forth the chamber's position, taken by action of the board of directors. The vote was unanimous.

It should be pointed out that the board of directors is composed of 27 members, elected from the general membership, and an approximately equal number named from the governing boards of commercial organizations, trade associations, and service groups who serve on the board as citizens and vote individually on all questions that come before the board.

With kind personal regards, we are,

Most respectfully,

DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
GEORGE E. COLLISSON, *Secretary.*

REPORT BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERING FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION CONTROL OF THE FIELD PRICE OF NATURAL GAS, OIL AND GAS COMMITTEE, DENVER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Subject: Control by the Federal Power Commission of the Price of Natural Gas at the well.

A state of confusion in the natural-gas industry has resulted from the recent Supreme Court decision supporting Federal regulations of natural-gas producers who sell their gas to regulated interstate pipeline companies. This Supreme Court decision was rendered in the Phillips Petroleum case under date of June 7, 1954. This is the first peacetime attempt to control the production and fix the prices of a basic commodity at the point of production, and to treat its competing producers as public utilities. It is an unwarranted attempt to impose price control on a business operated on a basis of high risk and intense competition.

Under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, the Federal Power Commission ruled that they had no control of the field price of natural gas when sold to a pipeline company, and upon 11 different occasions this opinion was substantiated. Earlier Supreme Court decisions held that this law

was actually intended to regulate the interstate pipelines which carry gas from producing areas into consuming areas. Congress did not intend the law to include independent producers, and for 16 years, the law was so interpreted. Now, this law has been reinterpreted to mean that competing producers were also subject to Federal control and the Federal Power Commission has the authority to set the field price of gas sold by the producers at the well, because the gas was shipped interstate through pipelines. This means that the Federal Power Commission according to their own records is now faced with the Herculean task of endeavoring to figure out a fair field price of gas being produced by over 5,000 producers throughout the Nation. It is our sincere opinion that it is impossible for any Government department to figure out a fair field price for gas at the wellhead because of the many complications involved in the production of gas. Natural gas is a commodity which is produced in many cases with the production of oil, and the cost of drilling various wells fluctuates to such an extent that it is difficult for anyone to determine the net returns from the investment of drilling a well and producing natural gas and oil. As a matter of fact, only 1 wildcat well in 9 wildcat wells drilled is a producer, and in many cases, both oil and gas are produced from the well. We feel that it is impractical to control the price of gas alone and it logically follows that the control of the price of oil will be the next commodity with Federal regulation.

We feel that this Government control is the first step in Federal regulation of all free enterprise and if this is allowed to continue, other commodities which are shipped interstate will soon be under Government control, such as coal, lumber, grain, livestock, etc.

There are 31 States in which natural gas is produced, but only 15 of them produce any appreciable quantity. The 6 largest producing States are Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, California, Kansas and New Mexico. Most of the gas, in fact about 90 percent, comes from the Southwest. Colorado is rapidly becoming one of the States producing natural gas in large volume. Natural gas is piped from the producing fields to consumers in 43 States, mostly for home heating, hot water heating, cooking, and industrial and commercial uses. The 5 other States (Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Maine, and Vermont), are scheduled to receive it, but we believe that this Federal control of natural gas will discourage gas producers to such an extent that the other States may never receive it in the future, although there are on file hundreds of thousands of new consumer applications for natural gas. Two natural gas pipeline projects under construction have been halted because of this Federal regulation of the price of natural gas. These pipelines are multimillion dollar projects and it is conceivable that these and other projects would be halted because the independent natural gas producer would prefer to sell his gas for local consumption and avoid Federal Power Commission regulation. This could conceivably stop the possibility of Colorado becoming an important natural gas producing State. It could also prevent natural gas reaching the other hundreds of thousands of people who have applied for it and it may even cut down the supply of natural gas available to the consumers in the 43 States who are now using natural gas and who have invested considerable money in furnaces, stoves, and equipment using natural gas.

The President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy has considered the desirability of legislation to eliminate the effect of the Phillips decision of June 7, 1954, and to remove the FPC control, as to prices and otherwise, the production and gathering of natural gas. In that connection this committee had the following to say:

"1. Natural gas regulation: We believe the problem of natural gas regulation should be approached from the viewpoint of assuring adequate supplies and the discovery and development of additional reserves to support such supplies, in the interests of national defense, an expanding domestic economy, and reasonable prices to consumers.

"To secure these objectives, it is essential to give due consideration to (1) the operations known as the production of natural gas, (2) the transportation of gas in interstate transmission lines, and (3) the distribution of gas in municipalities. Individual companies may engage in more than one of these activities. Each operation of such companies should be treated by like criteria according to its appropriate industry function.

"In the production of natural gas it is important that sound conservation practices be continued. This area of conservation management is under the jurisdiction of State conservation commissions. In the interest of a sound fuels policy and the protection of the national defense and consumer interests by assuring such a continued exploration for and development of adequate reserves as to provide an adequate supply of natural gas, we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

"The interstate transmission of natural gas by the interstate transmission lines and the subsequent sale of such gas for resale is a public-utility function and should be under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission. In considering the certification of new lines and applications for increased rates based on new or renegotiated purchase contracts, the Commission should consider, in order to provide protection for the consumer, not only the assurance of supply but also whether the contract prices of the natural gas which the applicant has contracted to buy are competitively arrived at and represent the reasonable market field price, giving due consideration, in the interest of competition, to the reasonableness and appropriateness of contract provisions as they relate to existing or future market field prices.

"The several States or their political subdivisions should continue to provide the public utility regulation of distributing companies in accordance with usual utility practices.

"Thus the complete cycle of natural-gas production, transmission, and utilization will be appropriately regulated: the production and conservation of natural gas by the State conservation commissions; the interstate transmission of natural gas by the Federal Power Commission; and the distribution by the local public utility commissions."

Your committee concurs in this view and also in the views of the United States Chamber of Commerce which considered the report of the President's committee and adopted a policy as follows:

"The national chamber opposes Federal regulation of independent gas producers and gathers and supports legislative efforts to remove that regulation. The chamber opposes all proposals for control by a Federal bureau of production, end use, or price of natural gas."

Various bills to accomplish this purpose have and will be introduced in Congress. What the exact form of the bill ultimately to be voted on will be is uncertain, and rather than recommending a resolution directed to the particular bill at this time, this committee recommends that the board of the Denver Chamber of Commerce go on record in favor of legislation which will in effect repeal the Phillips decision and removes control of prices and other matters affecting the production and gathering of natural gas from the Federal Power Commission, and that our Senators and Representatives be advised of this action and urged to make all appropriate efforts to support such legislation.

The committee believes that it is entirely proper and appropriate for the Denver Chamber of Commerce to take this action because:

(a) Such legislation tends to encourage the exploration and development of natural gas resources and tends to assure to Denver a supply of natural gas needed for its future growth.

(b) Natural gas producers contribute substantially to the prosperity of Denver through business generated here, and it is only proper that the Denver Chamber encourage legitimate development of that business.

(c) Although much has been said in the newspapers as to the possibility of increased cost to the consumer of gas if such legislation is adopted, the Committee is sceptical that any such increase substantially affecting the consumer will come about. It is estimated that on a national average only about 10 percent of the household gas bill goes to cover the cost of exploration and production; 90 percent of the gas bill goes to the pipeline company and the local public utility to cover the cost of the transmission and distribution. If the producer gave his gas away absolutely free the average household consumer would save only about 50 cents per month. Furthermore, we understand that the legislation proposed will contain provisions assuring the portion of the price to the consumer reflecting the cost of the gas purchased by the pipe line company will be a price which results from the highest competitive conditions at the production level. The remainder of the price to the consumer resulting from transportation and marketing services furnished by the pipe line company and local distributing utilities, which are regulated monopolies and public utilites, will, of course, continue to be regulated by the FPC and local regulatory bodies and legislation does not attempt to interfere with that situation.

(d) Lastly, your committee feels strongly that the Denver Chamber of Commerce as always should remain alert to see that any effort to extend governmental control over business activities not subject to regulation by reason of their monopolistic characters is opposed vigorously in the interests of preserving and protecting free competitive economy in this country as well as in this community.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, here again I want to point out to my colleagues that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives need not be changed because Alaska

comes in as a new State. I say this for the benefit of those of you who have been apprehensive that you might lose your seats through a change in apportionment. It provides that those changes will not be made so as to change the permanent membership as prescribed in the act of August 8, 1911.

Economic Health of Small Business Vital to United States Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is a growing awareness among the independent business proprietors of the importance of a sound and prosperous agricultural economy. The prosperity of Main Street is intimately related to the prosperity of the farm producers. Fair prices for agricultural commodities that yield a return on investment, modern marketing facilities, reasonable credit, and the care and conservation of the land are now the concern of everyone. The direct relationship of farm income to retail sales, and of farm income to factory employment, is openly recognized by business, labor, and agriculture.

I found a very interesting article in the Minnesota Pharmacist's March 1955 issue entitled "Economic Health of Small Business Vital to United States Farmers." The title could easily have been reversed. The economic health to United States farmers is vital to small business. Price stability and fair competition for the independent businessman are essential to his success. Price stability and fair market practices are equally essential to the farmer. Yes, price supports are to the farmer what fair trade is to the merchant. These are all independent producers. Honorable and fair regulations that prevent discrimination and price juggling are basic standards for a stable free-enterprise system.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC HEALTH OF SMALL BUSINESS VITAL TO UNITED STATES FARMERS, BUREAU ANALYSIS FINDS

The economic health of small business is intimately bound up with the well-being of the United States farmer in his triple role of producer, consumer, and citizen, and the farmer stands to lose if the small-business man is eliminated from the American scene, according to an analysis by the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade.

"In the interdependent economy of 20th century America, what happens to any vital segment of the economy, agriculture, labor, small business, big business, retailer, wholesaler and manufacturer, has a chain reaction on all the other segments," it is noted by Dr. John W. Dargavel, bureau chairman.

"When farmers cannot sell their products for a fair price, they cannot buy mass-produced goods, and this grim fact takes its toll in jobs and profits at the factory and the retail store. When retailers and manufacturers cannot sell their goods at a fair price, they retrench and let employees go. Unemployed workers and businesses in the red do not make good customers for the farmer," the Bureau analysis points out.

"United States farmers know, from bitter experience, the grave danger of having the distribution of agricultural products concentrated in a relatively few hands. The farmer is then at the mercy of the large distributor who can name the price which the farmer must accept if he is to sell his products. Parity, by which the United States Government establishes a price floor for various agricultural products, has been developed as a safeguard, not only against ruinously low prices but against the growth of monopoly in the distribution of farm products."

Monopoly in the distribution of manufactured products presents equally grave dangers to all segments of the economy, including agriculture, according to the analysis. It notes that "one of the most effective devices used to raise prices to the consumer is to achieve monopoly in distribution by destroying retail competitors and with them, the mass distribution needed to sustain mass production. Unrestrained price cutting on well-known trade-marked brands is the mechanism that triggers this device."

SMALL BUSINESS NOT EXPENDABLE

The unfair competition of price cutting on trade-marked brands can destroy small business, with serious consequences to the United States economy, the analysis points out. "The innumerable retail outlets provided by small business are indispensable to our free enterprise system in securing the mass distribution of national brands which makes possible the economies and low prices of large-scale production.

"Politically, a strong small business community constitutes a vital bulwark against the growth of collectivism so alien to the American tradition.

"From a social standpoint, the retailer contributes a very substantial share to the well-being of his community and State. He provides employment. He pays taxes which, in his absence, would have to be made up by other segments of the community and State, including the farmer. He provides support, participation, and leadership for community and State projects such as health, recreation, and education.

"The price juggler cannot and will not fill the economic, political, and social vacuum which would be left by the liquidation of a substantial number of retailers."

SMALL BUSINESS AND FAIR TRADE

The United States farmer, therefore, like all other citizens, has a vital stake in the preservation of small business. Continuation of the fair trade laws is regarded by the majority of American small-business men as essential to their survival. As one form of legally acceptable resale price maintenance, the fair trade laws simply give the efficient small-business man a fighting chance to compete with the giants, the analysis notes. It concludes:

"As a consumer, the United States farmer's long-term interest is dependent upon the existence of many competing retailers selling a wide array of goods competing with one another in price and quality. These conditions are satisfied under fair trade. It is unlikely that they will be satisfied in its absence since unrestrained price cutting breeds monopoly.

"As an income receiver, the farmer is dependent upon the prosperity and purchasing power of other segments of the economy. Prices were never so low as in the depression but they offered small solace to the farmer who could not sell his products and who had no income to buy other goods even at bankruptcy prices.

"The issue of fair trade must be weighed in these broad perspectives rather than in terms of today's bargains for the few who are determined enough to buy only today's bargains at the expense of the majority. How high a price is the American public prepared to pay for such bargains?"

Commission on Renewable Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill defining governmental policy in the field of renewable natural resources and providing for the appointment of a commission by the President to be known as the Commission on Renewable Natural Resources.

The bill declares it to be the policy of Congress that the conservation, orderly development, and sustained use of the renewable natural resources of the United States, such as land, water, forests and related resources, is the joint responsibility of the Federal Government, the States, the various subdivisions of government within the States, and the people thereof.

Senator FRANK CARLSON is introducing a companion bill in the Senate today.

The principal purpose of the Commission is to study and to recommend means for carrying out the declared policy of the bill. In addition, it is directed to study and investigate the present condition of the renewable natural resources of the United States as well as probable future demands upon such resources.

The Commission will consist of 12 members appointed by the President of which there shall be 1 member each from the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Army; 3 members representing the States; 3 members representing local subdivisions of Government; and 3 members representing the public at large. The bill provides that all members of the Commission must have expert knowledge of or experience with problems and management of the land, water, forests, and related renewable natural resources of the United States.

The Commission is directed to submit a report to the President on or before March 1, 1956, and a final report not later than June 30, 1956. It is also authorized to submit interim reports as it deems desirable or as the President may request.

The Commission is given the usual powers of such commissions with respect to the hiring and compensation of employees, the holding of hearings, and the securing of information from agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The policy set out in the bill is based on the idea that our renewable natural resources are indivisible. We cannot separate land and water or the things

that grow on land or in water—all of them bear a close relationship to each other. All of them and their relationship must be taken into consideration in determining natural resources policy. Likewise there are some phases of resource policy which come clearly within the scope of local and State government. Other phases by reason of their effect upon the Nation as a whole must be handled as problems of the Federal Government. But all of them should and must be considered in determining national policy.

Pearl Harbor: Admiral Kimmel's Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the supreme incidents of World War II was the Battle of Pearl Harbor. Obscured by official secrecy and confused by misleading propaganda, the full background of this great tragedy for a long time was denied to the American people.

Though many illuminating books on Pearl Harbor have been published since the war, it was not until 1955 that our people could read the story of Adm. Husband E. Kimmel, who was the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet, at the battle. Published in a volume by Henry Regnery Co., of Chicago, his story has attracted national attention as a major contribution to history.

Among the latest comments on Admiral Kimmel's Story is a book review in the May 1955 issue of Shipmate, the monthly magazine of the United States Naval Academy Alumni Association, which was written by Adm. H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired.

An officer of distinction, who in 1933–36 was commandant of the Pearl Harbor Naval Station, and during the critical years, 1936–39, was Commander in Chief of the United States Asiatic Fleet, Admiral Yarnell is well-informed on the essential events leading to the Japanese attack. Hence views expressed by him have historical value and form an important part of the record on Pearl Harbor.

To make Admiral Yarnell's magnificent review of Admiral Kimmel's Story more accessible to historians, statesmen, and the public at large, under leave accorded, I quote its text:

ADMIRAL KIMMEL'S STORY

Reviewed by Adm. H. E. Yarnell, U. S. N., retired)

In this brief book Admiral Kimmel has condensed the salient facts and correspondence leading up to and subsequent to the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

It is a convincing story, and to the future historian who is concerned with facts, rather than propaganda, it will be invaluable as source material.

As commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, Kimmel's main responsibility in case of war was to carry out offensive operations against the Japanese islands to the westward. Also his vessels served as a training squadron to supply trained men for newly commissioned vessels, on the east coast.

The defense of Pearl Harbor was a responsibility of the Army, which was charged with the protection of naval bases against enemy attack.

There were never enough planes assigned to either Army or Navy to carry out continuous scouting. The antiaircraft defense on the ships was woefully weak.

Kimmel struggled manfully to remedy the deficiencies and to prevent detachment of his ships to reinforce the Atlantic. He was assured by Washington that he would be kept in close touch with the political situation.

The key to an understanding of pre-Pearl Harbor events is contained in the "intercepted dispatches"—the Japanese messages to their representatives in Washington as to their intentions and plans.

The vital information contained in these dispatches was not given to Kimmel. Yet one dispatch in October 1941 asked the Japanese consul in Honolulu for continuous report as to the location of United States vessels at the wharves in Pearl Harbor. No clearer indication of a planned attack on these vessels could have been desired. The significance of this dispatch was not even recognized in Washington.

The several investigations and their results are outlined in the book. The first one, the Roberts Commission, although headed by a retired Justice of the Supreme Court, was a travesty of justice. It succeeded in casting the blame on Admiral Kimmel and General Short.

The Naval Court of Inquiry, composed of three retired admirals of distinguished record, held in 1944, completely exonerated Kimmel of all blame. The findings of this court were disapproved by the Navy Department and held secret.

The congressional investigation produced a vast amount of testimony, but its findings were vitiated by political interests.

It is to be hoped that out of the great mass of evidence, pertinent and otherwise, and especially through such books as the one under review, certain obvious lessons can be drawn as guides for the future.

The first one is the necessity of the commander in the field being supplied with all pertinent information regarding the military and political situation.

The second one is that political leaders should not attempt to direct military operations, as a corollary to the accepted principle that military leaders should not direct national policy.

The third is that in any activity, political or military, there must be loyalty downward as well as loyalty upward. The subordinate in the field should feel that he has the support of his superiors in GHQ or Washington. If he is not worthy of this support, he should be relieved.

When the *Repulse* and the *Prince of Wales* were sunk off Malaya a few days after the attack on Pearl Harbor an outcry arose in England for a parliamentary investigation. Mr. Churchill replied that he as Prime Minister would assume the blame until circumstances permitted of all the facts being known.

Had some of Mr. Churchill's moral courage prevailed in Washington, two innocent men would not have been crucified as they were to save the reputations of those directly responsible.

The finest review of Admiral Kimmel's Story is contained in its foreword. This was written by Mr. Charles B. Rugg and Mr. Edward B. Hanafy, two distinguished lawyers who devoted several years of untiring effort to secure for Kimmel a fair and impartial consideration of the events leading up to the Pearl Harbor tragedy.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I think this is the most important point in our admitting Alaska as a State. The question of where we should draw a line, as to whether we should set aside 10 percent, 20 percent, or 40 percent or more of Alaska as a military reservation, was one discussed pro and con in the Committee.

I received a letter from President Eisenhower in which he indicated that while he was somewhat concerned about any conditions of admitting Alaska to the family of States, he does say in his letter addressed to me, and in a similar one addressed to Senator JACKSON, that Secretary McKay had made certain proposals as to the line, and that if Congress approved this particular line he would give it his earnest consideration. I think that is as near as he could come to saying he would support the bill.

This new McKay line we had hoped to put into the bill, if the Rules Committee had not seen fit to report out a rule which would prevent such action, would have taken out about 287,000 square miles, I think about 44 percent of the Territory of Alaska, and set it aside in a military reservation. That is asked for by the military and by the President of the United States.

It is my hope that we can pass this bill, that we do not recommit it, but send it on to the other body, and we can hope that the other body will see fit to put in the line as suggested, and that the legislation may move forward.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Would the gentleman agree with my understanding that this is not a partition line, that this is merely a line north and west of which the President can make national defense withdrawals?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. The people in the area are citizens of the United States and can vote just as citizens in the other area do.

Mr. BARTLETT. On both sides of the line they are citizens of the United States?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. It merely makes it possible for the President to declare a military reservation. The line has been drawn. We had hoped in the committee it would have been possible to present it to the House.

But I beg the House not to recommit this bill but send it over to the other

body, and we will get this line in somewhere, and then we can proceed to have a vote on the two States.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the representation in this House would not be changed by the adoption of this bill; that the 435 Members would be exactly the same, and yet Hawaii would have 2 seats and Alaska 1, and that that would not upset anybody's seat at all?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; we adopted an amendment here that would not make a permanent change. Some future Congress could, of course, make changes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I agree to all that, but 435 seats have to be differently distributed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Congress will decide that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes; but some States will certainly lose a seat by this arrangement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We may have 437 Members in the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. You said it did not add to the 435 seats by the terms of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It does not affect anyone's seat, that is what I said—it will not necessarily affect any seat in Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What does it do?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It might add 2 or 3 more that Congress could accept. That decision rests with Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman.

Miss Barbara J. Bradfield Winner of Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the fact that Miss Barbara J. Bradfield, a senior at the New Trier Township High School, Winnetka, Ill., recently won first prize for Illinois in a national high school essay contest held in connection with the conference of the American Association of the United Nations on March 15 in Chicago, in which over 100 Illinois schools participated. Miss Bradfield was warmly acclaimed at the time that the prize was awarded and her many friends, as well as the faculty members of her school, had hoped that her words, herein quoted, could be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We, the young people of today, shall be the leaders of tomorrow. Will we be a generation tormented by the fears and hates of the world? Or will we be a generation united by peace and hope? We can live in a world where peace reigns if we begin now to face world problems with a positive attitude.

The United Nations signifies high, but attainable, ideals. It strives for peace and security, economic and social advancement, respect for human rights and freedoms. These goals are the keys to harmonious living.

We are a part of a wonderful and frightening age. We have the power to build, destroy, or be destroyed. Let us work for construction rather than destruction. Let us work for peace rather than war.

Excerpts From Address by J. Peter Grace, Jr., on Latin-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, an editorial, entitled "Rules for Good Neighbors," which I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 21, 1955, has engendered such favorable reaction, that I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, excerpts from the speech which formed the basis of those editorial comments. This comprehensive address, devoted to Latin-American relations, was delivered by Mr. J. Peter Grace, Jr., president, W. R. Grace & Co., before the Central States group, Investment Bankers Association of America, in Chicago, Ill., on March 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This afternoon I would like to present to you a prospectus of Latin America and submit it to your skilled analysis.

First, let me take a moment to get into focus the magnitude of our economic stake in Latin America, which, since at least 1897, has been the most important area for United States direct private foreign investment. At the end of 1953, such investment abroad stood at $16.3 billion, of which $6 billion was located in Latin America.

When people think of United States companies operating in Latin America, they usually think first of mining companies in Chile and Peru, or oil companies in Venezuela, fruit companies in Central America, or sugar companies in Cuba.

This picture of Latin America is certainly understandable. Traditionally, Latin America has been our leading supplier of raw materials and foodstuffs. The importance of this fact is clearly brought out when you consider that during World War II, Latin America supplied 75 percent of the crude foodstuffs, and 40 percent of the raw materials and semimanufactured goods which our country imported. In addition, approximately 30 of the 77 items on our stockpile list of strategic materials are imported from this area.

However, the Latin American people will not be satisfied with a raw material economy, nor with its corollary, a one-crop economy. They want to produce goods which will raise their standards of living. More and more of them want better homes to live in, better clothes to wear, better food to eat, better medicine for their children and families.

It is this great and powerful drive, it is these aspirations, on the part of the Latin American people for a better life which gives their countries the very dynamic quality which they have today.

I believe almost every visitor who goes down to Latin America comes back with a vivid awareness of this drive.

On the business front, a year ago we took 35 leading United States finapciers on a visit to 4 Latin American nations. These men represented United States institutions with total assets of over $40 billion. They came back with exactly the same impression and some of them have put their thoughts into investment action.

Of course, a major indicator of an area's vitality is its birthrate. I believe you all know that Latin America's population increase of about 2½ percent a year is greater than that of any other major area of the world. In the United States the increase is only about 1½ percent. It has been estimated that, should present rates continue, the population of Latin America may be twice that of the United States and Canada together by the turn of the century—more than 500 million people.

The combination of this tremendous demand for self-improvement and an exploding population provides a ready-made market. It is this condition that prompted a leading United States businessman to state the other day that one thing an investor in a new business in Latin America did not have to worry about was a constantly growing market for his goods. The market is there—ready for him and growing continuously.

Per capita consumption in Latin America increased 26 percent from 1945 to 1953. It has been projected to increase by almost 50 percent from the present level by the mid-1970's.

The major markets in Latin America are in the cities and the cities are growing almost twice as rapidly as the total population. For example, between 1940 and 1950 the population of 23 of the largest cities in Latin America rose 45 percent compared to 25 percent for the entire area.

This increasing urbanization coupled with rising living standards is leading toward the emergence of a middle class in the cities of Latin America.

Apartment houses and suburban developments, heretofore unknown, are now the coming thing in Latin American cities. A greater market is developing for washing machines, radios, television sets, refrigerators, and dishwashers. In addition—and this is a very important point to bear in mind—the development of a middle class is bound to produce greater economic and political stability which in turn strengthens the basis for investments.

I feel, of course, somewhat inhibited in this talk in mentioning our own company. However, I do feel that, I might be permitted to quote briefly on one phase of our operations from the National Planning Association's report, published just last fall, on "Casa Grace in Peru."

"Casa Grace's contribution to expanded Peruvian markets for textiles has been a long series of 'firsts' through the introduction of new textures, finishes, designs, and colors. It was the first in Peru to make bleached and finished cotton goods before World War I; pure indigo-dyed denim in 1927; printed cottons in 1936; mercerized cloth in 1942; combed cottons in 1947; spun rayon and other synthetic textiles and their printing by the silk screen process in 1948; and Everglaze cottons and its own roller engraving plant in early 1954."

For those of you interested in an objective analysis of our policies, our philosophy, and the growth of our business in Peru, all of which are typical of our affairs in other Latin American countries, I refer you to this NPA report.

Our company is evidence of the fact that the Latin American market is growing continuously. One example is our own paint business. Just before the war, we had only

one paint plant in operation in South America. Since the war, however, we have found th market for quality paint so greatly expanded that today we are in the paint business in an important way in Chile, Peru, Colombia, and Argentina.

The Latin Americans essentially are very much like ourselves. Once one man paints his house, his neighbor's wife wants her husband to paint his. In business, if one storekeeper paints his store and makes it more attractive looking, his competitor down the street will soon do likewise.

In Peru, we have had a similar experience in our paper business. In the late 1930's, we developed what has become known as the Grace process for making paper out of bagasse, or waste sugar cane fiber. Prior to this, Peru had to import all its paper requirements but the starting of a local paper industry, capable of making all types of paper from wrapping paper, kraft paper, and cardboard to specialty papers, has changed the retailing, merchandising, and packaging habits of the country. We developed the initial use in the country of corrupated boxes which previously had been unknown. We replaced cotton bags with multiwall bags in the bagging of cement, sugar, and many other products. We made the country paper and package conscious with the result that, from an initial capacity of 3,000 tons, we have expanded the capacity of our paper plant to over 20,000 tons and before the year is out it will reach 30,000 tons.

Getting back to our general topic, an interesting comparison showing the dynamic nature of the Latin American scene is between the recent growth of Sao Paulo and Chicago—two leading industrial and transportation centers.

Between 1940 and 1953 the population of Sao Paulo increased 97 percent, Chicago's population increased 12 percent.

In the same period, the number of airplane passengers passing through Sao Paulo increased 22 times compared to 11 times for Chicago.

Also, the number of telephones in use in Sao Paulo increased by 270 percent compared to 56 percent in Chicago.

This amazing growth is not limited to Sao Paulo.

Telephones in use for Latin America as a whole more than doubled from 1940 to 1954 as did automobiles.

Truck and bus registrations tripled and the number of tractors on farms rose five times.

In the postwar period, Latin America's gross product—measured in constant prices—has increased from $27.3 billion to $41.6 billion, or by 52 percent. In this same period, the United States' gross product increased from $263 billion to $307 billion, also measured in constant prices, or by 17 percent. Thus, it may be seen that Latin America's productivity in the postwar period is growing at a faster rate than that of the United States.

Whereas today Latin America's gross product amounts to a little over $40 billion, by 1975 it is estimated to increase to $100 billion—almost 2½ times the present level.

The Paley report estimates that the United States gross product will only double in this same period.

This progress can be grasped more readily by the following examples:

United States cement production went from 24 million tons in 1939 to 47 million tons in 1952—an increase of 96 percent.

In the same period, cement production in Venezuela increased from 43,000 tons to 941,000 tons; in Colombia, from 180,000 tons to 784,000 tons, increases of 2088 percent and 336 percent, respectively.

Crude steel production in the United States between 1939 and 1952 increased from 54 million tons to 95 million tons, or by 76 percent.

At the same time, crude steel production in Brazil rose from 128,000 tons to 1 million tons, or by 681 percent.

Electrical energy production in the United States during this same period increased from 146 billion kilowatt hours to 464 billion kilowatt hours, or by 218 percent.

In Colombia, electrical energy production increased 353 percent from 186 million kilowatt hours to 842 million kilowatt hours.

I hesitate to talk again about our own company but it is hard for me to discuss Latin America without mentioning our own experience. With the end of World War II, we naturally were anxious to push the development of our industrial businesses in this area. At that time we produced textiles, paper, paint, cement, flour, vegetable oil, and other basic items.

However, it was clear then that the highest rates of return were going to be made in the more specialized and complex manufacturing operations, just as is the case in the United States.

Thus, if our company was going to continue its role of leadership, we saw that we would have to develop research and engineering know-how comparable to that required in this country.

Moreover, in many of our Latin American industries we have important local partners. They have looked to us—as their North American associates—for continuing contributions of highly specialized know-how.

We decided, therefore, to obtain an important stake in a highly technical field in the United States. We chose the chemical industry as this field was closest to our own industries—textiles, paper, paint, sugar, food products—which, in turn, are chemical process industries.

As a result of this decision, in the last few years we have placed $130 million in the United States chemical industry and our annual research expenditures amount to over $3 million a year.

With the new research and specialized knowledge acquired, we have greatly strengthened our position for future progress in our Latin American industries. Not only can we now accelerate the development of our already established activities, but we are also in a better position to broaden our participation in the expanding chemical industry in Latin America. An example of this is our new chemical project in Brazil, a joint venture with the leading German chemical company, Farbwerke Hoechst, which will manufacture DDT, monochlorobenzene, caustic soda, chlorine, solvents, and textile auxiliaries. The total investment of this project is in excess of $6 million.

I bring this out because it has occurred to me that some of you may be wondering if there is any inconsistency between my enthusiasm for investment in Latin America and the heavy investment W. R. Grace & Co. has recently been making in the United States chemical industry.

I think you will see from what I have told you that we have the greatest faith in Latin America. Since the end of World War II we have invested between $25 and $30 million there, including commitments and investments in two countries in which we have not previously been identified industrially. These are Brazil and Argentina, in both of which countries we have tremendous faith.

In addition, we have now on the drawing board industrial projects in Latin America which will add another $15 to $20 million to our stake in that area within the next 3 years.

Thus we have actually stepped up our pace of investment in Latin America while moving into the field of United States chemicals in a manner which we frankly hope will develop into a hemispheric chemical operation.

Of course, in any discussion of foreign investments, the question of what rate of return the United States investor can expect inevitably arises. There is no pat answer to this question as it depends to large extent upon the type of investment and the wisdom with which it is made.

However, we all know that a United States investor is not going to place his capital in a foreign country unless he can reasonably expect a higher rate of return than that obtainable at home. Such a situation is not new. Capital has always sought the areas of highest return. This reflects the age-old economic law that those countries with a large demand for new capital—but a limited supply of their own—offer a higher return than countries rich in capital such as the United States today.

That this condition exists clearly shows up in the price one has to pay for commercial bank credit in Latin America.

Compared to the present prime commercial bank rate of 3 percent in the United States, credit is from about 3 to 4 times as expensive in Latin America.

The businessman in Latin America is able to pay such high interest charges on bank borrowings for the simple reason that business is much more profitable in Latin America than in the United States. High profit margins are the natural outcome of a growing demand for goods, reflecting the rising standard of living. Only in highly developed industrial nations, where capital has been accumulated over a considerable period of time, and where well organized capital markets exist, are profit margins low and still decreasing.

The average return for all industries on net worth has already declined in the United States from 13.4 percent to 10.5 percent between 1950 and 1953, and in Canada from 14 percent to 9.8 percent in the same period. Preliminary figures which I have seen indicate that the rate of return in the United States in 1954 might drop to below 10 percent. As you know, many of the older and more mature industries have even lower profit margins than these averages would indicate.

These same conditions do not exist in Latin America, as many industries there are still in their infancy. Although the Western World has the ability to produce increasing amounts of goods, keener competitive conditions are developing in the world markets. In view of this situation, I expect profit margins in the more industrialized countries to shrink still further, while profit margins in Latin America should be well maintained in view of its rapidly expanding markets. Herein gentleman, lies the future of investing in Latin America.

Today in Latin America there are many signs of an improving investment climate. Our Government is taking an increasing interest in the economic well-being of this area—and for good practical reasons.

Just recently, Peru and Costa Rica have joined our country's investment-guaranty program. Cuba is negotiating a tax treaty with the United States. Brazil and Argentina are easing their laws with regard to foreign investment.

I have enlarged, many of you perhaps will say with undue enthusiasm, on the opportunities for investment in Latin American countries. I am enthusiastic about them, but I am not at all unmindful of the arguments against investing in those countries. The usual objections which one hears are:

1. Risk of inconvertibility of currency.

2. The danger of expropriation of foreign assets.

3. Disturbed political conditions over which the investor has no control.

Now in the first place, I believe that any prospective investor in Latin America should carefully analyze conditions in the country or countries in which he proposes to invest.

In the second place, he should become associated with expert managers with experience in that field.

In the third place, he should consider his investment as a permanent one, which he would build up with plowed-back profits and to which he would apply long-range management and development policies, just as he would in the case of a domestic enterprise.

Bearing these precepts in mind, I don't think he has much to fear. There are countries in Latin America which have no exchange controls and which are operating under a full and free economy. There will be periods, as there are now and as there have been in the past, when earnings and reserves in some countries cannot be remitted.

There is no reason to consider that such conditions are permanent, or even more than transitory, and the return on investment can and should more than offset the transitory inability to remit earnings. In the meantime the accumulated currency earnings can be plowed back into the business.

With respect to expropriation, I feel that this bugaboo is a ghost that should be laid and all I shall say on the subject is this—our firm has been doing business in South America for more than 100 years and over all that period we have never lost a dollar of our money nor a square foot of our land through expropriation.

With respect to the third objection to Latin American investment, that is, disturbed political conditions, it would be foolish for me to say that the political history of all the Latin American countries reflects political stability in any degree comparable with that which we have known in this country. Again, however, I must call on the experience of our firm as authority for the statement that changing political conditions in any of the Latin American countries—unless they go completely Red—can be lived with by unswerving loyalty to a few simple principles:

(a) Stay out of local politics—this doesn't mean stay partially out—it means stay out. If you do this, you will be able to get along with whatever government is in power.

(b) Employ as the managers of your business able and outstanding nationals wherever this is practical and feasible, and keep them out of politics, too.

(c) Have your management, and particularly the Americans in your management, closely identify themselves with local community life and become part of the countries in which they live.

You know, during most Latin American revolutions, the traffic cop still directs traffic, the postman still delivers mail and life goes on pretty much as usual as far the foreigner and the foreign investor is concerned.

By rigid observation of these principles, our company's experience in Latin America has been highly successful and we have been able to grow with the expanding economy of this area.

Since 1940, we have doubled our production of textiles, compared to only a 47-percent increase in textile production in the United States.

We have increased our paper production 8½ times, compared to only 1.8 times for the United States.

Our paint production has increased 11½ times compared to only a 64 percent increase for the United States.

In a century of operation we have built enterprises which have brought great benefits not only to our stockholders but we like to believe to the Latin American countries in which we operate as well.

We hope to see many other enterprises created in Latin America with local and United States capital working in friendly cooperation. The philosophy o fthis cooperation was brilliantly summed up by President Eisenhower in his opening message to the New Orleans Investment Conference when he said:

"Behind all private plans and projects, behind Government help, behind a New Orleans conference or a Rio Conference, behind the words, the dollars, and the blueprints—there must exist the essential ingredient of faith—North American faith in Latin America, and Latin American faith in North America.

"And if today I had to choose only one thought to leave with you, it is the thought of our North American faith in the future of Latin America—economically, culturally, politically, and spiritually."

If the company which I represent stands for anything in the field of Latin American investment, it is that word "faith." Our growth has been built on faith in Latin America.

Hawaii and Alaska Statehood Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

Mr. Chairman, I do this not to stall this amendment but to give some reassurance to those who were worried about the number that might be in the House of Representatives from Hawaii. The committee wisely provided that if Hawaii comes in as a new State it shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives. Now, several Members were concerned about losing their seats in the House of Representatives, and it is quite plain, I think, with the adoption of this amendment, that the condition as to the membership in the House remains with the House. Any change can be made by Congress. I have no objection to the amendment. I wanted at this time to sort of reassure some of those folks who felt that, if we bring in two more Members, they will lose their seats. This is not necessarily so. I will also say that if a rule had been reported so that we could have amended this bill— and I hope it will be amended over in the other body—that I had intended to offer an amendment to provide for one Representative, and I believe it would have been adopted. I hope it is done in the other body. Again, the rule does not permit amendments.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. What the gentleman is telling the House is that the Membership Act of 1911 and the Apportionment Act of 1941 will still remain in force?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. Only Congress can change that act.

Tribute to Aldo Leopold by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, several months ago it was my pleasure to speak at the dedication of a memorial to Aldo Leopold. The memorial was in recognition of work Mr. Leopold did which led to the creation of a system of wilderness areas in the United States.

Mr. Leopold led an active life in the outdoors, and held a number of important posts in government and as a private citizen. He was a man whose friendship I considered a privilege, a man who recognized the degrees and kinds of solitude to be found in a wilderness. More than that, he recognized the need for the preservation of such areas for those who will follow us.

Quite recently some people questioned whether one could be a friend of conservation, or of the wilderness area, and still support the huge irrigation and power project on the Colorado River.

For this reason, and in view of my long interest in preserving primitive areas, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks at the dedication of the Aldo Leopold memorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The text of the address has been printed in the winter issue of the Living Wilderness, a publication of the Wilderness Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C. The address was delivered in New Mexico overlooking the Gila wilderness area on September 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WILDERNESS OF ALDO LEOPOLD

(Address by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON)

Some years ago there came from the presses a rather thin volume entitled "A Sand County Almanac." It was written by Aldo Leopold and in it there are these words: "There are degrees and kinds of solitude." Today it is our privilege to pay tribute to Aldo Leopold and to realize that there are as well degrees and kinds of wilderness.

This Gila Wilderness is the type which he liked and which he sought to protect and preserve—a wilderness not crossed and recrossed by oiled roads and excellent means of transportation, but a great tract that was almost pathless forest where a man travelled best if he travelled on foot or in the saddle. Two years ago when the proposal of the Forest Service to modify the boundaries of the Gila Primitive Area was under consideration I spoke of my remembrance of many Forest Service officials who were on duty in New Mexico when I first arrived in this State to make it my home. This day is set aside for the erection of a plaque to the memory of Aldo Leopold and I, therefore, will disassociate him from the others and speak only of my great joy to have shared his friendship and his comradeship 35 years ago.

Aldo Leopold recognized the degrees and kinds of solitude that men can find to match their needs and moods. He became secretary of the Albuquerque Chamber of Com-

merce, but he could not divorce himself from his love of nature and his desire to see set aside, even in a municipality, an area where people could breathe and could feel released from the restraints of society.

Back more than 30 years ago he sought the development of a Rio Grande Park in what had been a water-logged stretch of empty acres, and out of it with the passing of time there has emerged the Albuquerque Zoo, the Tingley baseball field, and a substantial area which will become more and more prized as Albuquerque continues to expand.

But it was the true wilderness which attracted him—the places where he could go and be alone, the spots in the White Mountains of Arizona or in the forests of New Mexico where a man could lose himself in his surroundings and be dropped back into complete comradeship with nature.

I talked to Aldo Leopold many times about the development of a wilderness area. There it would be possible to preserve scenic beauty and the natural accompaniments of the restricted country, the fish and the wildlife which had once owned these areas for themselves and now had become the hunted as man moved into these protected retreats.

It was such a place here in southwestern New Mexico, a hundred or more miles north of the Mexico border, where hazy blue silhouettes of the Mogollon Range mark the Gila wilderness, that Aldo studied the area, and in his report of October 1922 suggested this vast wilderness be named the Gila Wilderness Area or Gila National Hunting Ground.

Although most widely known for his eminence in technology of wildlife management, Aldo Leopold was a dominant influence in the movement not only to preserve the Gila wilderness, but also wilderness areas throughout the country.

Thirty years ago he enlisted me in the cause for preservation of wilderness areas in general. I shall never forget how he poured out his heart on the subject of primitive tracts which seemed likely to be destroyed with the development of the auto, the truck, and speedier methods of transportation.

What was his background?

Aldo Leopold was born at Burlington, Iowa, on January 11, 1886. There he developed an interest in ornithology and hunting. He attended Yale University where he received the bachelor of science degree from Scheffield Scientific School in 1908 and the master of forestry degree from the School of Forestry the following year.

From 1909 until he rose to chief of operations in the regional office at Albuquerque, he served with the United States Forest Service in Arizona and New Mexico. While there his interest in wildlife management developed and he became secretary of the Albuquerque and the New Mexico Game Protective Associations. His effort within these organizations to produce a rational system of game management and a nonpolitical administration of refuges attracted wide attention.

"It seems to me," wrote Theodore Roosevelt to Aldo in 1917, "that your association in New Mexico is setting an example to the whole country." It was in that year that Aldo was awarded the gold medal of the Permanent Wildlife Protective Fund of America.

In 1925 he left New Mexico and went to Madison, Wis., where he served for 2 years as associate director of the Forest Products Laboratory. Then he resigned from the Forest Service to conduct game surveys for the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute.

He was awarded the Outdoor Life medal for his first book, Report on a Game Survey of the North Central States, published in 1931.

A member of some 30 clubs, associations, and societies, Aldo served as president of the Ecological Society of America and of the Wildlife Society. He was a director of the National Audubon Society, and was vice president of the American Forestry Association, The Wilderness Society, and Friends of the Land. He also was an active member in the American Ornithologists Union. He served as associate editor of the Journal of Forestry and was also a member of the SAF Council.

He served on the Committee on Wildlife Restoration appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1934, as well as on many other conservation committees, and at the time of his death had been asked by Secretary of the Interior Krug to serve at the Inter-American Conference of Renewable Natural Resources.

Elected a Fellow of the Society of American Foresters in 1946, he had been professor of wildlife management at the University of Wisconsin since 1933.

Author of nearly 300 technical and popular articles, reviews, and his classic book, Game Management, Aldo Leopold was an internationally recognized authority on wildlife management as evidenced by his voluminous advisory and committee work and his membership in numerous conservation and scientific organizations.

But to us today as we meet here in his honor we can look at the great expanse of the Gila Wilderness, one of the few such areas in the United States virtually untouched by human hands, and honestly say this might not have been except for the initiative of Aldo Leopold. It was chiefly through his efforts that the Forest Service in 1924 established the first of its wilderness reservations, the Gila Wilderness Area or Primitive Area in New Mexico.

To what goals his love of nature would have carried him we have no way of knowing. Across the country his prestige had steadily grown. He was at the peak of his usefulness to the wildlife and the wilderness movements when those who had come to know and love him were shocked by news of his death. On April 21, 1948, he suffered a fatal heart attack after fighting a grass fire on a neighbor's property near his home at Baraboo, Wis.

There are other chapters in the history of the Gila Wilderness that had not been completed at his passing. After public hearings in August 1952, the area was permanently designated the "Gila Wilderness Area" and placed under a new and stricter regulation known as U-1.

Under the new regulation U-1, and upon recommendation of the Chief of the Forest Service, such areas may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as "Wilderness Areas" within which there shall be no roads or other provisions for motorized transportation, no commercial timber cutting, and no occupancy under special use permits for hotels, stores, resorts, summer homes, organization camps, hunting and fishing lodges, or similar uses. The only roads allowed will be roads of ingress and egress to any private property that might be in the area.

The work of Aldo Leopold has been done. We now become trustees of his inheritance. Those of us who may visit within the wilderness and who are able to rest and be restored in our peace of mind and body by the quiet that it will always possess have none the less an obligation to see that the work of one generation shall not be sacrificed by those that come after. We have an obligation to make sure that this area may remain untouched for generations and perhaps centuries to come. We cannot take our burdens as trustees lightly if we are to keep faith with those who struggled so mightily to achieve these precious spots within the confines of a busy continent.

The erection of this memorial not only says to Aldo Leopold, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant;" it reminds each of us that our lives as well can contribute to the things that mean beauty for the eye and rest for the spirit. We, too, can preserve the wilderness. We, too, can find in it "degrees and kinds of solitude" that will mean for all who live in the southwest and for all who come to it to visit a communion with nature that will bring to each of us peace and joy and enduring pleasure.

Bricker Amendment Should Be Adopted—Congress No Longer Bound by Constitutional System of Delegated Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement made by Mr. Carl B. Rix, of Milwaukee, former president of the American Bar Association, before a Senate subcommittee which is hearing testimony on the proposed Bricker amendment.

Mr. Rix points out clearly that articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations, which is an approved treaty, that Congress is no longer bound by its constitutional system of delegated powers. Under these articles Congress is in a position today to pass legislation which cuts across civil, political, economic, social, and cultural lines. Too few people in this country, much less too few Members of Congress, realize this fact.

Mr. Speaker, I am including Mr. Rix's statement and commend it to the attention of every Member of the House:

STATEMENT OF CARL B. RIX, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

I appear in favor of the amendments.

Congress is no longer bound by its constitutional system of delegated powers. Its only test is under the obligatory (the word is that of the Attorney General) power to promote human rights in these fields of endeavor: Civil, political, economic, social, and cultural. These are found in articles 55 and 56 of the charter of the United Nations, a ratified and approved treaty. They are being promoted in all parts of the world by the United Nations.

Congress may now legislate as an uninhibited body with no shackles of delegated powers under the Constitution. Our entire system of a government of delegated powers of Congress has been changed to a system of undelegated powers without amendment by the people of the United States.

The authority for these statements is found in a volume entitled "Constitution of the United States of America, Annotated," issued in 1953, prepared under the direction of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of the United States and under the chairmanship of Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton, aided by the legal staff of the Library of Congress. This is the conclusion at page 427 of the Annotations: "In a word, the treaty power cannot purport to amend the Constitution by adding to the list of Congress' enumerated powers, but having acted, the consequence will often be that it has provided Congress with an opportunity to

enact measures which, independently of a treaty, Congress could not pass, and the only question that can be raised as to such measures will be whether they are 'necessary and proper' measures for the carrying of the treaty in question into operation."

It will be noted that one of the principal cases cited is that of the Migratory Bird case.

These conclusions are those also of a committee of the New York State Bar Association, of which former Attorney General Mitchell and Mr. John W. Davis were prominent members.

Now, for some practical illustration of the new-found powers under treaties of what Congress may do:

1. It may enact a comprehensive education bill, providing for education in any State which does not provide it. In fact, it may take over all public education now provided by States and municipalities.

2. It may enact a prohibition act without an amendment of the Constitution.

3. It may enact a uniform divorce act.

4. It may take over all social and welfare services rendered by or through the States, or their agencies.

5. It may take over all commerce, all utility rates and service, all labor. The list may be multiplied extensively at your will.

The new test of constitutionality will apply to all legislation by Congress since 1945, which deals with any of the five fields of endeavor. Any judge deciding on the validity of legislation must have two books before him—one the Constitution of the United States and the other the Charter of the United Nations. If he does not find authority for the act in the Constitution, he will find it in the charter. That is the exact situation in which Justice Holmes found himself and the other members of the Supreme Court, when they decided the Migratory Bird case. The authority was not found in the Constitution—it was found in the treaty with Great Britain.

The question to be answered is this: Under which form of government do the people of the United States prefer to live? Manifestly, we cannot operate under both.

Senators, the people of the United States have given up their sons, they have given up billions of their substance—they should not be the only Nation in the world to give up their form of government—the wonder of the world—to discharge their obligations to the people of the world.

Atlantic Union and World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Atlantic Union and World Government," published in the March 1955 Bulletin of the For America Study Club.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC UNION AND WORLD GOVERNMENT FOR AMERICA—WEEKLY STUDY PLAN NO. 1

(Read this study plan for the answer to "What Can I Do To Help Save My Country?")

Today there exists in the Pentagon a certain document marked "Secret." It was written soon after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings. These disasters strengthened the dreams of those who believe in internationalism. Here, the authors of the document wrote, was a proven weapon so deadly that its use would have to be controlled. Among the family of sovereign states no nationalist power could be entrusted with it. Only a world state, acting in accordance with internatoinal law, should control such a deadly weapon. Nationalist states—their sovereignty yielded—must be permitted armed forces for internal security only. In the interest of peace all nuclear weapons must be in the hands of the world state.

The American people have never been especially interested in foreign policy. Our interest lies in things closer home. But if foreign policy is expressed in terms of taxes, conscription, overseas garrisons, nuclear weapons, foreign wars, acres of white crosses, and loss of sovereignty—we become deeply concerned. And now this prospect of yielding our sovereignty is, indeed, alarming.

Despite the fact that our international relations do reflect these grim realities, for nearly two decades the American people have been denied the opportunity to express themselves in foreign policy. Only in the vaguest terms has this momentous issue been mentioned by the candidates of either major party. Propaganda agencies have blared the virtues of bipartisanship while a few key officials have stealthily guided foreign affairs. And without realizing precisely how it came about, America has become inextricably enmeshed in tough international intrigue.

Meanwhile, foreign influences—together with internationalist-minded Americans acting under the guise of diplomacy—have quietly plotted their plot. They would have the Atlantic Union absorb the United States.

In keeping with this concept the creation of an Atlantic Union is well underway. A startling news dispatch from Ottawa, Canade, published in the Kansas City Star, Monday, December 13, 1954, disclosed:

"Creation of a super Atlantic community agency to merge the economic, defense, and foreign policies of the United States with other countries will be recommended to members of the North Atlantic Treaty Council in Paris this week."

The release continued:

"Signed by Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, Gen. George C. Marshall, and 70 other Americans, as well as Canadians, British, French, Belgians, Norwegians, Danes, and Dutch, the recommendation, in the form of an appeal for Atlantic unity, will be given Thursday to Lord Ismay of Britain, the Secretary General of NATO."

The signed statement itself declares:

"This is no time for halfhearted measures, while welcoming the progress made toward European union, we believe that nothing less than an effectively integrated Atlantic community * * * will in the end adequately meet the challenge of the times. Defense in today's terms extends beyond military requirements and into the political, economic, and cultural aspects of our lives."

And the signed statement calls for "the development of NATO as a central agency to coordinate the political, trade, and defense policies of the member nations."

According to the news dispatch, prominent American signers of the proposal are: Harry Truman; Adlai Stevenson; Gen. George C. Marshall; Norman Cousins, president of the United World Federalists; Owen J. Roberts, president of the Atlantic Union Committee; Will L. Clayton, vice president of the Atlantic Union Committee; Clarence K. Streit; Chester Bowles; Senator Humphrey, Democrat, Minnesota; Senator Kefauver, Democrat, Tennessee; Senator Lehman, Democrat, New York; William V. Griffin, president of the English Speaking Union; Edward Murrow, commentator; and Elmer Davis, commentator.

The news dispatch concluded with this amazing observation:

"NATO already has authority to adopt the proposed program, it is pointed out in the petition, under article II, commonly called the Canadian clause, which provides for economic development of the member countries."

From the above, every American must realize that the machinery already exists to take us into Atlantic Union. Meanwhile, prosperous and complacent, the American people continue to sleep. And we sleep at a time when only a great awakening can prevent our being slipped into a world state.

LOSS OF LIBERTY

What happens when the United States enters the Atlantic Union? The super state, Atlantic Union, with authority to enforce world law would take out of our hands the means to defend ourselves. The Atlantic Union would then dictate the terms under which Americans would be forced to live. Depending on circumstances beyond our control, the United States, stripped of sovereignty, might be sending our youth to fight under the Atlantic Union banner anywhere on the globe.

Some preach that the spiritual acceptance of the brotherhood of man can be achieved only through world government. Certainly our Bible teaches brotherly love but the Tower of Babel illustrates man's differences and limitations. No home is large enough for two families; likewise, no super state could control all members without resort to force. The super state cannot be a guarantor of world peace.

What happens to our patriotism when we join the Atlantic Union?

Suppose the Arabs of North Africa revolted against France. Americans have a natural sympathy for those who seek freedom. But expression of this sympathy would be treason against the Atlantic Union.

With our national military strength gone, what would happen to our liberty? What would become of our Bill of Rights?

Several hundred servicemen already lie in foreign prisons, sentenced by foreign judges under the Status of Forces Treaty without the protection of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

What would happen to our property when our Atlantic neighbors move in for the take? For some time it has been apparent that some foreign peoples were jealous of our standard of living and eager to reduce it to the level of their own.

Will not our Atlantic Union neighbors take advantage of our military weakness and demand that the wealth among the members be more equitably distributed? Will not the flow of wealth be from this country to our European neighbors? While it is more blessed to give than to receive, the Bible also warns against covetousness.

In the Atlantic Union we would inherit an obligation to support the European colonial system—an institution repugnant to Americans. We would inherit also the racial and social and national hates and the jealousies and sores of age-old Europe. None of these antipathies is our business. Such heritage would involve us in hopeless, endless quarrels.

If we join the Atlantic Union, we will have everything to lose and nothing to gain. Such a union would mean common citizenship, common foreign policy, common currency, mutual defense and economic measures, free and unlimited immigration. Our standard of living would be lowered, our security undermined, and our liberty lost. Yet, there is no reason to believe that our sacrifice would extend lasting benefit to the other nations. In fact, experience proves the contrary.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Where does the Department of State stand on this toying with America's destiny?

In its brochure No. 23, summer 1950, Building the Peace, the Department of State disclosed a strong and unmistakable affinity for world government.

"When and if the world's people set out in an earnest effort to form a world government, they will find in the U. N. a logical starting point * * * it is ready to take on new responsibility at any time.

"The creation of a world government * * * depends * * * upon the willingness of key countries to surrender certain sovereign rights."

Two years later, in April 1952, John Foster Dulles before he became Secretary of State, warned:

"* * * Congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

But after he became Secretary of State, Dulles obviously changed. He now holds that there should be integration of all NATO Forces "to the maximum extent possible and that this decision does not require the advice and consent of the Senate."

To Senator KEFAUVER in November 1954, Dulles wrote:

"I believe that what was accomplished there (London) has brought us closer to real Atlantic Union than ever before."

Can we longer doubt that we are moving toward Atlantic Union?

If there is doubt, pending congressional resolutions will clarify the misgiving. In the Congress are some 10 or 12 resolutions calling for an exploratory convention to determine a practical plan for the creation of a firm Atlantic Union, superstate.

CONSTITUTIONAL BARRIER

As early as 1930, the Kremlin, as well as other Internationalist plotters, had made their analysis of how the United States could be drawn into one world. Their penetrating study disclosed the difficulty. The barrier was our Constitution.

It reserved too much power for each of the 48 sovereign States and to the people. Consequently, the one worlders and the Kremlin decided to circumvent this great barrier. They would promote big government. They would shrink the power of the States and the people. The emergency powers granted the Federal Government during World War II fell like manna from heaven on these global plotters.

Today, as we look back the picture clarifies. The necessity for a superstate had to be created by discrediting our own free system.

The Constitution was branded old-fashioned.

The Supreme Court must embrace liberals.

Our economy must be enfeebled by debt, taxes, debasement of currency, class conflict, violent attacks on profit, and the capitalist system, and over-extension of our military commitments.

Slogans have had their place in this nefarious program. "Interdependence," "We can't stand alone," and "Coexistence."

After the Washington government had absorbed the powers which the Constitution reserves for the States and for the people, then would be the time to take the United States into world government via the treaty route. That tragic time has now arrived. The plan is on schedule. It is the intent of the plotters to take us into Atlantic union now; world government will come next.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Although victims of slick propaganda, the American people are still overwhelmingly opposed to Atlantic Union and World Government. Proponents of the superstate can achieve their aims only by resorting to the Trojan-horse technique.

Recently, speaking in New York, the minority leader of the Senate, the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, warned us of this danger:

"Lest we be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late where we have been taken, I believe every candidate for public office—executive, legislative, or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue."

Here, then, Senator KNOWLAND has given us the answer to the $64 question: "What can I do now to save our country."

Our Constitution put the power in the people. If we exercise this power, we can have the kind of government we want.

There is something which each of us can do:

Where does your candidate stand on Atlantic Union and World Government?

Write for our booklet, How You Can Start a For-America Study Club, For America, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill.

MARCH 1955.

Long Beach State College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to report to our colleagues the outstanding development and progress of one of the Nation's newest centers of learning, the Long Beach State College.

This institution is shouldering its full responsibility for the preparation of our more youthful Americans for lives of service to their fellow men and to their country.

Dr. P. Victor Peterson, president of the college, has earned a national reputation as an educator for his vision, foresight, and ability in developing the college and in recruiting its top-quality teaching staff. This is his story of the development of Long Beach State College:

CREATED IN 1949, COLLEGE OPENED 7 MONTHS LATER

(By Dr. P. Victor Peterson, president, Long Beach State College)

Almost everyone in the United States has marveled at the rapid growth of the southern California area since World War II. Typical of the regions experiencing such growth is that of southern Los Angeles County and adjacent Orange County. This region extends from the industrial city of South Gate to the shipping center of Wilmington and San Pedro, to the dairying area of Paramount and Bellflower, and to the citrus-growing sections of Fullerton and Orange; it includes resort towns from Redondo Beach to San Clemente, and the long-settled area of Santa Ana.

Almost in the middle of this coastal strip is Long Beach, fifth largest city in California and probably the most wealthy oil city in the United States.

Although the cities of this region vary in their economic base from industry and shipping to farming and to beach recreation, the one characteristic common to all has been a constantly increasing population.

Recognition of the growth of this region was indicated in the survey of higher education made under the joint auspices of the State department of education and the regents of the University of California in 1947–48, which recommended that a State college be established to serve the needs of Orange County and the southeast portion of Los Angeles County.

On January 27, 1949, Earl Warren, then Governor of California, signed assembly bill 8 (ch. 4, Statutes of 1949), which was "An act to provide for the establishment of a State college in the area of Orange County and the southeastern part of Los Angeles County." This signature brought into existence on paper the youngest of the 11 colleges of California's State college system.

In order to provide educational facilities for the region as soon as possible, temporary quarters were established in Long Beach and the college opened its doors to students for the first time in September 1949.

Meanwhile, the State public works board had undertaken a survey to select the best of several possible permanent sites for the new State college.

Because every educational institution needs a name, even though it be only a temporary one, the college began operation as the Los Angeles-Orange County State College. This stimulated sports editors in many of the nearby communities to propose several interesting versions of fight yells and songs based upon that tongue-twisting title.

FACILITIES SMALL

Although regularly established as a State college with authority to offer 4-year undergraduate and 1-year graduate programs, the college was forced by the extreme limitations in plant facilities to restrict its offerings during the first 4 years of operation to upper-division and professional curriculums.

To fulfill the normal functions of the State college system and to meet the demands for integrated programs of teacher training, and for occupational and professional curriculums, the State department of education directed the college administration to provide for limited enrollment of freshman and sophomore students beginning with the 1953–54 academic year. The college thus altered the historical pattern of development of this type of institution—from normal school, to teachers college, to State college—by moving instead, in a short 4 years, from senior college, to senior college-with-a-1-year-graduate program, to a regular 4-year-undergraduate institution with a graduate program.

In spite of its youth, Long Beach State College has received unrestricted accreditation by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools as a degree-granting college; and the California State Department of Education has authorized Long Beach State College to offer training leading to various credentials for public school service and to the master of arts degree in certain fields.

LOCATION OF COLLEGE

The temporary site for the new State college in 1949 consisted of two of several almost identical apartment houses then under construction near the eastern border of the city of Long Beach.

Lloyd S. Whaley, owner of the buildings, arranged for hurried alterations which provided the college with usable quarters, although visitors were often surprised to find the president in an office which had been originally planned for a bedroom, and the switchboard installed where a dining table should have been placed.

Among the traditions of the college today are the stories about students who, confused by the similarity of the apartment houses, dashed into someone's front room in the wrong building expecting to find a class in California history or nature study.

The faculty and students at the college, while it was operating in the apartment houses, considered themselves educational pioneers and soon adopted the symbolic name of "Forty-niners." The gold rush boom of 1849 made California famous, and doubled the population many times over in a few short years. In 1949 there was another "rush," this time for education in Long Beach. The population of the State college zoomed 700 percent in 2 short years.

During the first year of operation, Los Angeles-Orange County State College was a much sought after institution. Not only did many persons desire to attend classes at the college, but many cities of the area were eager to have the college located permanently within their boundaries. Numerous delegations made pilgrimages to Sacramento to appear before the Public Works Board, and representatives from the local legislative districts were advised by their constituents to "bring the college home."

After considerable investigation the sites under consideration were narrowed to 4—2 in Orange County, and 2 in Los Angeles County, 1 of which was near the unincorporated area of Downey in Los Angeles County and the other just outside the eastern boundary of Long Beach.

PROPOSED GIFT

A group of Long Beach citizens proposed to their fellow townsmen that the city purchase and give to the State this latter site as the permanent location of the college.

On April 15, 1950, the State Public Works Board agreed to locate the State college in Long Beach if the proposed site were annexed to the city and donated to the State.

On June 6, 1950, the citizens of Long Beach by overwhelming vote at a city election authorized the city council to acquire the property and donate it to the State as the permanent campus of the State college. On June 7, 1950, the State Director of Education officially gave the institution the name of Long Beach State College.

Although the permanent site is located within the city of Long Beach and the county of Los Angeles, it is within one-half mile of the Orange County border. The campus for which the city of Long Beach paid approximately $1 million comprises 320 acres fronting on Seventh Street. Its elevation is such that there is both an "upper" and a "lower" campus. At one time the land was a key part of Rancho Los Alamitos, an historic California land grant. At the present time the campus is enclosed on three sides by homes, all of which have been constructed within the last 5 or 6 years. Transportation between the campus and the area it serves is rapidly improving as the construction of major freeways moves forward.

Adequate emergency facilities were erected on the new site during the summer of 1951 and the college moved there for the opening of the fall semester. Additional emergency facilities were constructed during the summer and fall of 1952 in order to meet the demands of a rising enrollment. As in the case of the pioneers at the apartment house site, faculty and students alike approached the emergency buildings with the enthusiasm of eternal optimism. During the first few months of occupation the weather competed with the bell system of the college, for whenever rain started to fall students dashed out of the classrooms to move their cars from the fields to the street. Students using a nearby steep, adobe hillside for parking saw their cars sliding and bumping together during one particularly heavy storm. Construction of the emergendcy buildings was not completely finished by the opening of the 1951 fall semester, and many professors shared their classrooms with electricians and painters. One English instructor taught his class on the edge of the college trash dump in order to escape constant interruption. To this day those students have a special title and description for that particular semester of English.

Long Beach State College will experience another big change as five of the new permanent buildings on the upper campus will be available for use. As a result, the college will find itself with a third set of pioneers who, undoubtedly, will consider their experiences comparable to those of the pioneers in the apartment houses and in the emergency buildings. A few persons even suggest that a hierarchy of pioneers will develop at Long Beach State, for those who pioneered at the apartment houses will consider themselves superior to those who pioneered only at the emergency building site, and both of these will outrank those newcomers who arrived only in time to occupy the permanent buildings.

Treaty Law—Need for Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on the subject of treaty law. This editorial points out that for nearly 132 years the supremacy of the Constitution in treatymaking was not questioned. However, since 1920 the Supreme Court has followed a line of decisions which permits the President and two-thirds of the Senate to nullify the Bill of Rights, including states rights under the 10th amendment.

The editorial follows:

TREATY LAW

President Eisenhower has said, and Secretary of State Dulles has testified, that they would accept section 1 of the Bricker amendment.

The section declares that no treaty or other international agreement conflicting with the Federal Constitution shall have "any force or effect."

But section 1 is a lesser part of the amendment and is of little value in itself; for section 1, standing alone, has already been nullified by Federal court decisions under which the executive branch may disregard the Constitution without appearing to violate the Constitution.

Section 2 completes section 1 by stipulating that a treaty or other international agreement may be made domestic law for the United States only by "valid" legislation.

Every important foreign country except France, the Netherlands and Mexico retains this self-protection against excessive executive action. As to executive action in foreign affairs, the Bricker amendment only asserts that such actions must be constitutional.

"Legislation by treaty" can be, and has been, imposed on the United States outside the Constitution both by formal treaties and by informal executive agreements.

The Constitution does not even mention executive agreements.

It provides that treaties "made under the authority of the United States" are "the supreme law of the land," along with the Constitution itself, and it empowers the President to negotiate treaties.

For 132 years, the supremacy of the Constitution in treatymaking was hardly questioned.

Then came, in the following order, corrosive court decisions which have shunted the Constitution aside:

1920—The Migratory Bird case: The Supreme Court held that treaties may authorize Congress to pass legislation which the Constitution forbids Congress to pass. Under this decision, the President and two-thirds of the Senate may nullify the bill of rights, including the 10th amendment (States rights).

1936—The Curtiss-Wright case: The Supreme Court ruled that the treatymaking power does not derive from the Constitution, but is "an inherent power vested in the Federal Government as an attribute of sovereignty." This decision is tantamount to the obsolete Bourbon doctrine of the "divine right of kings." By its terms, the Federal Government is not restricted by the Constitution in making laws for the American people in the guise of treaties.

1942—The Ping case: This decision concerned an executive agreement—not a formal treaty—with Soviet Russia. The Supreme Court noted that a treaty is a "law of the land" under the Constitution and asserted that "such international compacts and agreements" as the one then in litigation "have a similar dignity."

This reasoning does violence to the Constitution.

According to the Constitution, a treaty becomes a "law of the land" only if approved by two-thirds of the Senate. But an executive agreement is not required to go before the Senate for scrutiny.

The Supreme Court decision therefore permits the executive branch to evade Congress and the Constitution, and to dictate laws to the Nation, by merely substituting executive agreements for treaties.

The danger to our institutions from treaty legislation is relatively recent, but it has become very great.

At a bar association meeting in Louisville in 1952, Mr. Dulles, speaking as a private citizen, warned that treaties can abrogate "the rights given our people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

Now, as Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles opposes the Bricker amendment. He pleads that the Eisenhower administration would not make a bad executive agreement or an unconstitutional treaty. But there will be other administrations after this one.

On this point, the Sentinel prefers the admonition of Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Peanut Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, because my current news release, somewhat whimsical in nature, regarding the farm price-supports debate, was entitled "Peanut Politics," I naturally was

attracted to the editorial in the Evening Star the next night, May 6.

This editorial sums up the matter in a very effective way and stresses several points I omitted. As the writer says, the taxpayers, year after year, have had to foot the bill for this economic folly—the folly of being taxed to keep our food prices up.

The editorial follows:

PEANUT POLITICS

The lowly peanut should be emblazoned on the banners of the Democrats who led and won the fight in the House to annul the flexible farm price-support program. For this was a demonstration of peanut politics in the smallest sense of the term.

Price supports are supposed to apply to basic crops—cotton, rice, wheat, corn, and peanuts. But the peanut crop amounts to less than one-half of 1 percent of the Nation's agricultural production. It is not a basic crop and it is in the support program only because of some potent politicking by Representative PACE, of Georgia, a few years ago. On Wednesday an amendment to remove peanuts from the program was adopted. This panicked a number of southern Democrats, who felt they could not vote for a support program, even a 90-percent support, if peanuts were excluded. So the Democrats, led by Speaker RAYBURN, got busy, and by Herculean efforts mustered enough votes to restore peanuts to the support program. Thereupon the bill to abandon flexible supports and revert to the rigid high supports was squeezed through by a vote of 206 to 201.

The voters should understand just what this means. Farm income has slumped—there is no doubt about that. But all of the slump has occurred under the rigid 90 percent support program. The flexible system will not go into effect until this year's crops are harvested. Meanwhile, enormous and unmanageable surpluses have piled up in the warehouses from one end of the country to the other. And the taxpayers, year after year, have had to foot the bill for this economic folly.

The flexible program may or may not be an answer to the problem. But it is important to note that what the Democrats have done is to vote for a return to the discredited program without giving the new program any chance to prove itself. They know, of course, that they will not succeed in this endeavor. The bill has virtually no chance this year in the Senate, and even if it should be passed there, the President certainly would veto it. So all of this to-do in the House boils down to a small-time political sideshow—a rather shabby attempt to embarrass the President in his politically courageous effort to find some solution to our desperate farm problem.

Fishers Island Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill calling for a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods.

I believe that this proposal can do much to alleviate the great damage, particularly to the eastern Connecticut shoreline, by hurricanes and severe Atlantic storms.

This proposal has already been discussed with the Corps of Army Engineers.

It appears to me to be a practical, efficient, and low-cost method of doing something soon about a grave problem.

This proposal originated with Mr. Henry R. Palmer, Jr., who knows the area in question.

Unless the measures suggested in this bill, or something like them, are undertaken the Government is wasting money on the continual repair and maintenance on breakwaters along this part of our coastline.

I am hopeful that the appropriate committees will give this proposal the most serious consideration.

Home-Aid Measure Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Bristol Herald-Courier of Thursday, May 5, 1955.

The Members' attention is called to this editorial which notes that the House Agriculture Committee has approved a bill to make it possible for our needy people to receive flour and meal to be used in making bread. This bill will provide for the processing of a portion of our surplus grains into flour and meal for distribution to the needy.

We should provide food to our deserving people; and my bill, which I hope will soon be taken up in the House, will make possible the addition of bread to the diet of many needy persons.

The editorial follows:

HOME-AID MEASURE SHOULD BE APPROVED

Representative PAT JENNINGS has scored a victory in the first round of his battle to provide meal and flour for thousands of unemployed persons in the Nation.

The House Agriculture Committee has approved a bill, introduced by Representative JENNINGS, which would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process surplus wheat and corn and make it available to State welfare departments. These departments, in turn, would distribute the flour and meal to labor-surplus areas, such as Virginia's Ninth District.

Inasmuch as the CCC soon will be paying more than a million dollars a day for storage of surplus products, including grain, and since staples such as flour and meal are desperately needed in some areas, it would seem that Representative JENNINGS would have no trouble finding support for his bill. But, on the contrary, he has found opposition. It comes from within the administration.

Ironically, while opposing a program which will provide aid at home, that same administration announces plans to pour a billion dollars into the aid-funnel held out by Asia.

We are not necessarily opposed to a program of military and economic aid to Asia, but we fail to see how such a program can be justified by men who oppose a tremendously less expensive program which would provide food for deserving persons in the United States.

Representative JENNINGS has cleared the first hurdle. We hope he wins the race.

Why Not Admit Spain to the U. N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Why Not Admit Spain to the U. N.?" written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT ADMIT SPAIN TO THE U. N.?—MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS EMBODY DOUBLE STANDARD AND INCONSISTENCY

MADRID, May 3.—This is a place where they can enjoy a big laugh at the expense of the various statesmen of the world who lately have been proclaiming that it doesn't matter what kind of government they have in Peiping—admission to the United Nations should be granted, anyhow. Yet the record shows that a resolution by the United Nations Assembly adopted December 12, 1946, did assert that the form of government in a given country is a matter for approval or disapproval by the United Nations.

The present government here is, of course, in complete control of every inch of Spanish territory, including all offshore islands. If international law and custom alone is the basis, Spain is entitled to admission into the United Nations. But there is another point, and that is whether an applicant government is or is not "peace loving" or whether its behavior constitutes a threat to peace. Spain has not manifested any threats against any other nation and is "peace loving" in every sense of the word.

Then why isn't the government of Spain admitted to the United Nations? The words of the 1946 resolution set forth the qualifications for Spain's admission. The resolution read in part as follows:

"The General Assembly, • • • further desiring to secure the participation of all peace-loving peoples, including the people of Spain, in the community of nations.

"Recommends that if, within a reasonable time, there is not established a government which derives its authority from the consent of the governed, committed to respect freedom of speech, religion, and assembly, and to the prompt holding of an election in which the Spanish people, free from force and intimidation and regardless of party, may express their will, the Security Council consider the adequate measures to be taken in order to remedy the situation;

"Recommends that all members of the United Nations immediately recall from Madrid their Ambassadors and Ministers plenipotentiary accredited there.

"The General Assembly further recommends that the states members of the organization report to the Secretary-General and to the next session of the Assembly what action they have taken in accordance with this recommendation."

The foregoing sounds strangely unlike the speeches which British spokesmen, for example, have been making in the United States lately telling audiences that it isn't a matter of approval or disapproval of a particular government when admission to the United Nations or even diplomatic recognition is involved. Indeed, between November 1936 and May 1939 53 governments of the world, including Great Britain, the United States, and France, extended diplomatic recognition to the present government of Spain, and not one expressed any reservation or allegation that the government here was not independent or free.

Today, however, if the resolution of 1946 by the United Nations means anything, it means that recognition must be withdrawn from the Soviet Union and the government at Peiping, or at least that Ambassadors must be recalled. Certainly the resolution means also that the United Nations considers itself responsible for the establishment of free governments through free elections.

But everybody knows today that the United Nations does not practice what it has preached. In fact, probably most of the members who voted for the 1946 resolution would like to see it expunged from the records because it contains a very troublesome precedent. Yet, if the principle is to be buried and governments like those at Moscow and Peiping are to be accepted as worthy members hereafter, then what possible excuse is there any longer for refusing to admit the government of Spain?

It so happens that the Spaniards are not knocking at the door of the United Nations. They still remember the unkind action of 1946, and they do not care to apply for admission to a club from which they have been blackballed.

Spain can get along without membership in the United Nations, but the big question is, how long can the members of the United Nations remain guilty of hypocrisy and inconsistency by arguing so fervently nowadays for admission of Red China, whose government just recently was declared to be an "aggressor"? The Spanish folks hereabouts smile at the discomfiture of their onetime critics.

Postal Salary Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to express my hope that the conference report on the postal salary bill will soon become law. In urging early approval of this legislation by the Senate and the President, I speak on behalf of minimum economic relief for one of the few major employee groups in the Nation having had no basic salary increase since 1951. I speak for local postal inspectors having less in purchasing power now than they did 15 years ago. I speak for local letter carriers forced to borrow money in order to feed, clothe, and house their families. I speak for mail sorters whose wives or children must go to work to help meet minimum family needs.

The proposed average increase of 8.8 percent for postal employees will do more than adjust postal salaries to take account of increased costs of living; it will help to raise the standards of post-office service. It will assist the Post Office Department in recruiting able employees hitherto receiving higher pay in other types of work. It will aid in reducing costly turnover among postal employees, by offering more opportunities for advancement within the postal service. It will improve the general morale and efficiency of persons having previously decided to devote their working lives to the collection and distribution of mail.

The conference report on the postal pay bill meets most of the major objections raised to last year's postal salary legislation which I also supported. The American people as well as the postal employees suffer from delay in the increase of postal pay. I hope that neither the people nor the employees will have to wait much longer.

The Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the postal pay bill has presented one of the most perplexing problems to this session of Congress thus far.

Knowing the administration's position, it seems to me that if I were to vote for a higher pay increase than the 7.6-percent contained in the House committee's bill, then logically I must be prepared to vote to override a veto. The logical test, then, seems to me to be whether or not the administration proposal was fair to postal employees by providing a rate of pay at least equal to that offered for similar work in private industry. This is particularly true in light of the fact that the post office is not self-sustaining, and that people in private industry, doing similar work, must pay the taxes to make possible the postal wages provided, at whatever rate.

As nearly as I can determine, from listening to all of the debate and giving it all the personal research that my time permitted, and from my recent personal experience with private industry in Wyoming, the administration proposal was not only fair but generous, in comparison with pay scales in private industry.

The most deliable comparative figures I was able to obtain covering Wyoming are for the Denver area, where the regional office of the Post Office Department serving Wyoming is located. From my personal knowledge, the Denver wage scale in private industry appears to be equal to or a bit better than that paid in the larger Wyoming communities; they are substantially higher than those prevailing in the smaller communities of my State.

As of December 1954 the average rate of pay for a janitor in the Denver area was approximately $222 per month. Under the administration proposal the minimum pay for a janitor would be $239 per month; and after 8 years automatic wage increases would bring this to $289 per month. Under the administration proposal an elevator operator would start at $256.66 per month, and with automatic wage increases after 8 years' service would be receiving $309.16 per month.

A material handler in the Denver area received an average of $269 per month; under the administration proposal a mail handler would receive a minimum of $277.50 per month, with increases to $332.50 per month after 8 years' service. A typist likewise would start at $277.50 and go up automatically to $332.50 per month. A truckdriver in the Denver area received an average of $295 per month. Under the administration proposal a truckdriver for the Post Office Department would start at $303 and go up automatically to $363 per month. An accounting clerk in the Denver area averaged $317, while under the administration proposal a Post Office Department accounting clerk would start at $323 and advance automatically to $385 per month at the end of 8 years.

City carriers similarly would start at $303 and advance to $363 per month, plus graduated rates of longevity pay to a maximum of $300 per year after 25 years' service. In addition, they would receive $100 per year for uniform allowance. This would represent an increase of 114 percent on the starting wage over what they received prior to 1945, and an increase of 108 percent on the maximum rate.

All of the Post Office pay figures cited above are guaranteed annual wages. Post Office Department employees have other benefits not ordinarily found in private industry. They have civil-service status, and retirement benefits. They have vacations of a minimum of 2 weeks and 3 days for beginners, up to 5 weeks and 1 day for employees with 15 years or more of service. Thirteen days of paid sick leave are granted each year, cumulative if not taken. Eight paid holidays are enjoyed each year, and nine in election years.

The rate of pay for post office carriers and clerks, provided in the administration bill, is from $1.75 to $2.24 per hour. A Congressman from a highly industrialized area in Michigan, where some of the highest wages prevail, stated that the maximum paid for similar work in his home community is $1.96 per hour. These people in private industry, he further pointed out, are subject to layoffs and do not enjoy the high degree of fringe benefits I have described.

In view of these facts and recommendations of other members of the committee, who have studied the problem seriously and sincerely over a long period of time, I could not justify voting to override a veto, and, therefore, could not justify voting for a higher rate of increase than the average of 7.6 percent, with reclassification as provided in the administration bill.

How Kansas Combats Mental Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, every community, every State, and the Federal Government, especially the Veterans' Administration, is plagued by the problem of mental illness.

Kansas has found and met that problem with great success, and has set an example that might well be followed by the other 47 States, and the Veterans' Administration.

Alvin McCoy, an outstanding news reporter, has done an exceptionally fine job on reporting the developments at Osawatomie, Kans., State Hospital. His feature story, appearing in the Kansas City Star of Sunday, May 8, 1955, is worthy of your time. It is a story of years of wasted time saved, of dollars saved, and above all the saving and rehabilitation of human beings, for which the State of Kansas and the public officials who have devoted their time and talent are to be highly commended.

This thrilling story of restoration to society follows:

NEW DRUGS AID IN TREATMENT OF MENTAL ILLS AT OSAWATOMIE—THE KANSAS HOSPITAL WITH IMPROVED METHODS DEMONSTRATES THAT EVEN PSYCHOTIC DISTURBANCES CAN BE CALMED—STATE'S PSYCHIATRIC PROGRAMS RESULT IN GROWING MAJORITY OF PATIENTS BEING RESTORED TO HEALTH

(By Alvin S. McCoy)

OSAWATOMIE, KANS., May 7.—Doctors agreed that the most potentially dangerous patient in the Osawatomie State Hospital is a 36-year-old woman with an oversize homicidal complex.

Mae (which is not her name) during periodic outbursts would attempt to kill someone. She had a fiendish cleverness in obtaining knives, broken glass, or other carving weapons. She wrote notes. Murder was the prevailing theme.

Attendants and patients, too, in the female ward for what the psychiatrists term "the most violently disturbed" frankly admitted they were terrified to be near her. She suffers with schizophrenia.

Mae's emotional binges might occur only once or twice a year. When they did, and the emotional regulator went haywire, they were something to behold.

Some time ago, related Dr. Wilbur G. Jenkins, superintendent, Mae went berserk. She obtained a piece of glass. The nurses asked for help. Two male aids rushed in, in an attempt to bring her under control. The woman ripped the face of one man, and would have killed him if others hadn't been able to subdue her.

BUT MAE HAS FREEDOM NOW

Once in leather handcuffs, she quieted down. She was given electric shock and sodium amytal and soon was able to mingle with the other patients again.

Today Mae is relaxed, calm, and has the same privileges and freedoms of other patients in her ward. She goes to the snack bar with others. No one fears her. On a recent visit, she chatted freely, if a little disconnectedly, with a reporter about Kansas City, Kans., where she once lived. She is under no physical restraint. Neither is any other patient among the 1,540 in the Osawatomie State Hospital.

Mae is an example of the miracle wrought by new drugs in the treatment of the mentally ill.

The drugs are thorazine and serpasil, in whose complex chemical names a layman would not be interested. They have received a great deal of attention in medical publications. At Osawatomie, where they now are in general use, they have left a marked imprint on the institution.

"These drugs," Dr. John E. C. Morton, clinical director and a psychiatrist, said, "are used in almost any form of mental illness where the picture is fear and anxiety, usually indicated by great excitement.

"The point is that an excited patient isn't what he appears to be. He is a frightened child, and in order to assuage his own fears, he challenges his environment. There is great evidence of hostility."

The drugs appear to work on a different section of the brain from that affected by sedatives, such as sodium amytal. The latter makes a patient sleepy. The new ones cause a patient to be tranquil, relaxed, and sometimes voluble.

"We can now reach them and talk to them," Dr. Morton said. "That is the first step in therapy, to induce a patient to talk."

Mae's treatment began in February. She was given electric shock and sedatives. Gradually these were tapered off, and thorazine was administered. It is given daily, either as an injection or as a tablet. There have been no outbursts since.

Doctors emphasize that the new drugs are not cures. Only in the earliest stages of mental illness have they apparently brought about sufficient improvement to permit a patient to be discharged. They are considered "valuable additional tools" in treating disordered minds.

NEW DRUGS IN ALL THREE HOSPITALS

"We were doing a pretty good job before we got them," Dr. George W. Jackson, director of institutions, reported. "They simply help that much more. We are using them generally at all three of the State's hospitals."

Osawatomie has used drugs valued at approximately $10,000 in the last 3 months, much of which represented gifts from manufacturers interested in research reports on results. The first use was last November. It was extended considerably during January, February, and March. Today 325 "disturbed" patients are receiving 1 of the 2 drugs daily.

The reporter asked to see the "worst" wards. He was taken to K building and an attendant unlocked a barred door. Here about 100 men were sitting on chairs or at tables, visiting, silent, or watching a wild west performance on television.

It was difficult to believe the most seriously affected patients in a 22-county area served by Osawatomie were here. The room was quiet. There was no screaming, usually associated with such wards.

"It's the new drugs," the doctor said.

There was cautious use of the drugs at first. Thorazine, the doctors report, has definite toxic effects on some 1 to 2 percent of the patients, causing agranulocytosis (destruction of white corpuscles) or liver damage. With such reactions it is stopped immediately. There have been no reactions to serpasil.

The new control measures also have had a marked effect on the use of insulin-shock and electric-shock treatments, which are rigorous measures. Before Christmas 80 patients in K building were being given electric-shock treatment twice a week. Since that time, the number has dropped to 12. Insulin shock was being used on 20 patients. It now is given to 10.

The drugs, and the State's improved mental-health program together, have changed the appearance of Osawatomie, where it was once a crowded, custodial institution with overworked doctors unable to see or classify the patients in their care.

"It doesn't even look like a mental hospital," Dr. Morton asserted. "Visitors constantly tell us they can't believe they are seeing one. It's so quiet."

THE NEW LOOK AT OSAWATOMIE

Externally the appearance is the same, excepting for a new geriatrics building. There is the same collection of red brick buildings on a hill a few miles north of the city. Inside, it is different.

Gone is the rocking-chair brigade, the rows of patients staring into space, withdrawn into their own confused inner world. Missing are the crowded wards, the silent people sitting, the occasional screams from the more violently disturbed that are the trade-mark of an asylum.

There is bustling activity. Supervisors, nurses, attendants, and doctors are beaming with that indefinable spark of pride in the job they are doing. The patients appear devoted to them, a factor in the treatment. The hospital has been cleaned up, painted up, and gleams like a well-run private institution. Good food is served cafeteria style to most, and patients sit at modernistic chrome tables for four.

It was time for occupational therapy, a word that may throw you, but which is highly important in treatment. Spectators were shown into several rooms, formerly occupied by hospital beds, where some 50 men patients were seated at tables. Each was sandpapering a piece of wood. Some were smoothing the surfaces efficiently, others were working in slow motion. Now and then a patient was sanding across the grain. With many, it was one of the first physical jobs the patients could be persuaded to do to start bridging the gap toward normality.

More advanced patients were sketching Christmas cards, working a rug-weaving machine, or making furniture. In a women's room, many were unraveling string, weaving rag rugs, or doing needlework. Later in the day they would watch television or possibly see a movie. There is a television set in every building on the grounds, and on every floor.

A group of 14 men walked into K building. The supervisor explained they had been fishing. A party is made up each day by employees who take requests from patients to join the fishing party. Attendants dig worms and give poles to the patients so they can sit on the banks of the reservoir and try for catfish.

THE STAGES OF RECOVERY

How good a job is Osawatomie doing?

Statistics are deceptive. Many patients are home on trial visits. They may come back. They do not always make it the first time. During the next visit home they stay longer. Ultimately a vast majority is discharged.

Here is the best picture of the Osawatomie operation:

A year ago the institution had a population of 1,650. Today it has 1,540. In the 12-month period some 600 patients were admitted, which would indicate some 710 patients improved and released, in this time.

Encouragement comes with the fact that Osawatomie, and the 2 other State hospitals at Topeka and Larned, are receiving many times more patients than ever before, but the hospital populations are declining. Elsewhere in the Nation, with more than 50 percent of the total hospital beds being occupied by mental patients, the emphasis is on building buildings and expanding the institutions. Kansas officials believe they may never need additional beds.

Two years ago there was a time when Osawatomie had no psychiatrists. Today it has 5, including 2 on the State's experience program for training residents. There are 4 psychologists and 5 social workers.

NO HORROR IN STATE'S HOSPITAL NOW

The team found most effective is composed of a psychiatrist, psychologist to give tests, psychiatric social worker to check the patient's background, psychiatric nurses, aides, occupational therapists, recreational supervisors, chaplains and dietitians.

The reporter visited the administration building. On several floors were semiprivate rooms, smaller than a hotel room, but containg, bed, dresser, and chair which the patients well advanced in treatment could call their own. Doors had been removed.

Not many years ago the public had a horror of mental hospitals. Popular conception was of a lunatic asylum, with padded cells, straitjackets, and other accoutrements of snakepit fame. There are no padded cells at Osawatomie, no straitjackets, no handcuffs. Only doors of some wards are locked to keep patients from wandering off.

Officials of the Osawatomie hospital are encouraging conducted tours by high school and college students. About 6 college groups have made the tour recently, and Paola, Kans., High School students are scheduled soon.

"We want young people to see what mental hospitals are like," Dr. Morton said. "We don't spend too much time encouraging older persons to visit. They have preconceived prejudices."

Staff conferences are held frequently to discuss a patient's treatment. Each patient sees a doctor at least once a day. There are still about 150 elderly persons at Oasawatomie, who could be transferred to nuring homes, since they require only physical care.

An outpatient clinic was opened last September, and receives 40 or 50 patients a month. These are referred by doctors, friends, or visit voluntarily. Each meets a psychiatrist, is given a preliminary interview, takes tests, and the social worker explores the family background.

Hospital officials decide whether the patient should be admitted to the hospital, or can be treated on an outpatient basis of visits several time a week. About 20 to 30 percent are treated on the latter program.

"We are rapidly approaching the point where we are doing most of the things we know how to do," Dr. Jackson, the institutional director, said. "We are approaching the minimum standards of the American Psychiatric Association and are reaching the approved standing pattern."

Dr. Jackson receives $25,000 a year, or $10,000 more than the governor.

Dr. Jackson believes if a Kansan is committed to a mental hospital, his chances are about 4 out of 5 that he will be discharged in a year. No longer is commitment to a hospital a lifetime sentence to vegetate in a chair. About half of those who can be discharged will be out in three months, Jackson estimates. He believes that the next step in the treatment of mental illness is more research on cause and cure, plus closer attention in the home communities.

What is the Kansas secret weapon? Probably a lot of things taken collectively. At the start, the State program had the guidance of Dr. Karl Menninger, one of the top-ranking psychiatrists in the country. He counseled setting up a training hospital for psychiatrists.

Psychiatrists are scarce. It is almost impossible, even if a State has unlimited funds, to employ them. A few came to Kansas from other States. But Kansas decided to train its own. In 1952 it began a training program at the Topeka State hospital. After receiving a degree of doctor of medicine, a physician spends 5 years more to become a psychiatrist.

In the Kansas training program, the doctors spend 2 of the 5 years working in other hospitals in the State.

Eight doctors are now in the experience-training phase, assigned to Larned, Topeka, Osawatomie, the boys' training school at Parsons, and other institutions. Soon there will be 15. The State has whipped the psychiatrist shortage by producing its own.

Another asset is the spirit that animates the institutions. Because of the remarkable results, the staffs have been inspired with pride in their work. Another advantage is the integration of the county welfare programs with the State program, all under the State Board of Social Welfare.

In 1947 Kansas discharged 340 persons from its State hospitals, average stay had been 3 years and 106 days. In 1954 the State discharged an even 1,000, whose average stay had been 1 year and 363 days. But 55 of these had been in the hospitals 10 years or longer. Eliminating these, the average stay of the other 945 was only 256 days.

Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, within recent days I called attention to an editorial in the Chicago Daily News commending the senior Senator from Illinois for his stand in opposition to the Colorado River storage project. I am extending my remarks at this point to include an editorial from a leading down-State newspaper in Illinois. The editorial in the Peoria Journal of April 22, 1955, reads:

DOUGLAS FIGHTS FOR ECONOMY

Frederick Othman's column carried on this page yesterday told of Senator DOUGLAS' opposition to plans for construction of five large storage dams to be constructed along the Colorado River.

The Illinois Senator questioned the advisability and the economy of such construction, regardless of the fact that his colleagues from the Western States, including several Democrats, are avid in support of the dam construction.

Mr. Othman ended his piece with this statement:

"I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois made many friends from the West this day. He didn't seem to care."

It is at times like these and when he tears into issues like these that you can unreservedly admire the senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS. His complete disregard for political consequences when he assails an issue on which he is convinced he is right and where he believes the public's best interests are not being considered is something which is exhibited only rarely in the Halls of Congress.

Conservation and dam building have been a big issue in the West. It is a highly popular one. The West continually is wanting more dams and more irrigation projects and more conservation in a time when we have so many surpluses we don't know what to do with them.

Support of the dam projects is good politics. It is good politics even for Senators and Representatives who don't come from the West because votes can be traded with the conservationist Senators of the West on projects which the eastern Senators might want.

The result is that the dam projects go through and we spend billions more putting up dams to water country that never has grown anything. As Senator DOUGLAS pointed out, the Mountain State Senators always are willing to vote for southern flood control so long as the southerners vote for western dams.

This sort of dealing doesn't seem to mean anything to Mr. DOUGLAS and he stands up and defies it. Political courage such as he exhibited isn't seen very often in Washington, or in any other legislative body either.

As we said before, when he does a thing like this, we can admire him without the faintest tinge of reservation. He's a rare bird as political officeholders go.

A Dog in the Manger Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was published in the May 4, 1955, issue of the Idaho Daily Statesman published at Boise, Idaho:

A DOG IN THE MANGER ACT

A plan for early development of hydroelectric power and for flood control by building of the Green Peter and Cougar Dams in the Santiam and McKenzie River valleys of western Oregon has encountered the same snag that is holding up or threatens to delay interminably development of other and larger dams like Hells Canyon on the Snake River and John Day Dam on the Columbia.

The pattern of the opposition is monotonous. It stubbornly resists any program for development except the one that would load the whole expense upon the Federal Government—as if the Federal Government had any resources at all of its own, and as if the Federal Treasury were inexhaustible.

A bill by Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican of Oregon, to permit local interests to join the Federal Government in the construction of the Green Peter and Cougar Dams is presently the subject for the hearing before a House subcommittee. It would permit the Pacific Power & Light Co., a private enterprise, and the Eugene Water and Electric Board, a municipal operation, to pay all of the costs alloted to power, with the Federal Government footing costs attributable to flood control, irrigation, recreation and other uses. It's a partnership proposal.

And, because of its aprtnership provisions, it is opposed by Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, and Representative FRANK SMITH, Democrat, of Mississippi. They referred pointedly to the controversial angles of the partnership proposal, and told the subcommittee it would be "faster to obtain direct Federal appropriations."

The same objections, of course, will be urged against the bill lately introduced by Representative SAM COON, Republican of Oregon, to permit local interests to advance a major portion of the cost of building the John Day Dam on the Columbia. Oregon's irrepressible Senator NEUBERGER already, and before even reading Representative Coon's bill, has announced his opposition to it.

There is a broad field of agreement on the need for more dams in the Pacific Northwest. Congressman COON has quoted estimates by both public and private agencies that more than 600,000 kilowatts of new power capacity must be developed every single year to keep pace with the region's anticipated growth. And the estimates are not disputed.

Only the way in which this development is to be accomplished is involved in controversy. But development may, and perhaps will, be postponed indefinitely if opposition such as has been manifested again against the Green Peter and Cougar proposals continues obstinant and obdurate.

With its head in the clouds, the opposition proceeds heedlessly on its assumption that the Federal Treasury is inexhaustible. It's a course that runs counter to common sense conviction that economy in government is a desirable objective, and that the rising burden of the public debt is a cause of concern.

In testimony Tuesday before the Senate Interior Committee which now is involved in another delaying action to forestall development at Hells Canyon, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay indicated strongly that Federal commitments may be already a bit overextended. The Government, he said, "already has an authorized program on the Columbia and lower Snake Rivers that probably would require more than one and one-half billion dollars to complete," aside from the cost of Hells Canyon which is conservatively estimated at another half-billion dollars.

There is always the probability that other sections of the country, which would have to share in the expense, are not as intensely interested in Pacific Northwest development as are the people of this region, and that a rising economy movement might seriously pinch the flow of Federal appropriations. So that, to mix a metaphor, a dog in the manger may some day wake up to find he has fouled his own nest.

There is to be considered, too, the impact of rising impatience hereabouts with "those who would obstruct our progress by making power a political issue." It is undoubtedly true that "most of our people feel that they have been getting more verbosity than voltage, and they want to get on with the job."

Treaty Law—The Power To Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal has pointed out the power to abuse the Constitution under recent decisions of the Supreme Court. The flip-flop by Secretary Dulles, who at one time said that treaty laws can override the Constitution and that they can cut across the rights given the people by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, prior to his induction into office, and who now takes the position that the present administration would not abuse these rights. All of this hardly makes sense.

I shall insert the editorial at this point in the Appendix:

THE POWER TO ABUSE

At his latest press conference Mr. Eisenhower had this to say of the Bricker amendment:

"If it would reassure the people of the United States to have an amendment saying that any treaty or executive agreement in conflict with this Constitution shall have no force or effect, I am perfectly willing to say it. But I will go no further."

Thus the conflict between the executive department and backers of a curb on international agreements is now a mater of agreement on language more than anything else. There seems to be no major disagreement on the purpose of the proposal. The President need go no further now than to tell his administration leaders to work for an agreement on wording.

The Bricker amendment represents much more a philosophy of government than a precise choice of words. There have been at least four versions by Senator BRICKER before the Senate. Another by Senator GEORGE, which had the same purpose, was supported by 60 Senators and was defeated by a single vote last year.

The purpose behind each of these attempts to write safeguards into the Constitution is the same. That purpose is to say that international agreements will not be permitted to override or to alter the Constitution.

It seems to us that the purpose is a simple one and a clear one. It can be said in many other ways and the exact language does not really matter as long as the amendment follows that purpose and neither falls short of nor exceeds it.

And it seems to us that reasonable men who are in basic agreement on a problem ought to be able to come to agreement on how best to solve it. When there is agreement on the general proposition that no treaty or executive pact ought to be allowed to conflict with the Constitution—and the rights and privileges it assures the people—it seems to us also that there is a responsibility to come to agreement.

During his discussion of Senator BRICKER'S amendment Mr. Eisenhower said that there is great fear among the people that treaties can be written that would violate the Constitution; we think the fear is warranted.

Secretary Dulles expressed those fears forthrightly and ably 3 years ago when he said that "treaty laws can override the Constitution," and that they can "cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights." What he said of treaties is also true of executive agreements for the Supreme Court has held such pacts to be of equal stature with treaties.

Mr. Dulles' estimate of these dangers had two results; it gave great impetus to proposals such as Senator BRICKER'S and Senator GEORGE'S, and it made many other people fearful of the dangers in abuse of the treaty power.

Those fears were not at all allayed last year when Mr. Dulles said no safeguard was necessary because the Eisenhower administration would not abuse those powers.

Mr. Eisenhower will not always be President. But unless the power to abuse is ended the dangers will always be there.

Agricultural Commodities Agreement Between United States and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following news release issued by the Department of State on April 29, 1955, is deserving of our attention.

I believe this is the way to reduce surpluses. If similar agreements were made with the Arab States, they might turn their minds from militaristic action against Israel to the peaceful pursuit of improving the standards of living of the Arabs.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ISRAEL UNDER TITLE I OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State John D. Jernegan, representing the United States Government, and Ambassador Abba Eban, representing the Government of Israel, today signed an agreement providing for the sale of $8.3 million worth of United States surplus commodities.

Effective immediately, the United States Government will, under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, title I, 83d Cong.), begin furnishing Israel with approximately 50,000 metric tons of wheat, 33,000 hundredweight of rice, 6,000 bales of cotton, 250,000 pounds of tobacco, 1,000 metric tons of butter, 40,000 metric tons of feed grains, and 2,228 metric tons of cottonseed oil.

The Israeli pounds derived from the purchase of these commodities will be used for various purposes including United States expenditures in Israel and some will be loaned for the promotion of Israeli economic development.

Tribute to the Solicitor General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Our Extraordinary Solicitor General," written by Anthony Lewis, and published in the May 5, 1955, issue of the Reporter. I commend the article to the attention of the Senate, together with my best wishes to the Solicitor General and my appreciation for his splendid services to the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR EXTRAORDINARY SOLICITOR GENERAL
(By Anthony Lewis)

When the late Robert H. Jackson was Solicitor General of the United States, he told of receiving a letter addressed simply "Celestial General, Washington, D. C." The post office, he said modestly, had no trouble deciding it was meant for him.

The office of Solicitor General carries with it no heavenly powers, but it does exert a broad influence on American law and command an extraordinary respect among lawyers. "The aristocrat of legal jobs," one authority has called it. The men who have held the position since it was created in 1870 include William Howard Taft (in the Benjamin Harrison Administration), the late John W. Davis (under Wilson), and Stanley Reed (under Franklin D. Roosevelt), who like Mr. Jackson became a Supreme Court Justice.

Despite its great history and high standing in the profession, the office is neither widely known nor understood by the public. Many generally well-informed people thought about it for the first time recently when the present Solicitor General, Simon E. Sobeloff, refused to endorse his administration's views on a major constitutional question—whether the Government can properly conceal the identity of accusers in loyalty and security cases.

Mr. Sobeloff's action, in the pending Supreme Court case of *Peters* v. *Hobby*, raised sharp questions: How could so fundamental a difference of opinion arise among the high legal officers of a government? Why was the dissent tolerated without animosity? The answers lie in the unusual nature of the job and the somewhat remarkable character of Simon Sobeloff.

MORE THAN WINNING CASES

The Solicitor General is appeal attorney for the United States Government. Whenever the Government loses a case in a Federal District Court, the Solicitor General decides whether it is to be appealed. When a case is lost in a Court of Appeals, he decides whether to take it to the Supreme Court. He has general charge of preparing the Government's briefs and arguments in the Supreme Court.

These are vast discretionary powers to be wielded by one man in a government that has been described as one of laws, not men. Legal cases assume broad significance only as they are decided on appeal. The Solicitor General, determining what should be appealed and how the Government should argue in the highest court, thus has a major influence in the shaping of the law.

The job, it follows, requires something more than the ability to plead brilliantly for a cause; it requires something nearer judicial qualities. Mr. Sobeloff has put it this way:

"When a lawyer in private practice advances an argument, he feels free to drive as far as he can. He is out to win that case * * * The Solicitor General, though an advocate, must not forget that his client is the United States Government * * * He must proceed with greater moderation and circumspection, realizing that what he says today will have to be faced tomorrow. He must be constantly aware that the rule declared in one case may be cited in the next."

In addition to this special concern for the consequences of his acts, a Solicitor General must have moral courage. He must withstand the pressures of agency heads and prosecutors who have in mind only victory for themselves in a particular case. He must take the larger view of what is best for the Government as a whole, remembering that it is an embodiment of all its citizens. These words written by one of Mr. Sobeloff's predecessors, Frederick William Lehmann, are inscribed outside the Attorney General's door: "The United States wins its point whenever justice is done its citizens in the courts."

Simon Sobeloff likes to quote that statement, and his action in the Peters case makes plain that he does not quote it idly. Judges and lawyers in somewhat cynical Washington regarded his refusal to move from his beliefs as an act of extraordinary moral courage—one that will have great significance for bench and bar and should not be lost on the public.

That neither his courage nor his morality was recently acquired is indicated by an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of February 8, 1934. Mr. Sobeloff had just completed 3 years as United States attorney for the State of Maryland. The Sun, praising his record, wrote: "He didn't forget that the district attorney is an officer of the court, whose duty is to see that justice is done, rather than to secure convictions, just or unjust."

Mr. Sobeloff was United States attorney in the last years of prohibition, and the Sun paid him the tribute of saying that he had enforced the Volstead Act for 3 years and emerged with the respect of both wets and drys. He prosecuted bootleggers, but he clamped down on overaggressive investigators.

In one notable case a private citizen telephoned a tip to dry agents that a man and wife had some whisky in their apartment. The agents found a bottle with what they called alcoholic "dregs" in it and charged the couple. United States Attorney Sobeloff investigated and learned that the tip had come from the couple's landlord, who was in a lawsuit with them. He ordered the case dropped and issued a statement beginning: "If the paid informer was a nuisance, the self-serving volunteer is an abomination."

During this stage of his career Baltimore customs officers seized as immoral copies of Aristrophanes's Lysistrata and Marie Stopes's Wise Parenthood. Mr. Sobeloff said he could not find anything "obscene, shocking, or offensive" in the books and ordered them released. The post office was still interfering with Lysistrata as recently as this year, but until some test case comes up, the Solicitor General will not be able to bring his views to bear this time.

Mr. Sobeloff has not spent all his life in an austere consideration of high principles. As a lawyer in Baltimore he had a general practice, one of the largest in the city. He represented such diverse clients as a race track and Rosa Ponselle, when she sued for divorce.

He was also in politics for a number of years, though of a different kind than usually practiced and with different results. A Republican in a Democratic city, he avoided extreme partisanship and was both respected and liked by many Democrats. A Sun political writer observed with awe several years ago that he "seems to have escaped most of the obloquy that is the normal lot of persons in public life. A review of voluminous newspaper articles and editorials reveals almost nothing of a censorious nature."

LIFELONG REPUBLICAN

Mr. Sobeloff was born in Baltimore on December 3, 1894. He made political speeches at 12, and a GOP congressional candidate who heard young Simon appointed him a House page. Herbert Hoover made him United States attorney; a framed letter from President Hoover hangs in the Sobeloff library.

But with all the Republican background, Mr. Sobeloff has never had regular Republican views on political, economic, and social questions. As early as 1929 he campaigned for unemployment insurance in Maryland; businessmen objected bitterly, and the State law was not passed until after the Wagner Act. As a public official and as a private attorney he fought for public housing. "When we try to take a family out of a rathole, they cry socialism," he said in one debate.

From his start in politics, Mr. Sobeloff has been associated with Theodore R. McKeldin, former mayor of Baltimore and now Governor of Maryland. Mr. McKeldin is a Republican with advanced views on civil liberties and social-economic questions—frequently more advanced than those of Maryland Democrats.

In 1943 Mr. McKeldin was elected mayor; he chose Mr. Sobeloff as city solicitor (1 of 5 top cabinet positions) and his chief adviser and speech writer. Mr. McKeldin was elected Governor in 1950 and reelected last fall—the first Republican ever to win the job twice. In his first administration, he made Mr. Sobeloff chairman of a Maryland "Little Hoover Commission" and later chief judge of the State's highest bench, the court of appeals. (His friends still address Mr. Sobeloff as "judge.") In 1952 Mr. and Mrs. McKeldin visited Israel with Mr. and Mrs. Sobeloff. Mr. Sobeloff, a member of a reform Jewish congregation, is a Hebrew scholar and a lifelong leader of Jewish organizations.

HE CAN TALK

It was Governor McKeldin who put Mr. Sobeloff's name before President Eisenhower for the office of Solicitor General. But politics has traditionally stopped at the door of the office, and the tradition has not been broken. The staff, just nine young lawyers, is recruited on a nonpartisan basis.

Staff members who have served under several Solicitors General consider Mr. Sobeloff unique in, among other things, his literary knowledge and his ability to express himself clearly and colorfully. (They note, of course, that other Solicitors have excelled in other respects.) Mr. Sobeloff has always had a way with words. He may well be the only lawyer to cite Disraeli in defense of the need for public housing. He is certainly the only lawyer whose report on a bankruptcy was praised by H. L. Mencken as having "all the racy charm of 'the gilded age.'"

Mr. Sobeloff is what psychologists call an oral thinker, a man who picks things up quickly by ear and prefers talking problems through to reading memos. To prepare his brief in the school-segregation case, for example, he met many times with two lawyers on his staff before anyone put a word on paper. Finally they prepared a draft which he corrected into final form.

Of all the Government briefs presented before the Supreme Court in an average year the Solicitor General and his staff prepare about half, turning over the rest to that division of the Justice Department which is particularly concerned. Arguments before the Court are also parceled out. So far Mr. Sobeloff has appeared in seven cases. His first oral argument, in an abstract-sounding bank case, exemplifies his ability to cut through to the heart of the matter with an apt illustration.

The dispute was over a New York State law that reserved to a certain few banks the right to advertise savings accounts. Other banks could accept savings but had to use a euphemism such as thrift accounts in advertising. Mr. Sobeloff told the Court the law made as much sense as one saying you could not call an apple an apple but could say that it was red, round, a fruit, and had a history going back to Adam and Ave. The Justices discussed apples briefly. Their decision struck down the law.

Aside from his ability to articulate, the quality especially praised by Mr. Sobeloff's acquaintances is warmth. "He enjoys people," one associate said. Another mentioned "sympathy for human beings, humaneness"—qualities that are especially important as he carries out the Solicitor's important job of deciding which cases shall be appealed.

Mr. Sobeloff contrasts as a person with what is usually expected in official Washington. To a newspaper reporter, one of his most striking qualities is a complete lack of cant. He talks freely—too freely, some associates think—giving blunt, often humorous appraisals of persons and policies. He means what he says.

In an average year more than 1,000 cases lost in district courts (or, occasionally, State courts) cross the Solicitor General's desk for consideration of an appeal. Almost 500 more are considered for appeal to the Supreme Court. In each case the United States attorney and the chief of the appropriate division in the Justice Department (Antitrust, for example, or Criminal) send along the record and their recommendation for or against appeal. A lawyer on Mr. Sobeloff's staff looks over the record and notes on it in ink whether he thinks the recommendation is correct. The Solicitor General makes the final decision in each case: "Appeal authorized" or "No appeal."

In the nature of the job the Solicitor General has to become familiar with far corners of the law not usually dealt with by any one person. "A lawyer could spend a lifetime

in active practice in Baltimore," Mr. Sobeloff said in a speech recently, "and never have occasion to think about the so-called aboriginal land rights of the Alaska Indians. * * * He might never be called upon to decide whether the marriage of a 14-year-old girl in Arkansas is void or only voidable * * * or whether giving away calves involves realization of taxable income."

The Solicitor General authorizes appeals in less than a quarter of the cases lost in District Courts, and in only one-eighth of those referred to him for possible Supreme Court action. He may say "No" because there is simply no appealable point of law—on a jury's award of $1,000 to a woman hit by a postal truck, for example. He may say "No" because he thinks a particular case is a weak one on which to risk establishing a broad rule of law. "Every experienced lawyer knows that in many instances it is wiser to leave a point obscure than to press for clarification," Mr. Sobeloff has said.

THE PETERS CASE

Many times, as the Government's advocate, the Solicitor General has the duty of presenting a viewpoint that is not his personal preference—because the Government's side is important and must be heard. Sometimes an agency such as the Internal Revenue Service may feel it essential to seek higher court clarification, despite the Solicitor General's warnings, and he may decide not to stand in the way.

But it is also his special duty to restrain the Government's lawyers, to counsel moderation. With agency attorneys, Justice Brandeis once said, "The Solicitor General should be a general."

"The office of Solicitor General is of great importance to the Supreme Court," Chief Justice Warren said once in introducing Mr. Sobeloff, "and when occupied by a man of great understanding and ameliorating influence greatly facilitates the work of the Court. Solicitor General Sobeloff is such a man."

His relationship with the Supreme Court is one of the major concerns of a Solicitor General. He is regarded as an officer of the Court, with an obligation not to bring before it unworthy cases or petty or harsh points of view. The Court can, of course, refuse to consider any case; it took on only 40 percent of those the Government sought to have reviewed last year, and only 8 percent of the private petitions. But an atmosphere of disapproval may develop if the Government presses too many appeals.

"The Solicitor General should guard the gate," one gentleman representing the Court's view has said. "The Court views with natural trust and confidence a Solicitor General who submits overwhelmingly meritorious cases," another authority has added. "We're in a realm of judgment. There is no machine to make decisions. It's a perfectly human thing to read a brief in one frame of mind or another, depending on who wrote it—to feel of a Solicitor, 'Out of that mint can come only true coin.' He must be a man who would rather lose a case here than present it on an unfair basis."

The greatest test of a Solicitor General comes when his study of a case leads him to decide that justice will best be served if the Government loses. If the Government has lost in a lower court, he can simply decline to appeal. But if the Government has won and the other side appeals, he faces a moral dilemma: Must he, as the Government's advocate, defend a course that he believes unjust?

From time to time a Solicitor General answers "No" and makes what the courts call a confession of error. In such a brief he concedes that the Government's views have been wrong in one or more aspects of the case. The Solicitor General does not necessarily have to come to any conclusion about the case as a whole to file such a brief. He may feel, for example, that a criminal defendant has simply not had a fair trial in some respect.

Richard Willard Kay, convicted of robbery in a Tennessee Federal court, asked the Supreme Court this term to reverse his conviction because he did not have effective legal counsel. His claim had been turned down by the district court and the court of appeals, the Government opposing it both times, but Mr. Sobeloff filed a brief saying that the contention had enough merit to justify a full hearing. He asked the Supreme Court to vacate the court of appeals judgment and order a district court hearing on Kay's complaint. The Court, citing the Solicitor's brief, did exactly as he asked.

Mr. Sobeloff had proposed that the Government make a similar "confession of error" in the Peters case. The case concerns a professor at the Yale Medical School, Dr. John P. Peters, who was fired under the old Truman loyalty program from his job as a Federal health consultant. The Loyalty Review Board reached the decision against him after a hearing in which Dr. Peters was not told the identity of his accusers, and not allowed to cross-examine them. He sued to get his job back, claiming that it was unconstitutional for the Government to label a man disloyal without letting him face all his accusers.

Exactly the same constitutional issue was presented in the 1951 case of Dorothy Bailey. There the Government maintained that it had no constitutional obligation to let a loyalty suspect confront his accusers. It narrowly won the case, the Supreme Court splitting 4 to 4, thus upholding a lower court ruling for the Government. Dr. Peters' suit was fought with equal vigor by the Justice Department, which won in the district court and court of appeals.

Nevertheless, Mr. Sobeloff proposed that the Government agree to let Dr. Peters have his job back. His brief said that there may be cases when concealment of secret accusers is necessary and desirable, but that the Government should have to prove the necessity of concealment in each case before some impartial board. The Government should not be allowed to declare something secret in the interest of national security on its own say-so, he argued, as it had done in the case of Dr. Peters.

That view did not prevail in the Justice Department. The brief eventually filed was signed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and not by Mr. Sobeloff. It defended as both constitutional and wise public policy the present practice of concealing the names of accusers in loyalty-security cases, even from hearing boards, whenever the Government desires.

There are precedents for Mr. Sobeloff's action in not signing the brief. Thomas Thacher, Solicitor General in the Hoover administration, frequently noted for the Court: "Though he signed the brief, the Solicitor General did not agree with it." The Supreme Court will accept a Government brief with either the Solicitor's or the Attorney General's name on it, though the Solicitor's almost always appears.

But this was the first public break by a Solicitor General on a major policy question in at least 20 years, and it was on an issue in which the heaviest political pressures were involved. Mr. Sobeloff has sought to make little of his dissent. He has told his friends that the case presents difficult legal issues on which thinking men disagree and that there was genuine, reasonable discussion in the Justice Department, not monolithic command, before the decision was reached. Department sources say warm mutual regard continues between Mr. Sobeloff and Attorney General Brownell, who fully understands the traditional independence of the Solicitor General's Office and respects Mr. Sobeloff's position in the Peters' case.

The Peters' dissent has not stopped the administration from using Mr. Sobeloff for special jobs outside his office. Notably, he has given several officially approved speeches taking a strong liberal view on immigration law. He certainly gives the impression of being entirely happy in his work and in the social relationships he has formed with the Justices, his departmental colleagues, and others.

The Solicitor used to be second man in the Justice Department, acting for the Attorney General in his absence. He was stripped of this role in a 1953 reorganization that was applauded by some as removing him further from politics, deplored by others as lowering his prestige.

NO HIGHER PRAISE

Mr. Sobeloff is mentioned, inevitably, as a choice for the next vacancy on the Supreme Court. But for the moment he is satisfied working toward a goal that he set out last year in a speech to lawyers.

"If the possibilities of this office are to be realized," he said, "the incumbent must strive to learn the meaning of the process he seeks to guide. He must try to discover the social tensions, the reverberations of strife and passion, the political issues, the clashes of interest that are dressed up in technical legal forms. * * * His constant endeavor must be, without falling prey to his own fetishes but obedient to the legislative policy laid down by others, to channel this mighty stream of cases so as to strengthen the foundations of our society, to make freedom more secure and to promote justice between man and man and between the Government and its citizens."

In Washington today many persons believe Simon Sobeloff is meeting his own standard. There is no higher praise.

Sarnoff Demands a Full Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, David Sarnoff has urged the Nation to wage all-out cold war against communism and be willing to accept the same costs and casualties as a hot war would involve.

The chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America charged that the Nation's political offensive against communism was inadequate. He warned that the cold war is not a preliminary bout but the decisive contest in which the loser may not have a second chance.

In a memorandum submitted to President Eisenhower last April 5 and made public on May 9, Mr. Sarnoff said the surest way to prevent a hot war was to win the cold war. The memorandum grew out of his discussion of the subject with the President on March 15.

Mr. Sarnoff urged the expenditure of up to $3 billion a year, or 7½ percent of the military defense budget, for political warfare.

I quote from just a part of General Sarnoff's inspiring statement:

It is well known that communism is challenging the freedom, initiative, and the individual dignity of all freedom-loving people. It is a threat to our very existence. We are attempting to combat this menace by means

of a strong military. Until a satisfactory peace is evolved, we must continue to be militarily strong. But the battle for peace cannot be won by preparedness alone. We need a more flexible and imaginative program for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously drawn attention to the brilliant speech of William Randolph Hearst, Jr., on February 26, before the National Press Club, along the same lines. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and I have introduced bills to carry out these general purposes. Today, one of the Hearst newspapers, the New York Journal-American, published an editorial which I quote below and which I heartily endorse. The quality of Mr. Sarnoff's leadership would be invaluable as chairman of the strategy board he proposes. Once again, the President has been given an opportunity to inaugurate a program that will lead to peace by forceful deeds, instead of conflicting threats and empty gestures.

Mr. Sarnoff's statement:

Logically, we have no alternative but to acknowledge the reality of the cold war and proceed to turn Moscow's favorite weapons against world communism. Our political counterstrategy has to be as massive, as intensive, as flexible as the enemy's.

The question, in truth, is no longer whether we should engage in the cold war. The Soviet drive is forcing us to take countermeasures in any case. The question, rather, is whether we should undertake it with a clear-headed determination to use all means deemed essential, by governments and by private groups, to win the contest.

* * * * *

Short of a blunder that ignites the third world war which nobody wants, the immediate danger is the debilitating, costly, tense war of nerves that is part of the cold war. The primary threat today is political and psychological.

If we allow ourselves to be defeated in the cold struggle, we will have bypassed a nuclear war—but at the price of our freedom and independence. We can freeze to death as well as burn to death.

Existing organization for fighting and winning the cold war must be adjusted and strengthened in line with the expanded scale and intensity of operations. I propose a Strategy Board for Political Defense, the cold-war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side, functioning directly under the President, with Cabinet status for its head.

* * * * *

The specific activities cited as examples in the memorandum would be carried out not only by official agencies but by private groups, such as labor unions, veterans' organizations, churches, youth and women's groups. The Soviet-controlled countries, it showed, are extremely vulnerable to precisely the kind of psychological pressures the Communists are using against free nations.

[From the New York Journal American of May 11, 1955]

WE MUST WIN

Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, board chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, has done this country a vigorous good service in proposing creation of a Government strategy board to coordinate efforts to win the cold war.

He has summed up his feeling on how vital it is to win in the following concentrated capsule of thought linking defeat in a cold war or a hot atomic war as twin disasters: "We can freeze to death as well as burn to death." The capsule could be the medicine for avoiding both.

The Hearst newspapers go all the way with General Sarnoff in his approach to the problem. In fact, his views are strikingly and happily similar to those advanced by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of our papers, in his speech last January 28 to the National Press Club in Washington.

Mr. Hearst emphasized the enormous importance of winning the battle of competitive coexistence, and urged the establishment of a national planning board to direct such efforts.

We have since come to think of such a board by the name of competitive coexistence council. We like the name because it is simple, it tells the story, and it can be condensed into the alphabetical symbol CCC.

There are some differences of detail and emphasis between General Sarnoff's proposal and Mr. Hearst's.

General Sarnoff suggests the head of the Board should have Cabinet status and should include representatives of the State and Defense Departments, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the United States Information Service. The Hearst proposal also would give high authority to the head of the Board but would include, besides Government representatives, the highest skilled and experienced civilian personnel that could be found.

Also, if we read General Sarnoff's views correctly, a great deal of stress is placed on massive psychological bombardment of ideas. To our thinking, the battle for competitive coexistence has entered a new phase that calls for quietly aggressive presentation of all the good things America has to offer and stands for.

By this we mean by word, by picture, by exhibit, by traveling delegations (Porgy and Bess, the New York Philharmonic, sports teams, for instance) to spread the story that this is indeed a land of plenty in industry, culture, sports—for are not these, after all, products of freedom?

But to General Sarnoff's objective, and the patriotic vigor of his interest, we offer a loud bravo.

And now we would like to make our latest contribution to this battle.

We propose General Sarnoff as Chairman of the Strategy Board.

Federal Pension Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 5, 1955, entitled "Federal Pension Views":

FEDERAL PENSION VIEWS

The charge of Powell B. McHaney, president of the General American Life Insurance Co., that social security is a Federal subsidy paid for by taxpayers without relation to benefits obtained, illustrates the different points of view possible concerning the program.

From an actuarial and contributory standpoint, the setup is both unfair and unsound. Under certain circumstances, a man can work in covered employment a mere year and a half, contribute less than $100, then receive $100 per month pension for the rest of his life. At the other extreme is the youngster beginning his work career now, who may contribute a substantial part of his pension before he retires, say 45 years hence—if indeed the program has not collapsed of its own weight by then.

On the other hand, the program at its start in 1937 was given only a thin pretense of being a contributory insurance system. Actually it was intended as an old-age dole, the employe contributions being designed merely to disguise the truth. It was another share-the-wealth project, pure and simple; which theoretically would save the states and Federal Government making outright old-age gifts. At that time too, Government was running to really substantial deficits, and the money coming in as social security "reserves" would make the books look better.

From either view the system is open to attack—just as it is open to commendation for the generally good old-age assistance it has rendered so far. But, as Mr. McHaney added, there can be no doubt it is also a "ready-made political football" for both parties. Therein lies perhaps its worst peril to current workers—that its benefits and coverage will be so relentlessly enlarged for vote-getting purposes that tomorrow's generation cannot or will not pay the taxes required to pension today's contributors.

Termination of Federal Administration on Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I commend to my colleagues' attention on a subject of great importance to a large segment of our Nation's people.

This statement was submitted to me by Mr. F. H. Sinclair, of Sheridan, Wyo., a member and committee chairman of the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians. This organization is composed of outstanding Americans who have been adopted by Indian tribes of North America. Membership extends even into this body and is represented on both sides of the political aisle.

I am most happy to submit the statement of this fine organization for the consideration of my colleagues and urge that it be studied fully.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, it would be neglectful of me if I did not say a word about the distinguished Wyoming citizen who sent the statement to me. Mr. F. H. Sinclair of Sheridan is one of my State's best-known and best-loved men among Indians all over the Nation. He is completely sincere in his effort to aid Indians in their struggle for survival as a race and in their uphill fight against discrimination.

Howard Sinclair recently was named by Wyoming's Gov. Milward L. Simpson as chairman of a newly formed Indian Affairs Committee in my State. Mr. Sinclair's work among American Indians

dates back many years, but his outstanding achievement in this field in recent years has culminated in an annual All American Indian Days spectacle at Sheridan. This year's will be the third annual event, during which authentic ceremonies and contests in dances, crafts, talents, and sports will be presented by members of more than 25 tribes.

All American Indian Days is an outgrowth of a program of human relations in which Mr. Sinclair took a leading part 4 or 5 years ago. This program which mushroomed spontaneously was aimed toward elimination of discriminatory practices, and was immensely successful. The net result—a practical demonstration of betterment of racial relations—brought international recognition to the Sheridan area in northern Wyoming and southern Montana.

I relate these facts, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the sincere approach to a very complex problem which has been adopted—successfully—by Mr. Sinclair. I believe this lends substance to the statement which follows:

STATEMENT OF TERMINATION OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS BY THE CONTINENTAL CONFEDERATION OF ADOPTED INDIANS

This national organization, the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians, consisting of regular members adopted into tribes of American Indians, and associate members concerned with Indian rights, has for its principal objective the promotion of the welfare and progress of American Indian citizens, and assistance to them in obtaining their full civil rights, is deeply concerned in the matter of the proposed termination of Federal administration of Indian affairs.

There is no need here to attempt to outline prevailing conditions now obtaining on the many Indian reservations in the United States, as these conditions have been made known by the testimony given before congressional committees and are known to the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

After considerable study and consideration of these existing conditions, and apparent intent of the Federal Government to proceed with the termination of Federal trusteeship over Indian people, this confederation respectfully submits the following statements of its position and recommendations in this connection:

1. We favor ultimate termination of the administration of Indian affairs by the Federal Government, but suggest the transition period be over a period of not less than from 10 to 20 years.

2. We oppose the transfer of Federal responsibilities and services to Indians to the several States, until and unless said States agree to the transfer, and have set up qualified agencies to assume these responsibilities and supply these services as adequately as they are now supplied by the Federal Government; and further, that sufficient funds be appropriated by the Federal Government to be paid to the States to enable the States to undertake these responsibilities and provide these services until such termination program becomes a full reality.

3. We oppose termination of Federal administration over the affairs of any Indian tribe, without full consent of the members of said tribe, honestly obtained by ballot.

4. As exemption of Indian lands from taxation was part of the purchase price of lands ceded to the United States by Indian tribes, we opposed turning these lands over for taxation by the several States, without full consent of the tribes affected, and then not until the said State in which Indian lands lie, can provide the same services, in every respect, which are provided for other citizens of such State.

5. We oppose attempts to abrogate existing treaties between Indian tribes and the United States, by the use of persuasion, coercion, or by any other means, by any Federal department or agency.

6. We oppose any arbitrary law which attempts to define an Indian. We suggest a registration system be set up, whereby any person with any degree of Indian blood may register and declare himself to be an Indian if he chooses. Such registration need not constitute enrollment in a particular tribe.

7. We oppose the relocation policy which would transplant Indians in industrial areas, far from their homes, while at the same time large parts of the lands or resources within the reservations from which these Indian people are taken to be relocated, are leased to non-Indians. Land resources on reservations should be developed for Indian people. Indian tribes should have priority over non-Indians to purchase trust lands. Indian reservation lands should be maintained at present levels, if not increased, to be developed for Indians. Long term loans, at low interest rates, should be provided for the purchase of tribal herds of cattle, or the development of natural revenue producing resources for the benefit of Indians. Indian lands provide the last of the natural heritage of Indian people—their only homeland—and they should be retained for their benefit.

8. We suggest an educational financing plan such as the GI bill of rights for young Indian people, to finance them in schools and colleges where they may obtain professional educations. We also suggest more vocational training institutions and on the reservation schools, where practicable.

9. We suggest exploration of plans to inaugurate small industries on Indian reservations to provide employment, such as the small factory on the Turtle Mountain Reservation in North Dakota.

10. We suggest a thorough appraisal of all resources on every Indian reservation, preferably made by some independent and trained agency, rather than a government bureau, so the true potential of each reservation be ascertained.

11. We recommend additional funds for law enforcement be appropriated, until this function is turned over to the States, and that the jurisdictional authority between State and Federal Governments be more clearly defined.

12. We recommend that appropriations for reimbursing State schools for the education of Indian students, under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, be increased and that more flexible means of processing these funds be devised.

13. We favor more authority and responsibility be given to superintendents of Indian reservations so that decisions can be made on the local level in accordance with local existing conditions, with a consequent reduction of personel in area offices and in Washington.

14. As Indians are American citizens, we oppose any ruling by a Government department preventing any tribe of Indians from employing legal counsel of their own choosing, without necessitating the sanction or approval of any governmental agency.

15. We oppose the enactment of any further legislation which would terminate Federal administration over the affairs of Indians, until claims by Indian tribes against the United States shall have been settled in full, or finally determined by the court of last resort.

16. It is our contention that more than economic factors are to be considered, and that the ethnic values should be considered and the efforts to break up tribal unity are not in keeping with the theory of the self-determination rights of minority peoples—and that the strong feeling of racial ties existing with Indians should be recognized; that understanding and sympathy toward Indian background, way of life, culture, and philosophy are essential; and the assimilation is a matter of evolution. Integration by practical progression should be the goal.

Committee on Termination: F. H. Sinclair, Chairman, Sheridan, Wyo.; John Batdorff, Manistee, Mich.; Joseph L. Boyle, Jim Thorpe, Pa.; Dr. Stanley Dougan, Palm Springs, Calif.; Theodore H. Haas, Washington, D. C.; Clyde H. Hendrix, Des Moines, Iowa; B. W. Jolly, Carnegie, Okla.; Mrs. Nicholas Merhab, Ada, Ohio; H. O. Waltmeyer, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Approved:

DANIEL FRANCIS CLANCY,
Continental Chief, the Continental Confederation of Adopted Indians.

For a Deeper Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the deepening of the Delaware River Channel is a matter of vital concern to the State of New Jersey and should have the serious consideration of the Congress. An immediate appropriation of $25 million to commence the program is needed.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to point out that the demand that local interests contribute to the deepening of a navigable river, as proposed by the administration, is unique in our history. The navigable waters of the United States, as the Saturday Evening Post pointed out editorially recently, always have been, and still are, the responsibility of the Federal Government. It would seem frivolous of me to suggest that local interests share in the moneys collected in customs duties from rivers deepened partly at their expense, but the suggestion is no more illogical than the demand that the same local interests pay for a share of the improvements of our navigable streams.

If local interests must pay for an improvement in the Delaware River then must they pay for improvements all over the Nation? Must local interests pay a share of the numerous projects which have already been approved by the Congress and which are awaiting funds at this moment? If so, then each of us had better look into his own situation, for if my district must depart from tradition, then so must all other congressional districts at a future date. I am for a meritorious project and, at the same time, against an attempt of our Federal Government to abandon its responsibilities, a unique and dangerous precedent. May I say that we in New Jersey are not asking for anything new. We are asking only that the Federal Government perform its functions as it should, without departing from 175 years of tradition and history for the sake of a pennyweight on

the scales upon which the political budget must be balanced.

I include as part of my remarks the statements by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of the State of New Jersey, and myself which we presented to the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 5, 1955.

The Saturday Evening Post editorial of April 30, 1955, entitled "Harbor Improvement Is One Federal Job That Has Paid Off" is included also.

The statements and editorial follow:

STATEMENT BY GOV. ROBERT B. MEYNER ON THE DEEPENING OF THE DELAWARE CHANNEL

Congress has sanctioned the deepening of the Delaware Channel project. We in the Delaware Valley consider it essential to the expanding economy of the area. The industrial development of the Delaware Valley is just beginning, and a channel capable of accommodating ocean-traveling ships fits naturally and indispensably into that development.

The plan for a channel 40 feet deep from Philadelphia Naval Base to the upstream end of Newbold Island and 35 feet from there to the Trenton Marine Terminal has been studied for years by the Army Corps of Engineers and other responsible agencies.

General Sturgis himself has said that the deeper channel would "unquestionably contribute to the general welfare of the region."

It is true that U. S. Steel would make good use of the deepened channel to bring ore-carriers to its docks. But it is illogical to say that only 1 company and no other would benefit from a 40-foot channel depth in the Delaware River.

The subsidy plan was probably devised as an economy measure, but its main effect is to slow down the pace of plans for a long-sought public improvement.

It should be remembered also that a concern like U. S. Steel already makes large payments to the Federal Government in terms of corporation and personal income taxes. Should such a firm—or any private enterprise, for that matter—be asked to meet even a part of the cost of benefits that might reasonably be regarded as a governmental responsibility?

To require private contributions for projects that have always been a Federal Government matter would establish dangerous precedents.

The benefits to be derived from opening the navigable section of the Delaware to deep-draft vessels, leads to the conclusion that the existing national policy of improving navigable waterways at the cost of the Federal Government should be adhered to and that it should bear the entire cost of the proposed project.

If a 40-foot Delaware channel is in the public interest, as it appears to be, it should be treated as a public improvement, built with public funds—not as part of a corporate investment.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, ON THE DEEPENING OF THE DELAWARE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955, 2 P. M., ROOM F 16, CAPITOL

Mr. Chairman, I come here today to support an adequate appropriation for the deepening of the Delaware River channel to Trenton, N. J. To one who represents the 4th congressional district, the shores of which are washed by the Delaware, the need for the deepening of this great estuary to the head of tidal influence at Trenton is crystal clear. A harbinger of the growth of the greater Trenton industrial area is to be seen in the choice by the United States Steel Corp. of its site for a tremendous operation. I refer to the great Fairless Steel Works near Morrisville, Pa., directly across the river from Trenton. Our area must accept the challenge that this growth presents, by providing a channel of sufficient depth to accommodate 40,000-ton-ore boats. Otherwise, a promise of progress may be rejected, and a threat of economic disruption and eventual stagnation result.

The choice of this area by United States Steel was acknowledged by numerous industries and business interests as an inducement to move into the Delaware Valley. The fact is that the enthusiasm of industries which considered the banks of the river as a location has noticeably cooled since doubts have been cast on the fulfillment of the deepening project.

It might be well to note here the fact that the decision of United States Steel to locate in the area resulted, for one thing, in a tremendous Levittown housing development in Pennsylvania. Indications that plans are underway for a great Levittown on the New Jersey side of the river, in the district I represent, are encouraging. Such plans are, to no little extent, due to the expectation of additional industries locating along the banks of the Delaware. Discouragement of such plans by the failure of the area to provide accommodations for these industries would be unfortunate indeed.

In the district I represent there is more unanimity on this issue than on any other matter directly affecting the district. There is nothing I remember that even remotely resembles the kind of unanimity that has been demonstrated. The resolutions in favor of the Federal Government's fulfilling its responsibility for the deepening are too numerous to mention here. My offices have been virtually flooded with representations in behalf of the project. They include practically every governing body of the communities in the district. Public endorsement by both business and labor organizations have been very numerous. The newspapers of the district have editorialized and given press coverage which have served to educate and arouse the people of the area to the importance of the project. The degree of response to a questionnaire, recently distributed among my constituents, has been considerable. I was elated by the responses given to two questions dealing with the deepening issue.

One question read: "Do you favor the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to Trenton?"

The answers: Yes, 630; no, 39.

Another question read: "Do you favor the administration's policy of requiring local contributions toward the cost of the channel, or do you believe the national economy and defense make the deepening project the sole responsibility of the Federal Government?"

The answers: Local contributions, 170; Federal responsibility, 434.

Clearly, the people of my district consider that in justice to them, this project should be undertaken as the sole responsibility of the Government as soon as possible. I would like, as their Representative in Congress, to impress upon you the urgency of this project if the well-being of my district is to be continued. It is, of course, most regrettable that some must suffer disadvantage and inconvenience. Every means of adjustment and compensation in individual cases must be considered. But progress requires that the greatest good for the greatest number be the prevailing criterion. Ours is an area where unemployment is a problem today, and where sustained full employment is a constant aim. Should this area not be given the opportunity this project affords, many jobs will never materialize. What a loss it would be for my district to be refused this golden opportunity to grow healthy economically. What a loss to the Nation that such new wealth should fail to be created.

Fortunately, the Congress has always recognize the impact that river and harbor improvements have had, not only on the economy of the areas immediately affected, but on the expansion and development of the entire Nation. The 83d Congress, consistent with this broad view in formulating policy on river dredging, authorized a 40-foot channel in the Delaware upstream from the Philadelphia Navy Yard. At that time the matter of cost-sharing was carefully reviewed, and the idea was rejected. It remained for the Bureau of the Budget to arrogate to itself the power to frustrate the will of the Congress. It is the right of the Congress to make clear that the violation of a well-established precedent shall not be undertaken in so cavalier a fashion. It is the duty of the Congress to see to it that the Delaware Valley is not thwarted in its pursuit of simple justice. It is an opportunity for the Congress to assist an area which can contribute immeasurably to the welfare of the entire Nation.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to point out to you that the demand that local interests contribute to the deepening of a navigable river is unique in our history. The navigable waters of the United States always have been, and still are, the responsibility of the Federal Government. It would seem frivolous of me to suggest that local interests share in the moneys collected in customs duties from rivers deepened partly at their expense, but the suggestion is no more illogical than the demand that the same local interests pay for a share of the improvements.

If local interests must pay for an improvement in the Delaware River, then must they pay for improvements all over the Nation? Must local interests pay a share of the numerous projects which have already been approved by the Congress and which are awaiting funds at this moment? If so, gentlemen, then each of us had better look into his own situation, for if my district must depart from tradition, then so must yours, at a future date. We are for a meritorious project and, at the same time, we are against an attempt of our Federal Government to abandon its responsibilities—a unique and dangerous precedent.

In conclusion, gentlemen, may I emphasize that we are not asking for anything new. We are asking that you insist that the Government perform its functions as it should—without departing from 175 years of tradition and history for the sake of a penny-weight on the scales upon which the political budget must be balanced.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1955]

HARBOR IMPROVEMENT IS ONE FEDERAL JOB THAT HAS PAID OFF

The administration has declined to include in this year's budget an appropriation for a deep-water channel in the Delaware River above Philadelphia as far as Trenton, N. J., unless the project includes a stipulation that local interests must assume part of the cost.

The total sum involved in dredging the channel to 40 feet as far as Morrisville, Pa., and 35 feet from there to Trenton, is about $91 million. It is estimated that $18 million of this amount represents half the difference between a 35-foot channel and one that would permit large ocean-going ships to unload ore at dockside. Therefore, the Army engineers argue, this is a "local benefit" and should not be a charge on the Federal budget. Although the local interests are not specifically mentioned, various statements by administration spokesmen indicate that United States Steel Corp., whose huge new Fairless plant is located on the river just below Trenton, is meant.

In his press conference of January 19, the President supported this position, adding, if it was a new policy, he thought it should have been considered long ago.

Although the principle of local participation in large public improvements involving Federal expenditures is a sound one, harbor maintenance and improvement of navigable rivers and harbors have been an exclusively Federal concern since the foundation of the Republic.

It was precisely the question of foreign commerce and navigation—over which the original Confederation had no control—that led to the movement for the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In the end, the States renounced the right to collect import duties, ceding that source of revenue to the new Federal Government, which in turn was forbidden (art. I, sec. 9, par. 6) to discriminate among the ports of the several States.

Maintenance and improvement of harbors, under control of the War Department, have normally been carried out at Federal expense, insofar as deep-water channels are concerned. That would be no reason for continuing the policy, if it were wrong or financially burdensome, but the reverse is true. Adequate ports and channels are not a liability but a gilt-edged investment. In the case of harbors along the Delaware, the Federal Government, during the last 50 years, has collected over $14 for every dollar spent on development.

It is true that, for the moment, a 40-foot channel may be represented as a benefit to United States Steel, although other plants along the river would benefit too. But that argument could have been advanced at any time in the past 168 years against any of the industries that line the shores of our great ports. The record of American enterprise indicates that opportunities to locate on an improved waterway are seldom neglected. It is hardly fair to impose the cost of creating them on the first user.

The responsibility of the Federal Government, in any case, does not go beyond the cost of deepening and clearing channels. A productive harbor, obviously, is much more than just a waterway. Local interests provide and always have provided piers, rail connections, loading and unloading facilities, truck highways, police and all the other necessities that go into the complex of services that makes a port. Without them the huge Federal revenues from customs could never have been available.

Sympathy is due residents of the upper Delaware who view with alarm the inevitable transformation of riverbanks from charming residence and recreation areas into grim industrial and commercial areas. We are not debating the issue of whether this particular project is necessary. But, if the channel or any similar one is to be deepened, there would seem to be no valid reason to change the policy, buttressed by specific constitutional mention, which makes channel costs a Federal concern.

Mormons and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following interesting article which appeared in the April 25, 1955, issue of Congress Weekly:

MORMONS AND ISRAEL

The 125th anniversary of the Mormon Church in America must stir in many Americans of all faiths renewed admiration for the profound sense of religious and civic dedication which has charaterized the founders and disciples of the Mormon Church. For American Jews, and especially Zionists, this occasion has added significance. It presents an opportunity to recall with deep appreciation and gratitude the encouragement given by the Mormon Church from its inception to the ideal of Zion's restoration.

Since 1830, the Mormon Church in the United States has included among its articles of faith the belief in the literal restoration of Israel to the Holy Land, though, to be sure, it regarded this as a necessary prelude to the second coming of Christ. Indeed, the commitment to this article of faith was so strong as to lead Joseph Smith, the founder of the church, to regard the restoration of Israel as imminent. He exhorted his disciple, Orson Hyde, to undertake a trip to Jerusalem to facilitate the consummation of this event.

In 1840, a conference of the Mormon Church authorized Hyde to proceed to Jerusalem and while en route, to consult with Christian and Jewish leaders, here and abroad, about this ideal. Bearing letters of recommendation from distinguished Americans, among them the United States Secretary of State and the Governor of Illinois, he zealously pursued conversations with a wide variety of people throughout the world. He spoke with fervor and displayed a serene confidence in the inevitable realization of this vision of Zion's restoration. In Jerusalem he told a missionary: "It was by political power and influence that the Jewish nation was broken down and her subjects dispersed abroad; and I will hazard the opinion that by political power and influence, they will be gathered and built up." With remarkable foresight, he predicted that England was destined for the leading role in the realization of this aim.

Orson Hyde devoutly prayed for the attainment of this ideal. With touching piety this American Mormon erected an altar of stones in Jerusalem, in the manner of the ancient patriarchs, and prayed for the return of the Jewish dispersion to the land of their faith, the restoration of the Kingdom of Israel, and the establishment of Jerusalem as its capital.

A little more than a century after Orson Hyde uttered this prayer the Biblical prophecy of the reestablishment of the State of Israel came to fulfillment. The Jewish people will remain profoundly grateful for the great part played by the American Government, and people in this moving chapter of Jewish history, and particularly to the Mormon Church for its unflagging faith and efforts in behalf of the cause of Israel.

On the 125 anniversary of the Mormon Church, American Jews are proud to join Americans of all faiths in wishing the Mormon Church continued progress and growth.

The Nature and Mission of Our Surplus Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an excellent statement on the subject of surpluses by Dr. J. T. Sanders, consultant for CARE:

THE NATURE AND MISSION OF OUR SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTION

(By J. T. Sanders, consultant for Care, Inc.)

The farm-surplus production problem is, I am convinced, not a temporary problem but one that will last for many years to come. The present capacity of our farms to produce, the inherent full-output nature of the farm business and several other factors make these surpluses almost inevitable for several years at least. Regardless of Government policies of restriction of farm production, regardless of good prices or low prices of farm products, of depressions or prosperous times, and of peace or war, I believe, for years to come, we can be reasonably certain that we shall be confronted with this problem of surpluses for which a satisfactory market cannot easily be found. We shall have to seek diligently for a solution to this problem that will enable us to use these surpluses and that will not allow them to be wasted and become a national and international disgrace.

On the other hand, our surplus products must not be disposed of under conditions and terms that would bankrupt our farmers, bring chaos to the markets of the world, and cause friendly nations to lose faith in the democratic way of life. Whether or not our inevitable surpluses shall become a great problem and curse to us; or whether we shall use them for the great blessing that they can and should be to us and a hungry world, depends on our ability to understand their causes and nature, and our ability to plan their use to our own advantage and for the most benefit to a hungry world. This is the heart of my message to you today.

No sound solution of our current and prospective farm surplus problem can be planned until we understand clearly the difference between the causes and correction of an overall surplus of farm products in general and the causes and correction of a surplus of a single farm product. This discussion will deal with overall surpluses, their probable inevitability for years to come and how our Nation can use them to our best advantage.

FARMERS CAN, AND DO, CORRECT SURPLUSES OF SINGLE FARM PRODUCTS

Correction of a surplus of a given or single product is easy and is almost invariably made by farmers shifting, in the years following the surpluses, away from the production of the surplus and relatively low price product to a product not in surplus supply and not so low priced. These corrective shifts are constantly being made by farmers; and it does not take a high order of competency on the part of a farmer to induce him to make them. Such shifts as a rule require no overall reduction in size of the operations of a farm, and of all farms, and no idleness of labor, of machines or of land. These changes are constantly being made by farmers, because the individual farmer can make them, and can see a financial advantage from making them. They are made at times regardless of Government price support policies or at other times as a result of such policies.

On the other hand when a farmer is confronted with a general or overall surplus of all his products or most of them, there is nowhere that he can turn to meet his problem. If he reduces his total output of all products in suprlus supply he wastes his idle labor, land, and machinery, and loses more by such reduction than he would if he did not make it. Presumably if he knows how, and is able to reduce his costs, he will have done so before he is confronted with overall surpluses and low prices. It is almost literally true that any farmer can meet

and deal with a single product surplus, but any and all farmers are practically helpless to correct the woes of a general farm surplus, such as we are now confronted with.

Since single product surpluses are corrected by shifts without reducing the total output capacity of a farm, or of all farms, these shifts have little, or no, effect on the aggregate output of a given farmer nor of the output of all farms in the land. Overall surpluses, therefore, cannot and will not be corrected by the aggregate of the action of individual farmers. Indeed I seriously doubt if any Governmen policy, any possible organized effort of farmers, or effort of farmers acting individually, can do much by way of reducing the overall farm surpluses confronting us now, and that will confront us in the next several years. It seems to me that the Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress, farmers, and the Nation must face the fact that these surpluses are inevitable and persistent.

RESPONSE OF FARM PRODUCTION TO LOW PRICES OF FARM PRODUCT

As stated previously, farmers invariably reduce the production of a given product following years of heavy surplus production and relatively low prices of the product. But one can find no valid evidence that farmers can or do reduce overall output following years of general drop in farm prices, or that farmers move to reduce surpluses with lowering prices. Let us briefly examine some facts showing that a marked rise or fall of all farm prices has little or no influence on farm output.

For the 24 years from 1930 to 1954 farm prices declined 5 points or more for 6 years, and rose 5 points or more in 15 of the 24 years. There were 3 years during the 24 when price changes were less than 5 points. Price index decreases averaged 28 points per year for the 6 years of decline; and price rises averaged 20 points per year for the 15 years of price increases. On the years following the 6 years of price declines farmers increased total planted acres for 3 years and decreased it for 3 years; with a net balance of reduction in planted acreage amounting to less than 1 percent. On the other hand, during the 15 years of significant price increases farmers increased total planted acres during 11 years with the total of these increases exactly equaling the decreases of acreage on the 4 years when acreage was decreased. In other words, decreases cancelled out increases during this 15 years of rising farm prices. After 1936 when adjustment in total planted acres had recovered from the drought of the early 1930's, the net change in planted acres, as a result of all the wartime stimulus, was less than 1 percent by the current year 1954. Evidently significant price changes were a minor factor in changes in farm crop acres. This is in marked contract to the response industry reflects when industrial product prices change.

FARMERS SUBSTITUTE MINOR CROPS FOR REDUCED ACREAGE OF BASIC CROPS

Another phase of this stability of total planted acreage is the response of farmers by substituting minor crops for basic crops when the Government restricts acreage of the latter—e. g., minor feed crops substituted for wheat when wheat acreage is reduced by the Government or for other reasons. History reveals overall surplus is actually increased by reduced wheat acreage.

Wheat acreage was decreased during 8 of the 23 years from 1929 to 1953, not counting the extraordinary reduction of 34 million acres during the severe drought year of 1934. This reduction of wheat acreage actually did not reduce the available supply of food and feed however. During these years reduction of wheat acreage aggregated 32.6 million acres and the corn equivalent for feed, thus lost, was 32.3 billion pounds. During these 8 years, however, increased acreage of minor feed crops amounted to 38.5 million acres and increase of output of corn equivalent from these minor crops amounted to 39.7 billion pounds or 23 percent more than the loss of corn equivalent from the reduced wheat acreage.

In this situation since much of our wheat production is fed, a cut in wheat acreage actually increased by 23 percent surplus feed. This is true of nearly all our reduction of major crops and a substitution of minor crops. The former are "extensive" crops that yield relatively low amounts of food and feed per acre; while the minor substituted crops in most cases are high producers per acre. Thus the shifts from major crops to minor crops due to Government restriction in most cases actually has the effects of increasing our aggregate overall surpluses of farm products.

OUR SURPLUSES ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN THEY SEEM

Cold statistics on our farm surpluses are misleading in forming a judgment of the importance of surpluses to our farm and national prosperity, and in forming a judgment relative to the good will of other nations. Our export farm surpluses rarely equal one-tenth of total farm output; and as a rule are less than one percent of our gross national product. This may indicate to a casual observer that farm surpluses are not important. But the near bankruptcy of a major export crop can and will drag down to depression, domestic market crops, that compete with the depressed crop for use of land. All major crops and livestock production are sensitively tied together through ability of the farmers to shift land from one crop to another.

Outside of agriculture, surpluses of farm products can be a powerful instrument of good or harm in our international relations depending on whether we use them to feed hungry people or let them go to waste and bring about national dispute.

If our surpluses were a passing problem, were temporary and not persistent, their outright gift to hungry peoples of the world who have been set back by the ravages of war and who truly desire to work out a sound democratic economy, would probably be justified, and would possibly be a wise policy for us to pursue. But such a giver-begger relationship as a long-time policy is not good for either men or nations. The durable nature of our surpluses calls for a more self-respecting and sounder method of handling these surpluses than that of continuously giving them to needy people, and repeating this so long as our long suffering tax payers would stand for it.

Good neighbor relations between both men and nations, over the long pull, must rest on exchanges, with the objectives between buyers and sellers built on a desire to help those in need to help themselves to a status of greater purchasing power. Where calamity or misfortune strikes and causes starvation anywhere in the world we should always stand ready and able to give of our abundance to help. But our policy should not be a continuous giving that encourages indolence or causes others to loose their desire to meet all their own needs by their own efforts. This, without doubt, is not the route we should take as a nation in meeting our present and prospective future surplus problems.

WHY SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTION IS NOT A TEMPORARY PROBLEM

The previous statements relative to the necessary and sound method of dealing with our surplus problem are valid only if my contention, that surpluses are to be with us for many years, is valid. Let us examine together briefly the facts backing up this claim of persistency of future farm surplus output.

In discussing this problem, I wish to emphasize that I am trying to avoid all semblance of discussing views of any particular farm organization, or those of any political party. If I seem to single out the views of particular farm organizations, political parties, or farm leaders, it is solely to present facts as I see them and not to act in a biased or partisan role. If, therefore, I sin in this respect I assure you it is my desire that it be the result of weakness and not of the heart.

Some of our national agricultural policies of the past and present have not been conducive to a clear understanding of our surplus problem. To talk of solving surplus farm problems by control of farm output does not contribute to an accurate understanding of the surplus problem; nor to its solution. Also to contend that high fixed price support with its accompanying efforts at restricting farm production and its failure to do so, have created our current surplus problem is an assertion that cannot be substantiated by careful analysis. Also current claims and implications that flexible price supports, if in operation, would cause farmers to adjust production so as to eliminate overall surpluses are claims that would prove entirely visionary if they were tried to their proponents' heart's desire. These statements are made with a deep conviction that they are statements of facts, and with a belief that if you will bear with me patiently, as I present the following on the true nature of farm surpluses, you will more likely agree with the above statements relative to current views being in error.

STABILITY OF PLANTED ACRES AS A CAUSE OF SURPLUSES

One sobering set of facts usually known by Agricultural Senators, Congressmen and leaders are those showing a remarkable stability in planted-crop acres in the Nation during the last 25 or 30 years and even longer. Through periods of good and low prices, through efforts at restriction of acreage and production, through periods of no such efforts, through depression and periods of prosperity, through price-control efforts and freedom from such efforts, and through peace and war periods, total crop acreage has changed but little. If this is true, given good growing weather, it is evidently one of the most basic causes of stability of farm output and surpluses.

For example, during the 5-year period from 1935 to 1939 American farmers planted 357 million acres of cropland on an average; from 1940 to 1944 they planted 355 million acres during the years 1945 to 1949, 358 million; and during the last 5-year period, 1950 to 1954, average cropland planted was 357 million acres. For the year 1954 farmers planted 354 million. These figures show nothing short of an astounding stability in the basis of farm output. Barring catastrophic drouths and plagues these facts almost insure great stability in agricultural production and continued surpluses.

If we look closer into the extraordinary team of man and land that we call a farm we shall see in an overwhelmingly convincing way why they perform with an unfailing full output.

HIGH FIXED COSTS IN AGRICULTURE AS A CAUSE OF CONTINUED SURPLUSES

Take for example farm costs. Taxes, land investment, upkeep, the operators' labor and many other costs of operation are in the nature of fixed rigid costs. These cannot be avoided or reduced materially by closing down part of the farm operations.

On our 5½ million farms there are today 39 million units of field horsepower, in the form of tractor and animal power, compared with an average of 26 million units 20 years ago; or 50 percent more horsepower to till, plant, cultivate, and harvest the same amount of land, 360 million acres. This

power cannot be carted to town during bad years and used by farmers in urban work. There is no conceivable use that it can be put to except to work this same 360 million acres of land, year in and year out. You and I know that that is the use, the full use, that will be made of it as long as it lasts and as long as farmers live on our 360 million acres of cropland. Its use for this purpose is almost as stable and as certain as the existence of the tractors and the land. In this sense it is a fixed factor and a powerful one for continued full output and surpluses from our farms.

Even if there is no other practical use of the farm power other than to tend the 360 million acres of cropland, "Surely," you say, "farmers will not continue to use their labor to produce crops at a loss." This item of labor too requires close examination. American farmers now furnish around 80 percent of all labor needed to operate the 360 million acres; and hire 20 percent of the labor needed. This 20 percent is not just added labor but it fits into the whole farm organization and operation. To completely dispense with the 20 percent of hired labor would in many cases render much of the farmer's 80 percent of labor nonproductive. If the 80 percent of unpaid labor which farmers and their family contribute to the operation of farms is not used it becomes a complete loss. Farmers cannot let their labor remain idle; and for farmers as a whole, this labor has no other use and market except its use in operating the farm power, and tending the 360 million acres of cropland, and the livestock on American farms. In all effects, therefore, this labor becomes a fixed cost on farms in the same sense taxes are a fixed cost. Despite low prices, and surpluses, the farmer loses more when he fails to use his labor than when he uses it to its full capacity.

WE SHALL NOT WANT FOR ENOUGH FARMERS TO OPERATE ALL OUR FARMS

This fixed land costs and supply, and these fixed power and labor supplies and costs, are almost unfailing insurance of full output efforts by the farmer, but they are not the complete set of forces insuring full output from our farms. For we are insured of a full supply of farmers in years to come. We need from 150,000 to 200,000 new farmers each year to replace dying and retiring farmers. For the past 30 years we have reared enough farm boys to supply this replacement, and in addition have sent annually a net of around 250,000 boys from our farms to cities. In other words, we have had more than twice as many farm-reared boys to supply replacement farmers as we needed. There's no probabilities that we'll have a shortage of new farmers to man our farms in the near future. This insurance factor for full output and surplus production is ample and certain.

INCREASE USE OF ELECTRICITY AND CONTINUED SURPLUSES

The great change in the increased productive power and surplus producing capacity of our farms compared with those of two decades ago is revealed by another remarkable change during these two decades—the great expansion in the use of electricity on farms.

During the past two decades we have changed from an agricultural economy where electricity was rarely known on our farms to an economy where it is rare to find a farm of any proportions not served by electric power. To say nothing of this great boon as a means of adding to the comfort and attractiveness of farm life (probably the greatest single blessing brought to our farm families during the past 20 years) its productive effects cannot be adequately measured.

The miscellaneous or "nonfield" work on farms such as feeding, grinding, lifting, cleaning, transporting, sawing, cutting, watering, painting, etc., constitute slightly over half of all work required to operate an average farm. Yet this work, as a rule, is subject to far greater laborsaving by use of electric machines, power, light, and heat than the laborsaving of power and machines used in the field. For example, a man or a woman operating a pump handle to lift water is worth less than 1½ cents per hour of electricity and motor costs doing the same job. Yet we have (due to the late arrival of electric power on our farms prior to world war) just began to scratch the surface of the added productive power of electricity on our farms. It has already been the basic factor in revolutionizing the broiler industry. In the years ahead greatly increased use of electricity will bring new productive power to farmers. A large part of our increased farm output in the years ahead will doubtless result from increased use of electricity.

RESEARCH AND CONTINUED SURPLUS PRODUCTION

A final factor for full output and continued surpluses is available in our great reservoir of agricultural research and education. A recent study of the Department of Agriculture concluded that if farmers used their presently available know-how, they could increase the volume of our output by from 50 to 75 percent from the same acres of crops and pastures, and from the same number of livestock, as we are now using.

Secretary Benson in a recent speech stated that a preliminary study of market waste indicates that around one-third of all food and feed value produced on our 360 million crop acres is wasted, that much of this waste can be prevented, and that its prevention roughly represented a possible increase of one-third of our potential food and feed supply.

POPULATION IS NOT LIKELY TO OUTSTRIP OUR SURPLUS PRODUCTION

If these factors insured only a stable full output our rapidly expanding population would soon catch up with output and we could expect surpluses to disappear. But these factors of full output have in the past insured expanding full output, not stationary full output.

The average volume of output in 1940–44 was 21 percent greater than it was for the previous 5-year period of 1935–39. In 1945–50 it was 35 percent larger; and in the last 5 years, 1950–54, it was 40 percent larger than in 1935–39. Despite the fact that this year has seen one of the worst droughts in history in many sections of the country, our volume of output has been maintained. Crop production is down 4 percent from the average for the 3 preceding years but livestock production is up 6 percent, making the overall output exactly the same as the 3 prior years' average.

THE GREAT NATIONAL VALUE OF OUR SURPLUSES

This stability of output from farms is uncanny in its dependability and its value to our democracy is beyond measure. It has doubtless been the preserver of our democratic way of life through more than one economic crisis. For example, had farm output been cut in 1933 to 57 percent of production in 1929, as was the case with industrial production, millions of people in our great cities would have starved; and under such a calamity our vaunted democracy would have probably ceased to exist. The stability of our production of food regardless of peace, war, depression, prosperity, and other changes, is of profound significance to the continuity of our liberties as a people, and to our leadership among the free nations. So, although our surpluses may present great difficulties to us, they are not unmixed curses, but essentially are great blessings if we use them as blessings.

Even a small surplus of most foods can have a profoundly depressing influence on market prices of the surplus foods. This is due to the well-known and everyday fact that the supply and price of most foods have a highly sensitive relation, or foods have an "inelastic demand," as the economist calls it. Consumers are willing to pay good prices for as much food as they need, but beyond this supply their paying price drops to prices that can, and often do, bankrupt producers. This is why surplus food supplies, if freely put on the market, often prove financially disastrous to farmers. This is also the reason why, since American farmers, in the years ahead, face inevitable surpluses in excess of our domestic needs, we must devise sensible means of disposal of these surpluses.

Although we have confronted surpluses in this sense for years, we, as a Nation, have not planned seriously for marketing these export surpluses to the best advantage of our farm producers and of people abroad who need them.

The current markets of the world for our export surpluses are in great disorganization and chaos. Many nations need these surpluses badly, but are unable since World War II to obtain dollar purchasing power to buy our surplus farm products, even at prices far below our domestic support prices. During the past few years we have used numerous makeshift arrangements to sell our Government surpluses at prices much below the price the Government paid farmers for these surpluses. As long as farmers receive the benefit of domestic price support above the price their surpluses will bring on the fully competitive world market, this dual price structure, this sale of our surpluses abroad at lower than domestic support prices, is inevitable.

WE HAVE MADE A CONSTRUCTIVE START AT SURPLUS DISPOSAL

During the 2d session of the recent, 83d Congress, the first serious, systematic, effort was made to deal with this farm surplus market problem. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 made it possible for our Government agencies, for private corporations and companies, and for organized relief agencies to dispose of Government-owned surpluses in countries that do not have dollar exchange; and for purchasing countries to settle for these surpluses in their own currencies. These local currencies can then be used for many purposes mutually agreeable to the buying country and representatives of the United States. Some of these authorized uses are: To buy strategic and stockpile minerals for the United States Government; for investment in productive enterprises in the country; for grants for charitable and educational purposes in the country by the United States Government or by charitable and nonprofit organizations such as CARE; and for loans for self-liquidating self-help projects of all kinds.

As an example of how this law will enable us to open up or tap new markets, I can cite a recent experience I had in Bolivia. A modern cotton mill in La Paz, the capital city, is able to buy in the normal cotton markets enough cotton to keep one shift per day working only part of the day; yet Bolivian citizens could use and buy in local currencies cotton goods in amounts that would keep this mill running 3 shifts, 24 hours in the day. But Bolivia does not have, and cannot get under present world commercial markets, enough dollar exchange to buy this cotton that it and its people sorely need.

If this cotton can be sold for local currency and this currency used to help resettle Indians, now living on cold bleak unproductive mountain lands, on lands in the valleys on the eastern slopes of the Andes, the investment in such resettlement, by any reasonable calculation, will in time pay back the loans and a 20-percent return in addition.

In Bolivia around 2 million or more Indian farmers that are direct descendants of the highly civilized Inca Empire of pre-Spanish days now eke out a miserable existence on bleak treeless plains that are 13,000 feet above sea level; because, heretofore,

these people could not protect their health in the moist subtropical but productive lands east of the Andes. Yet today there are many settlements east of the Andes that are protected by relatively inexpensive health measures that are relatively prosperous healthy communities. These resettlement projects alone could yield profitable returns on enormous new investments if they are soundly conceived and managed. At the same time such extensive resettlements would do much good toward leading the Bolivian nation to a sound stable democratic nation.

CARE, which is a cooperative nonprofit organization, was originally established to ship food and clothing packages to war-hungry and war-ravaged people in Europe and elsewhere. Its functions have gradually shifted to services of helping people help themselves by supplying such things as a kit of carpenter or shoemaking tools to a war refugee in the refugee camps; by supplying plows to peasants in India, who heretofore plowed with wooden plows; and to supplying glass jars to Grecian women to enable them to can vegetables and fruit which they have until now been unable to save from spoilage.

To enable CARE to supply more flexible but nonprofit yielding assistance to small productive enterprises in backward countries, CARE has recently organized the CARE Development Corporation to promote self-help projects in these countries. These enterprises will be supplied needed capital by the corporation as well as technical guidance. Capital will be loaned at 4 percent, and when repaid from earnings of the self-help project, will be placed in a revolving fund for reinvestment in other self-help projects. In the meantime CARE proposes to employ competent technicians and managers to operate self-help projects, until local competent talent is developed; at which time full control and management of self-help projects will be released to the local people.

Under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, surpluses can be sold to a country and local currencies used as investment in such self-help projects as those I have described. Under this law private concerns or nonprofit organizations, such as CARE, could be used under United States Government supervision to use funds raised by surplus sales for investing in self-help enterprises.

CONCLUSIONS

From the basic factors making for continued expanded full output, which I have enumerated and discussed, the conclusion seems adequately justified, that we shall be confronted with surplus production for years to come. On the disposal side of the surplus problem, world conditions and abnormal world market situations, do not give bright prospects of selling these surpluses for dollars, without dragging world prices—prices of our own farmer and other farmers—to disasterously low levels. We cannot afford to have this predicament happen—both because of our domestic economy and our international relations.

On the other hand, if this problem can be constructively met by a well conceived national policy of using these surpluses to feed and clothe people abroad the problem can be turned into a great service to us and them. This can be done in a way which I feel certain will return us a maximum of tangible and intangible value from our surpluses; and permit needy people abroad to contribute as much as possible in payment for these surpluses, and incidentally enable them to undertake self-help programs in their countries. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is a constructive beginning in the use of these surpluses. The probability of continued surpluses makes it necessary to perfect this act and our plan of using these surpluses in a sound, satisfactory way.

Hail to the REA on Its 20th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of real pleasure and personal satisfaction for me to arise on the floor of the House and pay tribute to the marvelous Rural Eelectrification Administration on its 20th anniversary. Truly, the program of this Federal agency is such a remarkable one that we should not let this day pass without recalling the origin and development of this outstanding Administration, together with the leaders and members of the local REA cooperatives who really did the job.

As we look back at the origin of the Rural Electrification Administration program, it is amazing to see how it ever survived. For it began in the dark days of the depression as a work-relief program, and ended up as one of the finest technical accomplishments in the Federal Government.

In the State of Louisiana the REA program is a great local institution. I know about it first hand and can tell you that this is one program that is really popular with our people.

It is easy to see why the REA program is so well-liked in Louisiana. All you have to do is to look at the record of accomplishment. It is hard to believe that back in 1934 when the REA was born only 1.7 percent of our 170,216 farmers, or 2,826, had central station high-line service. In other words, less than 2 percent of our farms had central station electric service. I believe that is about as close as you can get to the bottom and still have some rural electrification. Yet Louisiana was exactly in that status in 1934.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride for me to give you the rural electrification picture in my State of Louisiana today. The puny percentage of 1.7 percent has grown to 92.5 percent today. In other words, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, 114,917 Louisiana farms now receive central station electric service. This is an increase of 112,091 farms that have been electrified since 1934. Use any standards you desire and I believe you will agree this is truly a remarkable accomplishment.

This tremendous increase in rural electrification did not come about accidentally. The road was long, the disappointments were many, and the battle was continuous. A whole generation of pioneers was needed to carry on this valiant struggle. The private utilities had attempted to do the job at a price the farmers could afford to pay, but had not succeeded. So the rural folks themselves undertook the arduous task of banding together and forming their own local REA cooperatives in order to perform this essential task.

At the same time, their efforts would have been futile if we did not have in Congress men with vision and leadership like our present distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAMUEL RAYBURN, and his late colleague in the Senate, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska. Let us pay the highest tribute to these distinguished citizens who worked so hard and continuously to make a successful REA program possible.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for very public-minded Member of this body when I state the REA program is a tribute to America and is the kind of local program that is settling a pattern nationally and locally for the democracies of the world to follow. I am glad to have played a part in that program and will continue to support the REA as long as it serves these vital needs of our people.

With the Development of International Travel Comes International Understanding and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this year a million Americans will travel abroad and spend an estimated $1.5 billion. Half of this number are expected to visit Europe alone, with the rest visiting all parts of the world. The United States Government has recognized the importance of world travel both as an instrument for bolstering foreign economies without burdening the American taxpayer and as an excellent means for cultural interchange in the battle for men's minds in which we are presently engaged with the totalitarian powers.

On March 31, Mr. Preston Hotchkis, United States representative on the United Nations Economic and Social Council made a key speech on behalf of the United Nations resolution to encourage international travel.

The text of that address is appended hereto:

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

Peace—a continued effort to develop and enhance its prospects—prosperity, and improving standards of living.

These are crops which are harvested by increased international travel. And these are the major objectives of the United Nations as set forth in the charter.

Therefore the United States Government is gratified that international travel has been given its proper recognition by being placed upon the agenda of this session of the Economic and Social Council.

Travel from one country to another is not only an indication of peace and good will among nations, but it produces a chain reaction—the greater the volume of travel, the more people know about other countries and their peoples, the less become the prejudices, and the greater the prospects of lasting peace.

It is not too much to say that every traveler is a potential student and teacher and emissary of good will. But our primary emphasis at the moment is on the economic benefits

of international travel rather than on the social and cultural benefits that are also present.

My Government has submitted a paper (E/2688, dated February 15, 1955) which sets forth the large part which travel plays in international trade, its potential for growth, and certain constructive measures which can be exerted toward its further encouragement. My remarks today will highlight some of the points covered in the paper.

During World War II international travel was almost nonexistent. Since then, however, it is showing a healthy growth, but the opportunity for still greater development is tremendous.

In saying this I realize that there still remain some obstacles and barriers for free travel from one country to another. In fact, if it were not for the tensions that have developed in some parts of the world, we might not now be troubled by the remaining border crossing formalities which harass the international traveler in many countries, including our own; but the realities of the existing situation remain and must be dealt with in the interests of national security.

During the past few years many unnecessary restrictions to travel have been removed. A number of countries have embarked on tourist development programs with outstanding success. International travel has become one of the major factors in world trade. For example, the spending by United States residents in foreign travel is now equivalent to approximately 10 percent of total United States exports. In other words, our travelers have provided foreign countries with sufficient dollars to enable them to pay for approximately one-tenth of their total commercial purchases from this country.

Striking examples may be cited of the rapidity with which a substantial tourist industry can be built up by effective promotional efforts.

Puerto Rico in 1948 earned approximately $5.6 million from 58,000 visitors. This was increased by 1953 to $23 million and 110,000 visitors.

Nassau in 1947 had about 30,000 visitors; by 1950 the number had increased to 84,000.

Similar success stories are provided by Canada, Mexico, Hawaii, Bermuda, Jamaica, and other popular tourist areas.

Under its own energetic travel promotion program, Great Britain increased its dollar earnings from tourism from $56 million in 1948 to $110 million in 1954.

In 1949 the European Travel Commission launched a cooperative regional travel promotion campaign in the United States for Western Europe as a whole. These activities have helped to increase United States citizens' travel to Europe from 183,000 in 1948 to an estimated 456,000 in 1954. During the same period Europe's direct earnings from tourist expenditures climbed from $128 million to an estimated $330 million—and if United States tourist expenditures on Europe's ships and planes are included, total earnings passed the half-billion mark. All current indications point to the fact that both the volume of United States visitors to Europe and the amounts expended there during 1955 will be considerably higher.

UNITED STATES ACTIVITIES

Recognizing the importance of international travel, President Eisenhower in two recent messages to Congress cited its cultural, social, and economic significance, and called attention to the substantial source of dollars which foreign travel by United States citizens provides for many foreign countries. The President also instructed the appropriate agencies and departments of the Government to consider means to facilitate international travel.

Specifically what is the volume of United States travel to foreign countries? Latest estimates show that United States residents in 1954 spent $972 million for actual expenditures in foreign countries and $183 million in payments to foreign carriers; a total of $1,155,000,000 paid to foreign countries. In addition $211 million were spent in payments to United States carriers. The grand total of $1,366,000,000 was about 7 percent more than that for 1953, and it is expected that 1955 will show a further healthy increase.

In the United States the travel industry is well organized. There are the carriers—air, steamship, railroads, buses, and all the facilities which transport passengers including private automobiles. A large part of the efforts of these enterprises, both individually and through active associations, concern travel beyond the boundaries of the United States. There are several thousand travel agents engaged in the business of arranging trips and accommodations for their clients and energetically working to increase their numbers. There are national associations such as the American Society of Travel Agents, the National Association of Travel Organizations, and the American Automobile Association. The hotel and motel industry with its national trade organizations contributes much to this dynamic industry. Newspapers, magazines, and trade journals carry large volumes of editorial material, advertising, and travel news.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

International activities by governmental and private organizations are impressive in their scope. In the United Nations the Transport and Communications Commission has performed much useful work, and is continuing to give attention to the problem of international travel. A recommendation by the Commission that a new inquiry be made among governments as to the progress that has been made in implementing the recommendations of the 1947 conference of experts on border crossing and frontier formalities will be before the Council in May. Favorable action upon this meritorious proposal will provide helpful data on the continuing activities of many governments to simplify procedures for tourists. A convention on road traffic was prepared in 1949, simplifying and standardizing formalities for international motoring, and has been ratified to date by 18 nations. Further ratifications are desirable to bring this agreement fully into effect among all nations which desire to encourage the growth and safety of international travel by automobile. More recently, in 1954, two new international agreements were drawn up at a United Nations conference, looking toward the simplification and standardization of customs formalities for automobiles, and for personal effects of tourists in general. Through reports submitted to its periodic meetings the Transport and Communications Commission is keeping abreast of developments in the field of international travel.

There are numerous other examples of useful operations. The International Civil Aviation Organization is steadily carrying forward its program of facilitation for air passengers and cargo, and the beneficial results of this activity are felt in other fields than that of air transport alone. UNESCO is also doing helpful work in promoting the development of travel. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation has made outstanding contributions to facilitating travel through obtaining wide reduction or elimination of visa requirements among its member countries, and these benefits have also been extended to United States citizens. The European Travel Commission has an extensive promotional program, financed by OEEC, including advertising and publicity in the United States. Among other energetic organizations are the International Union of Official Travel Organizations, the International Air Transport Association, the International Chamber of Commerce, the World Touring and Automobile Organization, the Pacific Area Travel Association, and the Caribbean Tourist Association. The Inter-American Travel Congresses have stimulated interest in travel in the Western Hemisphere. It should be noted with appreciation that the International Union of Official Travel Organizations and the World Touring and Automobile Organization have submitted useful papers which are included in the documentation for the present session (E/C.2/412 and 413).

At a meeting of Ministers of Finance and Economy in Rio de Janeiro in November 1954 a resolution was unanimously adopted calling for constructive action by all of the American Republics on promotion of international travel and tourism. The resolution recommended that helpful consideration be given to the problems of travel development, with special attention to the strengthening and supporting of official and private agencies engaged in the development of tourism. It also recommended the preparation of sound technical assistance projects in such fields as hotel construction and operation, and promotional aspects of travel development including publicity and advertising. Further, it encouraged the improvement of tourist attractions such as health resorts, parks, historical, and archeological sites. Thus at Rio de Janeiro, in an atmosphere similar to that of our session today, high government officials joined in declaring the importance of international travel and in indicating initial steps for action.

Even the most remote corners of the world are becoming aware of the advantages of tourism. American newspapers this month carried an account of the arrival at Katmandu, Nepal, of a first party of 12 visitors. The report epitomized the way in which organized travel develops, by recounting how Nepalese officials suggested some months ago to an international travel agency that a tour be arranged, and how the agency promptly included a visit to Nepal in a round-the-world voyage it was conducting. Now in Katmandu, Government officials are talking of the new revenues to come from tourists, hotel facilities have been organized, and young men are planning careers as tourist guides.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Now what exactly do we mean by the word "tourist"? It is well to give a clear definition of the word because in some areas of the world it is used in too restricted a sense as only a sightseeing traveler. We use the term in its broadest sense—that is, the bona fide nonimmigrant who desires to make a temporary visit to a foreign country for any legitimate purpose.

Programs to attract tourists should have a particularly strong appeal to countries which now depend on 1 or 2 major items for most of their foreign exchange. Tourism brings a relatively stable source of income, less subject to sudden shifts in world prices, and yet requires only limited investment, primarily for hotels and advertising or publicity.

In facing the problem of lowering costs of travel and making it more available to a wider segment of the world's population, consideration should be given to development of off-season travel—more aptly termed "thrift-season" travel. When hotels, planes, ships or other facilities are provided to cater to a short season of a few peak months, prices tend to be high. Those tourist areas which have, through strong promotional efforts, together with the help of the carriers, developed a year-round tourist industry, have found it possible to provide low-cost travel packages of interest to a broad market. Continued efforts to extend the tourist season is highly desirable. In a number of areas great strides in this direction are already in evidence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the paper which my Government submitted to the United Nations in February, a number of specific proposals were offered for consideration by the council in the encouragement of international travel. These are also embodied in a resolution which is now before the council. Upon them I would like to comment as follows:

1. Granted that there is general recognition of the place of travel in the field of international trade and friendly relationships, effective development depends upon the individual countries. In each nation, increased attention to travel is needed as an important phase of its economic growth. This entails study of the current and potential travel market, tourist attractions and facilities, border-crossing formalities, promotional efforts—and the preparation of an efficient development program.

2. Because of distance and cost factors, regional travel presents advantages in attracting large numbers of visitors. Within any region, and particularly between neighboring countries, special measures for facilitating travel are possible, and indeed have been well developed in certain areas.

3. There is already a wealth of experience and talent available in the numerous official and private agencies engaged in the development of tourism. These resources should be strengthened and supported. Successful tourist development programs, in countries where a rapid growth of inbound tourists has been desired, have demonstrated the importance of strong governmental financial support of tourist promotional activities. The sale of a country's tourist attractions to people of other countries requires government funds for the establishment of foreign promotional offices, and for paid advertising, publicity and other sales development activities. Local tourist service industries receiving tourist income are usually too small to carry out effective foreign sales programs of their own.

4. In some areas, adequate hotel and other facilities are lacking, and this acts as a basic deterrent to travel. Now that means of transportation are readily available to almost any point on the globe, a dearth of living accommodations may be the sole obstacle to a flow of visitors. Here would seem to be a fruitful field for the provision of governmental incentives for the encouragement of private investment.

5. Countries possessing well-developed tourist programs and facilities have an opportunity and an obligation to assist those with less experience, if the goal of an expanded world travel market is to be attained. Technical coperation projects may be an answer to this problem, and are worthy of prompt consideration.

6. International conventions, drawn up at United Nations conferences and representing the best judgment of governmental authorities and other competent experts, provide a means of unified action by the nations. The United Nations conventions on road traffic (1949), on temporary importation of road vehicles (1954) and on customs facilities for touring (1954) are examples. Wide ratification of these agreements will provide a solid foundation for expansion and encouragement of international travel.

7. Statistics relating to travel are a fundamental requirement for intelligent planning. Improvement in their accuracy, comprehensiveness, and timeliness is desirable. Each country can well give attention to this problem. Means also should be found for establishing greater uniformity and comparability in travel statistics, and the services of the United Nations should be made available in arriving at uniform methods of compilation.

8. The problem of reducing border-crossing formalities to the fullest extent practicable requires constant study. These formalities include passports, visas, health and police certificates, travel taxes, exchange controls and other restrictive factors. In this area, the desirable freedom of movement of the traveler must be viewed in the light of the national security and welfare, but any improvement in world conditions should be reflected in an easing of current restrictions.

Land Reform in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an article from the Manila Bulletin of Monday, March 28, entitled "The 'Quiet Ambassador' Interviewed," setting forth the views of Adm. Raymond A. Spruance, upon his retirement as Ambassador to the Philippines.

Admiral Spruance showed a keen insight into the problems of the Philippines, and offered some sound advice about the importance of sensible land reform as essential to progress and development. His statement echoes statements I have repeatedly made about the need for our Government to take greater recognition of this problem in its international relations, and to give more of the kind of encouragement Ambassador Spruance was willing to give as his parting advice.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE QUIET AMBASSADOR INTERVIEWED—SPRUANCE GIVES HIS PARTING ADVICE ON PHILIPPINE ISLANDS LAND REFORM—UNITED STATES ENVOY RETIRING FOR SECOND TIME, LEAVES SOON FOR HOME IN CALIFORNIA

Ambassador Raymond A. Spruance's parting advice to the Philippines rests upon his deep conviction that sensible land reform is essential to the progress and orderly development of the nation.

The Ambassador is leaving very soon for good. With Mrs. Spruance he will fly to Hong Kong and there board a steamer for a leisurely voyage to the United States, where he will retire from public life and government service for the second time. They will resume residence at their comfortable home near the sea in Monterey, Calif., interrupted 3 years ago at the request of the President of the United States.

A few days past, at the Bulletin's request, he granted one of his rare interviews for this annual edition. It could be called a distillation of his thoughts and experiences of the last 37 months as Ambassador and chief of one of the largest Government missions the United States maintains abroad.

"You have in this country," he said, "a lot of unproductive land whose owners are content to let it remain idle while the pressures of increasing population boost its value. This is not a wholesome situation. It is a cause of unrest which can turn into rebellion, as it did in central Luzon after the war."

By land reform Ambassador Spruance means not just tenancy reform, giving the tenant farmer a better share of the crop he plants and harvests and getting him out of debt. He means an additional reform of the whole social structure built upon land ownership. He believes it can be accomplished partly through revision of assessment and tax application on land all over the islands.

He believes President Magsaysay, with his great strength and popularity among the people, could accomplish it by securing passage of the necessary tax laws.

"Remember," he said, "that in the Philippines the assessed value of landed property is sometimes as low as 10 percent of its selling value. Land taxes are rarely more than 1½ to 2 percent of the assessed value. And on top of that the percentage of people who do not pay any taxes at all is large."

The Ambassador believes that sensible assessment and taxation would induce landowners to sell their relatively unproductive property to people who would work it more productively. When a man knows it is going to cost him money in the form of Government taxes every year to retain ownership of property that produces little or no income to offset the taxes, he is going to do something about it. He will sell it rather than see its increasing value more than eaten up by the taxes he has to pay. The Government would benefit from increased taxes and the nation would benefit from increased production and greater employment.

The Ambassador fully realizes that strong opposition would be encountered to effective land-reform measures. He knows the present system is an inheritance from Spanish practices. Nobles and favorites acquired lands from the Spanish Crown, upon which they paid no taxes. They allowed peasants to till the soil under the old feudal system and gathered the profits of production. When the feudal system went out, portions of its structure remained. Basic changes are slow to come.

But he believes that President Magsaysay could get a land-reform program in the form of a bill passed by the Congress in spite of the opposition.

"Let the Congress vote openly on such a bill," said Ambassador Spruance. "Let the people know who opposes land reform. It takes a lot of political courage for a congressman to stand up and oppose the will of the people."

The position of the landowner who actively opposes reform is not basically sound, the Ambassador believes. He is perpetuating conditions of unrest which can lead to serious consequences and the loss of his own property and position through uncontrolled disorder. In the long run he is hurting himself.

It is the same with the wealthy person who appeases and contributes secretly to communism and Communist causes, in order to hedge against what he believes to be a possible victory for Russia and China after the dust has settled. A man has only to look at what has happened in every Communist-controlled nation. The help of the rich is welcomed so long as it is useful. When the Communists are in control then the landowners are the first to be put to death, as in China.

The landowner's only sensible course of thought and action is to resist communism with all his strength and to help create conditions under which communism cannot thrive. Promotion of land reform is one way to help create such conditions.

On questions of land reform Ambassador Spruance is not speaking merely from experience gained in the Philippines. Strange as it may seem for a man with a distinguished naval career behind him, he has been a student of land reform for many years. While climbing the promotion ladder in the United States Navy his hobby was reading on the economics of land tenure. The knowledge gained was useful to him as an Ambassador and statesman.

Admiral Spruance—the title comes more naturally to him than Ambassador

Spruance—has become known as the quiet Ambassador. He simply does not do any unnecessary talking, in public or in private, but when he does speak he always has something worth saying. In consequence he has established and retained the deep and often affectionate respect of both Filipinos and Americans. The parting tributes paid to him would be much more numerous and elaborate if he would permit himself to be lionized. He does not permit it. He shuns expressions of gratitude as he does publicity.

Admiral Spruance is 68. He was born July 3, 1886 in Baltimore, Md. and was graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1906. His naval career was steadily brilliant but never spectacular until his responsibilities in the war of the Pacific brought him into the limelight in spite of himself. He has been credited with turning defeat into victory for the democratic powers at the Battle of Midway on June 4, 1942. A noted naval historian, Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, has written that Admiral Spruance's wise command decisions "made it possible to change the course of history in 2 minutes." Spruance shared honors with a colleague, Adm. Frank Jack Fletcher, each having a task force under command at the time.

Spruance and Fletcher were badly outnumbered. Adm. Chester Nimitz's Pacific Fleet, crippled at Pearl Harbor, could muster only 3 large carriers against Japan's 4 to 6. Japan had 11 battleships against none for the Americans, 14 heavy cruisers against 8, and 45 destroyers against 15. Thanks to knowledge of Japan's top secret naval codes the American Navy was able to deploy its outnumbered ships to the right places at the right time. The Japanese won the first rounds, destroying or driving off all American planes sent against them without damage to themselves. Then Admiral Nagumo's luck ran out—or rather, as Morison says, Spruance and Fletcher had been making some better command decisions than Nagumo.

While Nagumo was ordering his carriers to switch from bombs and torpedoes for hitting the American warships to incendiary and fragmentation missiles for a second attack on Midway, air groups from the three American carriers were on their way to attack the Japanese.

Within a few minutes the dive bombers found and hit the Japanese carriers *Akagi* and *Kaga* and a few minutes later the *Soryu*. The fourth, the *Hiryu*, remained undamaged, to deal a mortal blow to the American carrier *Yorktown* but was knocked out later in the day. Japan's finest pilots and planes went to the bottom of the Pacific. The slow march back to liberation could now begin. Said Morison:

"It was a victory of brave and skillful aviators of intelligence intelligently applied, and of wise command decisions. Fletcher did well, and Spruance's performance was superb."

For his services at Midway, Admiral Spruance won the Distinguished Service Medal and a Presidential Unit Citation. In August of 1943 he became commander of the Central Pacific Force, which designation was changed the following April to commander of the 5th Fleet. He had already received two gold stars in recognition of the second and third Distinguished Service Medals in engagements ranging all over the central and western Pacific. For his accomplishments with the 5th Fleet he was given the Navy Cross. The citation read: "For extraordinary heroism * * * during the invasion and capture of Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, and Okinawa. * * * Responsible for the operation of a vast and complicated organization which included more than 500,000 men, 318 combat vessels, 1,139 auxiliary vessels, Admiral Spruance directed the forces under his command with daring, courage, and aggressiveness."

He was awarded another Distinguished Service Medal by the Army, many of whose men he had under his command during the Pacific operations. In 1945 he relieved Admiral Nimitz at Pearl Harbor as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas. Later he was ordered to duty as President of the Naval War College and was retired in 1948.

Admiral Spruance could wear a chestful of medals beside the ones mentioned, but he almost never does. As Ambassador he dresses like any civilian in the tropics. He has been decorated by Greece, Great Britain, and Belgium.

In June of 1954 the Spruances went to the United States for a brief visit, during which the admiral received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Yale University. The tribute paid to him at that time was as follows:

"Twelve years and three days ago the dawn of a day broke in mid-Pacific which was to make the names of *Midway*, *Enterprise*, and *Hornet* forever glorious in our history. It has been said of that day that 'you emerged from battle one of the greatest fighting and thinking admirals in American history.'

"At the end of the war, after serving as president of the Naval War College, you answered the call of duty to serve in a new and even more exacting role as Ambassador of your country. As such you have become a strong friend and wise counselor to a young nation struggling with almost overpowering problems; rarely has it fallen to a man to nourish in peace a country whose freedom he did so much to save in war.

"Tireless in preparation, never deflected from your mission, considerate of your subordinates, loyal to your superiors, you are the very ideal of the captain's admiral. In only one effort have you failed—to conceal the genuine and generous warmth of heart which powers your nature. Honoring you as one of the most useful and trusted citizens of our time, Yale confers upon you the degree of doctor of laws."

That was the kind of man that took over the exacting and trying duties of Ambassador to the Philippines in 1952. Rarely in the public eye, never in the limelight, his successful discharge of duties as Ambassador is reflected in the present state of cordial relations between the two countries. They were never better.

There have been disappointments, the Ambassador admits. He wishes that pending questions concerning American military bases in the Philippines and American Government ownership of property in the Philippines had been settled, as they should have been, long ago. But Philippine officialdom has never seen fit to settle down and talk out the problems clearly presented to them.

The political pressures confronting President Magsaysay are a source of regret to the Ambassador, and, one suspects, strong sympathy for a harassed chief executive. It is his expressed hope that President Magsaysay will more fully realize and make use of the powers that are his, conferred by an admiring and loyal political following throughout the nation. He feels that assertion of authority would melt a large part of the opposition and make the nation's multitudinous economic and social problems easier of solution.

The Spruance brand of diplomacy is an iron hand in a velvet glove. It has worked well here in all his relationships.

Everybody's Against Sin, But Not Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an interesting article on subsidies prepared by Mr. Clay Cochran, staff economist of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The article which follows appeared in the May issue of Rural Electrification magazine. Here is Mr. Cochran's article, which I recommend to my colleagues:

Subsidies are an ancient practice and problem. Technically, I guess, the oldest subsidy of which there is any record was the gift to Adam and Eve of the Garden of Eden.

As I recall the story, the Lord gave Adam and his spouse quite a nice setup and forbade them only one thing—the fruit from one of the trees. This was a fine, generous subsidy and should have satisfied anyone, but Eve, apparently a monopolist at heart, couldn't bear the thought of being denied anything so she connived to violate the subsidy agreement.

To achieve this end, she began to feed Adam propaganda about the matter, and attributed the propaganda to a forerunner of the modern Wall Street lobbyist. Adam, a simple and honest consumer at heart, ended up helping Eve achieve her monopolistic design, not because he was evil, but just because he didn't keep his wits about him. The result was that greed led to the cancellation of the whole subsidy arrangement, and Adam and Eve both had to go to work.

Since that first subsidy, we have had subsidies of numerous and varied types. Some subsidies are nice straightforward deals, out on the table, in the open. In the old days in England, the Parliament would tax the people and turn the money over to the king who used much of it up in high living but used part of it for public purposes. This money was openly referred to as a subsidy. But open subsidies are very rare in modern society. We have become very subtle. We find devious ways of giving subsidies, and the ways are so devious that many of the people never realize that a subsidy is being given.

The dictionary says that a subsidy is "a government grant to assist a private enterprise deemed advantageous to the public." The history of this country is full of instances of subsidy. Early organizers of colonies on this continent were paid subsidies in money for each settler they brought in; others were paid subsidies in land for establishing colonies and building forts. The gifts in land, in some instances as in New York, enabled the colonizer to levy rents and taxes upon his colonists—a kind of continuing subsidy to him with the free land as a base on which to collect it.

Less than a century ago the Congress voted millions of acres of land as a gift to the railroad promoters for building railroads across the country. This is one of the greatest single subsidies in our history.

JUMBO-SIZED SUBSIDY

But the greatest subsidy in this Nation was and is the tariff system, which has been in effect 125 years. It is also one of the more subtle subsidies. It was not a cash grant nor a grant in land, nor any other visible form. It was simply a Chinese wall built around the United States to keep goods out and which, in effect, levied a tax upon the American consumer. The immediate benefits of the tariff went to the investors and managers of manufacturing establishments, and the job protection for workers in tariff-protected industries is only a secondary and temporary benefit. And the tariff was and remains a clear subsidy designed to promote domestic manufacturing and other lines of activity at the expense of the community at large.

Subsidies in our society are common as sin, but subsidies, unlike sin, are not necessarily bad. Remember the definition of a subsidy: "It is a payment by government, direct or indirect, to assist a private enterprise deemed advantageous to the public."

THE SUBSIDY BLUES

Most people who get subsidies don't like to admit they are subsidized. This is partly because most people don't understand that subsidies are an ancient and honorable way of getting something done which the community desires to have done. But that is not all. Most people object to being called subsidized because they are always afraid that somebody will try to take the subsidy away or reduce it. It is frequently as painful to have part of your subsidy removed as it is to have part of your stomach removed. Another reason that some line of business enterprise objects to the public knowing it is subsidized is because this same business is busy denouncing subsidy to some other group.

People who live in subsidized glasshouses should not throw propaganda rocks. All of you have listened to or read the propaganda of the so-called investor-owned, business-managed, taxpaying private electric companies. In their propaganda, these poor, downtrodden electric sharecroppers—worth only about $26 billion—have wailed about their sad problems, about the unfair subsidies which they claim the Government gives to rural-electric cooperatives and the Federal power program.

All the while their profits have risen, dividends have increased, and the prices of their securities have passed or are passing the giddy peaks of 1929.

PUTTING UP A FRONT

The private electric companies operate through more fronts than you can poke a stick at, and each front peddles a different line of propaganda. But whether you are getting propaganda from the National Association of Electric Companies, the Edison Electric Institute, the Public Information Program, Ebasco Services, N. W. Ayres Co., Bozell & Jacobs (the public relations firm), Electric World, Industrial News Review, the Association of State Chambers of Commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Tax Equality Association, or Dixon and Yates—they all echo the charge that rural-electric cooperatives and the Federal power program are subsidized, whereas the investor-owned, business-managed, taxpaying private electric companies pay their own way; that is they receive no subsidies.

By comparison, the co-ops are charged with receiving a variety of subsidies. According to the propaganda, the co-ops pay no taxes, get their money at a subsidized interest rate, and get services from REA which they do not pay for. Then there is the Federal power program which, according to the propaganda, doesn't pay its own way. The Federal power agencies, so the utilities say, do not pay off their capital costs, do not pay enough interest, do not pay taxes, and so on and on. And the cooperatives, over 300 of them, purchase part or all of their power from Federal agencies—so they are tarred with two subsidy brushes—one marked anticooperative propaganda and the other marked anti-Federal power propaganda.

So here we have the power company mural—electric co-ops rolling in subsidy—private utilities efficiently managed, pure and sweet, thrifty, clean, and unsubsidized, generously digging into their bank accounts to pay taxes co-ops evade.

TURNABOUT UNFAIR PLAY?

Now, what about these subsidies? First, on our side: Electric co-ops in most states pay all the taxes any private electric company pays except Federal income taxes because co-ops make no profit and corporation income taxes are levied on profits. Any private electric company can reduce its income taxes by reducing its profits and it can stop paying income taxes altogether by stopping profit making, in other words, by becoming a cooperative. Can you imagine what screams we would hear if the rural electric cooperatives began to demand that all electric companies become nonprofit, either public or cooperative? But the same, poor, thrifty, hard-working, barefoot boys, by demanding that we make profits and pay taxes on them, are in essence demanding that all cooperatives change themselves into profitmaking corporations.

Moreover, all of us know that the owners of private electric companies do not pay the Federal income taxes. Those taxes are paid by the electric ratepayer, by the electric consumer, and the owners go ahead tucking away their 6 to 20 percent in profit over and above Federal income taxes, not counting what they can hide from the tax collector.

So much for this "you don't pay taxes" propaganda. It is in actuality an attempt to destroy all cooperatives. Fairness has nothing to do with the matter.

Now on interest rates: REA borrowers pay 2 percent per year on their loans. Utility companies say they have to make at least 6 percent after taxes to stay in business and they typically end up making more than 6 percent even on the basis of their own bookkeeping. But the measure of a subsidy is not 2 percent or 6 percent; the measure is whether all of the people are having to subsidize our 2 percent interest.

THE 2 PERCENT QUESTION

The question to us then is this: Does or can the Federal Government borrow money for 2 percent or less? If so, then we can borrow that money at 2 percent without enjoying a subsidy. The facts are that for many years the Federal Government has borrowed billions for 2 percent or less. According to the latest Treasury report on September 30, the Federal Government had borrowed $60 billion on which the interest rate was 2 percent or less. The REA interest rate is not and never has been subsidized. According to REA Administrator Ancher Nelsen's 1953 annual report, REA had netted over $45 million in its lending operations down to that time, and his figures are on the conservative side.

If the private utilities think the 2 percent REA money is subsidized, why don't they—why did they not in earlier years—borrow a few billion and do the job of rural electrification? You know why. One basic reason was that they did not want 2 percent money which had to be repaid. Private utilities do not pay off their indebtedness—it just climbs and climbs—and on top of that, the owners of private utilities are not interested in borrowing money from the Federal Government at 2 percent because those owners happen to be the very same people who are lending money to the private companies and getting a return of from 2½ percent to 20 percent.

I think the rural electrics should make this standing offer to the private electric companies; we will help them at any time to get the Congress to lend them money at 2 percent, repayable in 35 years, provided that the savings are passed down to the electric consumer. You don't need to worry about their taking you up on the offer. They don't want to do business at 2 percent and pay off their debts and provide cheap power.

Now for a word on the Federal power program. The Federal power agencies are required by law to reimburse the Treasury for the costs of power facilities over a period of 40 to 50 years, depending on the agency. Note that carefully: They are required to pay for the total costs of power facilities to become debt-free. No private utility is required to become debt-free. But they have influenced the Congress to force the Federal power agencies to pay off in 40 or 50 years.

Moreover, the Congress requires Federal power agencies to pay 3 or 4 percent interest on the unamortized balance of the cost of Federal power facilities. This 3 or 4 percent rate is about the same as the rate paid by private companies on their bonded indebtedness. What is missing is the profits. Even profits tend to be balanced by the law forcing Federal agencies to pay off debts.

Thus when the propaganda fronts of the private electric companies cry subsidy on Federal power, what they are really crying for is this: (1) They want the competitive influence of the Federal yardstick destroyed, and (2) they want control of the Federal power facilities so they can squeeze a subsidy for their investor-owners of the electric consumer for selling the people the people's own power.

Of course, if they cannot get actual ownership of the Federal power facilities, they will settle for less: (1) They will agree to buy all the Federal power so that it can be blessed with profit before it comes to your farms, or (2) they will settle for a deal which will raise the price of Federal power so high that consumers of it will, in effect, be paying an extra tax to Uncle Sam.

Rural electric co-ops get 5.9 percent of Federal power. The private companies get over 20.7 percent, or nearly 4 times as much. If they believe their own prapaganda, their conscience must ache under the weight of the subsidy they receive.

OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

But now let us turn the coin over: How about the subsidies to the investor-owned, taxpaying, business-managed companies controlled by the barefoot boys from Wall Street? Well, of course, everybody knows that they get no subsidies. Well, almost everybody knows they get no subsidies. Anyway, their subsidies are so big, maybe they ought to be called by some other name.

"Boss, there ain't nobody here but us chickens."

I have the figures on one subsidy to the private power companies since June 9, 1951, when the new section 124–A of the Internal Revenue Act was put into effect. And, sad to relate, even these figures would be a dark secret or a confused story if your own National Association and the Electric Consumers Information Committee hadn't done the job.

Section 124–A is a real innocent-sounding section. It provides that upon certification by the appropriate agency a corporation can indulge in accelerated tax amortization or rapid tax writeoffs.

Section 124–A gave ODM (Office of Defense Mobilization) the right to issue certificates to permit a corporation to speed up the write-off, to speed up the depreciation of private power facilities.

With this certificate, the power company could deduct one-fifth or 20 percent of the cost of the certified facilities each year for 5 years from its gross revenues. In other words, the company could subtract 20 percent of the cost of certified facilities each year for 5 years instead of deducting 3 or 3½ percent before taxes.

At the very best, this means that the power company gets to withhold Federal income

taxes for many, many years and these withheld or deferred taxes are actually an interest-free loan.

Just try it on yourself. If the Federal Government passes a law saying that for the next 5 years you could figure up your Federal income tax, and then keep half of it yourself with the understanding that you would repay it, beginning 5 years later at about 3 percent a year and no interest—wouldn't you consider that an interest-free loan?

The Federal Power Commission says the tax write-off subsidy is an "interest-free loan" to the private power companies. I estimate the value of the interest-free loan to be the total of what it would cost the company to float the loan plus compound interest for the period the interest-free loan is outstanding.

From June 9, 1951, until certification was suspended December 1953, the private utilities were granted rapid write-off certificates of nearly $2 billion. This means that between 1951 and about 1984, these companies will have the use of all or part of $860-odd-million—interest free.

Now, since the unwilling electric consumer, or Federal taxpayer—take your choice of victims—has been forced to make these interest-free loans to the power companies, we obviously should figure in a reasonable interest charge. Not that the companies will pay any interest; we are just trying to measure the size of the subsidy.

What is a reasonable interest change? I can't say precisely because I've always liked low interest rates, but since we are figuring this for the power companies, let us take their figures. They say they can't do business on less than 6 percent, rain or shine, war or peace.

So be it. I took the total interest-free loans, assumed they would repay it over 33 years, and charged them their own 6 percent interest rate, compounded annually. Computed this way, the total subsidy is $2.9 billion. I want to remind you that this is not the arithmetic of a New Deal bureaucrat, or a giveaway politician, because Ebasco computed them the same way. And Ebasco is as pure as pure can be.

Although the figures may sound fantastically large, as they are, the formula used in the same one recommended by Ebasco, the engineering, construction, accounting, propaganda outfit that took over where the old Electric Bond & Share Co. left off. In this case, the private utilities and I are in agreement on the estimated size of the subsidy.

Now almost $3 billion in subsidy is more than most people can picture. It is a large number of dimes or even quarters.

It is in fact about $500 million more than the total of all REA loans made from 1935 through 1954. In other words, Congress has given the private utilities more than the total of all REA loans—and they accuse us of getting a subsidy although we are required to repay our loans plus 2 percent interest.

Who's subsidized?

Col. Commandant Michael de Kovats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, 176 years ago today a great liberty-loving and heroic Hungarian soldier gave his life for the United States of America. This man was Michael de Kovats, of Hungary.

Wars for freedom generally rekindle dormant and slumbering emotions in many hearts. If the cause is a just and righteous cause, a popular and sacred cause, then it is bound to attract numerous adherents, even from the ranks of those who are not directly involved in the struggle.

The American Revolution was a popular and sacred cause, and the men who flocked to the defense of the colonists from many parts of the world and gladly gave their lives may be counted in the thousands. Among the most distinguished of such valiant and brave men was Michael de Kovats of Hungary.

Not enough is known of this remarkable man. It is generally believed that he was born in the year 1724. He had military service in his early life, and won his spurs in the service of Frederick the Great of Prussia. Then, early in our Revolutionary War, he arrived in this country. Here he met Pulaski. Later, upon Pulaski's recommendation, he was authorized by Washington to be the Colonel Commandant of the Pulaski Legion. In that capacity he led the charge against General Prevost at Charleston in May, 1779. There on May 11 he was mortally wounded and gave his life that our country might be born.

This very brief outline cannot do full justice to the memory of that brave and devoted servant of democracy and freedom. But we who are always grateful to those who gave their lives in our war of independence sincerely honor today the memory of that great soldier of freedom, Michael de Kovats.

All Americans are grateful to this great Hungarian and all Americans of Hungarian descent must take great pride in his heroism and patriotism.

Help by United States Called Vital for Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by A. T. Steele, which appeared in the May 1, 1955, issue of the New York Herald Tribune is deserving of our attention:

HELP BY UNITED STATES CALLED VITAL FOR BOLIVIA—CHAOS IS FEARED IF IT SHOULD END

(By A. T. Steele)

LA PAZ, BOLIVIA, April 30.—The Foreign Minister of Bolivia, Walter Guevara Arce, was quite definite about it. "United States economic aid," he said, "is absolutely essential to continued stability in Bolivia. The alternative is chaos and possibly communism."

Many foreign observers will agree that this is a realistic estimate of the situation in this country.

It was 2 years ago, with some qualms, that the United States embarked on a program of economic assistance to Bolivia's leftish revolutionary regime. It was a tough decision that involved a calculated risk. So far, the policy has paid off, though some risk remains. But for the stabilizing influence of the American aid program it is possible, even probable, that Bolivia would today have a government similar in orientation to that of the old Arbenz regime in Guatemala.

STILL FACES STRUGGLE

Instead, the moderate wing of the ruling party, led by Dr. Victor Paz Estenssoro, has managed to remain in power. And not only has the regime evidenced increasing friendship for the United States; it has also shown increasing distaste for the Bolivian Communists and their tactics.

But the regime is still a revolutionary one and is still struggling, with great difficulty, to make effective its revolutionary program. When the revolutionary party, the Movemiento Nacional Revolucionario (MNR), came into power in 1952, it cut virtually all ties with the past.

It nationalized the three major tin mines, which were the main prop of the country's economy. It adopted a program of agrarian reform. It proclaimed universal suffrage for all adults, regardless of educational or property qualifications. It dissolved the conservatively minded army as it then existed and passed out tens of thousands of firearms to miners, Indian farmers, and "peoples" organizations.

Though the army has since been rebuilt on a reduced scale, the bulk of the armed strength is still in the hands of the miners and campesinos. This is the most important political fact in Bolivia today. No government that does not satisfy these people can long survive.

TIN PRICES A FACTOR

The path of the Paz Estenssoro regime would have been much easier had it not been for the fall in the price of tin, which hit basement soon after the revolution. Since Bolivia had to sell tin at a good price in order to buy enough food to keep its population from starving, the collapse of the tin market created a desperate situation. United States aid—mostly in the form of foodstuffs—has helped the regime weather the storm.

There is no doubt but that the ex-economics professor who heads the Government in Bolivia is a popular leader. That must have been evident to anybody who witnessed the huge demonstration here recently on the third anniversary of the revolution and studied the faces of the paraders as they marched by the presidential balcony for nearly 6 hours.

Besides Paz Estenssoro, however, and a small group of able persons around him, there are few persons of outstanding administrative talent in the Bolivian Government. This is one of the weaknesses of the revolution, and it accounts for much of the inefficiency and confusion that is to be found in the Government departments.

The ruling regime is up to its ears in problems, most of them economic. Inflation is giving the most trouble, with the dollar quoted (at this writing) at around 2,800 bolivianos. The inflationary poison is fed by the necessity of subsidizing the production of tin at a cost far in excess of the price received. Agrarian reform has gone slowly and haltingly, except in the Cochabamba area, and in some cases the authorities have had difficulty restraining peasants from taking the law into their own hands.

ELECTIONS PROMISED

The Government of Bolivia is still essentially a one-party government, but President Paz Estenssora has promised general elections next year. In this balloting (probably in March), the people will elect not only a president but also a legislative body. Meanwhile, the Government rules by decree. The ruling party—the M. N. R.—is made of widely disparate elements, ranging from middle-

of-the-road to far left, with Paz serving as the balance wheel.

Opposition to the Government comes from extreme right and extreme left. The right-wing underground, called the Falange, is capable of stirring up occasional incidents, as shown by the abortive Cochabamba uprising in November 1953.

However, the organization appears to have little popular following. The greater danger is from the extreme left, where the Bolivian Communist Party and the Revolutionary Workers Party (Trotskyist) are working constantly to infiltrate labor and peasant unions and to undermine the Government's position.

Military Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, recently, John V. Thornton, adjunct associate professor of law at New York University School of Law, wrote an interesting article on military law. Mr. Thornton's article illumines the court's problems, compares it with civilian tribunals, both as to volume of work handled and similarity of legal concepts, and evaluates its decisions.

The judges on the court's bench are commended; at one point being portrayed in the superlative. The difficult status of the Court of Military Appeals as a court is referred to and the seriousness of its indeterminate status reflected upon. Scattered antipathy to the code is noted which gives vent to our prospective approval of any and all measures to achieve for the court the complete respect of the military hierarchy.

The scope of work confronting the court in its treatment of the appeals of American prisoners of war who collaborated in varying degrees with the Communists in Korea is not magnified by the article as the problem bespeaks great importance to all of us.

I insert this article herewith as a part of my remarks to urge life tenure for the judges of this commended court as an important step toward obtaining for it the dignity it has so earnestly merited and richly deserves:

MILITARY LAW

(By John V. Thornton)

Few civilian lawyers are aware of the huge volume of court-martial litigation. Approximately 450,000 courts-martial were held during the first 19 months after the new Uniform Code of Military Justice went into effect on May 31, 1951.[1] This is an average of over 1,000 trials every working day. During the first 2½ years of the code almost 50,000 cases were reviewed by boards of review (the intermediate appellate courts in the revised military justice system), and over 4,000 reached the Court of Military Appeals, the newly established civilian "supreme court" for military cases.[2] During 1953 alone that 3-judge bench passed upon some 2,400 appeals and petitions for leave to appeal,[3] compared with about 700 appeals and contested motions decided during the latest year for which data is available by one of the busiest State courts of last resort, the seven-judge New York Court of Appeals.[4] Since it is directed mainly to a civilian audience, the present article does not discuss the numerous decisions of the Court of Military Appeals dealing with the substantive law of military crimes or with other technical matters peculiar to the military system. The effort is rather to throw light on more basic problems, such as the fairness of military procedure and the rights of servicemen under the new code.[5] Civilian lawyers may find decisions in these areas not only of general interest but also of practical value as precedents in constitutional and criminal law. Since the concepts of military and civilian law have now coalesced to a considerable degree, it is likely that the excellent opinions of the Court of Military Appeals will be cited more and more before civilian tribunals.

I

Military jurisdiction

With the many new safeguards afforded accused persons within the military law system under the Uniform Code, it might be supposed that the number of habeas corpus applications to the civil courts would drop off sharply. So far as the reported decisions indicate, however, this has not happened. Indeed, it may be that the number of such applications is actually on the increase. A possible explanation is that the Court of Military Appeals has defined certain minimum standards or "military due process" which must be accorded servicemen under the new code, and some offenders sentenced in precode days are bringing habeas corpus proceedings in an effort to establish that they too were entitled to the protection of these standards. Another factor in stimulating such applications may be the recent decision in *Burns* v. *Wilson*,[6] wherein the Supreme Court for the first time ruled that the fifth amendment's guaranty of due process has some application to military trials, though it refused to equate the scope of review in military cases with that in civilian cases.

Thus far the precode offenders have not fared too well. It seems evident that the civil courts are not going to set themselves up as a super review board over these old convictions. Typical of their attitude is *White* v. *Humphrey*,[7] involving a serviceman convicted of murder under the old Articles of War. He demonstrated very convincingly that the law member (judge) of his court-martial had failed to instruct in open court on the elements of the crime and showed that such a failure is reversible error under the decisions of the Court of Military Appeals construing the new code. The third circuit pointed out, however, that the former Articles of War, in contrast to the code, did not require instructions in open court, and, since the absence of such instructions did not result in the denial of a basically fair trial * * * in violation of the constitutional concept of due process," [8] a civil court could not interfere.

Somewhat along the same lines is a case wherein petitioner claimed a denial of the constitutional rights of due process and confrontation in his trial for violation of the articles of war.[9] While recognizing that *Burns* v. *Wilson* expands somewhat the jurisdiction of the civil courts in military cases, the 10th circuit found that it was limited under that decision to inquiring whether the military authorities had fully and fairly considered the questions sought to be raised in the habeas corpus action. Since such consideration had been given, civilian inquiry was at an end.[10]

It would seem that these cases were correctly decided. It is unfortunate that military law prior to the code lacked some of the safeguards which have for years been commonplace in civilian trials. But clearly, convictions under the old law were not for that reason alone rendered constitutionally defective, and absent some fundamental unfairness, they should not now be laid open to collateral attack.

A newcomer to military law, article 3 (a) of the uniform code, provides in substance that one who, while under military jurisdiction, commits an offense punishable by confinement of 5 years or more, remains subject to that jurisdiction despite termination of this military status, if he cannot be tried in the civilian courts of the United States.[11] A discharged serviceman was seized in Pittsburgh by Air Force police under the authority of this article and immediately flown to Korea to answer a charge of having committed murder while in the service there. In short order a United States district court, perhaps incensed at what it regarded as high-handed action by the military, released the veteran in a habeas corpus proceeding.[12] As last year's Survey noted, there was great doubt as to the correctness of the district court's ruling,[13] and the case has now been reversed by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.[14] The higher tribunal took the view that article 3 (a) was constitutional, that the proceedings against the accused were court-martial proceedings, and that he was not entitled to a presentment or indictment since the fifth amendment's guarantee in this regard specifically excepts "cases arising in the land or naval forces." Moreover, due process did not require that the accused receive a preliminary civil hearing before being removed to the jurisdiction of the military courts.

The Supreme Court has granted certiorari,[15] and it will be interesting to see the reaction of the high bench to the case. A number of law review writers have taken the position that Article 3 (a) is unconstitutional,[16] and the question is certainly not free from doubt. My own view is that the article is a necessity to avoid miscarriages of justice, and, in the light of a long line of authorities dealing with a related statute,[17] is probably not subject to constitutional challenge. Nonetheless, as a matter of policy, and as a means of preventing friction in military-civilian relations, Congress might well consider the desirability of granting jurisdiction to the Federal district courts to try such cases.[18] At the least some kind of preliminary civil hearing could be provided before a veteran is transported halfway around the world for a military trial.[19]

The foregoing cases sought civil review of the judgments of military courts by the traditional route of habeas corpus. A novel method of attack was pursued in one of the most significant decisions of the year. There the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled in a case of first impression that it could not directly review decisions of the Court of Military Appeals, which is, as before stated, the highest "court" in the military system.[20] The petitioning servicemen urged that jurisdiction derived from a court of appeals rule permitting review of orders of administrative agencies. It was held, however, that the Court of Military Appeals "appears to be a cout in every significant aspect, rather than an administrative agency," and further that, even if it was "for some purposes" an administrative agency, the court rule in question was ineffective to grant jurisdiction. The rule merely prescribed the procedure for exercising jurisdiction over those cases which Congress had specially authorized civil courts to review.

The decision seems thoroughly correct. In view of the equivocal nature of the opinion, however, the difficult question of the precise

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

status of the Court of Military Appeals as a "court" cannot be regarded as settled. As a former commissioner of the court has pointed out, this status problem is no mere academic one.[21] Upon its answer may turn the court's power to decide constitutional questions and issue writs and orders in aid of its jurisdiction as well as the binding effect in habeas corpus proceedings of its pronouncements on the law.[22] Clarifying legislation in this area would be welcome.

II

Composition and conduct of courts-martial

Impartial tribunal.—In general: After the findings of guilty had been returned in one case, there was introduced in evidence, for consideration on sentencing, a certified copy of an entry from accused's service record showing a previous conviction. The certification was signed by an officer who sat as a member of the court-martial throughout the trial. The Court of Military Appeals took the position that the officer was disqualified because he was "a witness for the prosecution" within the meaning of the Code and Manual,[23] and reversed the conviction.[24] It decided also that the principle of general projudice required reversal when the trial counsel (prosecutor) of a special court-martial thereafter acted as staff judge advocate (legal adviser) to the commanding officer on the latter's review of the case.[25] The decisions are to be commended.[26] Confidence in the actions of military courts can only be maintained when their integrity is kept free of any question.

Impartial tribunal.—Command influence: One of the important objectives of the Uniform Code was to elevate the court-martial to a more independent status, free of domination by the commanding officer.[27] Though Congress retained the old practice under which the commanding officer appoints the law officer (judge), the members of the court (jury), the trial counsel (prosecutor), and the defense counsel, and reviews the court's findings and sentence, it provided in article 37 of the Code:

"No authority convening a general, special, or summary court-martial, nor any other commanding officer, shall censure, reprimand, or admonish such court or any member, law officer, or counsel thereof, with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court, or with respect to any other exercise of its or his functions in the conduct of the proceeding. No person * * * shall attempt to coerce or, by any unauthorized means, influence the action of a court-martial." [28]

The Court of Military Appeals is ever on the alert to detect instances of command influence, and, with the possible exception of one case,[29] has struck them down with vigor. Several particularly shocking instances of conduct violative of article 37 have manifested themselves this year. In one case an Army commander at a conference immediately prior to the trial of a theft case informed the members of the court-martial that court-martial cases received a thorough review and that they should not usurp the clemency prerogative of the reviewing authority. He also read excerpts from a letter from a higher command which pointed out the undesirability of light sentences in larcency cases and the impropriety of retaining thieves in the service and instructed commanders to recognize the performance of superior members of courts-martial by appropriate notations on their efficiency reports. It is perhaps superfluous to say that the court-martial promptly convicted the accused and sentenced him to a dishonorable discharge. As would be expected, the Court of Military Appeals unanimously reversed,[30] noting that the court-martial had been virtually coerced into adjudging the punitive discharge.

In another case a Navy commanding officer at a pretrial conference discussed the previous derelictions of the accused with at least three of the members of the court, informed them that a prior court-martial had adjudged a much too meager punishment, and suggested what the verdict should be. Again the Court of Military Appeals unanimously reversed.[31] In yet a third decision, the law officer (judge) granted a continuance in order to await action by the Secretary of the Navy to whom the accused (who had already been acquitted by a civilian court of the crime in question) had addressed a request, through regular channels, for termination of the proceedings against him. It was the claim of the accused that Navy policy forbade a military trial subsequent to a civilian acquittal. Two days after the law officer's ruling the commanding officer curtly informed that functionary that he did "not consider the desire of a man not to be tried a reasonable cause for delay" and condemned the law officer's ruling as an "abuse of discretion." The commanding officer was a rear admiral and the law officer, a lieutenant commander, so, needless to say, the trial resumed immediately. A conviction resulted, perhaps, as Judge Brosman noted in a concurring opinion, because the court realized that the admiral was actively interested in the outcome of the trial. The Court of Military Appeals again reversed,[32] but this time Judge Latimer dissented.[33]

It is depressing indeed to see these unfortunate instances of command influence creeping into the reformed system of military justice. The actions of the few officers who, deliberately or carelessly, engage in such practices can only operate to discredit the vast majority of their fellows who sincerely want the new code to succeed. Happily, cases of command influence seem to be relatively few and far between thus far, and, as the Court of Military Appeals cracks down on them, they are likely to diminish still further. On the other hand, there is no hiding the fact that a hard core of opposition to the code still exists, particularly among a small segment of the pre-World War II officers of the line. As one recently discharged Air Force legal officer puts it, "The reaction of these officers to the Uniform Code frequently ranged from mild antipathy to livid, and sometimes lurid, denunciation of the entire code and any person or group connected with it. * * * [I]f these can in any way disprove the desirability or effectiveness of the code—or hinder its operation without being too obvious about it—they will do so." [34] Such officers, well-intentioned but misguided, would do well to reflect that it was the occasional abuses of over-enthusiastic disciplinarians which gave the impetus to military justice reform after World War II. Had these abuses not occurred, the old system—which, whatever its theoretical deficiencies, was a reasonably good one in actual practice—would not have been displaced. If—and this is most unlikely—the few diehards succeed in sabotaging the reforms of the code, they are going to get from an aroused Congress and public just what they want least—another reform movement, but this time culminating in a military justice system entirely divorced from command and unresponsive to the needs of discipline.[35] It is my own judgment that the influence of these few officers is continually on the wane, and that military law is moving forward steadily towards that delicate balance of justice and discipline which is so essential and yet so difficult to achieve.

III

Personal liberties of servicemen

Right of free speech: The Court of Military Appeals has been concerned this year with a considerable number of what might be termed "civil rights" cases—that is, cases involving the personal liberties of servicemen. One of the most important of these was *United States* v. *Voorhees*,[36] in which each judge found it necessary to write a lengthy opinion agreeing in part and disagreeing in part with his brethren. (Parenthetically I might add that, though the Court of Military Appeals is one of the most brilliant benches in the Nation, its long suit is not conciseness of expression.[37])

In Voorhees the charges grew out of writings by the accused colonel concerning his experiences in Korea, some of which were highly critical of General MacArthur. He was alleged to have violated an Army regulation requiring clearance of writings through the appropriate security review authority for "deletion of classified matter and review for accuracy, propriety, and conformance to policy" before submission to a publisher. An applicable memorandum from former Secretary of Defense Johnson limited censorship to "deletion of matter which is classified for security reasons." All the judges agreed that review of the writings of military personnel for security reasons was not an unconstitutional abridgment of free speech. Two of them (Brosman and Latimer, JJ.) thought that the Army regulation, insofar as it required propriety and policy review, was illegal as in conflict with the Johnson memorandum, while the chief judge found it to be consistent therewith by construing the words propriety and policy as referable only to security matters. In Judge Brosman's view the Army regulation's "prior restraint" on the basis of propriety or policy was also unconstitutional under the first amendment. Judge Latimer, stressing the special needs of the military system, disagreed on this point, and Chief Judge Quinn, because of his construction of the regulation, found it unnecessary to pass upon the constitutional question. While the net result of these varying approaches was a ruling that prior restraint based on policy or propriety was unlawful in this particular case, the decision does not settle the issue from the constitutional standpoint.

Privilege against self-incrimination: Some time ago the Court of Military Appeals decided that an accused could not be required to furnish exemplars of his handwriting.[38] Now it has similarly held that he may not be forced to utter words for the purpose of voice identification.[39] The court, per Chief Judge Quinn, noted in a unanimous opinion that accused persons are "protected against this by both the Constitution [i. e., the fifth amendment] and the code.[40]

The judges also all agreed that the self-incrimination privilege was not violated when a sample of urine was taken from an accused, with his consent, by the use of a catheter.[41] But sharp disagreement arose when such a specimen was extracted while an accused was unconscious.[42] Judges Latimer and Brosman felt that self-incrimination was not involved since there was no "testimonial compulsion," or, as in the handwriting and voice cases, no active participation and affirmative conduct by the accused. Moreover, as there was no brutality or indecency in the process—unlike the famous stomach pump case [43]—those two judges opined that due process was not violated. Judge Brosman made it clear, however, that had the catherization been over the accused's protest, he would have regarded it as violative of military due process, though—apparently—Judge Latimer would not.[44] The chief judge on the other hand vigorously denounced the action of the authorities in the unconscious-man case as "shocking," "reprehensible," and "an invasion of the inherent right of privacy * * * prohibited not only by the fifth amendment to the Constitution * * * and * * * the Uniform Code

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

• • • but by natural and divine law as well." [45]

Also significant was a case wherein a soldier, suspected of housebreaking and larceny, was apprehended, and another prisoner assigned to watch him.[46] This prisoner, aptly characterized as a "good reliable rat," asked the soldier what he was in for, and in reply obtained most of the details of the larcenies. Article 31 (b) of the Code [47] provides that "no person" subject to it "shall interrogate, or request any statement from, an accused or a person suspected of an offense" without giving him the self-incrimination warning. Despite this broad language it was decided that the article is applicable only where the element of officiality attaches to the interrogation and hence was not intended to cover this kind of situation. The result seems thoroughly sustainable in the light of the statute's legislative history.[48]

Right to Speedy Trial: By virtue of the McNabb doctrine the Federal courts deny admissibility to a confession secured during the illegal detention of an accused.[49] This doctrine is not based on the self-incrimination privilege, but is simply a rule of evidence designed to insure that a person under arrest will be brought before a judicial officer without unnecessary delay. In *United States* v. *Moore* [50] an accused was taken into custody and questioned on a number of occasions over a 4-day period without charges being preferred, and the defense argued for the exclusion of incriminatory statements made during that time. The Court of Military Appeals pointed out, however, that article 33 of the Code requires only that charges be forwarded to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction within 8 days after the accused is arrested,[51] and that the civilian requirement of very prompt arraignment has no counterpart in the military system. Aside from the special problems posed by a failure to warn under article 31, said the court, the basic criterion of admissibility of confessions in military law is simply voluntariness.[52]

The Moore case appears to be correctly decided. This is not to say that unreasonably long detention of military prisoners is not a serious problem. It most certainly is, and, according to one observer, occurs in a substantial number of cases, mainly because of carelessness in making investigative reports promptly and correctly.[53] But the remedy for such difficulties would seem to lie in improving the efficiency of the administrative machinery rather than in trying to fashion some sort of McNabb rule for the military.

Protection against search and seizure: The Court of Military Appeals has sometimes been criticized for the wide powers it has granted the military authorities in making searches of their personnel.[54] The court, however, does not seem disposed to abandon its approach to this problem. Thus, in *United States* v. *Swanson* [55] a unanimous bench held that a field first sergeant of a gun battery in bivouac could, when the battery officers were absent and not expected to return for an appreciable time, order a search to recover money stolen from a member of the unit. The court found this action to be lawful, as within the manual's description of "a search under circumstances demanding immediate action to prevent the removal or disposal of property believed on reasonable grounds to be criminal goods." [56] The search being lawful, the fruits thereof were admissible in evidence under the doctrine of *Weeks* v. *United States*.[57] Swanson represents, in Judge Brosman's opinion, "as far as [the court] should ever go," and he dissented in another case wherein his brethren found a search by a first sergeant lawful when the necessity was considerably less compelling.[58]

Judge Brosman may well have a point when he complains that the court in the search area is riding "a good horse to death." [59] Possibly the court is not overly impressed with the general wisdom of the Weeks doctrine which excludes evidence obtained through illegal search,[60] and thus allows one criminal to escape because of the actions of another wrongdoer. But, since it is committed to that principle, it should not subvert the rule by the indirect device of expanding unduly the definition of a legal search.

IV

Status of forces agreements

It was noted last year that agreements had been reached with certain of our allies under which they were granted the primary right to exercise criminal jurisdiction over members of United States Armed Forces abroad except for offenses committed against United States property, security, or personnel.[61] In an effort to insure the maximum protection for servicemen arrested under these agreements, the Department of Defense has issued instructions requiring commanding officers to examine the laws of the foreign countries involved, with particular reference to procedural safeguards afforded an accused, and to request the foreign country to waive jurisdiction where such safeguards are not available.[62] In the majority of instances, the Defense Department states, the sentences imposed in the foreign courts have been extremely light.[63]

V

Prisoners of war

The American POW's who collaborated in varying degrees with the Communists in Korea have presented a difficult problem. Doubtless many of them were subjected to physical torture and "brainwashing" of a kind never before experienced by Americans, yet condoning their actions might well have a dangerous impact on morale and discipline. The services seem to be taking a middle road, trying only the most aggravated cases, and handling the others through administrative channels.

By the early spring of 1954 the Army had more than 200 case histories of men still in uniform who, on the basis of repeated accusations, were possible flagrant cases. This number represented about 6 percent of the total of Army prisoners in Korean camps. The original list of 200 was pruned to less than 50 by teams of legal and intelligence experts, and as of October 1954, two corporals and a colonel had been convicted,[64] and some 35 more trials were expected.[65] The Air Force originally had about 80 cases of suspected misconduct, and has reduced that list to about 10.[66] A Marine Corps court of inquiry determined in that service's leading case that a colonel who, under severe pressure, confessed to germ warfare should not be court-martialed, but the comandant of the Corps ruled that his future assignments should be such as to make only minimum demands upon leadership capacity.[67]

VI

Improvements in the code

The second Annual Report of the Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocates General (the top legal officers of the services) has now appeared.[68] Unlike the first report,[69] the second details numerous changes in the code which are recommended by both the court and the Judge Advocates General. Some of the more important of these recommendations, with my comments thereon, are as follows:

1. To authorize, where the accused so requests, a one-officer court (consisting of a qualified law officer) to accept a plea of guilty and adjudge a sentence in all general court-martial cases, except capital ones, in lieu of the present practice of convening a full court-martial. This appears desirable. It assimilates military to civilian procedure and saves cost and the time of officers in the guilty plea cases.

2. To authorize, where the accused so requests, a one-officer court (consisting of an officer certified as competent by the Judge Advocate General) to try special court-martial cases, in lieu of the present three-officer court without legal qualifications. This appears desirable. One qualified lawyer would seem to be able to handle these cases, and savings in cost and time of officers will result.

3. To make final the ruling of the law officer (judge) on a motion for a finding of not guilty, in lieu of the present procedure which permits the members of the court-martial (jury) to overturn the ruling. This appears desirable. It assimilates military to civilian procedure. Furthermore, the question is predominantly a legal one suitable for final disposition by the law officer.

4. To limit review by a board of review, in cases involving pleas of guilty, to those where the accused files a notice of appeal within 5 days, in lieu of the present practice of automatic review. This appears desirable. Automatic review in these cases is largely a waste of money and effort.

5. To enlarge the prohibition against censure of courts-martial by commanding officers to include their staff officers. The desirability of this is obvious.

6. To reduce from 30 to 15 days the period for filing a petition for review to the Court of Military Appeals. This appears desirable. The 30-day period has caused considerable difficulty in prisoner processing and seems unnecessary to protect the accused.

7. To extend from 1 year to 2 years the period for filing a petition for a new trial. This appears desirable. It assimilates military to (Federal) civilian procedure.

8. To increase authorized maximums for nonjudicial punishment so as to allow punishment not to exceed forfeiture of one-half of one's months pay per month for 2 months in the case of officers, and not to exceed the loss of one-half month's pay for a period of 1 month, or confinement up to 7 days, in the case of enlisted personnel. This appears desirable. The code as presently written does not give commanding officers adequate authority to deal with minor offenses without the stigma of court-martial convictions.[70]

The Judge Advocates Association, an affiliated organization of the American Bar Association composed of present and former lawyers of the Armed Forces, has gone on record in support of these and other recommendations contained in the report.[71] It has also added proposals of its own, namely, that the power to review sentences now vested in the boards of review (the intermediate appellate courts of the military system) should be transferred to the Judge Advocates General, and the Court of Military Appeals should be given power to review questions of fact and sentences.[72] Another observer has recommended that the law officer, by analogy to the civilian judge, be given authority to administer the sentence at the trial level rather than have that power, as at present, lodged in the members of the court.[73] While I personally have some reservations as to the merit of these latter suggestions, they do at the very least warrant the careful consideration of Congress.[74] The Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocates General have also put forth certain other recommendations on behalf of their individual organizations. Space considerations preclude their analysis here.[75]

Despite a few setbacks here and there, it may be said that the new military justice system is on the whole continuing to function well. Improvements have been noted

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

at the trial level which was originally one of the weak links in the chain.[76] The law officer is gradually becoming an honest-to-goodness judge rather than a mere figurehead. Important strides have been made by the services in expanding their legal educational facilities. The evil of command influence is being stamped out. The absence of adequate legal talent at the special (inferior) court-martial level remains a serious problem as does the vast burden of paperwork which the code has cast upon the services. Some of the reformative suggestions already discussed bid fair to help solve these and other difficulties, however.

---

[1] Annual Report of the United States Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocates General of the Armed Forces and the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury pursuant to the Uniform Code of Military Justice for the period July 1, 1952, to December 31, 1953, p. 11.

[2] Id. at 11, 21–22.

[3] Id. at 22.

[4] 19th Annual Report and Studies, The Judicial Council, State of New York 37 (1953). The data is for the judicial year 1951–1952.

[5] For the strictly military aspects of the court's decisions through May 31, 1953, see Aycock, The Court of Military Appeals—The Second Year, 2 J. Pub. L. 254 (1953).

[6] 346 U. S. 137 (1953), 1953 Annual Surv. Am. L. 125–27, 725, 29 N. Y. U. L. Rev. 125–27, 923 (1954), 27 So. Cal. L. Rev. 333 (1954). Colonel Wurfel comments on the case in Court-Martial Jurisdiction Under the Uniform Code, 32 N. C. L. Rev. 1, 77–80 (1953).

[7] 212 F. 2d 503 (3d Cir. 1954).

[8] Id. at 508.

[9] *Easley* v. *Hunter*, 209 F. 2d 483 (10th Cir. 1953).

[10] Another habeas corpus proceeding of some consequence is *Rubenstein* v. *Wilson* (212 F. 2d 631 (D. C. Cir. 1954)) (whether petitioner was a person "accompanying" the armed forces and therefore subject to court-martial jurisdiction only determinable upon a full record; case remanded to the district court for further hearings). See also the comedy of errors in *Neary* v. *Greenough* (120 F. Supp. 833 (D. Me. 1954)).

[11] 64 Stat. 109 (1950), 50 U. S. C. sec. 553 (a) (1952). The provision was designed to overcome the obvious injustices of cases like *In re Lo Dolce* (106 F. Supp. 455 (W. D. N. Y. 1952)), and *United States ex rel. Hirshberg* v. *Cooke* (336 U. S. 210 (1949)).

[12] *Toth* v. *Talbott* (113 F. Supp. 330, granting of writ of habeas corpus sustained, 114 F. Supp. 468 (D. D. C. 1953)), 67 Harv. L. Rev. 479 (1954), 25 Miss. L. J. 277 (1954), 33 Neb. L. Rev. 516 (1954), 30 N. D. L. Rev. 155 (1954), 7 Vand. L. Rev. 144 (1953).

[13] 1953 Annual Surv. Am. L. 127–28, 29 N. Y. U. L. Rev. 127–28 (1954).

[14] 215 F. 2d 22 (D. C. Cir. 1954), 28 St. John's L. Rev. 301. An interesting sidelight on the case is that the airman who, with Toth, allegedly killed a Korean civilian under orders of a lieutenant has now been restored to duty. His original sentence was life imprisonment. New York Times, May 15, 1954, p. 3, col. 1.

[15] 348 U. S. 809 (1954).

[16] Note, 67 Harv. L. Rev. 479 (1954); Decisions, 30 N. D. L. Rev. 155 (1954), 28 St. John's L. Rev. 301 (1954).

[17] Former Article of War 94, which provided for the retention of military jurisdiction over discharged servicemen accused of certain frauds against the Government, was pretty uniformly upheld. *Kronberg* v. *Hale* (180 F. 2d 128 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 339 U. S. 969 (1950)); *Terry* v. *United States* (2 F. Supp. 962 (D. Wash. 1933)); *Ex parte Joly* (290 Fed. 858 (S. D. N. Y. 1922)); *In re Bogart* (3 Fed. Cas. 796, No. 1,596 (C. C. D. Cal. 1873)). Cf. *United States ex rel. Flannery* v. *Commanding General* (69 F. Supp. 661 (S. D. N. Y. 1946)).

[18] This proposal is discussed further in 1953 Annual Surv. Am. L. 128, 29 N. Y. U. L. Rev. 128 (1954).

[19] In the Toth case the court of appeals commented: "It may very well be that Congress should add to the Uniform Code a provision that a civilian apprehended under Article 3 (a) pursuant to court-martial charges should not be removed from continental United States for trial until he has had a preliminary hearing before either a civil magistrate or a military tribunal. * * * But such questions are for Congress, not for the courts." (215 F. 2d 22, 30–31 (D. C. Cir. 1954).)

[20] *Shaw* v. *United States* (209 F. 2d 811 (D. C. Cir. 1954)), 22 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 773. The court recognized that collateral attack by habeas corpus is permissible under the Uniform Code, a principle which is established law since the decision in *Burns* v. *Wilson* (346 U. S. 137 (1953)), and suggested the further possibility of a Court of Claims suit, as in *Shapiro* v. *United States* (69 F. Supp. 205 (Ct. Cl. 1947)). For a different view as to the availability of an action in the Court of Claims see 1951 Annual Surv. Am. L. 160 n.20.

[21] Walker, An Evaluation of the United States Court of Military Appeals, 48 Nw. U. L. Rev. 714, 715–19 (1954).

[22] Since the tenure of its judges is less than during good behavior the Court of Military Appeals is not a "constitutional court" created by virtue of article III of the Constitution. *Williams* v. *United States* (289 U. S. 553 (1933)). The problem is whether it is a "legislative court" like the Court of Claims or the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or an administrative agency like the Tax Court. See *Old Colony Trust Co.* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (279 U. S. 716 (1929)).

[23] Article 25 (d) (2), Uniform Code of Military Justice (64 Stat. 116 1950), 50 U. S. C. sec. 589 (1952):; Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, paragraph 63 (1951).

[24] *United States* v. *Moore* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 675, 16 C. M. R. 249 (1954)).

[25] *United States* v. *Coulter* (3 U. S. M. A. 657, 14 C. M. R. 75 (1954)). Such conduct is proscribed by article 6 (c), Uniform Code of Military Justice (64 Stat. 111 (1950), 50 U. S. C. sec. 556 (1952)). Judge Latimer dissented upon the basis that the trial counsel did not actually "review" the case but merely gave information on matters relating to clemency.

[26] Somewhat questionable, however, is *United States* v. *Thomas* (3 U. S. M. A. 798, 14 C. M. R. 216 (1954)), dealing with the impartiality of a board of review.

[27] It was frequently said, and there was at least some truth in the charge, that courts-martial in pre-Code days were often mere disciplinary tools of command. See the authorities collected in 1951 Annual Surv. Am. L. 158 n. 15.

[28] 64 Stat. 120 (1950), 50 U. S. C. section 612 (1952). A violator of article 37 is subject to prosecution but, as of April 30, 1954, no such offender had ever been tried. Note, 63 Yale L. J. 880, 881 n. 10 (1954).

[29] *United States* v. *Isbell* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 782, 14 C. M. R. 200 (1954)).

[30] *United States* v. *Littrice* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 487, 13 C. M. R. 43 (1953)).

[31] *United States* v. *Hunter* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 497, 13 C. M. R. 53 (1953)).

[32] *United States* v. *Knudson* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 587, 16 C. M. R. 161 (1954)).

[33] *Id.* at 598, 16 C. M. R. at 172. Two additional cases of some importance involved claims of command influence. In one, error was found but no prejudice (*United States* v. *Self* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 568, 13 C. M. R. 124 (1953))), and in the other, no error (*United States* v. *Isbell* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 782, 14 C. M. R. 200 (1954))). In the last-mentioned case Judge Brosman filed a dissent with which I am in accord. *Id.* at 788, 14 C. M. R. at 206. A note in 63 Yale L. J. 880, 888 (1954), also agrees with the dissent and comments that under the court's present tests, "all but the most unwary commanders may influence courts-martial with reasonable impunity." Though I do think the Isbell case is wrong, I cannot subscribe to such a sweeping generalization.

[34] Barnard, The Uniform Code of Military Justice—A Recommendation, 26 Rocky Mt. L. Rev. 48, 51 n. 15 (1953).

[35] "Only a scrupulous adherence to the Code's mandate can avoid drastic proposals to cut down the jurisdiction of courts-martial. * * * Vigilant watchfulness against the abuses of 'Command Control' can alone preserve sound 'Command Control,' which must always be the core of efficient military operation." White, Has the Uniform Code of Military Justice Improved the Courts-Martial System?, 28 St. John's L. Rev. 19, 20 (1953).

[36] 4 U. S. C. M. A. 500, 16 C. M. R. 83 (1954).

[37] I sometimes cannot help but feel that the court might avoid future difficulties for itself by confining its discussions more rigidly to points directly involved in a case, and avoiding, where possible, promulgation of broad principles and involvement in side issues. Deciding—or seeming to decide—questions not squarely raised is a dangerous practice. Had a concept like military due process, for example, been allowed to develop in more of a case-by-case fashion its meaning might today be somewhat clearer.

[38] *United States* v. *Rosato* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 143, 11 C. M. R. 143 (1953)), 22 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 371 (1954) (unfavorable comment); *United States* v. *Eggers* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 191, 11 C. M. R. 191 (1953)), 7 Vand. L. Rev. 147 (favorable). See also, *United States* v. *Morris* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 209, 15 C. M. R. 209 (1954)).

[39] *United States* v. *Greer* (3 U. S. C. M. A 576, 13 C. M. R. 132 (1953)).

[40] Id. at 578, 13 C. M. R. at 134.

[41] *United States* v. *Booker* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 335, 15 C. M. R. 335 (1954)).

[42] *United States* v *Williamson* (5 U. S. C. M. A. 320, 15 C. M. R. 320 (1954)).

[43] *Rochin* v. *California* (342 U. S. 165 (1952)).

[44] See *United States* v. *Booker* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 335, 337, 15 C. M. R. 335, 337 (1954)).

[45] 4 U. S. C. M. A. 320, 334, 15 C. M. R. 320, 334 (1954).

[46] *United States* v. *Gibson* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 746, 14 C. M. R. 164 (1954)). Cf. *United States* v. *Josey* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 767, 14 C. M. R. 185 (1954)).

[47] 64 Stat. 118 (1950), 50 U. S. C. 602 (1952).

[48] *United States* v. *Hernandez* (U. S. C. M. A. 465, 16 C. M. R. 39 (1954)) was also of some consequence. The court there held that an accused who is advised of his rights under article 31 must actually understand such rights, and hence a reading of the article in English to one who did not understand that language did not constitute compliance.

[49] *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332 (1943)); *Upshaw* v. *United States* (335 U. S. 410 (1948)).

[50] 4 U. S. C. M. A. 482, 16 C. M. R. 56 (1954).

[51] 64 Stat. 119 (1950), 50 U. S. C. 604 (1952). See also, Manual for Courts-Martial, United States ¶¶ 18b, 22 (1951).

[52] The Moore case held that accused had no right to be furnished with counsel during the interrogation. To similar effect is *United States* v. *Manuel* (3 U. S. C. M. A. 739, 14 C. M. R. 157 (1954)) (no right to consult with counsel prior to interrogation). The current attitude of the judges on waiver of rights under article 31 by failure to object to the introduction of the statement at the trial is illustrated by *United States* v. *Fisher* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 152, 15 C. M. R. 152 (1954))

and *United States* v. *Henry* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 158, 15 C. M. R. 158 (1954)).

[53] White, supra note 35, at 22.

[54] Note, 101 U. of Pa. L. Rev. 851 (1953).

[55] 3 U. S. C. M. A. 671, 14 C. M. R. 89 (1954).

[56] Manual for Courts-Martial, United States par. 152 (1951).

[57] 232 U. S. 383 (1914). The Court of Military Appeals follows the Federal rule which, in an effort to protect the rights guaranteed by the fourth amendment, excludes evidence secured in violation thereof. *United States* v. *Doyle* (1 U. S. C. M. A. 545, 4 C. M. R. 137 (1952)).

[58] *United States* v. *Davis* (4 U. S. C. M. A. 577, 581, 16 C. M. R. 151, 155 (1954)).

[59] Ibid.

[60] *Weeks* v. *United States* (232 U. S. 383 (1914)).

[61] 1953 Annual Surv. Am. L. 139, 29 N. Y. U. L. Rev. 139 (1954). The NATO countries and Japan are covered by such agreements.

[62] Jurisdiction Over Servicemen Abroad, The Judge Advocate Journal, Bull. No. 16, pp. 20–21 (1954).

[63] Ibid.

[64] For the corporals' trials see New York Times, July 14, 1954, p. 9, col. 1, and for the colonel's, New York Times, August 21, 1954, p. 7, col. 6, and id., September 24, 1954, p. 11, col. 1. One of the corporals was sentenced to 10 years and a dishonorable discharge on charges of having had communication with the enemy and informing of the escape plans of a fellow prisoner. The other corporal, accused of collaborating with the enemy, was to have headed a Red-inspired postwar organization of fellow prisoners. His sentence to life imprisonment may well be cut down on review. The colonel was charged with collaborating with the Communists by leading pro-Red discussion groups, making propaganda broadcasts and writing pamphlets. His punishment was dismissal from the service. None of the cases has yet completed its route through the military appellate process.

[65] New York World Telegram and Sun, September 24, 1954, p. 1, col. 1; New York Journal-American, September 25, 1954, p. 4, col. 4.

[66] New York Times, July 14, 1954, p. 9, col. 1. Many of the Air Force cases involved "confessions" to germ warfare. The general problem of the weak substandard individual in uniform is dealt with in a provocative book, Huie, the Execution of Private Slovik (1954), detailing the case of the only American soldier executed for desertion since 1865.

[67] New York Times, April 28, 1954, p. 1, col. 3. This case was the first of its type in the history of the Marine Corps. Id., February 17, 1954, p. 4, col. 3.

[68] See note 1 supra.

[69] The first report recommended that Congress take no action on changes in the Code pending further experience, except for the elimination of the power of special courts-martial to adjudge bad conduct discharges. This has not yet been accomplished.

[70] In Father White's recent cross section study of 253 Navy summary courts-martial, 160 gave punishments which could have been given under the old system at captain's mast. White, supra, note 35, at 25. It is interesting to note that a French commanding officer is given considerably more power than his American counterpart in administering non-judicial punishment. Gaynor, the French Code of Military Justice, 22 George Washington L. Rev. 318, 325 (1954). The Soviet Code also gives broad powers in that area. Gaynor, Soviet Military Law, the Judge Advocate Journal, Bull. No. 17, p. 19 (1954).

[71] Id. at 15–16.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Barnard, supra note 34, at 52–53.

[74] There is also a lot of good sense in Father White's recommendation that courts-martial be allowed to give more than 6 months of confinement without—as is presently required—also imposing a bad conduct discharge. Such a discharge is often the heart's desire of a "B. C. D. striker" who is, typically, guilty of an unauthorized absence offense. If the "striker" knew he was going to get a longer term and still stay in the service, he might think twice about going "over the hill." White, supra note 35, at 25.

[75] See note 1 supra.

[76] Walker, supra, note 21, at 719.

We Pray or We Perish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith remarks by Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, entitled "We Pray or We Perish." Commissioner Murray delivered these inspiring words at the annual dinner of the American Irish Historical Society in New York City:

WE PRAY OR WE PERISH

It is always a pleasurable experience to receive recognition from one's fellowmen—one would have to be something less than human, or more than human, to deny it. Perhaps some of the pleasure derives from the thought, consciously or unconsciously realized, that such expressions of recognition are but the meager foretaste of that everlasting "Well done" to which all of us look forward.

When this recognition comes from as distinguished in association as the American Irish Historical Society, the feeling of pleasure is seasoned with an understandable pride. For it is evident that the honors of this society are not lightly given nor cheaply bestowed. But by the same token, a glance at the roster of distinguished persons whom you have selected to honor in the past tempers this feeling with a sense of deep humility. I wish that for a few moments I could be endowed with the gifted eloquence of the O'Connell himself at Tara or Mullaghmast. Then I might adequately express the sentiment that at present overrides all others—my deep and sincere appreciation for this expression of your kindness.

Nevertheless, I can assure you that I will treasure this gold medal as a token of the generous estimate you have placed on my endeavors. It will ever be a reminder of your friendship and confidence. It is my hope that when my race is run, and this golden symbol passes to my children and grandchildren, it will also serve to inspire each and everyone of them to carry on the traditions of their Irish ancestors.

These traditions have been part of my own life from earliest childhood. My first awareness of Ireland, and what the Irish stand for, came from my mother's father—Daniel Bradley. My deep affection and love for my ancestors is to be credited in great part to him. Daniel Bradley reached the shores of America in 1849, about 50 years before the founding of the American Irish Historical Society. He was 19 years old at the time. What a thrill it was for me as a young boy to hear his tales of that stormy 2 months passage across the Atlantic in a sailing vessel. No sooner was he ashore at Castle Harbor than he was ushered by some forward-looking friends over to Brooklyn. In those days the Borough across the river was a separate, independent city with its own mayor, its own municipal government.

It was there his first mail reached him, addressed in this unusual way: "Daniel Bradley, Fornenst the Catholic Church, Brooklyn, USA." Now there is no need to tell an Irish audience that "fornenst" means "nearby." But I tell this story to remind us all that the young men and young women who emigrated to this country from Ireland were first and foremost profoundly religious. The folks back home knew that wherever Daniel Bradley settled, a Catholic church would be nearby.

Men like Daniel Bradley, and there were thousands, would not dream of living very far from a priest and the sacraments. Up to the time of his death grandpa always lived not only "fornenst" the Catholic church, but even closer to it in a spiritual way. Scores of priests have told me that they remembered him best, not as the proprietor of a small tobacco shop within the very shadows of the Brooklyn Bridge, nor as a fearless and much respected political crusader. They rather knew him best as their Sunday School teacher—and a great one he must have been. The spread of Catholicism was made possible by the dedicated and devoted clergy of those early days. But that same clergy would be the first to pay tribute to the many Daniel Bradleys who helped so much in their apostolic mission.

Daniel Bradley had many of the noblest attributes of the Irish race, but none in more abundant measure than two which I believe are all important today: Profound faith in God and belief in the power of prayer. These represent sources of strength upon which we as a Nation can and must draw in the present world crisis.

Throughout our history men of Irish lineage have demonstrated a patriotism and love of country that have been characteristic of the race in every age and clime. Bravery and heroism seldom reached greater heights than that displayed by Meagher's Irish Brigade, nearly cut to pieces holding the center of the Union line at Antietam. Nor has such devotion been confined to the battlefield. Few individuals have made greater engineering contributions to the strength of this Nation than John Holland who came to this country in 1872 from County Clare. Beginning with experiments on the *Fenian Ram* he developed the basic principles that enabled him to build the first really successful submarine. These principles found ever widening application and even today are embodied in the now famous atom-powered *Nautilus*.

The times in which we live continue to demand the bravery of Meagher and the genius of Holland, but they require much more. They demand not only a sense of duty to country, but the same faith in God and trust in prayer which our forebears had in such abundance.

Today we stand on the edge of the abyss of atomic annihilation. Daily the threat of world destruction grows measure by measure. Who can foretell the day when disaster will strike and mankind shall be hurled into a hydrogen holocaust surpassing imagination?

Speaking from the vantage point of 5 years of intimate association with the world nuclear crisis, I can assure you that I do not overstate the danger. Man's power to destroy was multiplied tens of thousands of times over with the first atomic explosion at Alamogordo 10 years ago. Before any progress toward political control of that original awesome weapon of mass destruction could be made, events had overtaken us. When I first became a member of the Atomic Energy Commission early in 1950 we were stockpiling bombs of the Alamogordo type. At that time a practical hydrogen bomb was considered by some as bordering on the impossible, by many others as something in

the distant future. However, by the end of 1952 we had achieved a large scale thermonuclear reaction that literally dwarfed the bombs then in our atomic arsenal.

I witnessed that first hydrogen bomb test at Eniwetok in the far Pacific on November 1, 1952, and not many months thereafter publicly announced the broad potentialities of the titanic nuclear forces there unleashed. If there ever has been any doubt, then that Pacific detonation, which was given the code name "MIKE," made it clear that the discovery of the key to the release of nuclear and thermonuclear energy has completely changed man's relationship to the world in which he lives. "MIKE" put within man's grasp the power to destroy civilization.

Nothing in the history of the human race has prepared us to cope with this awesome situation. In this new era the destructive capabilities of man have taken on new dimensions, orders of magnitude greater than anything in man's experience. To all this, the world, not only has had no time to adjust, but no time even to comprehend.

The 10 years since the first nuclear explosion and the less than 3 years since "MIKE," have been all too short a time. In that brief interval the world has scarce begun to understand the forces that men could release to destroy in a matter of seconds what it took centuries to put together. It is not strange that man is overwhelmed by the problem of controlling these forces so capable of tragic misuse. Yet time is running out. Man must quickly recognize his atomic dilemma and make the superhuman effort to resolve it.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki were laid waste by atomic bombs equivalent in destructive power to 20,000 tons of conventional high explosive. Yet this cold technical fact cannot of itself convey a sense of the immense suffering involved, nor of the thousands of souls dispatched in a matter of seconds before the judgment seat of God. Neither can one adequately describe the terrible power of thermonuclear detonations like "MIKE" by describing them in terms of millions and millions of tons of high explosive. It is not sufficient alone to think of these engines of mass destruction in terms of blast and heat. We must think also of their ability to contaminate temporarily thousands of square miles of the earth's surface with life-destroying radioactive particles. Small wonder then that words are inadequate to convey a real appreciation of the horrendous nature of this threat to our existence.

Yet if we cannot adequately convey the real meaning of today's weapons, how can we hope to imagine what tomorrow's weapons will bring forth. Is there any basis for believing that the weapons developments of the past few years will not be matched and even overshadowed by those of the years just ahead? Each new series of weapons tests has opened new avenues of weapons development. With each test it becomes easier to reduce our present civilization to ashes.

In this slide toward the precipice whence can we be saved? There is little in the history of man's efforts to achieve disarmament that gives cause for hope. Yet never before have the wages of failure been so tragic. The need has never been so compelling.

I have repeatedly and publicly advocated that one and all should become acquainted with the realities of the nuclear arms race. In particular the leaders of all nations must become completely and fully aware of the present and evergrowing threat of world destruction. A well-informed leadership on a worldwide basis is absolutely essential to survival.

In this connection I have been urging for some time that, as a first step, world leaders be shown the full effects of large-scale thermonuclear explosions. Such demonstrations can be arranged without disclosing weapons technology. What a tragedy it would be if after a nuclear holocaust it was disclosed that those who struck the atomic spark had no real understanding of the extent to which the nuclear fire would spread. How can the world take any chance that each one in authority is not thoroughly familiar with what an all-out atomic war would really mean?

Under present world conditions we, as a nation, have no immediate alternative but to maintain our military strength unimpaired. Our weapons programs must continue to move forward in order to maintain our world atomic superiority. Of itself, however, this daily increase in nuclear strength can never resolve the dilemma in which we find ourselves. Military might must rather be subordinated to those God-given laws of spiritual and moral conduct on which true peace and justice depend. This right order will not be realized so long as men persist in the convenient fallacy that they can compartmentalize military might and moral principle.

The dilemma of our times was clearly defined by Pope Pius XII last January when he said: "Each of the two groups into which the human family is divided tolerates the existence of the other because it does not wish itself to perish. * * * Each of the two groups smarts under the fear of the other's military and economic power. In both of them there is a grave apprehension of the catastrophic effect of the latest weapon. * * *"

The Holy Father goes on to say: "The present coexistence in fear has * * * only two possible prospects before it: either it will raise itself to a coexistence in fear of God, and thence to a truly peaceful living together, inspired and protected by the divine moral order; or else it will shrivel more and more into a frozen paralysis of international life, the grave dangers of which are even now foreseeable."

If, then, man is to avoid world suicide, he must think in terms of rebuilding the arsenals of the spirit. Preoccupation with the power of thermonuclear weapons must yield to the infinitely greater power of prayer. Prayer is the one and only force by which man will ever receive the inspiration, the courage, and the strength to enable him to direct nuclear forces toward a better and more abundant life.

The providence of God Almighty has deigned to reveal to the minds of men some of the deeper secrets of His creation; He has subjected to the will of man immeasurable forces for good or for ill. To that same providence man must have recourse, instant and persevering, for the enlightenment of his understanding, and the direction of his will, for the wisdom to use the bountiful gift of God as He has willed it—for man's good. Human prudence is not enough to cope with this situation, even if we could count on the good will of every person on earth; much more do we need the help and the direction of divine guidance, when half a world is intent on the goal of our destruction.

This duty of prayer, though it falls most heavily on those in whose hands rest the fateful decisions of our critical times, is not confined to them alone. It is a duty which lies upon all who have a stake in the survival of our Nation. To state it baldly: we pray, or we perish. The greatest source of hope in our present trying and difficult times is that we are a Nation of God-fearing people, that we have not repudiated our dependence on God, nor blinded by our achievements, set all our confidence in the material and the technological.

Prayer, obvious as its necessity may be to any right-thinking person, will either be rejected, or what is equally tragic, never be seriously considered by large numbers of people. Among these are many who are convinced that all the afflictions of man can be overcome merely by dispelling ignorance and relying on human intelligence. Even more numerous are those who are preoccupied with the material considerations of an increasingly secular culture that has no time for God.

All the more important then become the prayers of those who do believe in Him. Yet, in a special way, I look to womanhood. Surely this will include legions of daughters of Irish descent the world over. Beyond them, however, I look to womanhood everywhere for the inspiration and example to turn us toward God and prayer. For wherever men are strong in faith, is not that faith nurtured from the cradle by their mothers and strengthened by the example of their wives? What more appropriate occasion than the eve of Mother's Day to recall all that we owe to their interior strength and gentle guidance.

It is to women like our own wives, and our mothers and grandmothers that we must look to lead us back to God. Had not my own wife emulated and carried on the principles of my dear mother, I surely would not be here tonight to receive your signal honor.

I am convinced that the strength of this as of all nations lies in its womanhood. Now more than ever the issue of survival requires that we call on that strength, so firmly founded on faith in God. Doing this, we shall be inspired to go forward in that faith with courage and optimism for the future. And so find good cause for recalling that old familiar toast with this slight modification:

"Here's to God and Ireland
To her glorious and virtuous womanhood
And death to tyrants everywhere."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4020 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Florence Nightingale, National Hospital Week, and Speech by Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 135th anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, the founder of nursing methods as we know them today. During the Crimean War Miss Nightingale raised a band of nurses and took them to the Turkish military hospital at Scutari, on the Bosphorus. On November 4, 1854, she assumed control of the hospital and introduced system and order where indescribable chaos had reigned—and thereby laid the foundations of modern scientific nursing.

But Florence Nightingale is known for more than her heroic deeds in the Crimea. As Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, of the United States Public Health Service, says in the appended speech:

All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale.

To Florence Nightingale we owe both the high professional standards and the system of professional education which has given us 390,000 active professional nurses in America today. Other American nurses are giving their services throughout the world. Among them are such women as Mary Mills, of the United States Public Health Service, Chief Nurse, on a technical-assistance mission to Lebanon for the Foreign Operations Administration. I understand that Miss Mills has just been awarded the Lebanese Order of Merit by the Minister of Public Health for establishing the new Makafid School of Nursing in that Near Eastern nation. Miss Mills was previously decorated by the Liberian Government for a comparable feat.

NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

This week we are observing another major influence on the good health of Americans through National Hospital Week. Just recently I delivered an address at the oldest hospital in the United States, the 200-year-old Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia. The tradition of that fine institution reminded me of how far we have come since the days when hospitals were considered places to die.

Today hospitals are the centers of our community's health services, and our national and State hospital associations are working hard to provide the highest quality care for all Americans.

In the past several years there has been a great increase in hospital construction. This is due both to the stimulus offered by the Hill-Burton Act, and to the determination of the States and communities that their citizens should receive the full benefit of new advances in the medical sciences.

It has been estimated that the number of persons in the United States without access to acceptable general hospital services has been reduced from 10 million in 1947 to less than 4 million last year. New hospitals in rural areas are attracting physicians and other health personnel. Most new hospitals are using sound architectural practices. They are making provisions for consultation services in such fields as pathology, roentgenology, and other diagnostic services. All of these factors contribute to better care of the American people.

There is still ever so much to be done, with facilities for the chronically ill and for mental patients still in very scarce supply. But we are making progress, and that is what is important.

During National Hospital Week and the anniversary of Florence Nightingale, we should all offer our sincerest thanks to the men and women in the health professions who have dedicated their lives to fighting disease, to relieving human suffering, and to preventing needless death.

ARNSTEIN SPEECH

Under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech by one of the leaders of the nursing profession, Miss Margaret G. Arnstein, Chief of the Division of Nursing Resources of the United States Public Health Service. Her address was made before the section on historical and cultural medicine of the New York Academy of Medicine in New York City, May 11, 1955:

THE INFLUENCE OF FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE ON NURSING

Modern nursing derives so completely from the example and teaching of Florence Nightingale that it is hard to pick out the particular practices that owe their existence to her influence. All nursing has been influenced by her. One might say modern nursing is Miss Nightingale—that her name is a synonym for nursing. She demonstrated in a dramatic fashion in the Crimea that nursing—and sanitation—could reduce mortality, as Dr. Berry will describe to you.

The medical profession has long recognized the essential role of nursing in care of patients and prevention of illness. The Academy of Medicine tonight in paying tribute to Florence Nightingale; is paying tribute to the contribution nursing makes to medical practice.

Nursing literally did not exist, except in a few religious orders, until Miss Nightingale showed what it could do, and more important, established a school to produce people who could do it. This first school at St. Thomas' Hospital in London was a model for all the later schools in England and the United States. Nightingale nurses became heads of all the early schools established in England. Bellevue Hospital School of Nursing in New York, the first in this country to introduce the Nightingale principles, was actually guided by letters from Miss Nightingale.

This evening I would like to detach Miss Nightingale's principles from their historical setting and discuss them in relation to modern nursing. To do this one must recognize that Miss Nightingale had both a good influence and a bad influence on nursing. Most of the bad influence is due to the fact that we have slavishly followed some practices she strongly advocated, long after the need for them has disappeared. Some of it is due to the fact that we have continued with practices she initiated, but have ignored the underlying principles which she set forth.

The influences that have outlived their social usefulness are almost entirely related to the conduct of student nurses. When Miss Nightingale started the first training school, the Nightingale nurse, in the words of one of her biographers, "had to establish her character in a profession proverbial for its immorality."

The probationers, as students were called, had their entire lives controlled by the school as though in a convent. They had 2 hours of outdoor exercise each day, outside the dormitory. They were never allowed to leave the dormitory alone. All other time was scheduled: meals, work and learning, and sleep. All this control probably was necessary at that time. The fact that some of it has lingered on into the middle of the 20th century shows we did not consider the reason for the practice but clung to the practice itself long after the respectability of nursing was established, and young women in our society had attained much more independence.

Miss Nightingale herself recognized the danger of sterotyping. In the paper, Sick Nursing and Health Nursing, that she read in Chicago in 1893, when she was in her seventies, she said, "No system can endure that does not march."

On the other hand, if we had followed as closely all else that she taught, we would not now be trying to undo so much of what we recently have been teaching and doing in this country in nursing.

This astonishing person had such vision and understanding that I sometimes think a school of nursing today could not do better than read from her writings each morning a lesson for the day. The lesson could then be expanded with the knowledge of human relations and with the scientific facts we have acquired since her day, but I doubt that many new lessons would be needed.

It is a little disconcerting to realize some of our most modern ideas—that are still opposed by some nurses and some of the related professions—that these dangerous new ideas were taught by Miss Nightingale 95 years ago. Our leaders in nursing today have come to these ideas quite independently and have contributed greatly to getting us back on the track and several miles ahead of the point where we went off.

We might consider these ideas under three main headings: care of the patient in the hospital and in the home; administration of of nursing services; and education of nurses.

About care of the patient, the most advanced members of the nursing profession are stressing the idea that we must nurse the whole patient and not just his disease. Miss Nightingale expressed the same principle. She said, "The art is that of nursing the sick." And she added, "Please mark—nursing the sick; not nursing sickness."

Her definition of nursing the sick included giving the medicines and stimulants prescribed, and the surgical appliances, proper use of fresh air, warmth, and cleanliness, proper choosing and giving the diet, and quiet. All this was to be done, she wrote, "at least expense of vital power of the sick."

Psychosomatic medicine is a relatively new concept, yet the great physicians and nurses of the past recognized the influence of emotions on disease conditions. In writing about the care of patients, Miss Nightingale gave attention to the ways a patient's illness is affected by his state of mind, his worries and fears, the attractiveness or drabness of his surroundings, and the noise around him. She summed it up as follows:

"The symptoms or the sufferings generally considered to be inevitable and incident to the disease are very often not symptoms of the disease at all, but of something quite different—of the want of fresh air * * * or of quiet or of cleanliness or of punctuality. * * * The reparative process * * * has been hindered * * * by some want in one or in all of these things."

We can almost hear the modern cardiologist saying, as she did, "Apprehension, uncertainly, waiting, expectation, fear of surprise, do a patient more harm than any exertion."

Psychiatrists today teach us that the type of reassurance which tells a patient not to worry, the operation will not amount to anything, he will be all right, and other such encouragements, often defeats its own end. Today we believe that listening to the patient, the process we call nondirective interviewing, is actually more helpful. Although we did not learn this principle from Florence Nightingale, we might have done so. Although no one had ever heard of "nondirective interviewing," Miss Nightingale admonished, "Do not cheer the sick by making light of their danger," and continued at length to discuss the understanding of patients' fears and their individual differences.

In recent years we have recognized that color affects the productivity of industrial workers, and are now experimenting with the effect of color on patients. Although Miss Nightingale made no controlled experiments, she observed keenly, and in this instance her observations have been proved correct by later scientific experiments. "Little as we know about the way in which we are affected by form, by color, and light," she wrote, "we do know this, they have actual physical effect." Another observation from her writing of the same period was: "No one who has watched the sick can doubt the fact that some feel stimulus from looking at scarlet flowers, exhaustion from looking at deep blue, etc."

On the other hand, Miss Nightingale recognized that the connection between mind and body is not a one-way street. She said she wished "a little more was thought of the effect of the body on the mind." Today we recognize this fact and no longer say, as we did some years ago, that a patient "is or is not cooperative." We try to understand why he complains, or why he is angry, or why he resists treatment. Miss Nightingale summed up the patient's difficulties so succinctly that we might repeat her words everyday: "Almost any sick person, who behaves decently well, exercises more self-control every moment of his day than you will ever know till your are sick yourself."

Until recently, the recognition given Florence Nightingale by the nursing profession has been primarily for her work in establishing decent standards of nursing care for patients and starting a system of training for those who give the care. Yet perhaps her real genius was in the management field. She may have been so far ahead of her time that we did not appreciate the principles she bequeathed us; we have had to discover them for ourselves. Nurses, like hospital administrators, have gone to industry and business for ideas on better management. So we cannot say that Miss Nightingale has influenced our profession greatly in this aspect of nursing service. Yet she knew the basic principles of good management and expressed them so well I would like to quote part of her statement on the first requirement of an administrator:

"To be 'in charge' is certainly not only to carry out the proper measures yourself but to see that everyone else does so too. * * * It is neither to do everything yourself nor to appoint a number of people to the (same) duty."

Miss Nightingale had much to say about applying this principle and other principles of good management. In 1858 she advocated conserving the nurse's time and energy in almost the exact same words that were used in 1955 in a recommendation growing out of a recent time study of nursing activities. I quote from the report by a Michigan hospital:

"Following the study made in our hospital we now have a messenger service that brings supplies and drugs to the patient units and transports patients from place to place in the hospital."

Miss Nightingale said that "nothing should be fetched by the nurses," and that "the nurse should never be obliged to quit her floor except for her own dinner and supper." She had a scheme to make this possible—more revolutionary in her day than pneumatic tubes in ours—a "windlass installation," or lift to bring up the patients' food. She also had a scheme for saving work by having hot water piped up to every floor. Without systems of this kind, she said, the nurse is converted into a pair of legs.

She was not only an administrator but an inventor of labor-saving devices. The intercommunicating system at which we marvel today seems only a natural descendant of her suggestion that "the bells of patients should all ring in the passage outside the nurse's door on that story and should have a valve which flies open when its bell rings and remains open in order that the nurse may see who has rung."

Perhaps some of Miss Nightingale's ideas have remained dormant in nurses' consciousness like recessive characteristics. Even today only the more progressive hospitals have written job descriptions for all nursing personnel. We rather timidly suggest that the good staff nurse should receive recognition through higher pay and more responsibility without necessarily having to become an administrator.

Miss Nightingale said in 1858, in her subsidiary notes as to the introduction of female nursing into military hospitals, that the duties of each nurse, senior and junior, and of the orderly should be clearly outlined. She also wrote: "Many women are valuable as nurses who are yet unfit for promotion to head nurses. It appears to me that it would be desirable to have intermediate recompense."

The recent studies to which I referred have analyzed the pattern of interruptions in the head nurse's activities and have shown that the head nurse seldom spends as much as 5 minutes on an activity without being interrupted. Miss Nightingale had a gloomy outlook for people who spent their days in this fashion. She said, "I have never known persons who exposed themselves for years to constant interruption who did not muddle away their intellects by it at last."

Examples of her astute understanding of administration and her inventiveness could be multiplied for the rest of the evening. I shall quote only one more, under the heading of administration: "Unless the matron's authority is supported by the principal medical officer, the patients always suffer." When we read Miss Nightingale's writings we are never in danger of forgetting the patient.

In the field of nursing education, we have been grappling with numerous perplexing problems and divergent ideas in recent years. Here again Miss Nightingale offered many ideas that today would be considered progressive, perhaps even radical. Many students of our system of nursing education maintain that the school of nursing should be independent of the hospital. It is interesting to note that the first school of nursing, the Nightingale School at St. Thomas' Hospital in London, had its own endowment fund and its own board of managers.

The first schools in this country, at Bellevue and Massachusetts General Hospitals, were not established primarily to insure better care of the sick, but to educate nurses. The impetus for these schools came not from the physicians or the hospitals, but from the New York State Charities, and from the Women's Education Association in Boston. Each was directed initially by its own board of managers.

Recent studies of costs of schools of nursing have wrestled with the question, "Should nursing service personnel, head nurses, and others contribute to the education of the students?" In the Nightingale school, the head nurses and the director of nurses were paid part of their salaries from the Nightingale fund for the training of students. So we at least have a precedent for this practice.

Some of us have believed that having the students work full time on the wards was "the good old way." Yet even in Miss Nightingale's era, when theory was a much smaller part of the preparation for any profession than it is now, Miss Nightingale stated as one of the essentials of a training school that "there shall be an organization which by giving proper help in the wards gives probationers time to do their work as pupils as well as give service to patients. Seventy years later we are proposing not a completely different philosophy of training, but rather more of the pupil and less of the service.

Nursing educators are convinced of the necessity of students understanding the reasons behind the things they do—of the value of the case-study method of teaching. Miss Nightingale must be nodding her head in approval. Her spirit perhaps is murmuring "at last." For in 1882 she wrote, "We require a special organization for the purpose of training." Then she explained:

"Training is to teach not only what is to done * * * not only how to do it, but why such and such a thing is done, and not such and such another; as also to teach symptoms, and what symptoms indicate what of a disease or change, and the 'reason why' of such symptoms.

"Without time for these things, average nurse-probationers degenerate into conceited ward drudges. Without a system for these things, they potter and cobble out their year about the patients, and make not much progress in real nursing—that is, in obeying the physicians' and surgeons' orders intelligently and perfectly."

In her forthright way, Miss Nightingale's predicted dire things for the students if we do not give them proper training.

So summarized so well all the attributes we want in a nurse today that I am going to end with this quotation:

"Training is to teach a nurse to know her business, that is, to observe exactly, to understand, to know exactly, to do, to tell exactly, in such stupendous issues as life and death, health, and disease.

"Training is to enable the nurse to act for the best in carrying out her orders, not as a machine but as a nurse; as an intelligent and responsible being. Training has to make her, not servile, but loyal to medical orders and authorities. True loyalty to orders cannot be without the independent sense of responsibility, which alone secures real trustworthiness."

Hoover Commission Report on Veterans' Medical Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government dealing with veterans' hospitals and benefits makes me think that the Commission was far more aptly named by the public in calling it the Hoover Commission than in its own formal title. The consideration shown our veterans in the Commission report, it seems to me, is comparable to that shown veterans under the Hoover administration at the time of the famed veterans bonus march on Washington.

It is true that, given the composition of the present Hoover Commission, as appointed by President Eisenhower, and the Republican leadership of the 83d Congress, we might have predicted that social welfare matters would be treated on a cold cash-and-carry basis, without regard for the human principles involved. The fact that as the Commission reports come out they go right down the line in recommending elimination or reduction of many such programs is not too surprising—in spite of the fact that the previous Commission, appointed under a Democratic administration, had adopted a much more sympathetic attitude toward social-welfare programs in general. It might be well in passing also to mention that the present Commission seems to have gone a long way out on the limb in the way of recommending changes in basic and fundamental policy without confining themselves to considerations involving organization of the executive agencies or administration of policy.

However, despite the bias of the Commission implicit in its membership, we might have hoped that they would soften their strict dollars-and-cents thinking in view of the tremendous debt the country owes to the veterans of our Armed Forces. Analysis of the report on medical services as it applies to veterans' hospitals and benefits shows, however, that this was not the case.

The Commission seems to have used as their yardstick for operation of veterans' hospital, as an example, the sole question of whether or not such a hospital can be "operated effectively and economically," with callous disregard for all the human and humane factors involved. Certainly their recommendation "that all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals be rescinded except for those now under construction or contract" shows a cynical attitude toward the situation in many areas of the country where hospital facilities are sadly lacking. The Commission calls attention to their claim that during the past 20 years all service-connected cases could have been taken care of in existing hospitals without any new construction as justification for their recommendation. Their other recommendations calling for a crackdown on hospitalization for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities, coupled with this statement, give a clear indication of the Commission's feeling that the Federal Government should get out from under its strong moral and legal obligation to provide medical treatment for needy veterans unable to provide such treatment for themselves.

I know from personal experiences with hundreds of cases how difficult it is for any veteran to establish service connection for any of the ailments, physical and mental, which may attack him following his service. The Commission's recommendations for cutting down on non-service-connected cases, together with their recommendation to tighten up on the already strict criteria for establishing service connection, would work untold additional hardship on the many deserving veterans now denied adequate treatment because of faulty medical records maintained by the services, or because of the Administration's unwillingness to accept medical evidence indicating service connection unless the medical records for the veteran's period of service give proof positive that the specific ailment had its onset during the period.

This situation is particularly bad in cases where mental illnesses have occurred as an aftermath of wartime service although at the time of discharge the condition may not have been evident. In northern California alone, as an example, the existing Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital at Palo Alto has a waiting list of over 1,000 cases of veterans classified as non-service-connected crying for admission and the treatment they so badly need. In the meantime our State institutions or the families of the veterans must bear the burden. Yet, for almost 10 years the construction of another such hospital in the San Francisco area has been authorized, only to have construction delayed year after year on one excuse or another. Money has now been appropriated, but the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have not yet given the final all clear which would permit signing of contracts and start of construction. Presumably, if the Hoover Commission has its way, the construction would never be started, since, technically, these are non-service-connected cases. Yet I would like to know who would dare to stand up and say that, medical records or no, most of these cases are not the direct result of the wartime strains and stresses to which the individual veterans were subjected.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the Congress does not abrogate its own responsibility to make policy determinations on how far care for veterans should be extended. If I am any judge the Congress will give the inhumane recommendations of the Commission the treatment they deserve. I, for one, will oppose any move to put them into effect with few exceptions and will support consigning them, for the most part, to the wastebasket.

Hon. David Crockett, Representative From Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, the following sketch was taken from a book published by Perkins & Marvin, Boston, containing speeches on the passage of the bill for the removal of the Indians, delivered in the Congress of the United States April and May 1830:

A SKETCH OF THE REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DAVID CROCKETT, REPRESENTATIVE FROM TENNESSEE, ON THE BILL FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE INDIANS, MADE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1830

Mr. Crockett said, that, considering his very humble abilities, it might be expected that he should content himself with a silent vote; but, situated as he was, in relation to his colleagues, he felt it to be a duty to himself to explain the motives which governed him in the vote he should give on this bill. Gentlemen had already discussed the treaty-making power; and had done it much more ably than he could pretend to do. He should not therefore enter on that subject, but would merely make an explanation as to the reasons of his vote. He did not know whether a man[1] within 500 miles of his residence would give a similar vote; but he knew, at the same time, that he should give that vote with a clear conscience. He had his constituents to settle with, he was aware; and should like to please them as well as other gentlemen; but he had also a settlement to make at the bar of his God; and what his conscience dictated to be just and right he would do, be the consequences what they might. He believed that the people who had been kind enough to give him their suffrages, supposed him to be an honest man, or they would not have chosen him. If so, they could not but expect that he should act in the way he thought honest and right. He had always viewed the native Indian tribes of this country as a sovereign people. He believed they had been recognized as such from the very foundation of this Government, and the United States were bound by treaty to protect them; it was their duty to do so. And as to giving the money of the American people for the purpose of removing them in the manner proposed, he would not do it. He would do that only for which he could answer to his God. Whether he could answer it before the people was comparatively nothing, though it was a great satisfaction to him to have the approbation of his constituents.

Mr. Crockett said he had served for 7 years in a legislative body. But from the first

[1] That is, a Member of Congress.

hour he had entered a legislative hall, he had never known what party was in legislation; and God forbid he ever should. He went for the good of the country, and for that only. What he did as a legislator, he did conscientiously. He should love to go with his colleagues, and with the West and the South generally, if he could; but he never would let party govern him in a question of this great consequence.

He had many objections to the bill—some of them of a very serious character. One was, that he did not like to put half a million of money into the hands of the Executive, to be used in a manner which nobody could foresee, and which Congress was not to control. Another objection was, he did not wish to depart from the rule which had been observed toward the Indian nations from the foundation of the Government. He considered the present application as the last alternative for these poor remnants of a once powerful people. Their only chance of aid was at the hands of Congress. Should its members turn a deaf ear to their cries, misery must be their fate. That was his candid opinion.

Mr. Crockett said he was often forcibly reminded of the remark made by the famous Red Jacket, in the rotunda of this building, when he was shown the panel which represented in sculpture the first landing of the Pilgrims, with an Indian chief presenting to them an ear of corn, in token of friendly welcome. The aged Indian said, "That was good." The Indian said, he knew that they came from the Great Spirit, and he was willing to share the soil with his brothers from over the great water. But when he turned around to another panel representing Penn's treaty, he said, "Ah, all's gone now." There was a great deal of truth in this short saying; and the present bill was a strong commentary upon it.

Mr. Crockett said that four counties of his district bordered on the Chickasaw country. He knew many of their tribe; and nothing should ever induce him to vote to drive them west of the Mississippi. He did not know what sort of a country it was in which they were to be settled. He would willingly appropriate money in order to send proper persons to examine the country. And when this had been done, and a fair and free treaty had been made with the tribes, if they were desirous of removing, he would vote an appropriation of any sum necessary; but till this had been done, he would not vote 1 cent. He could not clearly understand the extent of this bill. It seemed to go to the removal of all the Indians, in any State east of the Mississippi River, in which the United States owned any land. Now, there was a considerable number of them still neglected; there was a considerable number of them in Tennessee, and the United States Government owned no land in that State, north and east of the congressional reservation line. No man could be more willing to see them removed than he was, if it could be done in a manner agreeable to themselves; but not otherwise. He knew personally that a part of the tribe of the Cherokees were unwilling to go. When the proposal was made to them, they said, "No; we will take death here at our homes. Let them come and tomahawk us here at home; we are willing to die, but never to remove." He had heard them use this language. Many different constructions might be put upon this bill. One of the first things which had set him against the bill was the letter from the Secretary of War to Colonel Montgomery—from which it appeared that the Indians had been intruded upon. Orders had been issued to turn them all off except the heads of the Indian families, or such as possessed improvements. Government had taken measures to purchase land from the Indians who had gone to Arkansas. If this bill should pass, the same plan would be carried further; they would send and buy them out, and put white men upon their land. It had never been known that white men and Indians could live together; and, in this case, the Indians were to have no privileges allowed them, while the white men were to have all. Now, if this was not oppression with a vengeance, he did not know what it was. It was the language of the bill, and of its friends, that the Indians were not to be driven off against their will. He knew the Indians were unwilling to go; and therefore he could not consent to place them in a situation where they would be obliged to go. He could not stand that. He knew that he stood alone, having, perhaps, none of his colleagues from his State agreeing in sentiment. He could not help that. He knew that he should return to his home glad and light in heart, if he voted against the bill. He felt that it was his wish and purpose to serve his constituents honestly, according to the light of his conscience. The moment he should exchange his conscience for mere party views, he hoped his Maker would no longer suffer him to exist. He spoke the truth in saying so. If he should be the only Member of that House who voted against the bill, and the only man in the United States who disapproved, he would still vote against it; and it would be a matter of rejoicing to him till the day he died, that he had given the vote. He had been told that he should be prostrated; but, if so, he would have the consolation of conscience. He would obey that power, and glorified in the deed. He cared not for popularity, unless it could be obtained by upright means. He had seen much to disgust him here; and he did not wish to represent his fellow citizens, unless he could be permitted to act conscientiously. He had been told that he did not understand English grammar. That was very true. He had never been 6 months at school in his life; he had raised himself by the labor of his hands. But he did not, on that account, yield up his privilege as the Representative of free men on this floor.[2] Humble as he was, he meant to exercise his privilege. He had been charged with not representing his constituents. If the fact was so, the error (said Mr. Crockett) is here (touching his head), not here (laying his hand upon his heart). He never had possessed wealth or education but he had ever been animated by an independent spirit; and he trusted to prove it on the present occasion.

[2] Colonel Crockett represents more voters than any Member of Congress, except Mr. Duncan, of Illinois. The reason is the great influx of population since the State was formed into districts. There were 20,000 voters in Colonel Crockett's district more than a year ago. There are probably more than 22,000 now.

Townsend Convention Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address I made before the National Townsend Convention at St. Petersburg, Fla., on May 2, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Townsend, distinguished guests, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a source of personal inspiration to see so many of you here at this, your 15th convention, and to look back on your significant accomplishments under the leadership of your beloved Dr. Townsend.

It is fitting that you have chosen to meet in this beautiful city of St. Petersburg. It is known throughout the land as a haven for our retired senior citizens. I am sure that your visit here will be a most pleasant one.

I come to talk with you, briefly, on a matter in which you, and millions of other American citizens, are deeply interested. I come also to pay a tribute to the founder of your organization, Dr. Francis E. Townsend. In all our land, no other person has done more to improve the lot of the senior citizens of our country. His efforts have done much in lightening the burden of our old folks and in making possible for them a better opportunity for a decent livelihood in their retirement.

I know that the pages of history will duly record his tremendous contribution to the well-being of his fellowmen. His perseverance and courage against overwhelming obstacles serve as inspiration to all of us, and to those who will follow along the path toward social and economic justice which he has so clearly marked.

This 15th convention has been most aptly entitled the "Torchlight Convention." Truly, the purpose of this gathering is to light the torch of truth, showing the way to a better tomorrow for the senior citizens of the Nation and for our younger folks to look forward to.

I have always admired the Townsend organization because of its sincere concern with the problems of people. In this day of increasing mechanization and preoccupatio with such things as automation, A- and H-bombs, guided missiles, V-8 engines, television, and other mechanical and technical advancements, it is encouraging to find such a dedicated organization striving to obtain for our old folks an equitable share of the Nation's abundance which you have helped to create.

You have made outstanding progress in an area where any progress is difficult. The struggle for social reform is a constant uphill fight. Tremendous pressures for inertia must be overcome before any advances can be made.

Great gains have been won. And although you have not obtained your objective for adequate insurance or retirement benefits for elderly citizens, you have made great progress. You have been a tremendous force for good. You can rightfully claim much of the credit for improvements that have been made in State and Federal legislation pertaining to problems of the aged. You are a force for good because you put human values above everything else.

We need only to refer to history to find illustrations of successful campaigns which have been won against the forces of social inaction. Some of these fights have taken many decades, others hundreds or even thousands of years.

Consider the struggle over the ages for the realization of the inherent worth and dignity of the human spirit. From the days of Christ, man has been taught that human dignity and spiritual values transcend all other values. The basic elements of Christianity teach that we are all God's children and that we are important in His plan. This teaching survived the tyranny of the Roman Empire, the Dark Ages and was reborn in the renaissance. Down through the centuries man has struggled to break the chains of feudalism, political and religious persecution and to improve his status. Our own forefathers came to America to find a freedom which was denied them in their native lands.

Yes, the struggle for freedom and social progress for the individual has carried down into our own lifetime. We have achieved a measure of freedom and dignity unsurpassed in all of the history of the world. But we continue to fight for an even better life for ourselves and our children and our grandchildren because there still are inequities today which need remedying.

Some of the struggles for social progress have been of a shorter duration, but nonetheless intense. The fight against the inhuman institution of slavery in this country lasted almost a hundred years, and was won at the fearful cost of human lives and suffering in a great Civil War.

Woman suffrage was not achieved until the recent past, after decades and decades of agitation. No, my friends, real social progress is not easy to win. It is a continuing struggle against powerful forces who seek to maintain the status quo and who fear change.

Your program is one which should attract interest from young people as well as old folks. The young man or woman who has the foresight and vision to look ahead, will be interested in the kind of Federal insurance, or social-security program that will adequately provide for them in their twilight years. Young people are naturally concerned about the welfare of their parents and that, too, should interest them in a security program that is adequate in meeting the needs of their elders.

We are not much concerned about the name of a program so long as the objective is to adequately compensate retired citizens and to provide for them the opportunity to properly share in the abundance with which this Nation is blessed.

Any program of social reform which gives a break to the average citizen will always be denounced by those who traditionally have opposed social legislation and social progress.

The objective you seek will one day be realized. It would be unrealistic to expect it to come without great effort and sacrifice, for social reform unfortunately does not move as fast as we would like.

Progress has been slowed down by those who say that the Nation cannot afford a program such as yours or, even programs which are not as far advanced as yours. They ignore the facts that one of our Nation's great problems today is how to meet the challenge of abundance.

We are worried about the great surpluses of farm products. We are concerned because the storehouses are filled with all sorts of electrical gadgets, automobiles, and other items essential for good living. It seems to me that the question is whether we can afford to hold back on programs for adequate retirement benefits. Can we afford to block plans to raise the living level of millions of American workingmen and women and their families who now live on incomes that are not adequate to provide the kind of livelihood and opportunities they are entitled to?

There is something seriously wrong when millions of our fellow citizens are suffering because of the lack of goods which the Nation has in such great abundance. Some folks say we are living beyond our means. They suggest that because of this great abundance we should adjust ourselves downward and backward. Because there is so much of everything they believe people should live on less. That, to me, does not make good sense.

In this great land of ours there is no good reason why everyone should not have the opportunity for a full, happy, and productive life.

In order to build an expanding, full employment economy we must make it possible for our old folks to share in our economic progress. This is one of your aims and it is sound. Increased purchasing power is the key to a brighter tomorrow. Millions of citizens now barely able to exist on meager pensions, inadequate unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, or public assistance today constitute a great potential force for economic advancement if they are given the opportunity to share in the Nation's wealth.

Our Nation was founded by men who had a deep and abiding faith in human progress and a humble respect for the needs of our people. Democracy can be hurt only in times of chaos and in an atmosphere of fear, uncertainty, and hopelessness.

Your own organization was born in the grim days of depression. You remember well that panic which seized our people when our economy was in a state of collapse because of policies which ignored the welfare of the average American. We must remember well the lessons we learned 25 years ago and resist any attempts to again take us down the road to economic disaster.

I regret to say that already I see some of the same danger signals of the 1920's in certain policies of the present administration. The ill-fated "hard money" policy has already forced increases in the interest rates on Government securities and has worked a hardship on borrowers and small businesses. Preoccupation with the alleged needs for encouraging investments has taken precedence over the real needs of the average American for tax relief and resulting increases in purchasing power.

Some people in the administration believe that a float of unemployment is essential in a competitive society in order to keep production on a high level. They overlook human values and fail to see the suffering that comes to several million American families who are compelled to live on inadequate unemployment insurance, public assistance or private charity. They fail to see the tremendous waste in human and natural resources that comes with idle men, idle machines and idle factories.

The real waste in our Nation today is the loss in national output because of this backward adjustment and fear of abundance. This loss last year amounted to something like $30 billion. It does not make sense that several million workers who desperately seek work in our country today are unable to get jobs, particularly when there is so much work to do. There is a great need, all over the country, for more and better schools. There is a crying need for hospitals and increased medical care for our citizens. In all parts of our great country there is the need for the building of highways and expansion of water, sewer, sanitary systems and the like. There is a great new field for employment in serving the millions of people for whom new avenues have opened for longer vacations, travel, recreation and culture because of automation and increased productive power.

We need not fear abundance. We should not be frightened about a program which would permit all of our citizens, and particularly our deserving senior citizens to fully share in the necessities and luxuries of life which we, as a Nation, have in such great abundance.

If we have the vision, our productive capacity can provide more leisure. It need not be unemployment and suffering amid plenty. If we have the vision, abundance should be cause for rejoicing, not confusion, fear, and sorrow.

But, shortsighted economic thinking and philosophy which we had hoped was discredited, dead and buried in the great depression, is now making its reincarnation. I am seriously alarmed at some striking resemblances to the predepression administration which are now appearing on the present-day Washington scene.

In my opinion the present administration is not concerning itself with the problems of people but is focusing more and more attention on the health of the stock market, the banking interests, and the profit figures of our giant corporations.

The administration should realize that the needs of our aged are becoming more critical each year. The number of persons over 65 years of age is increasing at the rate of over 1,000 persons a day. Senior citizens now make up over 8 percent of our total population and the proportion is rising rapidly as medical science makes new discoveries which prolong our life expectancy.

The hard fact of the matter is that our social and economic advances have not nearly kept pace with our medical, scientific, and technical advances. Concern for human needs has been shoved aside in the mad race for profits and economic power. But how can we achieve real and lasting progress unless the needs of our aged are given the serious consideration they deserve? Today, even middle-aged workers are being discriminated against in employment opportunities. What happens to these citizens who can no longer find employment? A few have been able to accumulate savings in their lifetime, however meager. But how far will savings go when the cost of living remains at such a high level. Some aged persons are cared for by children or relatives, but we know of the natural desire for independence and freedom of action.

One of the most effective ways which the administration could begin to meet the problems of the aged would be in supporting a housing plan for the older citizens of this Nation.

An example of how this plan could be geared to the needs of our aged is to be found in Cleveland, where a public housing development has set aside 100 apartments, with special provisions such as elevators, nonslip floors, handrails and other fixtures which would make life easier for old people.

Rent in such a project would be low and independence would be assured without isolation, since the apartments are a part of a larger development which would have occupants of all ages. This is the type of program which the Federal Government should undertake on a nationwide scale to reassert its interest and concern for the needs of our growing aged population.

Of course, the Federal Government must begin to face up to the realties of the basic financial needs of the senior citizens. Present levels of benefits under the old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act are pitifully inadequate despite recent increases. Even $100 a month pension would be little enough to buy the bare necessities of life. Millions of Americans are trying to exist today on far less than that. Coverage, while extended recently, still does not provide for aged persons not eligible for benefits at the time of their retirement because of limited original coverage and other disqualifications. Permanently and totally disabled persons are discriminated against under the present law.

I share your views that our present social security law is far from adequate. But it can, and will be improved, as more citizens show an interest in their Government and in legislation that means so much to themselves and their families. We can make our social security law whatever we want it to to be when we arouse enough public support.

Dr. Townsend has displayed wisdom in looking toward his objective. He is realistic enough to know that it requires organization, work, and effort. He has called attention to the great need for unity and action on the part of elderly folks throughout the Nation. He has wisely suggested that you make common cause with organizations of working men and women who are your strongest allies. Labor organizations are made up of members, who like yourself, are deeply concerned about humane problems and about the security of our senior citizens.

Don't forget, there are some in this country who would like to destroy social security, not because they want something better, but because they don't like security at all for the average citizen. They don't like welfare programs. The security that comes regularly with an old-age insurance or pension check—something that is yours as a matter of right—gives to old folks a sense of dignity, self-respect, and independence.

Some folks don't want you to be independent. They don't want you to be in a position where you can't be pushed around or be told what to do. Old-age insurance or retirement pension legislation, or whatever you wish to call it, can be improved to the extent that people desire, if they have the initiative to exert themselves and to apply themselves to the task that must be done.

There is really no need to worry about the financial soundness of the social security system. Social security is just as good and strong as your Government.

The real test, as to whether the Nation can and will adequately provide for retired folks and for all of our people will finally depend upon whether or not we have the real wealth in human and natural resources and in food and other essential goods.

In closing I must say a good word about my friends, Mrs. Ford and Mr. ELLIOTT. They are doing a good job for you in Washington and have the respect of my colleagues in the Congress.

Dr. Townsend is also greatly admired by Members of the Congress for his outstanding leadership in your great cause.

Many Members of Congress have signed the Townsend petition requesting that consideration be given to your program in committees and on the floor of the Congress.

Although this objective has not been achieved, your work has been most fruitful in that it has had a powerful impact on bringing about improvements in social security.

In this beautiful Florida city are a number of people who have come here from my congressional district. I had the pleasure of meeting some dear friends only a few moments ago. I refer to Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Birch, who are now residents of this city and are with us here in the convention hall. Mr. Birch was a prominent citizen of Reading, Pa., and for many years principal of the boys high school. I was one of his students.

I regret that I can't stay here a few days instead of rushing back to Washington. To all of you, my sincere best wishes. May you enjoy continued success in advancing a just cause to which you are so faithfully devoted.

Surplus Wheat and Corn Processed Into Flour and Meal Should Be Made Available to the Unemployed of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Agricultural Committee in support of Senate bill 661 which will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process wheat into flour and corn into meal for distribution to the unemployed and their families. S. 661 is similar to a bill I introduced on the subject in the House of Representatives.

My statement before the Senate subcommittee follows:

Mr. Chairman, S. 661 is similar to H. R. 2851 with the exception of amendments adopted by the House Committee on Agriculture. I introduced similar legislation in the House because the subject of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal is of great interest to the unemployed people in my congressional district who can use surplus commodities to better advantage, if they are processed as provided for by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time over 18 percent of the civilian labor force in my congressional district is unemployed and is principally composed of coal miners and railroaders who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, liquidated their savings accounts, borrowed on or have taken the cash value of their insurance policies and today are living on public assistance and surplus commodities.

To give you some idea of the overall picture of unemployment in my congressional district, let me call your attention to the following chart that describes the number of families and persons receiving surplus commodities:

Surplus commodities

County	Number of families	Percentage of all families	Total number of persons	Percentage of county population
Blair	10,801	26.8	32,561	23.3
Centre	2,939	15.9	9,362	14.2
Clearfield	9,988	42.2	37,179	43.3
Total	23,728	28.8	79,402	27.1
Entire State of Pennsylvania			1,020,963	[1] 9.7

[1] Percent of State population of 10,498,012.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, before you receive coupons for surplus commodities you have to be certified as eligible by a local welfare agency.

Therefore, these figures are official and have been verified not only by the State of Pennsylvania but also by the county commissioners in each of the three counties in my congressional district.

Surplus commodities by carload lots to Mar. 1, 1955

County	Beans	Beef	Butter	Cheese	Dried milk	Rice	Shortening
Blair	2	16	21	19	18	1	16
Centre	½	4	3	5	5	½	4
Clearfield	4	5	16	14	16	1	13
Total number of carloads	6½	25	40	38	39	2½	33
Grand total			184				

Mr. Chairman, there is no denial of the fact that these figures are startling and are an answer to those who smugly insist that there is no acute unemployment problem in the labor-surplus areas of the Nation.

Think of it, Mr. Chairman, according to the Pennsylvania department of property and supplies, in this great industrial State of Pennsylvania, out of its 10⅛ million residents, nearly 10 percent, or 1,020,963 are living on surplus commodities.

In this congressional district comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, out of a population of 292,000, nearly 28 percent or 79,402 persons are receiving surplus commodities.

Mr. Chairman, these figures are startling for they truly portray the extent of unemployment in my congressional district as well as in the entire State of Pennsylvania.

As I said in the beginning of this statement, the processing of wheat into flour and corn into meal will enable the families of the unemployed to use these surplus commodities to good advantage since many housewives still bake their own bread and muffins and can put the flour and meal to good use in arranging the family diet.

Mr. Chairman, this idea of processing wheat into flour and corn into meal as provided for in S. 661 will not establish a precedent in the handling and distribution of surplus commodities, because over a period of years the United States Department of Agriculture has been distributing canned beef and gravy in processed form.

According to the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, during the period from March to December of 1953, they purchased nearly 172 million pounds of canned beef and gravy for distribution here in the United States, while nearly 12 million more pounds of canned beef and gravy were purchased for export, mainly to Greece and Germany. The cost of these purchases was in excess of $72 million.

Mr. Chairman, if it has been possible to put beef and gravy in a tin container for distribution, I can see no reason why wheat and corn should not be processed into flour and meal for the unemployed of the Nation. Therefore, I hope that S. 661 will receive the favorable consideration of this committee.

Public-Opinion Survey—11th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth consecutive year, I have conducted a public-opinion survey among the constituents of my congressional district, and this year mailed out 19,700 questionnaires, of which 250 were returned undelivered, showing a net mailing of 19,450.

To date, 3,520 questionnaires have been returned and tabulated, which represents 18.1 percent of the net mailing and which, according to professional sampling criteria, is a very good return.

Besides the 4,200 people on my semimonthly newsletter mailing list, the

questionnaire was sent into every precinct in the district to people picked at random without prior knowledge of their political affiliation, so that the distribution accomplished was as fair as was humanly possible and indicates that a typical cross-section of the constituency was sampled. The results of the survey are as follows:

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No answer	Percent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	2,445	69.5	996	28.3	79	2.2
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?	1,579	44.9	1,753	49.8	188	5.3
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?	1,759	50.0	1,622	46.0	139	4.0
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	2,004	56.9	1,066	30.3	450	12.8
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	2,298	65.3	840	23.9	382	10.8
6. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, just off the Chinese mainland, if these islands are attacked by Chinese Communist forces?	1,221	34.7	2,069	58.8	230	6.5
7. Do you approve of using United States military forces to defend Formosa if it is attacked by Chinese Communists?	2,206	62.7	1,136	32.3	178	5.0
8. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public housing program?	1,921	54.6	1,477	41.9	122	3.5
9. Do you favor the Federal Government reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical plans?	1,530	43.5	1,750	49.7	240	6.8
10. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's 10-year highway-construction program requiring the expenditure of $101 billion?	2,680	76.1	717	20.4	123	3.5
11. Do you favor the administration's education proposal in which the Federal Government share would be $1.1 billion, of which $200 million would be in grants, the rest in loans to support local and State school bonds?	2,539	72.1	842	23.9	139	4.0
12. Do you favor a program of universal military training requiring every man to spend some time in military training and then have to join the Reserves?	2,320	65.9	1,103	31.3	97	2.8
13. Do you approve of statehood for Hawaii with a population of 499,794 (1950 census)?	2,696	76.6	674	19.1	150	4.3
14. Do you approve of statehood for Alaska with a population of 108,543 (1950 census)?	2,664	75.7	697	19.8	159	4.5
15. Do you favor revealing to the American public more of our foreign agreements such as the recently disclosed Yalta documents?	2,852	81.0	567	16.1	101	2.9
16. Do you believe we are spending enough for military security? (The estimated budget expenditure for 1956 is $62.4 billion; 65 percent of this or $40.5 billion is for major national military security.)	2,768	78.7	487	13.8	265	7.5
17. Do you think the average American company can pay its employees a guaranteed annual wage?	1,202	34.1	2,067	58.7	251	7.2
18. Do you favor President Eisenhower's conducting personal talks with the heads of the Russian and British Governments?	2,311	65.7	1,045	29.7	164	4.6
19. Do you approve of a questionnaire of this type as a means of helping a Congressman to know the thinking of his constituents?	3,451	98.0	38	1.1	31	.9

Five of the questions asked in this year's survey were identical in content and similarly worded in 1954 and 1953, and a comparison of the results over these 3 years is as follows:

	Percentages							
	1955			1954			1953 [1]	
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	69.5	28.3	2.2	67.0	29.9	3.1	64.1	35.9
2. Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations?	44.9	49.8	5.3	45.7	46.4	7.9	44.7	55.3
3. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward areas?	50.0	46.0	4.0	54.4	38.8	6.8	43.3	56.7
4. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	56.9	30.3	12.8	52.9	36.6	10.5	78.5	21.5
5. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	65.3	23.9	10.8	58.0	25.9	16.1	84.2	15.8

[1] It is to be noted that in the percentage of "yes" and "no" answers tabulated in the 1953 questionnaire, the "no" answers were not included in the percentage breakdown.

Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, of Lawrence, Mass., conducted their annual dinner on Thursday evening, May 6, 1955, at the Central Catholic Memorial Auditorium at Lawrence, Mass. Although I did not have an opportunity to be present as one of the speakers due to the heavy legislative program in the House of Representatives, I am advised, however, that this event was one of the most successful held by that organization.

The capacity attendance, I am informed, enjoyed the extemporaneous and off-the-cuff remarks of the principal speaker, Harry A. Stuhedreher, former All-American Notre Dame quarterback and one of the so-called Four Horsemen and now an executive of the United States Steel Co.

The toastmaster for the evening was Charles J. McCabe, and he introduced the speakers consisting of Arthur M. Sullivan, general chairman of the banquet committee; Very Rev. Vincent A. McQuade, O. S. A., Ph. D., president of Merrimack College at North Andover, Mass.; Hon. John J. Buckley, mayor of the city of Lawrence; Joseph A. Torrisi, the president of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce; Rabbi Joseph Rudavsky of Temple Emmanuel; and Rev. Allan R. McAllaster, Ph. D., president of the Greater Lawrence Council of Churches.

The highlight of the evening, introduced by Toastmaster Charles J. McCabe, labeled, Spotlight on Optimism, in which James F. Hennessey, superintendent of schools of the city of Lawrence, was commentator and consisted of a group of attractive young women appearing on the stage carrying printed cards honoring each phase, as Superintendent Hennessey spoke. The well-prepared and enlightening remarks of Mr. Hennessey are as follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON OPTIMISM

The story you are about to hear is true. Even the names are the same, to identify the heroes. It is the story of one community's struggle to live and to keep growing—after its chief source of livelihood, to a large extent, had died. It is the straightforward account of what great achievements are possible for a people with a will and with willingness—with a determination and a determined goal—with an intense pride in their proud past and in their noble destiny.

The scene is Lawrence—Lawrence, Mass.—center of the happy Merrimack Valley, populated by 125,000 diversified people. Over 99,000 of these people native born, locally educated, with their income derived from local sources.

The theme of our story is a call to optimism.

The spotlight will fall on those aspects of our educational, religious, cultural and civil life that justify firm and reassuring confidence in our future. We shall see and hear things of which we are proud. Out of it all will be a realistic proof of our reason for optimism.

First, there is that remarkable asset which so completely makes the Greater Lawrence area strong: Our people. There is only one way to account for the historic development of Greater Lawrence and more particularly the tremendous industrial growth of the first few years. That is that Lawrence has a greater number of diligent, courageous, and industrious people than any other comparable community in America. So skillfully have our people adjusted to the techniques and demands of modern industry, that our labor force now provides the knowhow for the manufacture of over 100 different products—an adjustment they had to make within the brief space of less than a decade. Mature union leadership, responsible union members, understanding and enlightened management have developed a labor-management record that stands up well in the scrutiny of our spotlight. From the day when our country adopted a national labor-relations law, no city in America with a high percentage of union membership and its resultant high standards of living, has had a better record than we have had in Lawrence. Lawrence people are friendly, they

are sincere, they are proud, and they are generous. There are no masses, no classes. We are a spirited, independent, freedom-loving people. We like politics, because we like the democratic way of life. We enjoy a measure of controversy and debate, and we don't mind fighting for what we believe. That's the kind of people we are, and our spotlight shines on the people of Greater Lawrence as our first and greatest cause for optimism.

Few communities in America can boast of finer educational facilities than Greater Lawrence.

At the base we have splendid systems of public and parochial schools, elementary and secondary. Then there is Abbot Academy, the first incorporated school for girls in New England. Phillips Academy is one of the foremost boys' preparatory schools in the world. On its grounds is the Addison Gallery of American Art—one of the truly outstanding art museums in the United States. We have Brooks School, with an enrollment of boys from 22 States and the District of Columbia and Hawaii.

Merrimack College, the university of the future, already has a student body of over 1,000, and a tremendous expansion program already underway.

But the spotlight must also fall on the Methuen Memorial Music Hall, home of the internationally renowned Serlo organ, completed after 5 years of painstaking craftsmanship, standing 60 feet high, 40 feet wide, and supported largely by public subscription.

Yes; Greater Lawrencians believe in education—in culture—in the training of the mind as a way of developing the whole man and raising the dignity of the human person.

The spotlight falls on Abbott—on Phillips—on Brooks—on Merrimack—on all our educational and cultural achievements, and gives us cause for optimism.

Faith in ourselves is exceeded only by our faith in God. We are a people of deep religious conviction. From that early day in 1661, when our first house of prayer was built, until the present time, succeeding generations have desired, created, and supported the churches of their choice. Today there are 88 churches providing ample opportunity for the religious practice of all our people.

And still our people are planning and building for our future. Within the past few days we witnessed the groundbreaking for a new Jewish community center, and also the dedication of the Collegiate Chapel of Christ the Divine Teacher on the grounds of Merrimack College. Listen carefully to the words of Harry H. Koffman, president of the Jewish Community Center, on the occasion of the public groundbreaking ceremonies, which so accurately describe the significance of these facilities and justifies our optimism for the future. Mr. Koffman said: "Our faith in the growth of our city, the realization that Lawrence is our home, and a sincere desire to contribute to the social welfare of the city has made all this possible. The building we plan here will contribute to the welfare, not only of our own people, but of the city as a whole." And so our spotlight falls on the faith of our people, their faith in their God, their faith in themselves, their faith in our great future.

Traditionally, Lawrence has always been a natural shopping center for a substantial portion of the Merrimack Valley. To serve this population of over a quarter of a million people, with an annual purchasing power of almost a quarter of a billion dollars, Lawrence has approximately 1,700 retail outlets doing a gross annual sales volume of over $150 million. They provide employment for about 5,000 people. Lawrence has the most active, most successful downtown shopping area of any city between Boston, Mass., and Montreal. Among metropolitan communities, Greater Lawrence has the 23d largest sales volume of any area in the Nation, including the capitals and principal cities of every State in the Union.

The preservation of our shopping area is vitally important to the future of Lawrence. It represents almost one-third of the total tax base of the entire city. Any shrinkage in value here will be reflected in increased taxes to every homeowner. On the other hand, any programs that tend to bolster or to expand the downtown property valuation have the effect of lightening the tax burden for the people who own their own homes.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to spotlight our traffic and parking survey, our urban-renewal program, a revamped and more aggressive sales-promotion effort, as items in our future hope for a greater, more modern, more successful downtown shopping area for Lawrence.

From its earliest days, the hum of industrial activity spelled economic vitality for the thousands of Greater Lawrence workers. From our earliest days we were an industrial center, and manufacturing plants dotted the banks of our Merrimack River. The story of our growth to one of the dominant giants in the textile world is too well known to repeat here tonight. Our economic losses suffered as a result of the recent drastic changes in the textile industry are too vivid in our memory to require any review at the moment. But we fear that the spectacular and impressive achievements of innumerable community and civic leaders in rebuilding our industrial activity, in generating an economic rebirth, have escaped the attention and notice that they so richly deserve.

With a grateful salute to the many courageous individuals who have played heroes' roles in this drama, we put the spotlight now on the new industrial opportunities that surround us.

Consider for a moment, if you will, the achievements of Lawrence's famed and self-styled two-pronged attack, (1) the utilization of the existing properties and (2) the construction of new facilities, both with the single objective of creating jobs and job opportunities.

Listen to these examples: There were 1½ million feet of idle space in the Everett Mill properties—tonight there is only 25,000 feet on a 3d floor for rent.

There were 2 million feet to be filled in the Lawrence Print Works. This morning, a new prospect could find only approximately 100,000 feet for lease.

The Atlantic Enterprises acquired several industrial buildings with almost one-half million feet of space. Today not one single square foot is available.

The Greater Lawrence Industrial Associates acquired the Arlington Mill property last December 1. In less than 5 months, in addition to thousands of feet rented, they have sold 4 substantial buildings to firms who, by reason of their ownership are planting their roots deeply into our soil.

Last week we read with great joy the letting of a contract for the construction in Greater Lawrence of the new Western Electric plant. It is the largest single industrial development in the entire State in many a month. It will bring fine employment opportunity for thousands in our area.

Most certainly, ladies and gentlemen, our spotlight should shine brightly on these men in all of these enterprises who have accomplished so much for Lawrence. Their initiative, their faith, their confidence in our future, are the principal reasons why Lawrence is today hailed as the city of industrial opportunity.

Sometimes unappreciated is the fact that Lawrence is the principal wholesale and distribution center for lower Merrimack Valley. With 151 establishments providing employment for over 3,000 people, grossing sales in excess of $62 million, this business of distribution makes a very substantial contribution to the economy of the greater Lawrence area and justly deserves to take its place in the brightness of our spotlight.

Several factors are responsible for our prominence as a distribution center. First there is the network of highways that serves the area: Routes 28, 110, 113, 114, 125, and 133 all contribute to giving Lawrence ample and easy access to the rich New England markets.

Boston & Maine Railroad with its mesh of spur track running like arteries through the heart of our industrial areas, the Northeast Airlines providing a conveniently accessible daily air freight service, the healthy number of reliable and competent trucking and expressing firms, all these media guarantee the greater Lawrence area efficient and competitive and economical transportation. And so we turn our spotlight on these varied services that contribute so substantially in retaining for our community its prized reputation—distributing center of Merrimack Valley.

But great cities, like great men, advance only by doing more than resting on their laurels. Even when your're on the right track you can get run over if you just sit down. The great danger in looking back is that you'll fail to look ahead. The optimism that can be generated by a glance at past accomplishments will evaporate into empty hopes unless the future is tackled with equal vigor and vitality. The battle is never completely over, the contest is never ended, for as we travel along the highway of community development the look ahead is ever necessary, for danger may be lurking around the next corner.

The spotlight on the future shines brightly on several projects that give rise to a confident and enthusiastic optimism. We have urban renewal, new route 28, new North Andover and Lawrence bridge, long range off-street parking program, community hotel, industrial park, airport development, Northeast Airlines extension of service. All these hold a measure of promise for a better future. Some of these subjects are dreams in the minds of dreamers, some of them are hopes in the hearts of the hopeful, some of them are actual plans already blueprinted on the tables of doers. But all of them are part of the total challenge that spells opportunity for those who want to forge a dynamic future for greater Lawrence.

This is our story. This is the story of Lawrence, its past, its present, its future. It is a story that should stir hope and confidence in the hearts and minds of all of you who have a vital interest in this area. Your chamber of commerce believes in this story, it believes in the lesson it teaches.

While mindful of these reasons for optimism, let us not forget our future problems. There are days of struggle ahead. There are skirmishes that must be fought. The road to a prosperous future, with a high standard of living for all our people is still rough, hazardous, and full of pitfalls. But problems are challenges to those who want to lead. There can be no prize without a contest, there can be no victory without a battle.

Let us all take heart and draw encouragement from the treasure of good things we have stored up. Let us go forward with courage and enthusiasm to solve the problems that lie ahead obstructing our progress. Let the dead past bury its dead. We have seen the worst, so let us be done with pessimism. Let us eliminate the negative and accentuate the positive. Let us all, in unison and in unity, accept the challenge that the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce issues here tonight; with convinced minds and stout hearts let us answer the call to optimism.

Long-Short Haul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from Chairman Richard Mitchell, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and a statement from the Commission giving its justification for a bill I have introduced today by request of the Commission:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

The Honorable J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRIEST: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies of a draft of a bill to amend section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, together with a statement of justification of the bill.

After an intensive review of the operation of the fourth section of the act, with particular reference to its impact on the work of the Commission and the ratemaking function of the rail carriers, the Commission has come to the definite conclusion that this section should be amended so as to eliminate therefrom all unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, but at the same time retain the central objective of the fourth section, i. e., departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over direct routes.

The Commission would be very grateful for your assistance in introducing the bill and giving it early consideration.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft of proposed bill is intended to amend section 4 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to remove therefrom all unnecessary and unduly burdensome refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, which principle was originally designed to prevent the specific discriminatory practice of charging more for a shorter than for a longer haul. That principle is still valid today.

Section 4 (1) of the act now prohibits any common carrier subject to part I or part III thereof from charging or receiving any greater compensation for the transportation of passengers, or like kind of property, for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance, or from charging any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of part I or III. It further provides that upon application the Commission may, in special cases, after investigation, authorize such carriers to charge less for the longer than for the shorter distances, and that the Commission may from time to time prescribe the extent to which such designated carrier may be relieved from the operation of the section, except that in exercising such authority the Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed.

The proposed amendment is specifically designed to make the fourth section self-operating with respect to the right of a circuitous route to meet the rate or rates legally established between competitive points over the more direct routes. No further authorization from the Commission would be required other than the standards laid down by other sections of the act. As an incident of this suggested change we are proposing to remove from section 4 the so-called reasonably compensatory provision. This, in our opinion, would eliminate from section 4 all of the unnecessary refinements of the long-and-short-haul principle, would terminate our responsibility with respect to fourth-section departures over circuitous routes, and would limit our jurisdiction to authorizations of relief over direct routes, upon application and after investigation, where special justification for such relief is shown.

Experience has demonstrated that the public interest is not being served by the imposition of the restrictions in question. The history of their administration has proved them to be excessively burdensome to all concerned. Together they have resulted in disproportionate expenditures of time, labor, and funds by both the carriers and the Commission in comparison with the relatively small benefits derived. Moreover, almost all of the dissatisfaction with section 4, which is expressed periodically by carriers and shippers alike, appears to stem from the same burdensome provisions.

Section 4 has been highly controversial since its inception both as to its substantive provisions and as to the manner and extent of its administration. In implementing this section the Commission initially adopted a vigorous policy, but due to the early attitude of the courts, especially the narrow intepretation given the words "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions" (which were contained in the original act) in *I. C. C.* v. *Alabama Midland Ry. Co.* (168 U. S. 144 (1897)), the Commission was compelled to abandon, at least temporarily, its forceful approach.

The enactment of the Mann-Elkins Act, June 8, 1910, however, gave new life to the section by eliminating the phrase "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions"; and, as set forth in that act, section 4 appeared to contain all the essentials necessary for effective and efficient administration. The Transportation Act of 1920, however, added two refinements, viz, the "reasonably compensatory" provision and the so-called "equidistant" provision which proved to be troublesome. The latter provision was repealed by the Transportation Act of 1940, at which time the "reasonably compensatory" provision did not appear to be quite so objectionable by comparison. In retrospect, however, it is now equally clear that the carriers should not be required to secure our permission for the publication of rates over circuitous routes equivalent to the going rates over direct routes when in their managerial discretion such rates are necessary because of competitive factors.

The Commission is now firmly of the view that the "reasonably compensatory" provision no longer serves any useful purpose, and that it may well be eliminated from section 4 without jeopardizing the public interest. And, in this connection, we wish to point out that under other sections of the act the Commission is constantly seeking assurance that all rates subject to its jurisdiction, including those published under section 4, are not unjust or unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, nor unduly prejudicial or preferential. For this reason we do not believe that the proposed amendment would detract substantially from our jurisdiction, but would, on the other hand, allow us greater discretion in the administration of this section, which should inure to the benefit of the carriers and the public as well.

It is our view that the central principle of the fourth section, i. e., control of departures from the long-and-short-haul principle over the direct routes—is sound and should be retained, and that enactment of the proposed amendment would serve to streamline section 4. It would likewise enhance our administrative effectiveness and relieve the carriers of an unnecessary burden.

Fifty Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Henry H. Heimann, executive vice president and editor of Credit and Financial Management:

FIFTY STARS

In these days of world unrest many colonies are seeking their independence. This has given rise to the expression that the days of colonial empires are past. In many instances the people who desire their independence and wish to strike out on their own are ill prepared for acceptance of the responsibility that accompanies an independent status. The Kremlin is, of course, constantly agitating to create unrest among the colonials.

It is significant that in this world situation there are at least two outstanding exceptions, though they are by no means colonies or dependencies, but part of the United States. Hawaii and Alaska are seeking to make closer their ties to the Nation. They are asking for statehood. There are many reasons that it should be granted. They are an asset to the Nation, a part of it, loyal in the extreme, and should enjoy the full privileges of States. In former years, if they had enjoyed full statehood, the Government might have been restricted in giving them essential territorial aid and services. That reason no longer prevails. The Government now gives a large measure of assistance to the various 48 States in the Union.

Brushing aside all of the arguments political and economic for and against statehood, there is one undeniable advantage in having Alaska and Hawaii become States. The world public relations value of such a move, voluntarily requested by both Alaska and Hawaii, could not help but have an arresting and damaging effect upon the propaganda of the Communists.

Here are at least two cases where large groups of people want to be closer to their Nation. They are not seeking independence; on the contrary they want to be full-fledged partners in our ventures and to accept the responsibility that goes with this partnership. Granting Hawaii and Alaska full statehood would have a tremendous effect upon world thought regarding territories and colonies.

Aside from the fact that they are entitled to statehood, their acceptance into statehood would do much to offset the false and malicious doctrines of the Kremlin. The 48 States in this Union should be proud of the fact that these two areas of the United States want to become more intimately a part of the family. It should not be subject to further debate. There should be constructive and favorable action.

Federal Regulation of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of Tuesday, May 10, 1955, citing arguments for spokesmen for Federal regulation of the price of natural gas:

HOLD THAT PRICE

WASHINGTON.—If a housewife in the city of Philadelphia doesn't like the price of eggs charged at the Giant store she can go across the street to the big glass-front window of the A. & P. and buy eggs there. She has freedom of choice.

But if a householder in Philadelphia using gas for cooking, water heating, and heating doesn't like the cost of gas, which is now enriched by natural gas brought in from a thousand miles away, he must scrap a $1,000 investment in order to burn coal, or oil, or electricity as a substitute.

The United States is now covered with an amazing network of pipelines bringing natural gas to the big cities. It is the sixth biggest industry in the Nation. Natural gas now supplies some 25 percent of domestic fuel. Raising the price of natural gas 1 cent a cubic foot would add $400,000, for example, to the annual gas bill of Philadelphia—the city taken for the purposes of illustration.

Today there are about 20 million homes, mostly in cities, which have natural gas mixed with the fuel they burn. The population affected is estimated at around 60 million. The natural gas comes in primarily from Texas, Louisiana, and other southwestern States.

That is the background of a big fight in Washington. Congress is asked to scrap a law which requires the Federal Power Commission to police the industry in the interest of consumers.

HOUSE COMMITTEE HEARS MAYORS

It is a complex question. The arguments for repeal as seen by oilmen and gasmen were presented in this space on December 30. The following article is an effort to present the counterarguments as they have been presented by various groups, including an organization representing the mayors of 50 American cities to the House committee hearing testimony on the matter.

Congress passed the Natural Gas Act of 1938, and the Supreme Court ruled last June that "the primary aim of this legislation was to protect consumers against exploitation at the hand of natural-gas companies."

The administrative agency under this act is the Federal Power Commission. The act requires the FPC to allow natural-gas companies a just and reasonable rate of return, and these companies may compel the granting of such a return by appeal to the courts.

This looks like a clear-cut case to the city mayors fighting to maintain full Federal regulation. But they have powerful opponents. President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill in 1950—another effort to free independent producers from governmental regulation. Now it is up again.

Here is the story of the battle as it is presented from the view of the city mayors fighting the repeal law.

The Wall Street Journal, January 12, 1955, noted that the gas producers next week "will kick off a king-sized publicity campaign to persuade consumers that their best interest lies in removing the Federal control decreed by the Supreme Court. • • • Newspapeprs, magazines, trade papers, and radio and TV stations will soon be bombarded with feature stories and even suggested editorials pleading the gas producers' case." The fund for this drive was estimated by the newspaper at around $1,500,000.

INDUSTRY ARGUMENT

The argument offered by the oil and gas industry against regulation is that it runs counter to the free competitive system and that private enterprise will protect the consumer better than Federal regulation. Federal regulation may be right and proper over gas distribution through pipelines, but it should not extend out into the fields to cover gas producers. If coal and oil aren't regulated in the field, why should natural gas be? That is the argument against regulation which the mayors and their allies try to answer.

Mayors of cities like New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Kansas City, Mo., Nashville, Tenn., or their representatives, as well as the spokesmen of other groups, have been appearing before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The National Institute of Municipal Law Officers at their September meeting in San Francisco last year passed a resolution supporting Federal regulation, presented by John J. Mortimer, corporation counsel of Chicago and chairman of the institute's resolutions committee.

Again, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican), of Wisconsin, introduced to President Eisenhower at the White House a delegation of State and municipal law officers from over the country, strongly urging continuation of the Federal regulation, which they said is designed "to protect helpless little people under the free-enterprise system."

EDISON TESTIMONY CITED

This drive for continuing the law, the city mayors argue, is not a "left-wing" move, or even a drive of so-called "liberals." It is rather, they maintain, motivated by pocketbook considerations affecting some of the biggest and—presumably most hard-boiled—corporations.

For example, the mayors' committee points out, on April 14 Randall J. Leboeuf, Jr., testified in behalf of the billion-dollar Consolidated Edison Co. (the public utility serving New York City) and 13 other private utilities serving the area. Mr. Leboeuf said his company is thinking of giving up natural gas altogether to use oil and other fuels to manufacture gas because of present rate uncertainties. He blamed those uncertainties upon "escalator" and similar clauses in contracts that gas producers in the field hold with interstate pipelines. The cost of natural gas is set in the fields, he explained, and increases are passed on to the consumers by way of the interstate pipelines.

Representative OREN HARRIS (Democrat), of Arkansas, sponsor of the bill to kill the regulation, took issue with some of the Consolidated Edison argument. Mr. Leboeuf stuck to his guns.

The city mayors deny that the production of natural gas is a free enterprise in the way that production of coal is. They argue that it is largely in the hands of a few big oil companies. There are about 4,100 producers selling natural gas to pipelines, they say, but 7 of these supply a third of the total, and 100 producers supply more than 85 percent of the total.

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS TIED UP IN EQUIPMENT

Nor is the situation comparable, they argue, to the big oil companies competing for the autoist's dollar in filling his gasoline tank. The driver can always go from one company to another. But it is different with the householder with $1,000 tied up in gas-burning equipment. The mayors argue that it is a monopoly industry because only 1 gas producer normally sends gas through 1 pipeline to supply a particular area.

It is no use, they maintain, for the FPC to regulate the pipelines if it is not able to regulate the natural gas company that really sets the price at the far end of the pipeline at the oil-gas well. In many cases the pipeline company has a monopoly contract—escalator clauses and all—with one particular supplier.

Would the natural gas companies go on a sit-down strike, and would the supply of gas dwindle if Federal regulations were continued?

"Nonesense," says Philadelphia Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr. The oil companies are protected by a juicy 27½ percent depletion allowance, he argues.

"That the oil companies will continue to drill for oil," he says, "I would think, is obvious.

"That a great deal of gas will be discovered in conjunction with newly discovered oil is certainly the history of the industry today."

Summing it up, here are the arguments for continuing Federal regulation as the advocates offer them:

This is a business affected with public interest.

It is in interstate commerce and hence affected with Federal responsibility.

Congress established the FPC to regulate the business.

The Supreme Court has upheld FPC's authority.

Yet now the gas industry, through the Harris bill, would tie the FPC's hands and prevent it from regulating adequately the fuel product whose price affects 60 million Americans.

It will take more than the $1,500,000 fund of the gas producers as reported by the Wall Street Journal, January 12, to persuade consumers that their interests lie in ending Federal regulation, the mayors of the big cities say.

Rigid Farm Price Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I quote herewith an editorial which appeared in the Lynchburg Daily Advance on May 9, 1955. The Daily Advance was founded by Maj. Thomas Whitehead on May 5, 1880, and was later owned by the late distinguished United States Senator Carter Glass. The paper recently celebrated its 75th birthday as one of the oldest newspapers of continuous publication in western Virginia. The editorial follows:

RIGID FARM PRICE SUPPORT

One of the principal arguments of the Democrats in the House for changing the law back to establish the rigid high-level price supports for farm products was that farm prices are going down. But they did not make any reference to the fact that they are going down while price supports remain high and rigid. This is so because the new law providing for flexible supports in basic farm products does not take effect until the current farm production season is over. What they voted for was then a restoration,

which would mean a continuance, of the program under which prices are falling.

This is all very simple, even though it makes no economic sense. The Democrats who obtained a slim majority for their rigid high level supports are not interested in anything but the purely political aspects. They are after the farm vote and believe their method will get it. But the Senate will block this obviously dangerous move and insist on the flexible-price program going into effect for thorough trial.

The House Democrats may not be concerned about what the Senate will do. Their purpose is largely accomplished in putting themselves on record for the high, rigid price-support system. They consider that they have made their point with the farm vote.

That point will have to face a test. If, when the flexible program goes into operation, there is an improvement in farm prices and farm economics in general, opponents of rigid price supports will remind the voters of the action of the House Democrats. Those who voted for the rigid system will be on record and the voters will not be allowed to forget. The Democrats who so voted are, of course, gambling on no improvement under the flexible-support system. They are likely to lose on that gamble.

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have asked why I supported the bill for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and why I did not go along with my colleagues from Nebraska on the vote. The reasons are as follows:

First. For 12 years I have been a member of the committee that has had long hearings on the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Second. We have heard more than 700 witnesses, and there has been more than 4,000 pages of testimony covering 57 subjects. Ninety percent of the testimony is favorable to statehood.

Third. The five Gallup polls conducted since 1941 all indicate a heavy percentage favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Fourth. The poll I conducted in the Fourth Congressional District this last month indicated that 75 percent felt Hawaii and Alaska should have statehood. I doubt it differs much in the other three congressional districts in the State.

Fifth. There have been 35 bills introduced on the question of statehood.

Sixth. There have been five complete investigations by congressional committees on Hawaii, the last committee headed by the late Senator Hugh Butler. The Senator himself strongly recommended statehood.

Seventh. The governors of the 11 Western States at their 1953 convention unanimously approved statehood for Hawaii.

Eighth. Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska has been advocated in the campaign platform of both political parties for many years.

Ninth. The President has recommended statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska if the so-called McKay line would be adopted. The McKay line sets aside about 40 percent of Alaska as a military reservation.

Both Territories, being incorporated, are entitled to statehood. It has been promised to them.

I am certain the question of statehood will be up again and many who have been opposed, if they study all the evidence, will see the justice of admitting Hawaii and Alaska as new States.

Soroptomist of the Month: Congresswoman From the First Idaho District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD at this time an article from the April 1955 issue of the American Soroptimist which pays tribute to the charming lady from Idaho, the able and conscientious Congresswoman from the First District, Mrs. GRACIE PFOST. Mrs. PFOST is the only soroptimist in the United States Congress, and this outstanding organization has recognized her devoted service to the good people of her district, State, and Nation by naming her as the soroptimist of the month.

Mrs. PFOST and I both came to Congress in 1953. Since the beginning of the 83d Congress I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with Mrs. PFOST on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and on several of the subcommittees of that committee. Consequently I have had many opportunities to observe her effective work and her development into a very capable legislator. She has performed admirably for the good people of her district and is dedicated to their service. Her recognition as the soroptimist of the month is a reward she justly deserves.

Therefore I have asked permission to place in the RECORD this article so that our colleagues may know the honor that has been conferred upon our GRACIE.

The article follows:

SOROPTIMIST OF THE MONTH: CONGRESSWOMAN FROM THE FIRST IDAHO DISTRICT—GRACIE PFOST, CALDWELL (IDAHO) CLUB

Service—personal, intimate service to the people and the community has been the keynote in the rise of Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, personable Congresswoman from the First Idaho District and the only Soroptimist in Congress.

Twenty years ago she was a young deputy in the county clerk's office, where her more interesting work was the issuance of marriage licenses and the making out of the county warrants. These were depression days, and conditions in the agricultural area were rough.

The young and gracious county official made the problem of each person who came to her her own. In businesslike, personal style, she helped those caught in the complexity of filing legal papers work out their problem.

Friends saw in the dynamic, freckle-faced young redhead a person qualifying for higher responsibility—maybe county clerk—at a future date. For 9 years, she dispensed pleasant, personal service in this position, winning political opponents as well as political friends by the service she gave.

Then came the step-up. The position of county treasurer seemed to be available, and GRACIE declared herself a candidate.

"If there is a person in Canyon County Mrs. PFOST does not know by first name, it's because she hasn't visited the maternity ward in the hospital lately," a political opponent remarked in discussing the election prospects.

Five consecutive times the voters trooped to the polls to elect GRACIE PFOST—always by heavy majorities. And she smilingly continued to dispense the same service.

"She listens too well and doesn't talk enough," was the bitter comment of an opponent who could not trap Mrs. PFOST in public debate over issues beyond the jurisdiction of her office. She would discuss freely the problems of her office and the matters pertaining to its efficient operation, and confined herself to matters which were her business.

Her campaigning consisted largely of meeting people and listening. Everyone wanted to tell her how she should campaign. She listened to everyone—and they surprisingly found themselves campaigning for her.

In 1950 she announced her candidacy for the congressional position from the First District. "GRACIE is overreaching herself," her political opponents chortled, contending that she was not qualified for so high an office.

Her friends, knowing the First Idaho District, also feared she was overreaching—but for a different reason. The district extends from the Snake River in the southwest, northward and eastward, and includes the panhandle. Its interests include forestry, mining, grazing, cattle raising, as well as irrigation farming.

First District Congressmen have traditionally come from the area north of the Salmon River, which is the heart of the mining-timber area. And here was a woman, from the heart of the irrigated-farming area, seeking to represent the lumber and mining interests of a State which included such vast enterprises as the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mine, one of the greatest silver-lead producers in the Nation.

GRACIE PFOST calmly set out on her campaign, knowing that she would not be able to shake the hands of all the 100,000 eligible voters on the isolated farms along the Lemhi, in the forest camps of the Sawtooths, or the mining camps along the Lochsa, all in her district, but determined to give it a try. She concentrated her efforts in north Idaho, the region where all believed that she would be weak. She visited the lumber camps, conferred with union officials and others in the mining camps. Five and ten persons in isolated communities back in the mountain areas on a dirt road beside some mountain stream were apt to find themselves shaking hands with a candidate for Congress.

"Covering" the First District in a campaign was an undertaking which made strong men shudder at the prospect, and yet the smiling, friendly, redhead fought for votes where it counted—at the level of the voters themselves—and did a more thorough job than had ever before been done. In the general election, she was defeated by a

small margin. But her defeat came not in the northern counties where she had staged her battle, but in the counties closer to her home, where she believed her friends could carry the burden.

Characteristically, GRACIE took her defeat in good humor. "Guess I should have spent more time at home," she said, "but, good gosh, I couldn't be home and up there, too."

She settled down in the real-estate business in her home town of Nampa—a city of 16,000. There was little question that she would try again, although she says that she was needled by her husband, Jack, into seeking election in 1952.

Once defeated, the comely redhead was no longer considered invulnerable by her opponents in 1952, they threw all their weight against her along the entire line from Snake River to the Canadian border. Her opponent, Dr. John T. Wood, was the same man who had defeated her in 1950.

GRACIE just worked a little harder. Midway in the campaign she was talking in a husky voice a couple of octaves below her normally soft and quite deep speaking voice and certainly a number of degrees harsher. By election time, she was whispering hoarsely.

But her assurances were accepted. In a State which elected Republicans to all congressional positions but one, and which elected Republicans to all major State offices but one, GRACIE PFOST, a Democrat, went to Washington from the First District.

Mrs. PFOST was born in Boone County, Ark., and was reared in the Boise Valley in which she has since resided. Her community activities have been legion since the days in which as deputy county clerk with a half dozen other young kindred spirits, as well as a few older heads, she formed the nucleus of the Democratic Party in Canyon County.

She was active in forming the Caldwell, Idaho, Soroptimist Club when she was county treasurer and served as its first president in 1946. That year, under her leadership, the club laid the foundation for the expansion of the Girl Scout movement in the county seat. The work was no accomplished entirely by delegation of authority. During her lunch hour, GRACIE often was seen doing a job of selling the organization's principles to a businessman, a store clerk, a father—anyone who seemed to have a moment on his hands—with missionary-like zeal. She served also as regional treasurer for the Soroptimists.

The pioneers who settled in the small valleys that dot her district, or who prospected in the mountains had only the forces of nature to conquer. GRACIE, who spends an average of 16 hours a day on the job, would have found in pioneering a gentle, back-to-earth restfulness had she had an opportunity for a spell of it during the heights of her political campaigning last fall. It was a real uphill battle for reelection, but she won.

Her vivaciousness and enthusiasm left no doubt in the minds of her listeners that the Congresswoman from the Idaho First District was a public servant, and enjoying every moment of it.

New England Farmer Views 90-Percent Supports on Basic Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter to the editor which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe, Wednesday, May 11, 1955:

A BAY STATE FARMER EXPLAINS WHY HE WANTS NO PART OF 90-PERCENT SUPPORTS

To the EDITOR:

One of your May 3 editorials dealt with a pending congressional battle very important to thousands of New England farmers. It seems that every time a newspaper refers to the farm bloc and the farmer, it categorically lumps them into that group which once again is pressuring for mandatory 90-percent supports on basic crops.

I am but one voice among the thousands of your own New England neighbors who are farmers and who are sick and tired of this misconstrued designation.

We farmers here in the northeast have long since called for an end to mandatory high-support prices, which are not only a fantastic load on the taxpayer, but a severe handicap to the dairy and poultry industry of the northeast.

The poultry industry has been in a price depression for the last 17 months; the dairy farmers' lot is little better because of the ability of the farmer to produce so much more per man than ever before.

Yet, while we have no control over the price of our products other than the natural law of supply and demand, we are saddled with feed grain prices that are fixed at very high levels which have driven hundreds of good farmers out of business.

We farmers in New England are certainly not in the farm bloc. We have nothing but losses to gain from a revived 90-percent bill, while a return to flexible 75-percent supports would give us an equal chance to make a living in competition, where at least the feed grain prices would be at levels that would enable us to make a decent living wage.

Supports have brought nothing but controls. A poultry farmer in Pennsylvania has been fined by the Government for exceeding the 15-acre allotment of wheat plantings, even though every bit of his home-grown grain was fed to his own livestock. Simply a case of an industrious man trying to control the costs of his production, but our asinine marketing quota system which follows supports has made this ridiculous situation possible.

I should also say here that this is not a political issue with the New England farmer; it transcends party lines, for I am a voting Democrat.

CHARLES PILIGIAN.

FRANKLIN.

Address by Charles H. Percy at Chicago World Trade Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles H. Percy, president of the Bell & Howell Co., of Chicago, at the concluding luncheon of the 1955 Chicago World Trade Conference, held in the Morrison Hotel, Chicago, March 2, 1955, sponsored jointly by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry and the Export Managers Club of Chicago:

I feel today that I am facing a more sympathetic audience than was the case a month ago in Washington.

That was my first experience in testifying before a congressional committee, and it was unlike anything I had expected. The largest hearing room in the House of Representatives' new office building holds about 400 people. The committee of 25 members was seated like the Supreme Court in a great semicircle.

As I looked into the faces of NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois, DAN REED from Rochester, N. Y., Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and several others, I was convinced that they were not exactly friendly to the President's program.

Mr. REED of New York was written up extensively in Time magazine, and was quoted as saying that he had decided that protectionism was the policy this country should adopt when he was 12 years old, and that he has never changed his opinion. I should guess that that was about in 1890. I wanted to ask him if he didn't feel that conditions in this country and in the world have changed since 1890. But although I thought it was a pertinent question, I feared he would find it impertinent.

Today I would like to talk to you off the cuff, because I feel that we are in sympathy. According to your poll, you are heartily in favor of H. R. 1, and you need no convincing. Therefore, all I will attempt to do is to give you a few facts about the photographic industry—an industry that is protected, that is strategic, that faces foreign competition—concrete examples that may help you meet the arguments of the protectionists.

The photographic industry has about 50,000 people. It is a relatively small industry, but during World War II it converted almost 100 percent to war work, as did our own company here in Chicago. The industry competes with manufacturers in Belgium, Germany, Italy, France—you can hardly name a country that doesn't make some kind of photographic product.

I have seen skilled Japanese workers paid 27 cents an hour, skilled Italian workers who receive 34 cents an hour, and German workers who earn 37 cents an hour. In contrast, at Bell & Howell the average wage is in excess of $2 an hour.

Germany alone exports to the United States over 150 different models and brands of still cameras. In 1949, the United States imported 16,000 lenses; last year imports rose to a quarter of a million lenses competing with the products of domestic manufacturers, including the lens division of our Lincolnwood plant.

Bell & Howell's position is this: We are a company employing 3,000 people here in Chicago. We have a very high labor content in our product, almost 50 percent of our total cost of sales being direct labor and indirect labor. We have a great deal of foreign competition.

We manufacture a total of about $40.5 million worth of products, only 6 percent of which goes abroad. So exports are not an important percentage of our business, though they are a strategic part from the standpoint of prestige and maintaining our name in some 68 countries. We also manufacture under license in England and we are covered completely in the sterling area.

Although our company has gone on record as supporting the President's program, our position is by no means the official position of the photographic industry. Of the 85 members of the National Association of Photographic Manufacturers, 84 are firm protectionists.

We have done a good deal of soul searching on this subject over the past several years. Our international vice president, Ernest Schimmel, has been a tremendous asset in interpreting the position of our company and country in the world economy. Over the past several years we have determined our position.

We believe that it is in the interest of the free world to trade. Many people abroad—2½ billion of them—want the prod-

ucts of the United States. If we don't trade with them we are going to limit our market to 160 million people in the United States, a market exceeded by our productive capacity. We need export markets and at the present time our exports exceed our imports. You have heard the details of that in the last 2 days.

But we cannot maintain our export market if we refuse to trade with the world. We were discussing at luncheon how we can gain public understanding of the concept that that only place the American dollar can ultimately be spent is in the United States. When we import products and pay dollars for them we do not lose those dollars. They always come back to us. The American eagle on the dollar is a homing pigeon.

To import products which foreign manufacturers can make better than we is as beneficial to us as to the free world. It simply means that we shift our domestic capital and labor to items which we can produce more efficiently.

Last year about this time as I stood on a street in Tokyo I asked our agent, who was kindly escorting us, what the loud speakers on the mobile trucks were saying. I think he was a little embarrassed, and I say that because he is here in the audience today. But he gave me a straight-forward answer. He said, "They are denouncing American imperialism and demanding that the United States troops go home."

We talked to our Ambassador, we talked to educators and to business people, both Japanese and American. They all told the same story—a story of the sagging Japanese economy. For example, 40 percent of the graduates of Japanese universities this year would not be able to find jobs.

The United States has said to Japan, "We cannot trade with you freely because of your cheap labor. We have imposed restrictions and barriers against you, and the free world has followed our example." But we have also said, "We will be very unhappy if you trade with the Communist bloc."

So, we have placed Japan in an untenable position by saying, in effect, you cannot trade. I say to you that no nation can long endure such a situation. More and more Japan becomes susceptible to the wooing of the Chinese Communists and Russians—the resignation of their last Premier was over this very question.

The same day that I testified in Washington, the President submitted a message to Congress on the Formosa question. The President asked authority to use ships, guns, and planes to defend the security of our country and its allies, and within a week Congress acted. The House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly, and the Senate voted almost unanimously (with the exception of Senator LEHMAN, from New York; Senator LANGER, from North Dakota; and the Independent Senator MORSE, from Oregon) to give him this authority.

This was an issue they could clearly understand; it was an issue they would have no trouble explaining to their constituents at home. But it was a complex problem. Yet for a year and a half the President has said, "It is in the national interest that we liberalize our trade abroad." And he has gone so far as to say, "If we fail in our foreign trade economic policy, we may fail in all."

If the President today sent a message to Congress and asked for $40 billion for a network of radar and guns to ring our coast line and for planes to patrol our shores, Congress would not hesitate to appropriate the money, and we know it. They couldn't defend their position if they didn't.

But he has said that in a nuclear era it is in the national interest to ring this country with a network of free nations, who will form an integral part of our national security. This is more difficult to explain to the constituents back home. It steps on a few toes. Despite the fact that the heads of labor, the AFL and CIO, the chamber of commerce, the head of the Farm Bureau, and many business people favor it, it was passed by only a slim majority and was almost sent back to committee on three different votes. It was and is a complicated problem and a difficult problem.

It is also fraught with emotion. It has become an emotional rather than a rational issue. I think, though, that there is little doubt about the interest of the consumer in freer trade. It is he who benefits when competition lowers prices, and he is entitled to the benefits of foreign competition.

What happens when an American manufacturer faces foreign competition? I can best demonstrate this by telling you what happened to us when we entered the high-priced 35-mm., still-camera market a few years ago. This is a camera that has many features. It winds like a movie camera, clicks off five pictures a second, taking wonderful action photographs. But it required a lot of handwork that necessitated a selling price of $700. In competing with foreign camera manufacturers we lost a million and a quarter dollars.

We had to decide what to do. We could say we were being hurt by foreign competition, and we could seek higher tariff protection. But from the moral standpoint, we would be prohibiting the American consumer, who likes German cameras, from buy-them unless he paid a subsidy in the form of a higher tariff. In other words, the consumer would be penalized because we had decided to enter a field in which we were not as efficient (from a cost standpoint) as the Germans. We decided to write off our million and a quarter dollar loss.

I have heard many protectionists say, "You can't compete with cheap foreign labor, if your product has a high-labor content." Manufacturers in our own industry have repeatedly testified that there is a high-labor content in photographic equipment, and I can show you how high it is on a photographic lens.

This is the aluminum we use to make a one-half inch b/1.9 movie camera lens. This is the chunk of optical glass we mold into four different elements and assemble into this lens. The raw material costs 43 cents and the finished lens has a retail value of $87. So the difference between 43 cents and $87 is cost of labor in manufacturing or merchandising.

Since our purchasing division is authorized to buy where they can get high quality at the lowest prices, our own lens division competes with foreign manufacturers for the business of our own purchasing division. I think this is the way it should be. For a while they continually lost orders on a very high volume lens. They lost an order for 10,000 lenses and it broke their hearts. They really started to dig in.

The factory superintendent, the vice president of manufacturing, and the optical division manufacturing superintendent held a meeting with 150 people on the tooling and engineering phases of our lens designing and manufacturing program.

Working together, they approached this particular lens in an entirely different way. As a result, the last order for some 20,000 lenses was awarded to our own lens division, on a strictly competitive basis. At Christmas, in the lens division, they had big signs on the bulletin board, "We beat foreign competition." I talked to the superintendent of manufacturing and the foreman about it a few weeks ago, and I said, "In all honesty, would you have done this without the spur of foreign competition?" and they said, "No."

An industry that is protected is in a dangerous position. Its shelter can be taken away at any time. But an industry that is strong because of competition is an industry based upon a firm foundation. The best weapon of management is its ability to meet competition. The ability to improve its manufacturing techniques cannot be sharpened and developed under the soft blanket of protection.

Again and again manufacturers have pointed out the disparity between American and foreign-labor rates. Never in any of those testimonies have I found reference to the unit cost of production. Yet this is the true and the important element of cost, the controlling factor and the answer to the problem of cheap foreign labor.

Here is an illustration. We had cheap domestic labor in this country a relatively few years ago. When I worked on the Bell & Howell assembly line, we were paid 40 cents an hour to assemble this particular 8-mm. movie camera. We sold this movie camera for less than $50—$49.95, to be exact. When the war ended and our labor had almost tripled, we asked ourselves whether we would ever again be able to sell a movie camera for less than $50.

We started to work on a design concept, a tooling concept. Whole groups of people worked on it as a team. We produced a camera at $49.95, a camera with 6 exclusive features that the other camera did not have. It is made with such precision that the parts resemble those of Swiss watches, yet it is assembled on a conveyorized line. We did it with $2-an-hour labor, because we designed the camera and developed manufacturing methods to use the mind of our workers more than their hands and their muscles. And our labor cost per unit was very low.

Recently in Des Moines, I spoke to the National Farm Institute. I'm not an expert on farm problems, but I have studied the impact of our export trade on the farm market. My wife and I own a farm in Iowa, and I told them I am ashamed to sell corn to the Government each year and then approve the plans of the farm manager to plant more corn the next season.

We know the country needs corn like it needs butter. Yet we do it because if we didn't, our farm manager would think we should be committed to a mental institution. Probably it is best to go along until this thing finally rights itself nationally and farm products are sold on the free market. But I will never stop talking about it.

How wrong it is to freeze unneeded capital and labor on the farm today. What if they had done this 80 years ago when the population distribution was 90-percent rural and 10-percent urban, instead of the reverse? It is little more sensible today to freeze the 10 percent and keep labor and capital employed where it is only relatively efficient.

Where does the farmer stand? On an average, about a thousand dollars of his cash receipts come from exports. We export 25 percent of our corn, 33 percent of our wheat, 25 percent of our tobacco and soybeans, and 33⅓ percent of our cotton and rice.

The dairy farmers in Wisconsin, who were successful in forcing the infamous cheese quota, export 42 percent of their dried, evaporated, and condensed milk. If it weren't for the export market they would be hard-pressed. Yet they, like every other economic group in the United States, including business, want a one-way street. Farmers favor a free-trade policy almost universally, until it comes to import quotas that interfere with the artificially high prices of their own products. They do not ask where the dollars for their exports are to come from if we refuse to trade with their foreign customers. Are we to give dollars away, or are they to be syphoned from some other part of our economy?

The farmer, depending tremendously now on the export market, must face the issue. On which side does he want his bread but-

tered? In the long run he cannot have it buttered on both sides.

It is often said that freer trade is all right in theory, but would not work in practice. And to the protectionists we are the theorists and they are the practical men who built America. They know that we have to keep out cheap foreign labor and keep our market to ourselves. The fact that almost every economist in the United States favors the President's program does put us in a category with college professors and economists. But I submit to you that the real theorist is the protectionist, because protectionism is fine in theory, but it has never really worked in practice.

Who is to decide what infant industry is to be protected? Who is to decide when an infant industry has grown to maturity? Many are protected, but few, if any, are ever weaned.

The argument that our national defense depends upon strategic industries that must be protected is essentially theory. In actual practice, most of our defense industries—the aircraft, automotive, electronics industries—have little, if any, tariff protection, and have never needed it.

I should like to mention that our own Bell & Howell executives have stood with me in my support of the President's foreign economic trade policy. Without their support, or with their veto, I could not have acted. Time after time in Washington a Congressman would say to me, "Yes, but you don't have any constituents back home." I, too, used to be naive enough to think that the president of a company is his own boss. But when I became president of Bell & Howell, I found that some 3,000 employees, 2,400 stockholders and directors and several thousand dealers were my bosses. Congressmen at least have tenure of office for 2 or 6 years. But corporate presidents have no such job security.

I have expected to hear from some Bell & Howell stockholders who might ask, "What are you trying to do to our company by lowering tariffs?" But I haven't received a single adverse letter, and I have received many favorable ones.

I am sure that the bylaws of our corporation are not very different from those of other corporations. And nowhere do I see that the officer of a company is required to subordinate the national interest to the immediate short-range interest of his own company.

I think we must always, in American industry, in farming, and in labor, determine what is in the national interest and then find a way to adjust our company programs to that interest. It is not always easy, but it is necessary.

The last thing I have to say is this: We who are Republicans worked awfully hard to put this administration in Washington. I would be very discouraged, as an officer of our company, if the board of directors who had elected me opposed the policies I thought best for the company.

President Eisenhower said in a letter to Congress, "I am not going to ruin any industries. This is a gradual, moderate program." He has said that our present situation is a perilous one, and I believe that all of us here agree. I hope that all of you will act—that you will talk to everyone you can, and write to your Senators. They are tremendously responsive to letters. MARGUERITE CHURCH, our own Congresswoman, told me she has been snowed under by emotional letters from small groups of protectionists, but seldom has she heard from the other side. She wonders if we are a small voice or if others believe as we do.

Support for our program is growing. Day by day people are telling their Congressmen to vote in the national interest and not in the special interests of particular groups.

The future security of our Nation will be imperiled if this program is not approved by the Senate. The bill must be passed, I believe, but it will be passed more quickly if everyone in this group will wholeheartedly support it. If each one of you were to go on record with your Senator, that alone would carry the issue.

I believe, and I am sure that you believe, that a liberalized trade policy in the national interest will make industry in this country more efficient. It will help lower our unit cost of production, lower our cost, and raise our standard of living, strangthen our allies, weaken our enemies, and provide a greater measure of strength and support to the defense of this Nation than $40 billion worth of guns ringing our shores.

George Kennan Displayed Great Foresight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, today many public figures are demonstrating great powers of hindsight in relation to diplomatic relations with Russia. An article by R. H. Shackford, which was published by the Washington Daily News on May 11, indicates that George F. Kennan, of Adams County, in the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, is one of the very few who had the foresight to make the correct analysis well in advance of the events.

Mr. Kennan, it will be recalled, is the trained Russian expert, long in the diplomatic service, whose advice and counsel Secretary of State Dulles has indicated he can do without. This action on the part of Mr. Dulles may account in large measure for the aimless drifting of our foreign relations.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the article by Mr. Shackford:

A WARNING ABOUT RED NEGOTIATIONS

(By R. H. Shackford)

Normal negotiations with the Soviet leaders are impossible.

When they want something from the West, according to George F. Kennan, former State Department Russian expert, they are willing to put on a show of negotiating and to soft pedal temporarily their basic duplicity.

"And when that happens there will always be Americans who will leap forward with gleeful announcements that 'the Russians have changed' and some who will even try to take credit for having brought about such changes."

So wrote Mr. Kennan in 1947.

As the United States rushes now toward another big power conference "at the summit," it seems wise to recall another Kennan warning.

THE WARNING

At the end of the war with Germany, 10 years ago, Mr. Kennan was stationed in Moscow. He wrote an appraisal of the Soviet position. The warning in this hitherto unpublished document was:

"Remember that the Russian views all currents of public sentiment as a sailor views the winds. If he cannot sail into the wind, he can at least use his power to tack in directions against the way they blow. * * *

"In the case of the United States, the Kremlin * * * knows the American public has been taught (this was in 1945) to believe:

"Collaboration with Russia as we envisage it is entirely possible.

"That it depends only on establishment of proper personal relationships of cordiality and confidence with Russian leaders.

"That if the United States doesn't find the means to assure this collaboration (again as we envisage it), then the past war was fought in vain and civilization is faced with a complete catastrophe.

"The Kremlin knows that none of these proposals are sound. It knows the Soviet Government is technically incapable of collaborating with other governments in a manner which Americans have in mind. It knows the Soviet secret police has no intention of permitting anything like the number of personal contacts that is required to lead to a broad basis of personal confidence and collaboration."

UNITED STATES TRIES

"It knows through 11 years (in 1945) of diplomatic relations it has been the United States in 99 cases out of 100 which has taken the initiative to try to establish relationships of cordiality and confidence; that these efforts met almost invariably with suspicion, discourtesy, and rebuff, and that this will not and cannot be otherwise in the future.

"Finally, it knows that the type of intimate collaboration for which Americans yearn is by no means necessary for future world peace. It knows, as a body thoroughly versed in the realities of power, that all that is really required to assure stability among the present great powers for decades to come is preservation of a reasonable balance of strength between them and a realistic understanding as to mutual zones of vital interest.

"But it is not the job of the Soviet Government to disabuse the American public of prejudices highly favorable to Soviet interests. It is entirely agreeable to Moscow that Americans should be indulged in a series of illusions which lead them to put pressure on their government to accomplish the impossible and to go always one step further in pursuit of illusive favor of the Soviet Government."

Mr. Kennan pointed out then that the Soviets never looked on international cooperation as anything except an instrument to support their own aggressive policies.

Amendment to Section 406 of the Federal Seed Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Seed Act.

The purpose of this proposed amendment to one of the penalty provisions of the Federal Seed Act is intended to remove the stigma of having petty and unknowing violations of the Federal Seed Act by reputable businessmen in the seed industry being classified as criminal violations.

This amendment will enable the Government to hereafter have the option to bring civil proceedings for violations of the Federal Seed Act in addition to criminal actions. In civil proceedings the Government will not have to prove intent, but in criminal actions to knowingly violate the provisions of the act will be a factor in determining the violator's guilt.

Dentists and Their Families Can Profit Greatly by Inclusion in Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter in the RECORD which I have written. A new group has been formed to undertake what I consider a very worthwhile cause. The cause is the inclusion of all self-employed dentists throughout the United States in social-security coverage starting in 1955. Being a member of the House Ways and Means Committee who has devoted many years of study and thought to the inclusion of self-employed professionals in the system, I am fully in accord with this effort. The group is the Congress of American Dentists for OASI. The following letter, addressed to the president of the group, I think fully expresses my views on the importance of the goal they are trying to achieve:

MAY 9, 1955.

J. GARRETT REILLY, D. D. S.,
President, Congress of American Dentists for OASI, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. REILLY: I am extremely pleased that the Congress of American Dentists for OASI has been founded and is prepared to work on a nationwide basis to help get social security for the self-employed members of your important profession.

Now that you have organized to accomplish this worthwhile objective, I would like to point out that your group has no time to lose if the dentists of this Nation—approximately 75,000 strong—expect to receive coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system without being penalized.

Let me explain what I mean by this word "penalized."

Social Security benefits are calculated on the average wage received by a worker from January 1, 1951, until he reaches the age of retirement. However, the law provides that a worker, in making this calculation, may drop out his 4 years of lowest earnings.

Zero earnings under covered employment, of course, will pull down his average wage.

Other professional groups first brought into the system this year will not be penalized because they can drop out the 4 years, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

However, if dentists were not included until after April 15, 1956, they would have zero earnings for 1955 to pull their average wage down. For example, one whose wage computation is based on the maximum $4,200 for 4 years but must include a year of zero earnings has an average wage for the 5 years of $3,560, instead of having benefit entitlement figured on $4,200 for the period.

But, as the self-employed only pay their Social Security tax for 1955 when they pay their income tax on April 15, 1956, if dentists are brought into the system before that date and pay their 1955 Social Security tax then, they would have no years of zero earnings on their record and, as a result, would get the maximum Social Security benefits if they earn $4,200 a year.

Important too is the fact that, under the Social Security system, those nearing the age of 65 will be entitled to coverage if they are in the program half the time between 1951 and the date they reach the age of 65 (after using the drop out) with a minimum necessary coverage of 6 quarters (18 months). Therefore, the sooner those nearing retirement age can join the system the better for them.

In the past some associations have opposed dentists entering the Social Security System largely on the theory that many dentists never retire and, therefore, would not receive the old-age-retirement benefits themselves.

Of course, we know that a good many dentists, men whose work is very delicate and who almost always must stand on their feet, do retire at or about the age of 65. However, even if the old argument of some of the organizations was true, we must face the fact that, unfortunately, some dentists do die leaving widows and minor children and some dentists are forced to retire because of ill health.

If my bill, H. R. 6049, to include dentists becomes law what can social security mean to the self-employed dentist and his family? If self-employed dentists are given coverage, a dentist who has an average net income of $4,200 a year, or more, and who has a wife and two children, would have protection for them if he died in the amount of $200 a month tax free until the older child reached the age of 18. At that time, the monthly benefit would drop to $162.80 a month until the younger child reaches the age of 18. After that there would be no benefits until the widow reached that age of 65 when her benefits would be resumed at the rate of $81.40 a month unless she remarried.

If the children were age 6 and 4, these payments would amount to $32,000 assuming that the mother and children live until the younger child reaches the age of 18.

The widow, if she lives to age 65 would then have a life expectancy of 14 or more years and her benefits, in addition to the above mentioned $32,000, would be in excess of $13,000.

It should be mentioned in this connection that the social-security system would also provide a maximum lump-sum payment of $255 to cover funeral expenses.

An income of $81.40 a month is equivalent to $976 a year. It would take $32,500 of accumulated capital invested in Government bonds at 3 percent to produce an annual income of $975.

I will also mention the benefits available to dentists upon retirement. If a dentist should retire after the age of 65 and had earned an average of $4,200 a year, he would receive a monthly tax-free income of $108.50 which would be increased to $162.80 when his wife also reaches the age of 65. At the age of 72 old-age insurance benefits would be paid to him as an outright annuity.

In addition, the law provides for a waiver of premium for a person who becomes totally disabled before age 65. Because of this protection, a disabled individual can qualify for full benefits at 65 even though full contributions have not been paid.

For all of this protection the dentist with a net income of $4,200 or more a year would pay premiums of $126 annually. The premium would rise by a series of steps beginning in 1960 to a maximum premium—beginning with the year 1975—of $252 annually.

Many dentists have already received social-security credits. Among these are those who have served in the Armed Forces, dentists employed in medical departments of business and industry, those employed on hospital staffs, laboratories, and clinics operated for a profit, and many of those employed by educational institutions and other nonprofit groups. Under the present law, however, self-employed dentists have little opportunity to participate in the program and maintain an insured status.

With the present high income-tax rates, it is difficult for any individual to set aside substantial savings for his dependents. This, of course, is particularly true for those with moderate incomes. The young dentist starting his private practice usually has high expenses and heavy family obligations at a time when his income is relatively low. Death of the young dentist at this time is a real hardship on his widow and children and social-security payments might be the one thing which could keep the family together.

It is difficult to have a comprehensive and fair social-security system with some individuals covered and some individuals not covered. I believe that self-employed dentists, if fully informed, would generally favor coverage. However, knowing the deep respect Congress holds for dentists I realize that persuading that legislative body to include you will continue to be difficult unless representative groups of dentists favor inclusion. Possibly the Congress of American Dentists for OASI of which you are president will aid in starting the necessary movement.

I do feel that the plan that you outlined to me of urging all of the dentists in the United States to record their views, pro or con, about inclusion in the OASI system by mailing a postcard to you at the above address is excellent. This expression of opinion, if those dentists sign their names and addresses on the postcard could make a salesworthy exhibit to offer the Congress as sure proof that the great majority of dentists want social security.

Another thing to remember is that Members of Congress, when they go home for adjournment often visit their dentists for a checkup. Dentists interested in social security can greatly advance their cause by expressing their views on social security to their Congressmen at that time.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT W. KEAN,
Member of Congress, 12th District, New Jersey.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., on May 8, 1955, by Americans of Polish descent of the Detroit area, gathered to commemorate the enactment of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

The resolution follows:

Whereas World War II resulted from the invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany, and 10 years ago today a defeated Germany sued for an armistice. The Allied Powers cannot claim victor in that war since Poland is now occupied by an enemy power; and

Whereas after World War II while attempting to form a democratic government in Poland, 16 Polish political leaders were imprisoned by the Russian Soviets. Today, long after the expiration of their sentence, four of these leaders are still unaccounted for. Poles everywhere express their gratitude to the United States for its humanitarian action in demanding their release; and hopes that these demands will be fruitful; and

Whereas 2 years after the Korean rrmistice many American soldiers and civilians are still imprisoned by the Chinese Communists; and

Whereas it appears that the Communist forces of both Russia and China are attempt-

ing to enslave the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we on this solemn occasion pledge our loyalty to the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and the executive department take steps to—

A. Demand through the United Nations that free elections under international control be held in East Central Europe accompanied by the withdrawl of Soviet troops and police forces behind the 1939 frontier.

B. The maintenance of the Oder and Niesse Rivers as Poland's western border to preserve peace and with economic and political stability in Europe.

C. Demand that Russia restore political freedom and independence to the countries she now occupies.

D. Abandon the rearmament of Germany, and use peaceful steps to solve European problems.

E. Repeal the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act with its policies of nationalism consistent with the solemn promises of General Eisenhower and the Republican platform of 1952.

F. Implement and carry out the spirit of the Refugee Act of 1953 and cease playing politics with human misery.

G. Abandon support of colonialism which denies freedom to millions of unfortunates.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the 17th Ohio District, whom I represent.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, and to give information on many troublesome subjects, I deem it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of our district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems.

Having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session, I will again, this year, follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the 7 counties in my district.

I have established the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 22 and 23, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 24 and 25, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 26 and 27, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 29 and 30, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 31 and September 1, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, September 2 and 3, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Tuesday and Wednesday, September 6 and 7, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Weekdays 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

The Asian-African Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly the Asian-African Conference that took place in Bandung, Indonesia, on April 18–24 last. It is important that its implications as they affect the United States and the free world be carefully studied by us. We belong to the legislative branch of our Government and many of our decisions have a direct bearing on what will result from the decisions made at Bandung.

It should be a matter of gratification for us that when 29 nations of Asia and Africa met, the world found out that democracy is strongly entrenched in that area; that despite the efforts of neutralists and Communists to slant the conference against the free world, those who believe in freedom asserted themselves and succeeded in defeating all attempts to make of the conference a sounding board for neutralism and communism.

That we did not suspect this unexpected strength of democracy in Asia and Africa is a lesson we should remember. It shows that we have more friends than we know. In not knowing that we have such stalwart allies we are guilty of either indifference or neglect, and this we should correct at once. This is the first moral that we should draw from the Bandung meeting.

The second lesson is to be drawn from the fact that in Bandung the conferees exercised restraint of the highest order. Their utterances and decisions showed dignity and sobriety. No attacks were made based on racism. Where we feared the color line would be drawn because of the manner the participating countries were selected, nothing in the proceedings of the Conference showed that any of the delegates were animated by racism. Asia and Africa, through their delegates, extended to us the hand of friendship and good will. We should, in equal reciprocity, grasp that hand of friendship and good will. Here is where we can together lay the groundwork for peace for all mankind.

The third lesson is that we should not be too hasty in judging the motives and purposes of other nations. When the Conference was first announced, it was with misgivings that the convening of the meeting was received. Many fears were expressed. As a result, our Government, through President Eisenhower, failed to send a message of greetings to the Conference. This is unfortunate. We should have been the first ones to welcome the Conference and to send our official greetings to the conferees, the majority of whom turned out to be our best friends and allies. Here the State Department failed us in not giving our Government the correct intelligence and background information.

The fourth lesson is that as Ernest Lindley in his column in Newsweek aptly said, we cannot discount the Asians who in the Conference showed they have statesmen and diplomats of the highest caliber, seasoned and mature, who can match the best of Europe and America. Among these I wish to single out a former Member of this House, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who was the Philippines' chief delegate in the Bandung Conference. All the press dispatches were unanimous in acclaiming him as the leader of the democratic forces in the Conference. The Filipino people should be proud that in a meeting of 29 Asian and African nations it was a Filipino voice that spoke for democracy so effectively that the whole world listened.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD General Romulo's speech that will go down in history as a classic that turned the tide for the free world in Bandung:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CARLOS P. ROMULO, MEMBER OF THE CABINET, CHAIRMAN OF THE PHILIPPINE DELEGATION TO THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE, BANDUNG, INDONESIA

I am proud to bring to this conference the greetings of the President and people of the Republic of the Philippines.

We of the Philippines have a profound sense of the great historic events dramatized by this unique gathering; we were, may I remind you, the first of the new nations to emerge in the great rearrangement of the world which began after the end of the Second World War. Our Republic came to being, freely and peacefully, on July 4, 1946. Since that time we have watched with proud solidarity and a feeling of oneness the establishment of the other independent nations of a free Asia, so old and yet so new. We have in these 9 years taken our stand firmly behind the struggle of every people to become master of its own fate, to enjoy its own identity, to be responsible for its own acts, to join in the immense task of building a new structure of human well-being and free institutions, the task, indeed, of changing the face of the world. To the peoples of Africa, already setting forth on this same path, we pledge our friendship and all the moral and practical support within our power to give as they join us of Asia in the great universal effort to better man's estate.

We come as members of one great family long separated from each other. In this family reunion we are here to talk of man's estate. But I do not think it will serve us well to have come here from our many corners of the earth to shroud the truth about man's estate in platitudes, propaganda, or easy self-deception. The world is too harsh a place for this, our problems too great, too perilous, too complicated to allow us this luxury. This conference will justify itself if we share our views frankly and realistically

as brothers should. We will serve each other if we examine ourselves, if we state the issues and problems plainly as we see them, if we clarify, as far as we can, our needs, our choices, our goals—and our obstacles. Let us seek a true meeting of minds on those we share in common and where there are differences, let us try at least to understand them.

All who are represented here are certainly concerned with the issues of (1) colonialism and political freedom, (2) racial equality, and (3) peaceful economic growth. The history of the world in our time turns on the ways in which these issues are met and resolved, or not met and not resolved. We are part, all of us, of a time of great transformation, for each of us and for all the people on earth. It is a trying, difficult, dangerous time—but with it all a good time to be living in. Never before, surely, have so many people been consciously a part of the history through which they were living. We in this room are, for our brief moment, a part of this history. How do we see it? How do we understand it?

To begin with, the very fact that we have come together here in this manner illustrates the great new fact that these issues of freedom, equality, and growth are no longer merely national problems but world problems. Indeed, the United Nations was created as an attempt to grapple with this great new fact. In one sense, this conference suggests that for the peoples of Asia and Africa the United Nations has inadequately met the need for establishing common ground for peoples seeking peaceful change and development. But I think we must also say that if the United Nations has been weak and limited in its progress toward these goals, it is because the United Nations is still much more a mirror of the world than an effective instrument for changing it. It has been in existence only 9 years, and through that time always subject to all the pressures and difficulties of national rivalries and power conflicts, large and small. It is a place where man, not quite yet a reasonable animal, is trying very hard to become one.

We do not have to be satisfied with the rate of progress being made. But neither can we be blind to the great changes that have taken place in so short a time. The world is a very different place from what it was a scant 15 years ago, and hence the United Nations is a very different body from the old League of Nations. A primary difference is the presence of the new spokesmen for Asian and African peoples who never allow the Western representatives to forget that the United Nations Charter pledged the freedom and self-determination of all peoples and that there are peoples in Asia and Africa who take that pledge with literal seriousness, and who will not rest until it is redeemed.

The majority of independent nations represented here won their independence only within the last decade. Who would have been bold enough, 20 years ago, to predict that this would be so? Who will be bold enough now to say how soon or how slowly those peoples in Africa strong enough to win it will acquire the right to face their own problems in their own way on their own responsibility? The handwriting of history is spread on the wall: But not everybody reads it the same way or interprets similarly what he reads there. We know the age of European empire is at an end; not all Europeans know that yet. Not all Asians or Africans have been or are still aware that they must make themselves the conscious instruments of historic decision.

Political freedom has been won by many different means. The British surrendered power in southern Asia because they knew they could no longer maintain it and were wise enough to base their action on reality. The French and Dutch had to be forced to the same conclusion. The United States has at times appeared to us lacking in consistency and vigor in upholding the right of non-self-governing peoples to independence. It has on some issues leaned heavily in favor of colonial powers and has sometimes disheartened us because of its failure to make its actions dovetail with its ideals of equality and freedom. We think that this was more than regrettable; we think it has been unwise. Let it be stated in fairness however that uniquely among the colonial powers the United States in our case made a formal pledge of independence, fixed a date for it 10 years in advance, and fully and honorably redeemed that pledge. True, we fought ceaselessly for our freedom and never gave up our struggle and we earned it when it came. But we of the Phillippines have directly experienced the basic good faith of the United States in our own relationship and we feel that the principles upon which it was based will ultimately prevail.

It is to be hoped, however, that this conference will help remind all the Western powers that the issue of political independence for subject peoples does not depend on their goodwill or slow access of wisdom or virtue. The age of empire is being helped into oblivion by the aroused will and action of people determined to be masters of their own fate. Those of us here who have already won our independence were only the initiators of this process. All the others, almost all now in Africa, stand at various points along their own roads to full self-determination. There is much, of course, one cannot readily foresee. But everything we know and understand about history assures us that whatever new travails the future holds, the old structure of Western empire will and must pass from the scene. Will it expire quietly and in dignity? Will it go out crashing violenty? That will depend on many things. But the end is not in doubt.

There are at least three things more to be said here about this matter of national political freedom:

First, it is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact. Because it expresses the deepest desires of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a façade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection. I know that on this score there are violently different opinions in the world. I can recall how new nations like India, Indonesia, and Ceylon were called puppets of imperialism when they were newly born to freedom. And of course, the Philippine Republic has been described by these same sources as a mere tool of the United States. On the other hand, there is the way some of us view the position of certain other countries which from our own perspective we consider as subservient to other powers. I wonder if in such countries you could read in the press or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen anything resembling the open criticism and other attacks that were common fare in places like India and the Philippines even before independence? I wonder if any of the spokesmen of these countries would ever speak as freely in criticism of the bigger country to which they feel friendly or allied as, say, we in the Philippines speak our minds about the United States? I am sure you will forgive my frankness, but in this land of the ingenious and artistic wajang, of the wonderful Indonesian shadow play and puppet shows, I think we ought to say plainly to each other when we think a puppet is a puppet.

Secondly, is political freedom achieved when the national banner rises over the seat of government, the foreign ruler goes, and the power passes into the hands of our own leaders? Is the struggle for national independence the struggle to substitute a local oligarchy for the foreign oligarchy? Or is it just the beginning of the conquest of real freedom by the people of the land? Is there political freedom where only one political party may rule? Is there political freedom where dissent from the policy of the government means imprisonment or worse? It strikes me that autocratic rule, control of the press, and the police state are exactly the worst features of some colonialist systems against which we have fought all our lives and against which so many of us are still fighting. Is this really the model of the freedom we seek? Or is it the free interplay of contending parties, the open competition of ideas and political views in the market place, the freedom of a man to speak up as he chooses, be he right or wrong? I know there are many possible answers to these questions. But for my part and for my people, may I say plainly that we regard the struggle for freedom as an unending, constant, unremitting demand upon us, that with all our acknowledged failings, faults, and weaknesses, we are seeking to build in our land a society in which the freedom of our Republic will truly become the freedom of every one of its citizens.

Finally, in this world of contending great powers, the independence of the small or weak nation is at best a precarious and fragile thing. Obviously, the ultimate greater freedom will lie in a greater coherence, a uniting of regional interests, in the creation of counterbalancing moral, economic, and physical strength, in the greatest possible common action by all to avert the disaster of a new world war. Let us face squarely up to the fact that within the Nation we can regain our self-respect and grapple with our local problems but that for the primary goals of economic transformation and well-being and peace, the Nation no longer suffices. Western European man today is paying the terrible price for preserving too long the narrow and inadequate instrument of the nation state. We of Asia and Africa are emerging into this world as new nation states in an epoch when nationalism, as such, can solve only the least of our problems and leaves us powerless to meet the more serious ones. We have to try to avoid repeating all of Europe's historic errors. We have to have the imagination and courage to put ourselves in the forefront of the attempt to create a 20th-century world based on the true interdependence of peoples.

I have said that besides the issues of colonialism and political freedom, all of us here are concerned with the matter of racial equality. This is a touchstone, I think, for most of us assembled here and the peoples we represent. The systems and the manners of it have varied, but there has not been and there is not a western colonial regime, which has not imposed, to a greater or lesser degree, on the people it ruled, the doctrine of their own racial inferiority. We have known, and some of us still know, the searing experience of being demeaned in our own lands, of being systematically relegated to subject status not only politically and economically, and militarily—but racially as well. Here was a stigma that could be applied to rich and poor alike, to prince and slave, boss man and workingman, landlord and peasant, scholar and ignoramus. To bolster his rule, to justify his own power to himself, western white man assumed that his superiority lay in his very genes, in the color of his skin. This made the lowliest drunken sot superior, in colonial society, to the highest product of culture and scholarship and industry among the subject people.

I do not think in this company I have to labor the full import of this pernicious doctrine and practice. I do not think I have to try to measure the rule played by this racism as a driving force in the development of the nationalist movements in our many lands. For many it has made the goal of regaining a status of simple manhood the

be-all and end-all of a lifetime of devoted struggle and sacrifice.

Today this type of western racism survives in virulent form only in certain parts of Africa, notably in the Union of South Africa, but certainly in many other places as well on that vast continent. Against this every decent man on earth has to set his face. In the United Nations the Asian and African states have again and again forced this issue on the unwilling attention of the other members. There we could see palpably the extent to which western men have had to become defensive about their past racist attitudes. Few of the western countries were willing to go far enough in condemning the racial practices of the Government of the Union of South Africa. They have yet to learn, it seems, how deeply this issue cuts and how profoundly it unites nonwestern peoples who may disagree on all sorts of questions. Again, we can only hope that this conference serves as a sober and yet jolting reminder to them that the day of western racism is passing along with the day of western power over nonwestern peoples. Its survival in any form can only hang like an albatross around the necks of those many people in the West who sincerely seek to build a freer and better world.

No less than this can be said. But there is something more, too. It is one of our heaviest responsibilities, we of Asia and Africa, not to fall ourselves into the racist trap. We will do this if we let ourselves be drawn insensibly—or deliberately—into any kind of counterracism, if we respond to the white man's prejudice against us as nonwhites with prejudice against whites simply because they are white. What a triumph this would be for racism if it should come about. How completely we would defeat ourselves and all who have ever struggled in our countries to be free. There is no more dangerous or immoral or absurd idea than the idea of any kind of policy or grouping based on color or race as such. This would, in the deepest sense, mean giving up all hope of human freedom in our time. I think that over the generations the deepest source of our own confidence in ourselves had to come from the deeply rooted knowledge that the white man was wrong; that in proclaiming the superiority of his race, qua race, he stamped himself with his own weakness and confirmed all the rest of us in our dogged conviction tht we could and would reassert ourselves as men.

Our quarrel with racism is that it substitutes the accident of skin color for judgment of men as men. Counterracism would have us do the same: to lump white men by their supposed racial grouping and govern our acts and reactions accordingly. It is our task to rise above this noxious nonsense. We have the responsibility to remain aware that this kind of racist attitude has been the practice, not of all white men but only of some, that it flies in the face of their own profoundest religious beliefs and political goals and aspirations, that in almost all western lands, and especially in the United States, the internal struggle against racism and all its manifestations has been going on steadily and victoriously.

We have the responsibility to acknowledge more than this; this business of racism, or other things like it, is an outcropping of one of many human weaknesses that we all share. The racism of western white man has played an especially prominent role in history because the western man associated it with the establishment of his great power over so many nonwestern peoples. As such, it deserves the special and prominent place it must have in the thinking and feeling of everyone. But we must also soberly ask ourselves: Is there a single society or culture represented in this conference which does not in some degree have its counterpart of this kind of prejudice and ignorance? Where is the society in which men have not in some manner divided themselves for political, social, and economic purposes, by wholly irrational and indefensible categories of status, birth, and yes, even skin color? It was a major part of the greatness of India's immortal leader Mahatma Gandhi, that he devoted so much of his fruitful life of selflessness and sacrifice to a struggle against precisely this kind of thing in Indian life. Would that we all gave as much time to the mote in our own eye as we give to denouncing the beam in the eye of another.

Surely we are entitled to our resentment and rejection of white racism wherever it exists. But we are also called upon, as honest men who want to better man's estate wherever and whatever he is, to acknowledge that in degree we all suffer from the same sin of ignorance and immorality. I ask you to remember that just as western political thought has given us all so many of our basic ideas of political freedom, justice, and equity, it is western science which in this generation has exploded the mythology of race. Let us not preserve stupid racial superstitions which belong to the past. Let us work to remove this ugly disease wherever it is rooted, whether it be among western men or among ourselves.

Lastly, I have said that all of us here are concerned with peaceful economic growth. This brings us closest of all to the hub, the center, the heart of our common preoccupations, because the political forms and methods we seek and choose, the social ideas and ideals we embrace, are all wrapped up in the way in which we strive for growth. Economic growth, economic change, transformation of our backward and inadequate economies—these we all seek. These we must seek, else we stagnate and die. After all, it is precisely because the billion and a half people of Asia and Africa have begun in our time to strive for a better economic stake in life that most of us are here today. This is the great new overwhelming fact of this century. The way in which this is achieved will fix the shape of history for all future men.

We all confront the staggering facts of our economic backwardness. This has been partly due to factors of climate, geography, and the stubborn survival of obsolete social patterns. But it has also in large measure and perhaps decisively been the result of patterns imposed upon us by Western colonialism. This heritage is the heaviest burden we carry with us into the new epoch of national freedom. The great masses of our people live in a state of rural poverty. We need to diversify our economies. We need to industrialize in accordance with our resources and needs. We have to win a more balanced place in the market places of the world. We have to do this in a manner that will effectively raise the standard of living of our people. These are the things we have fought for. These are the things that some of us here are still fighting for. For these things above all, we have needed to be free to seek our own way.

But let us not have too many illusions about national independence. We arrive in the world as nations in the middle of the 20th century, not the 19th or the 18th. We have to strive to become nations in a time when history has already passed from the nation to larger units of economic and social coherence: the region, the continent, the world. It is a world as envisioned by Rabindranath Tagore, "not divided into fragments by narrow domestic walls * * *." The idea of national self-sufficiency served the Western World only for a short time as a means to effective growth. Indeed, the great travail of the Western World, its conflicts, rivalries, and wars have derived in no small degree from the fact that the nation, as such, has outlived its usefulness as an instrument of progress. Not even the great powers of today can stand alone, much less newly emergent states weak in everything but the will to grow. In this 20th century world the sober fact is that a purely national economy is an illusion. We cannot start where, say, England started two centuries ago. We have to make our places in a world that has already made tremendous advances technologically and where economic interdependence has become the key to effective economic development and growth.

Considering the present state of the world, with its profound conflicts and insecurities, this may be viewed by some as a crippling disadvantage. But in a very real sense, and a more hopeful sense, it is rather an advantage if we can but grasp it. It means that we need not go through the equivalent of the decades and centuries of ugly, painful, and costly development which occurred in most western countries. It means that if circumstances favor it, we can make use of the most ultramodern technologies to transform ourselves more rapidly, to make new and hitherto unforeseen use of our resources. Who knows yet what the new potentialities of nuclear power are going to mean for Asia and Africa? It is obvious that the real world we live in does not at this moment offer much promise of any early opportunity to find out. But here we have one of the real stakes we all share in preserving the peace, in creating international instruments which will put men to work for man's growth instead of his destruction.

Our fate is bound up with the fate of the whole world. National isolation, in any real sense, is an impossibility in our time, whether we think of an ideal world uniting its human and natural resources for the well-being of all, or the real world, deeply divided and groping its way to decisions that will in one way or another affect every person on earth. The fact is that we will need greater world coherence than we have now if we are to thrive. The fact is that the effective mobilization of world capital and resources will be absolutely vital to us in the process of mobilizing our own capital and our own resources. The fact is that these things will depend in great measure on the further course of the conflicts that now govern all world affairs. It is pure illusion to think that we can be independent of these big facts.

But this by no means leaves us helpless to act in our own interest. It does not mean that we have no choice but to leave the great decisions to others. Quite the contrary. Quite the contrary, because it is precisely in our lands, in our continents, that the most important decisions are going to be made. And it is we who will make them, by what we do or by what we do not do in the coming years.

It could be that Russia's bombs or America's bombs will determine the future shape of the world and the fate of humanity. If it comes to that the tragedy will be total: it will make all we say or do here or anywhere else quite irrelevant. Reason will die and the survivors will move as best they can into a new epoch of savagery. But I do not think the great decisions will come that way. I think the shape of the world is going to be determined in large measure by the way in which the peoples of Asia and Africa go about the business of transforming their lives and their societies.

What do we want? How do we propose to seek it? These are the questions on which the fate of the world really turns. In not fully understanding this, many in the western world commit their most tragic blunder. For our part, we of Asia and Africa have to face up squarely to the big choices that lie before us. We have to try to understand as clearly as we can exactly what they mean.

There are certain things in all our minds on this matter. We all want to the best of our power and wisdom to seek change in

terms of the genius of our own various cultures and histories. We all want no more foreign exploitation of our wealth for the benefit of foreign interests. We do not want our future development to turn out to be another alien graft on our lives. We want this development to raise the physical and educational standards of our peoples. What roads lead to these ends? How do we begin to face up to these vast and formidable tasks?

There is no magic wand or automatic formula to bring about social and economic change. It means that we have to assume our own heavy responsibilities. It means mobilizing people, mobilizing resources. It means great toil, flexibility, adaptability, intelligence. But it also means defining our goal. Is our goal just so many new industries or factories, new dams or bridges or transportation systems? Or is our goal the betterment and the greater freedom, through these and other things, of the lives of the people?

This is no simple rhetorical question. Wrapped up in it are all the troubled issues of our time. And because according to the joint communique of the Bogor Conference "the basic purpose of this Conference is that the countries concerned should become better acquainted with one another's point of view," may I outline for you our views on the possible choices open to us.

There is one road to change which some countries have adopted and which offer itself to the rest of us as a possible choice. This is the road which proposes total change through total power, through avowed dictatorship and the forcible manipulation of men and means to achieve certain ends, the rigid control of all thought and expression, the ruthless suppression of all opposition, the pervasive control of human life in all spheres by a single, tightly run, self-selected organization of elite individuals. I know that an elaborate series of phrases and rationalization are often used to describe this system. But I am concerned not with propaganda myths. I am concerned with realities. I think we all have to be concerned with what this system offers and what it means.

Does the road to greater freedom really lie through an indefinite period of less freedom? Is it for this that we have in this generation raised our heads and taken up the struggle against foreign tyrannies?

Has all the sacrifice, struggle, and devotion, all been, then, for the purpose of replacing foreign tyranny by domestic tyranny?

Do we fight to regain our manhood from western colonial rulers only to surrender it to rulers among ourselves who seize the power to keep us enslaved?

Is it true, can it be true, in this vastly developed 20th century, that national progress must be paid for with the individual well-being and freedom of millions of people? Can we really believe that this price will, in some dim and undefined future time, be redeemed by the well-being and freedom of the yet unborn?

The philosophers of this system have answered this question through their doctrine of the so-called withering away of the state. But the rulers who have established their power in real life and not in the realm of bookish dreams have abandoned this tenet of their faith. We have had ample opportunity to witness over more than a generation now that this kind of power, once established, roots itself more and more deeply, gets more and more committed to perpetuating itself. Moreover, and the whole logic of human experience throws its weight into the scale, this system of power becomes inherently expansionist. It cannot accept the premise of peace with opponents outside its borders any more than it can make peace with opponents inside its borders. It seeks and must seek to crush all opposition, wherever it exists.

This road is open before many of us. The gateway to it is strewn with sweet-smelling garlands of phrases and promises and high sentiment. But once you march through it, the gate clangs behind you. The policeman becomes master and your duty thereafter is forever to say aye. Even those who enjoy the role of mastery must know that this system devours its own.

No, my friends, I don't think we have come to where we are, only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperalism, a new superpower. We do not want leaderships in our countries subservient to foreign rulers, be they in London or Paris, The Hague, or Washington, or, we must add, Moscow. I think our peoples want to worship the Almighty and live in accordance with His laws, to better their lot, to educate themselves and their children, raise themselves from the degradation of want and disease and misery, by holding up their own heads and acting freely to achieve these great and difficult aims by their own free means in partnership with similarly dedicated people everywhere in the world.

That is the freedom of the democratic way of life. That is the freedom we want all the peoples of Asia and Africa to enjoy. That is the freedom that President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines had in mind when he authored the Pacific Charter which enshrines the dignity of man, his well-being, his security, his progress, his nation's right to self-determination. The Philippine delegation is here not only to reiterate the ideals of that charter but to underscore in this conference that it is the sense of the Filipino people that such right of self-determination includes the right of nations to decide exclusively by themselves their ability to assume the responsibilities inherent in an independent political status. This is the time for Asia and Africa to reassert this principle and serve notice to the world that only by its unqualified acceptance by everyone can there be peace and justice for all mankind.

The success of this conference will be measured not only by what we do for ourselves but also by what we do for the entire human community. Large as is the cause of Asia, there is a cause even larger. It is the cause of the human family in a world struggling to liberate itself from the chaos of international anarchy. In short, our cause is the cause of man. If the voice coming out of this conference speaks for Asia and Africa alone, the words will have energy and force but they will make no claim on history. But if our voice speaks for man—man as world citizen rather than world warrior—then we can return to our peoples with the knowledge that we have served them as they need most to be served.

Fellow delegates, our strength flows not out of our number though the numbers we represent are great. It flows out of our perception of history and out of vital purpose for tomorrow. If that purpose is stained by resentment or desire for revenge then this conference will be a fragile and forgetful thing. Let us, therefore, draw strength not from the hurts of past or present but from our common hopes—hopes that can come to life in all peoples everywhere. And if the test of that strength should be our ability to forgive, then let it be said that we were the giants of our time.

Let us invoke the blessing and the guidance of Almighty God over our deliberations so that this conference may prove to be the radiating center of the divine injunction "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" and we may help to make the East and West live together as enjoined by our ancient Asian creed, "We are all brothers under the canopy of heaven."

We Question George Humphrey's Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following text of a splendid speech made by our colleague, the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner of the Young Democratic Club of York, Pa., on Saturday evening, April 23:

ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY AND TAX POLICIES OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY GEORGE HUMPHREY

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Member of Congress)

It is difficult to find or establish a frame of reference for criticism of the present administration. Even before President Eisenhower was elected, it was stated by one of his chief supporters, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, that we should not expect him to have a clear stand on issues but anticipate that he would act on the basis of subconscious principles. We have since been assured that his appointments—Cabinet positions and others—are men of good will. If one questions program or policy, he is readily accused of questioning the integrity and the good intentions of these governmental officials. Mistakes do occur. Republican defenders say the President is not responsible because he was not informed. It was contended in a Washington newspaper recently that the "kitchen cabinet" should be held responsible. Apparently having excused the President, the current move is to excuse the Cabinet and to lay responsibility, if it is necessary to do so, on the third level of officials in the present administration.

I do not tonight intend to criticize the President, nor the third-level Government officials, nor even those in the second or Cabinet level who are not considered strong men or important influences on Government. I would like, however, to take up with you the record and the policies of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, who is generally accepted as being the strongest man in the Eisenhower Cabinet. The story of his appointment as the Secretary of the Treasury has, insofar as I know, never been fully reported. Politically he called himself a Taft man before the 1952 convention. He is reported to have worked in some manner, although there is no extensive public record, for the election of President Eisenhower. Again according to a report, he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury on the recommendation of Gen. Lucius Clay. Whatever his background and whoever his supporters were, George Humphrey seemed quite ready to assume the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury. Apparently he almost immediately impressed President Eisenhower, who said, shortly after he took office, that "In Cabinet meetings I always wait for George Humphrey to speak. I sit back and listen to the others talk while he doesn't say anything. But I know that when he speaks up he will say just what I am thinking." If this is actually the case, it would seem quite unnecessary for George Humphrey to speak at all to the President unless the President preferred to have Humphrey tell the other Cabinet members what he, the President, was thinking rather than tell them himself.

The Secretary of the Treasury, as a man responsible largely for fiscal and economic

policy of the United States, has when he took office, I assume, some sense of responsibility with regard to statements made by Republicans in the course of the 1952 campaign. There were, of course, the regular, expected denunciations of taxes in general, promises of tax reduction, of balancing the budget, and reducing the national debt. Some Republicans spoke of imposing a 25-percent limitation on personal income taxes, charging that the graduated scale as it existed in the law was immoral. There were many Republicans who denounced the corporate profits tax and others who said that the excise taxes were iniquitous. They expressed general dissatisfaction with what their candidate called treadmill prosperity and spoke of stabilizing and at the same time expanding our economy. The Republican platform promised to "aid small business in every practicable way." "The Republican Party will create," the platform said, "conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability safeguarding the farmers independence and opening opportunities for young people in rural communities." These in general were the promises and the program with regard to Government finance and the American economy.

Let us look now to the performance. In the first 3 years of the present administration, there has been a budget deficit each year, and it is estimated that the deficit for fiscal 1956 will be approximately $3½ billion. If this estimate is correct, the 4-year Republican administration will show an increase in the national debt from approximately $259 billion at the end of fiscal 1952, to approximately $276 billion at the end of fiscal 1956—an increase of approximately $17 billion. The Republicans have attempted to distinguish between good and bad deficits—the standard being for the most part that a deficit occurring under a Democratic administration is a bad deficit, whereas one occuring under a Republican administration is a good deficit. A sharper distinction has been made by one observer who states the difference in these terms: That the Democrats spend more than they collect, whereas the Republicans collect less than they spend. Promises to give the country something other than treadmill prosperity have been partially fulfilled, but in a negative way. The gross national product declined by approximately $7½ billion in 1954. Talk of 100 percent of parity for farmers in the market place does not stand up well in view of the present parity ratio of approximately 86. The fact that farm income is generally down and that the number of people living on farms is declining does not square very well with the Republican platform statement that it would create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability and that it would open opportunities for young people in rural communities. The rate of small business failures has increased.

Of course the Secretary of the Treasury is not entirely responsible for these developments any more than he would be entirely responsible if the level of prosperity had increased, if farm income were high, if unemployment were reduced. There are limits to what Government can do in the way of directing the American economy and fortunately, also, as result of the passage of legislation such as the social security program, the farm program, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, and similar legislation, limitations were placed upon the disastrous effects which the operation of an entirely free economy and unrestrained competition might have upon the domestic economy of the United States. Nonetheless, Government policy, particularly fiscal policy, does have an important bearing upon the economic welfare of the Nation.

Let us look at the record of the administration. Shortly after being established in the position of authority, the Secretary of the Treasury initiated what was called a hard-money policy. This hard-money policy essentially involved an increase in interest rates so that those who had to borrow money would be required to pay more to those persons and institutions who were lending it. The tight-money policy has since been reversed or at least modified. The experiment, however, was expensive. For example, on one long-term Government bond issue, the Secretary of the Treasury set an interest of 3¼ percent, which was 30 percent higher than the previous rate of 2½ percent. This issue was extremely popular. It was oversubscribed by five times. The taxpayers of the country will pay in added interest on this bond issue alone over the life period of the bonds approximately $200 million. Interest rates on other Government securities were also increased and the increased interest rate spread throughout the entire economy. Although the administration has had to retreat from its extreme position on interest rates, its general policy has been one of tightening the money market and increasing the cost of money to borrowers. There is evidence that the economy is recovering now, but, I think, there is no question but what it was staggered and seriously hurt by the hard-money policy.

In the field of taxation, the attitude of the administration, or at least of the Secretary of the Treasury, is becoming clear. There has been, of course, no general attack upon all taxation, as was indicated there might be in the campaign. The direction of the administration's tax policy is indicated in the administration's support of two major tax changes. First, in its support of the dividend exemption provision in the 1954 tax law, and in its more recent opposition to the $20 income-tax credit proposed in the 84th Congress. The administration argued for the dividend exemption on the grounds that this would eliminate double taxation. It is significant to note, however, that at the same time the administration was asking for an extension of the regular corporate profits tax. I think it fair to ask the question as to why, if the administration was concerned about double taxation, it did not simply recommend that the corporate profits be reduced and the complicated provisions with regard to dividend exemptions not be injected into the tax program. This would have been the simple way to eliminate so-called double taxation. As a matter of fact, however, the corporate profits tax is to a large extent a regressive tax which falls upon the purchaser of the corporation's products or services—to a large extent, therefore, in the nature of a sales tax. Dividend exemption, however, gives tax advantage and tax relief to those who receive an income from investment. Seventy-six cents out of every dividend dollar are paid to the top 4 taxpayers out of every 100 taxpayers.

The Republican administration, led by the Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, was successful in defeating the $20 income tax credit proposed by the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives in this session of Congress. The argument of the administration was that the condition of the Federal budget did not justify a reduction in taxes. The Secretary of the Treasury argued that this consideration was the primary one and that in view of the budget deficit the tax rates should not be reduced. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Republican tax reduction bill was under consideration in the 83d Congress, the administration in the face of a budget deficit of approximately $4½ billion supported a bill which was expected to reduce revenue by approximately $1½ billion. They then argued that revenue was not the important consideration, but that the economic effects of taxes were to be given primary consideration. Approximately 1 year later in anticipation of a deficit of $2.5 billion, the administration opposed as unsound a reduction of approximately $815 million in tax revenue arguing that economic considerations were of secondary importance.

On the basis of this record, I think that the following conclusion can safely be made. First, that one can expect no consistency in the arguments of the administration on tax or economic questions. Second, that the administration is not as strongly opposed to the corporate profits tax as it has sometimes indicated, but is rather concerned about reducing taxes paid by people in the high income bracket, especially when that revenue is derived from investment in corporations. Third, that it is not as anxious as it claimed to be during the 1952 campaign to reduce excise taxes, although there has been little indication of late that the Secretary of the Treasury intends to press for consideration of a national sales tax. Their policy is not one of killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, but rather one of overfeeding the goose.

Actually we should not be altogether surprised at the policies which have been adopted and supported by the administration. Examination of the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury indicate that he has acted about as we should have expected him to act and as we may expect him to act in the future. We should not, for example, be surprised that business failures in the $5,000 to $25,000 class increased by approximately 70 percent between 1953 and 1954. We should not be surprised to learn that the administration is inclined to favor in its defense contracts the larger corporations, for the Secretary of the Treasury has said that "America needs big business, its requires big businesses, big enterprises, to do the things in big ways that a big country has to have." I think that we would all agree that America does need big business, but that it also needs small business and businesses of medium size. We should not be altogether surprised that the administration's tax policies particularly have tended to favor investors, for the Secretary of the Treasury, testifying before the Senate Committee on Finance in 1954, said, "There is nothing more important for the future of America than to encourage widespread investment in American business." All of us would agree, of course, that investment in American business is important, but I am sure that few would say that there is nothing more important than such investment. We cannot, for example, sacrifice necessary provisions for defense in order to encourage American business. We cannot neglect our international problems in the interest of stimulating such investment. Nor can we sacrifice any large number of our own people to poverty or to unemployment in the interest of investment in business. What we have reflected in the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury is at best an acceptance of the trickle-down theory, and more obviously an acceptance of the old fallacy of accepting the primacy of economics over every other consideration. It leads one to believe that President Wilson was right when he said that the Republicans thought that the only persons who could be trusted with the prosperity and welfare of the Nation were those who had the greatest material stake in it.

In view of this emphasis on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and the acceptance of his judgments by the President, we should not be surprised to learn, as we could

from a recent report of the U. S. News & World Report, that during the time covered by its survey the President had invited 294 businessmen to his dinners but during the same period, only 9 farmers. That while he had invited 294 businessmen, he had invited 8 labor union officials; 294 businessmen, but 6 church leaders; 294 businessmen, but only 30 educators.

We should not be too surprised at what the Secretary of the Treasury recommends with regard to taxes, since he stated to the Ways and Means Committee of the House that the only purpose which the Ways and Means Committee was to take into consideration in connection with tax programs was that of raising revenue. He said that questions of social reform, or social well-being, should not be considered in relation to tax policy. I suppose that had he been hard pressed, he would not have recommended, at least publicly, that taxes should be imposed so heavily upon low-income groups that they could not adequately support their families, but such a conclusion is certainly inherent in the tax policy which he announced to the committee.

The political and economic philosophy is perhaps best summarized in his statement: "We must remember the fundamental principle that the best government is the least government." If this principle, as he calls it, were accepted and carried to its logical conclusion, one would be an anarchist advocating no government at all. This statement of Humphrey does not express any kind of fundamental principle, but rather a fundamental misunderstanding of the function of government. The best government is the government which is adequate to the needs of the people and which performs those functions which government should perform. The function of laws in government and governmental institutions is to protect people from force and violence by those who are more powerful either in terms of physical, or economic power, or whatever other power they may possess; and on the positive side to promote as the preamble to our Constitution says, "the general welfare." In the period in which government was weak in this country, we had exploitation in the economic field by powerful forces—exploitation of men through unjust and depressed wages and inhuman working conditions; exploitation of consumers and of competitors; and exploitation, also, of our natural resources. It was the policy of those who were interested in such exploitation to keep government weak, because they were then relatively strong. The history of the United States shows that through government the people of the country have come to exercise some measure of control over these forces, and through government action to secure some measure of justice for all of our citizens. Of course, if government were weakened, the economic institutions and forces in which the Secretary of the Treasury is interested could operate with greater freedom and independence and so could use their power without intervention, or without opposition by government.

We need not question his integrity, nor his good intentions, but certainly we can question his judgment. If what he has said indicates what he really thinks, and if he intends to carry through to logical conclusions the potential of his political philosophy, then we have genuine cause to be concerned and to be alarmed, and, as active members of the Democratic Party, to intensify our efforts to continue control not only of the Congress of the United States, but also of the executive branch of the Government; not with the intention of using that power and control to advance our personal interests or the limited interests of the Democratic Party, but with the purpose in mind of controlling government and using it so that the best interests of the people of the United States may be served by the Government.

Persecution of the Church in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 8th day of May constitutes the second anniversary of the isuance of the last official protest of the Catholic clergy in Poland against persecution of the church by the state Communist authorities. Severe repression has made subsequent effective protests impossible.

In view of the continued persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland, and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain, contrary to all human laws, and to international law, it is timely today to recall this memorable occasion.

On May 8, 1953, the last assembly of the Polish bishops was held in Krakow. The occasion was the 700th anniversary of the canonization of St. Stanislaw Szczepanowski, bishop of Krakow and patron of Poland. The Polish episcopate then assembled in Krakow, sent to Boleslaw Bierut, chairman of the State Council in Warsaw, a lengthy document presenting the situation of the church and religious life in Poland from 1950 to 1953 under Communist domination.

The document, an example of a great moderation, of a deep understanding of the apostolic mission of the church and of great love for the Polish nation, does not enter into any polemics, but states and lists "before God and history" the wrongs which Marxism has been doing to the Catholic Church and the Polish nation, trying to deprive it of its thousand-year-old Christian tradition and attempting to destroy in Poland the faith of the people in God.

This memorial has become the last great document of the Polish episcopate containing the signature of the Primate Cardinal Stephen Wyszynski. From that time it was impossible to hold another assembly of the Polish episcopate and from that time on the bishops were prevented from presenting any further documents on religious life in Poland and on the fate of the church there. Five months thereafter Cardinal Wyszynski, the head of the church in Poland, was placed under arrest and has not been heard from since.

At the very beginning of the document, the bishops state: "In accordance with truth, the Polish episcopate feels it is its duty to state that the situation of the church in Poland is not only not improving but, on the contrary, is steadily deteriorating. The responsibility toward God, the community and history demands that at least the more menacing negative aspects be named without covering them up, and defined accurately." After this preamble the bishops gave a list of wrongs which the Communist regime had committed during the past 3 years against the church in Poland. Among these wrongs the episcopate enumerates the "removal of religion from the schools and of God from the hearts of the youth," "political pressure and attempts of diversion among the clergy," "absolute destruction of the Catholic press and periodicals," "intrusion in church affairs and attempts at hindering Apostolic activities of the church," "unusual hard fate of the church in western territories."

Each of these charges was supported by substantial evidence. Furthermore, the episcopate emphasized "attempts and efforts of the episcopate in creating mutual relations."

The document was ended by a solemn declaration of the bishops of the following conditions:

POLISH BISHOPS' DECLARATION

Feeling that it is their highest duty, the Polish episcopate points herewith to the tragic fate of the church in Poland, to the symptoms of the opporession and its causes, and the sources from which flows the concern, the anxiety, and the exasperation of the broad masses of the Catholic community.

We see the basic and main cause of this state of affairs in the hatred which destroys the strength of our country and seems to forebode sinister wrangles. We are acting not with any controversial aims in mind, but only to emphasize the burning necessity of finding an honest and fair way out of the existing situation. We are seeking a positive solution, which would be beneficial both to the church and the state. Nothing is further from us than to destroy the unity, to introduce dissension, or spread hatred. So this time again we do not refuse to reach an agreement, we do not forsake the will for a peaceful solution and collaboration in the important task of a successful settlement of relations between church and state in accordance with the agreement reached on April 14, 1950. However, in the present state of affairs it depends solely on the sincere and good will of the government whether internal peace and reciprocal harmony which are so essential, will be really achieved. It depends on whether the government will forsake its radical, destructive hate toward Catholicism, whether it will abandon its aim of subjugating the church and turning it into an instrument of the state.

We wish that the government should clearly understand what the decree about the filling of church positions really means for the structure of the church. We therefore remind that by this act, which is illegal according to the constitution, the state has usurped for itself the right to a constant intrusion in the internal affairs of the church, sometimes pertaining to the conscience of the priests, and to a willful and systematic subjection of church jurisdiction to its own will.

This is inadmissible from the point of view of the church. First because the jurisdiction of the church pertains to strictly religious, internal and supernatural matters, such as teaching God's revelation, the teaching of Christian morals, the administration of the Holy Sacraments, the organization of religious services, the spiritual guidance of the souls and the consciences of the people.

In the name of what rights could the authority over such strictly religious matters be submitted to the authority of the state, which by its nature pertains to matters which are exclusively secular and temporal? Particularly, if that authority is based upon a materialistic and anti-religious ideology, and is filled with destructive hatred toward the church? Every person, even an atheist, should understant that such a dependence is quite impossible. Therefore Lenin justly condemned the subjugation of the church to the state as a "cursed and disgraceful" thing. This is moreover, an impossible thing for the church because, in accordance with its unalterable constitution, with regard to which even the Pope is helpless, there is not and cannot be in that Catholic community

another jurisdictional authority except the one which flows from above, from the Pope and the Bishops.

Therefore, whenever the secular authority willfully tries to grasp the ecclasiastical jurisdiction, in order to make it dependent, it usurps something which does not belong to it, and violates not only the rights of the church, but also the divine law. On what basis therefore could the government require of the Polish episcopate to accept a fact which is so glaringly inconsistent with the structure of the church and its rights, and which even violates the sacred divine laws.

Shortly after the announcement of the decree about filling the church positions, representatives of the episcopate deemed it their duty to make a formal protest in that matter. Today, the whole Polish episcopate protests.

We declare, aware of our apostolic mission, in a most solemn and categorical manner, that we cannot consider as legal and binding this decree, because it is inconsistent with the constitution of the Polish People's Republic, and violates the laws of God and of the church. "One should obey God rather than men."

We do not refuse to take into consideration the motives and the suggestions of the government. But in filling church positions we must be directed by divine and by ecclesiastical law, and we must appoint only those priests whom we consider, in our conscience, as fit and worthy. We find it difficult to hide how little worthy of those positions, especially the more important ones, are those, who yielded to external political pressure and allowed themselves to be used as instruments of diversion in the church. Those priests give very slight guaranty that, as representatives of the church, they will defend with devotion and firmness the essential and divine principles and rights of the church.

If it should happen that external factors will make it impossible for us to appoint competent and proper people to ecclesiastical positions, we are decided to leave them vacant rather than to place the spiritual rule of souls in the hands of unworthy individuals. And if someone should dare to accept any ecclesiastical position from outside (the church) let him know, that by the same fact he falls under the heavy punishment of excommunication.

Similarly, if we are placed before the alternative: either to subject ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the state making it an instrument of the latter, or to bear a personal sacrifice, we will not hesitate, we will follow the voice of our apostolic vocation and our conscience as priests, with peace of mind and the knowledge that we have not given the slightest reason for persecution, that suffering becomes our lot for no other reason than the cause of Christ and His church.

We are not allowed to place the things belonging to God on the altar of Caesar. Non possumus.

We respect the personal opinions of all people, also those of our present adversaries, whom we as Christians are not permitted to hate—but we demand the same respect for the religious opinions of Catholic Poles, especially children and the youth.

We respect the duties toward the nation and the state, and often remind our faithful about them, but at the same time we demand that no obstacles be placed in the way of Catholics for the performing of their duties toward God and the church. We are conscious of the special tasks and duties of the Catholic priest toward his country, and that is why we often reminded our priests about them, requesting their solicitude for the development and welfare of our country. But we also demand with emphasis that our priests should not be torn away from their religious duties, that they should not be drawn into political affairs which are alien to their vocation, that political pressure aimed at using them as instruments in the struggle of the state against the church be stopped, that they should not be forced to break their oath by which they pledged loyalty to the church and their bishops.

In short, in accordance with the principle of separation of church and state, as guaranteed in our constitution, the state must abstain from interfering in the religious, spiritual, and internal affairs of the church.

In the name of the welfare of our nation, we have the right to demand from the leaders of the Marxist camp a revision of the principles of ruthless hatred and ostracism toward our religion, the church and God. The Polish episcopate demands from the council of ministers that, in accordance with article 32.7 of the constitution of the Polish Peoples Republic, it undertake the defense of the rights of Catholics in the Polish Peoples Republic.

This memorable espiscopate letter of May 8, 1953, can be well described as an important historical document in the war against God, religion, and the church in Poland conducted by the Communist regime.

The history of this war with God and religion in a previous period, from 1945 to 1950, is described by another Polish episcopate letter dated September 12, 1950. It was signed by Cardinal Adam Stefan Sapieha and by the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszynski. It was unanimously adopted by all the Polish bishops assembled in Czestochowa and forwarded to President Boleslaw Bierut. In it the following was said:

In the history of the Catholic Church in Poland the last 5 years (1945–50) have been marked by unprecedented oppression. Unilateral withdrawal of the concordat by the Polish state; failure of the state to give recognition to the church organizations in western occupied lands; the failure to permit renewal of Catholic organizational activities; gradual but steady liquidation of Catholic schools; unusually strong limitations on religious press and religious publications by censorship and limitations so that they have almost ceased to exist; depriving the church of diocesan publications; taking over by the state of social organizations and hospitals belonging to the church; barring of organization church life and compulsive registration of cloisters; limitation on the public freedom of religious cults and limitations of the right to conduct Mass and religious practices, such as missions, public processions, religious gatherings and congresses; the liquidation of the church welfare organization Caritas; nationalization of church properties; the press campaign against the episcopate; the limitation of religious practices in schools; removal from the schools of hundreds of religious text books; support of youth organizations with ideology inimical to Christianity; support of publications discrediting historically the accomplishments of the church in the field of scence and national life; antireligious propaganda conducted by the press, by lectures, and by thousands of publications; limitations on the freedom of conscience of members of organizations, parties, and trade unions; antireligious propaganda in kindergartens and schools, summer camps, and in youth camps; the use of the whole administrative apparatus, the courts, police authorities, and tax offices to exert pressure on the conscience of the citizenry and of the priests and bishops. All this is only a partial list and does not give a picture of the whole truth of the situation of the Catholic Church after 5 years (1945–50). Having this in mind the episcopate has, on many occasions, presented its complaints and protests to you, Mr. President and chairman of the committee of ministers. Unfortunately, it was without results. The last year, 1949–50, particularly after the concordat of April 14, 1950, was marked by a hastening of the tempo of the liquidation of the church's social institutions and activities.

This document of September 12, 1950, together with that of the Polish espisopate of May 8, 1953, gives a true picture of the religious persecution in Poland on the part of the Communist regime in the period from 1945 to 1953. They present a picture of the brutal war with God, religion, and the church conducted by the Communists in Poland.

With the arrest of the Polish Primate Cardinal Stephan Wyszynski on September 26, 1953, and his imprisonment by the Communists, an end came to the period in which the Polish episcopate could present this type of memorial, which is now a historical document, to the Warsaw regime. Since that time it is unknown where the Polish primate is imprisoned, what his condition of health is, and under what circumstances he is living. Despite the fact that it has been requested from all parts of the world, the Communist regime has to this day given no official information regarding him.

The high moral position which Cardinal Wyszynski has gained in the Catholic world is best attested to by the greeting sent by the American cardinals and bishops to Cardinal Wyszynski through the Voice of America during the last Christmas holidays. Cardinals Spellman, Stritch, Mooney, and McIntyre joined in the greetings, as did also a number of American bishops such as O'Boyle, Alter, Donahue, Keough, Lucey, Byrne, Gannon, Russell, Meyer, O'Hara, Cushing, Wosnicki, Kroll, and many other high dignitaries of the Catholic Church in the United States. They all emphasized the fact that in Cardinal Wyszynski, the primate of Poland, they see "a symbol of courage which every man should display in defense of freedom."

The Communist attack on the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyzsynski opened a new period of religious persecution in Poland. The war with God, religion, and the church took on a new form, but it never stopped or slackened.

After nearly 2 years the Polish bishops and the Polish episcopate are Communist prisoners of the Warsaw regime. Deprived of its leader, the Polish Primate Cardinal Wyszynski, there have been no plenary assemblies of the Polish episcopate for nearly 2 years. After 2 years the episcopate has been compelled by the Communist regime to be silent. The bishops have very rarely been able to be heard, and then only on strictly religious matters and on subjects in which they are compelled to speak by the Communists.

On the other hand, immediately after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski the Warsaw regime has pushed to the forefront the so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics. In the memorial of September 12, 1950, the bishops already affirmed that these patriot priests were in conflict with their moral and church obligations, and many of them

were under church discipline. As to the so-called progressive Catholics, they were publicly condemned in February 1950 by the Primate Cardinal Wyszynski, who confirmed the fact that their activities and the activities of their publications cannot be considered as Catholic.

In the fall of 1953, after the arrest of Cardinal Wyszynski, the Communists called to life the so-called State Committee of Catholic, Ecclesiastical, and Lay Activists of the National Front. This committee was given the job of diversional work among the Catholic people. Later the Communists added to this group the "patriot priests," putting them under leadership of "progressive Catholics."

How ineffective was the work of this committee and how effective were the auditions of the western radio, particularly Voice of America, as best evidenced by the statement of the secretary-general of this committee on February 22, 1955, who, despairing on the lack of ability to operate effectively, said:

This national committee having ambitions to influence and to direct the processes of evolutions now going on in the minds of clergy cannot at any time afford to neglect the influence of western radio of diversional character on a certain group of priests and Catholics in general. These radios lost their appeal for the Polish people by unmasking their lies and hatred toward anything which is cherished in the heart of every Pole. Nevertheless these radio programs aim to disturb the minds of the faithful and to exploit for hostile political aims religious feelings and devotion to the church of people.

One of the means used by these western radios—which flatters us because it strengthens our belief in the righteousness of our ideals—is an avalanche of lies and insults directed against our movement. Our strength and our achievements compelled the enemy propaganda to change also its methods. Even they noticed our great movement and ineffectiveness to combat it from outside as it was when they successfully went to isolate progressive Catholic movement. Therefore the struggle has been changed for a diversion with the scope to concentrate on disintegrating processes and opportunistic tendencies within our movement. It is logical—if one is unable to conquer or destroy a movement, if one cannot retract its development, he must try to weaken this movement, to loosen it and undermine its ideals.

And therefore the weight of enemy propaganda is pushing now not on our organizational forces—it is even afraid to use its name—but is attacking the very ideology. The enemy propaganda is trying to undermine among the people its confidence in this ideology and abate its authority. They talk no more about a heritical group or heretical ideology, they discriminate not only people and their activities, but they strike against the fundamental belief of progressive Catholics.

This is the reason why we must come to certain conclusions for our further activity, why we have to deepen morale of our activists and take care of a high moral standard of our leading groups.

This wailing of those who were bent on destroying religious life in Poland is good evidence that their efforts have been unsuccessful and have not fallen on fertile ground.

In the perspective of 10 years of religious persecution in Poland and in the light of the history of 10 years of the war of Communists with God, religion, and the church in Poland, it is now clear how important were the statements of the Polish episcopate. It is obvious that the Communists to the present time have been losing that war. The Polish nation has successfully fought off the attacks. This, however, does not minimize for a moment the dangers which appear to exist. The Communists have chosen Poland as the base of their great diversion war with the entire Christian world. The so-called patriot priests and progressive Catholics are being used by the Communists to divert activities in various countries in the world. They are being sent to Belgium, France, Italy, and even to North Vietnam and to the United States under the guise of various missions, sometime diplomatic. The Catholic mask is used to conceal their Communist activity to procure advantages for Moscow. We must consider these matters when we reflect on this second anniversary of the historical document, the memorial of the Polish espiscopate of May 8, 1953. We must remember that the goal of the Communists is not only to destroy the Catholic world in Poland, but to destroy all religious activities everywhere in the world, including these United States.

Increase in Minimum Wage Aids Independent Local Merchant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the May 9 edition of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily. This timely editorial summarizes some very forceful arguments in behalf of legislation increasing the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour:

AN IRONIC SITUATION

The United States Chamber of Commerce is supposed to represent the small retail merchant. But every time the chamber goes on record about a particular issue, it takes a position which is opposed to the interests of the retail merchant.

The minimum wage, for instance.

The present legal minimum is 75 cents an hour, which means that a man supporting a family at the rate of the minimum wage would receive a gross weekly income of $30 for a 40-hour week. Thirty dollars gross, of course, is not what the wage-earner brings home to his family. More likely, for the average family, it would be closer to $20.

There are proposals to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour. This is the rate supported by organized labor. The Eisenhower administration is sponsoring an increase to 90 cents an hour. Others feel the minimum ought to be pegged somewhere between the 2 figures, perhaps at $1 or $1.10.

But not the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The national chamber wants to keep things just the way they are—at 75 cents an hour, or between $20 and $30 a week.

The retail merchant, the fellow the United State Chamber is supposedly to be representing, depends on consumer purchasing power for his volume of business. It does not take much thought to realize how much purchasing power in bulk can be put together from figures of $20 to $30 a week. Very little. The bare necessities of life can be obtained for that amount of money. Just think of a family with 2 or 3 children trying to live on, say, $24 a week. Fantastic.

Moreover, the secret of purchasing power does not lie in profits. Profits flow to a relative few. They are essential to expansion and to creation of new enterprise. But when they are held at a high level at the expense of wages, the opportunity for expansion or for new enterprise does not appear. For there is no one to buy.

This is the lesson such organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce cannot bring themselves to study.

If they truly had the interests of the retail merchant at heart, or if they took anything except the most shortsighted view of economic realities, they would be out campaigning like zealots for a substantial increase in the minimum wage.

Here, then, is an ironic situation. The organized labor movement is supporting what is in the interest of the average retail businessman. But the United States Chamber of Commerce is supporting the interests of a selfish myopic few.

Proposed Antitrust Action of the Department of Justice Against the ANPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Richard W. Slocum discussed the proposed antitrust action of the Department of Justice against the ANPA in a speech in Chicago, May 10, at the convention dinner of the National Newspaper Promotion Association. After discussing current business problems of newspapers, he said:

I don't yet know enough about the proposed suit by the Department of Justice against ANPA and others to appraise its legal merit. I have seen but 5 or 6 of the several thousands of letters and documents the FBI took from the files.

In my starting years I was a Philadelphia lawyer but I never practiced in the so-called antitrust field.

But as lawyer or newspaperman or citizen I know enough to be concerned when the Federal Government exhibits a determination to saddle the press with a continuing injunction.

When we were told by top Justice Department officials the results of their investigation we were told we were going to be sued, but that a trial could be avoided and the suit wrapped up in a consent decree which the Department would be willing to take whatever time was necessary to work out. We said, well, can't we go into the facts with you and give you our side of it—maybe clear up wrong interpretations or conclusions from that material—and if the law has advanced or extended its prohibitions so that whereas 10 years ago we were not in violation but are now, tell us what those things are and we will change them. Certainly the press does not want even to try to

operate beyond legal right and if the law has changed by Supreme Court decision, as they told us it had starting about 10 years ago, we will adjust to whatever the law may now be.

We emphasized that the press claims no special position for itself. That it wants or would accept no disposition of the matter except in accord with proper application of current law. We thought there was advantage to everyone, and certainly fairness, if we could talk the whole situation over with them.

When we expressed those things we were told we could talk and they would not rush the talk, provided the talks would end in a consent decree; no willingness to talk about whether or not the antitrust division had gotten the right understanding of our activities—whether they might be wrong on some facts, as they were in the early stages when they thought a standard rate card meant advertising rates were standard instead of it being merely a card standardized in size to fit a No. 10 envelope.

This is supposed to be the day, and it is so preached in high Government places, that people should take time to discuss things before they fire their guns. But, no, in the Justice Department of the Government we couldn't sit down and talk unless we were talking about a consent decree. We first had to agree to confess our guilt. The only thing we could talk about would be our sentence. It would be in the civil area of the law, not the criminal, but the idea is the same.

And that is why I am concerned, greatly concerned, and why you, as newspaper men and women, should be concerned. Concerned not that ANPA might have to change as court law may have changed, but concerned over the Justice Department's determination to hang an injunction upon an important operating arm of the press—ANPA—and have it constantly in court and subject to the contempt determination of a judge, on application at any time of a Department of Justice that may have in it people who berate and belittle the press. Don't think that can't happen. Just think of the attitude toward the press again recently expressed by some people in high places, or recently there—partisans who don't like the ceaseless search of newspapermen for news the public is entitled to have or who try to smear the press with partisan unfairness because it does not view things their way.

The importance of the press is not to its owners, or the jobs of its craftsmen. Its importance is to the people, as the active working trustee of their fundamental freedom, their right to know what their Government is doing so that it can make the proper decisions, for public opinion is the true determinant of our course.

So, when a Department of Justice insists on blood before it will talk—is not willing to discuss merits unless it has been promised a public victory and some kind of a restriction on the press—there is the thing really to worry about. A will to understand correctly before acting is more important for the people to have in the Department of Justice than a prosecutor complex.

Do with the press whatever the changed law requires but don't be afraid to discuss the facts, or reveal opinions on anything that contributes to proper determinations. The Department of Justice has been wrong many times before in its accusations. Why it isn't willing to take a further look here with us before firing, is something for ponder and for regret. The public servant who thinks costructively is willing to discuss facts. He is not in such a hurry after almost 2 years of thinking about a matter that he will not take a little time to talk, and where the result may be so important and the interest of the public so great he would do well to think more of being right and less of exacting conceded victory.

Of one thing I am satisfied, this decision to haul the press into court is the decision of the top man, the Attorney General himself, joined by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Stanley Barnes. I would not lay at their door all of the thinking and purpose I would ascribe to their underlings but I believe they have been too ready to follow the will of their underlings.

It is not too late to avoid or correct these mistakes. The Department of Justice should and still can, if it will, talk this situation over on its full merits with ANPA. ANPA will gladly go into the matter on such basis, prepared to make any necessary changes. What is right is never blocked nor should the position of either party be "frozen by public announcement." Apart from being willing to discuss the matter, ANPA has not yet determined the course it should take in the best interest of ANPA, the press, and more important, the public. We had a legal opinion from our counsel and that was released for all to see. ANPA's Board has not all the information it should have before making its decision. It asked the Justice Department for a copy of the proposed bill of complaint but that was denied; presumably the victory complex might be injured by revealing the Department's intended lines of evidentiary attack.

It is the Department of Justice that blocks full constructive discussion—a simple procedure accepted as fair and commonsense and modern in other fields of possible disagreement—by insisting any such talk must be conditioned on our agreement to end up saddled with a court injunction.

ANPA asks only what good sense and good will and fairness should quickly grant particularly from a Government agency, and so long as it is refused ANPA must move with added concern and caution. Its course will be determined by a deep consciousness of its trusteeship of the free press for the people.

ANPA is not looking for a fight. It hopes there need be none. It is prepared to help avoid one. But it never runs for cover when it is challenged and it puts fundamental fairness and constructive results above legal maneuvering and victory complexes.

Public Power Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a very interesting communication received from a constituent, Mr. Eugene F. O'Hara, of New Haven, Conn., which I think is the most informative communication I have received on this subject. You will note that it is not a mere attack on an important problem for the sake of opposition. Mr. O'Hara's presentation, arguments, and his conclusions are worthy of the few minutes' time of my colleagues to read it.

The letter follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *May 1, 1955.*

Hon. ALBERT CRETELLA,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRETELLA: The present administration, while proclaiming its economy, is nurturing a pair of multimillion-dollar programs that can deal crippling blows to our natural resources. These two projects are regional in their immediate impact, their economic effects will be felt by every American taxpayer, not only for their huge initial cost of construction but also in a loss of wildlife resources that can never be replaced by dollars and cents. These projects are planned for widely separated sections of the country, Arkansas and Idaho.

ARKANSAS

The Cache River Basin is slated for a drastic drainage program by the Army engineers.

The Cache River is 210 miles long and is dotted with lakes, marshes, and forests, all crammed with wildlife. This valley has been part of the greatest hunting and fishing area in the United States since the dawn of American history. What is planned for the Cache River Basin was done to the St. Francis River Basin (which parallels the Cache River Basin some 10 to 30 miles to the east) which now cannot support any wildlife.

The land that they obtain from this project theoretically will be clear and used for farming. The Cache River will be transformed from a meandering stream that supports numerous lakes, bayous, and ponds, into a fast moving drainage canal that will empty into the White River (which empties into the Mississippi River).

At a cost of $22,400,000 the Army engineers say they can do the job, this cost being charged off to the rise in property values that is supposed to result. However, the Army engineers overlooked the fact that it will cost an additional $100 an acre (there is 2,000 square miles in the basin) to clear the land and make it useful farmland. There is the physical factor that must be considered, that is the water that is drained out of the basin will flow into the White River and on to the Mississippi. This could definitely create a flood hazard to the lower White River. The main reason for this drainage program is to create farm land. The main crop will be rice although row crops such as cotton and corn will also be raised. The United States grows about 1 percent of the worlds rice crop and that is more than the people of the United States consumes. Rice elevators throughout eastern Arkansas are bulging at the seams. Export to the foreign market on a profitable basis is impossible. What happens to this extra rice? We taxpayers buy it. We taxpayers also pay to make the farmland on which this extra rice is grown.

The Army Engineers claim flood control, but that is to impress you in Congress as much as anything else. The people of Arkansas will tell you that the Army will create more floods than they will control. The best way to control floodwater is to let it go off into small ponds, lakes, and etc.

Let us consider the other damage that will be done to the wildlife in Arkansas. Some $50 million a year is spent by sportsmen in Arkansas most of it in the region around the Cache River Basin. The fur-bearing animals alone are worth a million dollars a years to commercial trappers.

The wet lands of eastern Arkansas are worth far more in their present condition than they ever will be as farm lands. It will cost millions of dollars to transform them into agricultural lands and if it is done, what have you got? A $50 million a year industry obliterated and in its place a false prosperity for relatively few which has to be supported by the rest of the Nation.

This drainage program doesn't affect the sportsmen of that State alone but if the Arkansas bottom lands are eliminated the Mississippi flyaway may be dealt a blow from which it can never recover. Once the Army engineers put over the Cache River deal, what's to prevent them from similar programs on the L'Anguille and Black Rivers

(both of which parallel the Cache) and other waterways that are throughout the country that are today among the last strongholds of wildlife.

IDAHO

There are two high concrete dams that are proposed for the Clearwater Basin in Idaho.

The pro factions contends that the dams will furnish much needed hydroelectric power for an expanding Northwest, will make huge areas of valuable timber available, and will bring prosperity to the towns of Lewiston and Orofino.

The anti faction maintains that the American public is being asked to subsidize power companies and timber interests by footing the bill for ruinous exploration of Idaho's resources.

It is readily admitted that the dams will produce electric power and will make available huge areas of timber that are now somewhat difficult to get at. It is also conceded that if the dams are built a minor business boom may result for the towns of Lewiston and Orofino. But what will all this cost, who will pay for it and will it be worth the price?

The Army engineers said fish-passing facilities for both adults and fingerlings will be installed. So far the greatest height attained by spawning salmon in passing a dam over a fish ladder is about 60 feet. Both proposed dams at the Clearwater Basin will be close to 600 feet. Fish cannot exist in a body of water that fluctuates nearly 200 feet, which is exactly what will happen if the dams are built.

These dams would cut off one-third of the range of the big-game animals in the affected region. There is already a shortage of range area in this region.

Idaho is a great hunting and fishing State. Its income from fishing and hunting, over $43 million, is one of its chief sources of revenue. Damming the two forks of the Clearwater River would deal a body blow to the hunting and fishing in Idaho, not only in the immediate area but to the State as a whole.

The recreation values will be mighty slim for the two new lakes, for who is going to build a house or go boating on a lake whose surface jumps up and down for 200 feet between near vertical walls?

The Lewis and Clark Highway situation is one that directly concerns every taxpayer in the Nation. If the Penny Cliffs Dam (one of the two dams proposed) on the middle fork of the Clearwater is erected, it will flood out 46 miles of the highway already built. This road cost $100,000 a mile in its present condition. Also the backed-up water of the dam will flood out five bridges, a million-dollar United States Forest Service installation and numerous dwellings. The famed Selway Falls will be but a memory because the water will penetrate beyond it for 6 miles in the Selway-Bitterroot National Forests.

The road that will have to be built to replace the Lewis and Clark Highway will cost the taxpayers at least $400,000 a mile and will be much longer.

The Army claims for the two dams is flood-control help amounting to $1 million a year, yet the Idaho conservationists say that its Clearwater River has inflicted only $3.5 million of damage in 17 years.

If the dams are built it will cost the United States taxpayer $309 million (estimated cost of the two dams) and we will hand over these structures as gifts to power interests so that they can erect powerhouses. Five interested power companies formed the Pacific Northwest Power Co. and petitioned the Federal Power Commission for a permit to construct power units at the dams, they have changed their plans now.

Since Congress has to give the Army engineers the money to go with these projects, I thought I would write you and state my views on the matter. (I got most of my information from different articles I have read. I took this information to be truthful and would appreciate hearing from you as to the outcome of this matter. Thank you.)

Sincerely,

EUGENE F. O'HARA.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley Before the Canadian Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a fine address given by the Honorable James A. Farley before the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in Montreal, Canada, on April 29, 1955.

The address follows:

Many distinguished Canadians and Americans have appeared before the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in the past and I consider it a privilege to address your splendid organization, conscious of the fact that, as in the rest of Canada, it is representative of the industrial and business life of the metropolis of Canada.

The tremendous growth of your manufacturing industry and the part it has played in the development of the country is too well known to require elaboration at this time. It has reached the point where today it is by far the most important single factor in the economic fabric of Canada as a whole and of Quebec Province in particular.

Your achievements and those of our own industry across the line have been instrumental, under our democratic system, in the establishment on this continent of the highest standards of living enjoyed by mankind.

Moreover, as the result of her magnificent contribution to the cause of freedom, Canada has, in recent years, won a leading place in the councils of the world. Leadership involves responsibilities. Your country and mine have been called upon to assume the burden of great responsibilities, and circumstances have willed upon us a common mission. You are particularly kind in inviting me to discuss this mission in today's world. Diplomats and scholars are discussing this subject throughout the United States and Canada alike. I can only contribute the observations of a man whose life has followed the paths of practical politics and still more practical business. Yet it is possible that politicians and businessmen as well as students can make a contribution to this, the chief problem of our time.

I think this is the best possible place to offer such a contribution. Throughout the entire world no two great, independent countries have more nearly achieved civilized international relations than have the United States and Canada. If everywhere in the world, relations between peoples and governments were carried on as they are between the people and Government of Canada and the people and Government of the United States, the world's pressing dangers would be met.

We share a common resource, the electric power of the magnificent spillway of the St. Lawrence River. We have borne together the costs and the expenses of developing that splendid gift of nature according to a common plan. There are many other illustrations. It is not too much to say that our two nations have attained the highest level of foreign relations known to civilization.

One other factor makes it, I think, not presumptuous for me to claim that we have a common mission. Both our countries are the product of religion and education, far more than they are of politics or war. The United States, like Canada, owes its framework chiefly to great Christian movements, which have given form to its institutions. Canada, like the United States, owes an enormous debt to its universities and colleges, founded in hope and now grown great. One cannot think of Canada without thinking at once of your own McGill and Montreal Universities, and of Laval and Toronto, just as one cannot think of the United States without thinking also of Harvard, of the University of Notre Dame and of the University of California, and of numberless great and small colleges in between. In both our nations, pioneers built churches and schools. Now in their maturity, both give us the strong red blood which is the life of great democracies.

So we have a common understanding of each other, and from that comes a common mission in world affairs.

I, for one, am not as happy about the state of world affairs as some who today are writing and speaking about them. Our free world is under pressure. In the next few years, it is quite likely to be tested as never before. In Europe there is, for the moment at least, an alliance which may serve to hold the Communist powers at bay. But in Asia we have not peace but an armistice resulting from the bloody stalemate of the Korean war and a French defeat in Vietnam. Both in Indonesia and Indochina, I am afraid we are slowly losing another major area to Moscow's Chinese partner. Still more disturbing, and as we sit here, the Colombo powers with Communist China as the driving force, is holding a conference of some 30 Asiatic and African nations. The Chinese Communists, of course, paraphrase it as a league of "peace." What they mean to do is to create a pro-Communist alliance of all the nonwhite races against the white races. Their propaganda agents are entirely frank about this. They are frank, too, in insisting that they consider the United States as an enemy. Perhaps you will not disagree if, as an American, I think that an enemy of the United States is necessarily an enemy of Canada, just as we consider an enemy of yours to be an enemy of the United States.

Now, don't believe that I hold, or that I think that you hold, that there has always been, and always will be, smooth sailing between our two countries, or that public opinion on any issue is necessarily the same in both countries. Healthy minds do not always agree, but it is the health and open discussions which will always bring us to the best understanding. An illustration of this is found in the recent statements of the official diplomatic representatives of your country and mine. I pick up a well-known international magazine which, under the head of Diplomacy, refers to Life With the United States. I read:

"External Affairs Minister Lester B. Pearson created a small flurry 4 years ago when he warned Canadians that 'the days of relatively easy and automatic relations with our neighbor (United States) are over.' Last week in a policy speech before the Canadian Club, of Toronto, he reexamined the suggestion and confirmed his earlier prediction.

"'It was true then,' he said, 'and is still true now. Not because our relations are less friendly or close than they used to be but, on the contrary, because they are closer than ever. * * * (We) must now discuss together frankly a good many topics on which each

could previously afford different and even divergent views.'

"Those topics include war and peace; and Mr. Pearson continues: 'Today I think that the neutrality of either of us, if the other were engaged in a major war in which its very existence were at stake, would be unthinkable.' Nevertheless, 'certain United States commitments, those, for instance, covering help to Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa and certain Chinese coastal islands, have not been accepted by us.'

" 'The situation,' Pearson summed up, 'is something like living with your wife. Sometimes it is difficult and even irritating to live with her, but it is always impossible to live without her.' "

I have also before me the official press release from the United States Embassy relative to a statement made by the Secretary of State of the United States whilst in Canada a few weeks ago. The press conference concluded with a question and answer period, from which I quote:

"Question. Mr. Pearson said that in the event of a major war it would be impossible for Canada to stand aloof if the United States was at war. Some people interpreted that to mean the United States can now count on Canada in an emergency, and therefore you will not pay as much attention to any protest against American foreign policy you get from Ottawa?

"Answer. It is decidedly not true. The extent to which our countries can count upon each other depends primarily upon whether or not we each conduct ourselves in a way which wins the moral approval and support of the other.

"Now, there are, to be sure, explicit engagements which are expressed in the North Atlantic Treaty. Aside from that, the question of whether we support each other depends on the judgment that each country has of the other. I would not expect that Canada would blindly support the United States and I suppose the Canadian people would not expect to count on the support of the United States if they should engage in a venture which alienated public opinion in the United States."

Mr. Dulles adds what I think is of real importance, and I quote:

"It is highly unlikely that those contingencies will occur, because we do have the same ideals, and because we do keep in touch with each other. Common action depends, for its mainspring, upon what our Declaration of Independence calls 'a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.' That relationship makes it sure that each of our countries will seek and pay heed to the views of the other."

As I read these lines there comes before me the report of Hansard on the conclusion of the discussion last week on Canada's foreign relations in the House of Commons. Mr. Pearson, with clarity and logic, closes a long debate. I quote:

"It is quite true that there are strains and stresses on the coalition at the present time. There has never been a coalition, even in wartime, which was easy to manage. In peacetime, they are not very often necessary. But in a period such as we have at present, between peace and war, a coalition is not only desperately required but it is very difficult indeed to manage. So there are stresses and strains now pressing against it, but we will be able to weather them."

The Minister cites from the Economist—that great English publication:

"The danger of the next few months is that, confronted by the threat of renewed fighting off the China coast, many otherwise sensible people in Britain"—and the writer could have added Canada—"will say that they would rather have peace than the American alliance. Nothing, in fact, could be sillier, for there is no such choice. It is still possible to have both peace and the alliance. It is certainly not possible to have peace for long without it."

Mr. Pearson then concluded:

"We wish to have in this Parliament and in this country both peace and the alliance—not merely the American alliance but an alliance for friendly cooperation with all peace-loving free countries of the world."

In any event and whatever problems we have to face, I am sure our two countries will come through the crisis years ahead in quiet but unquestionable triumph. We shall, I think, make it clear to the world that creative communities of freemen make stronger nations and give more to their own people, and to all other peoples, than any other form of organization man has yet devised. We shall not do this by boasting about it, though the boasts are true. We shall not do it by threat to use atomic or other force, though we do have that force. We shall no do it by new and greater scientific discoveries, though it is clear these are already in sight. We shall do it because by successful example at home, and by cool and resolute maintenance of our rights abroad we will inspire whole peoples to follow our course. We will make membership in a free community of nations more attractive and more advantageous than servitude in any Communist empire.

It is no accident that communism has established no effective bridgehead either in Canada or the United States. The reason is simple: the people of Canada and the people of the United States have already achieved results beyond the wildest promises of Communist dogma. In the light of the achievements of Canadians and Americans, Marxism belongs not in the 20th century politics but in a 19th century museum. If, throughout the world, peoples knew that they could live as our peoples do any Communist empire would promptly begin to contract.

There is evidence that this process is already beginning on Russia's western borders. Hungarians, Poles or Czechs look across the Iron Curtain and wish they were on the free world side. The stirrings in those captive satellite countries and in East Germany already suggest that Moscow domination there rests now only on besieged and isolated occupation forces; there is no assent of peoples; the promised revolution proved to be only a bloody conquest. To that fact, perhaps, we owe the upsurge of coexistence talk which has emanated from Moscow. Now as our two countries, both great trading nations, increase our understanding and wisdom in the ways of foreign commerce, as we find means of assuring that our trade shall benefit other countries as well as ours, we emphasize the clear advantage of the free world system, not by talking but by doing.

This is apparently beginning to be achieved in the West. I am confident it can be achieved in the Far East. The process there will be longer. The task will be larger. Whole populations there have never known freedom; to such people one master is no worse than another; the lot of the coolie is the same in either case. But if a way can be shown by which those masses of coolies can have themselves a stake, however modest, in the miracle of our 20th century American production, the picture changes. A beginning has been made along these lines in that great archipelago which is today the Philippine Republic. Canadian enterprise has made a beginning in other parts of the Pacific. Our two countries have worked together toward that end in the less favored countries of Latin America. We can, we should, and indeed we must, make it clear that liberty and prosperity go together and that prosperity is not bought at the price of freedom. After all, Russia, struggling desperately to give her own people the most modest standard of living, is not the country which can introduce to Asia the almost limitless production all Canadians and Americans take for granted.

The word "freedom" is used advisedly. In our countries we speak of democracy. Freedom will very likely find different forms in different countries. Here we are devoted to our own democratic form. We will gladly teach it to any who wish to learn from us. But we cannot impose it, and have no business to try. What we can do is to make clear that the chief end of any government is the development of free men in a system by which they work together. Each people has its own wisdom about its own affairs. Probably even the most backward people can teach us something. Their ways are not our ways. But we will be well advised to work with them within the forms which they themselves know and understand.

In thus working for a peace which shall be real and not a double-talk mockery, both of us must increasingly work together and with other nations. Canada was among the first signers of the Declaration by United Nations on January 1, 1942, which foreshadowed the United Nations organization of today. Sometimes we falter in using that great organization well; but it remains the frame of our hope of the world to be, a world at peace, under law, guaranteeing freedom from fear to the world.

Combined our two countries constitute in present fact the largest and strongest single regional group in the free world. There are others like it, notably the British family of nations, the Commonwealth, and the Atlantic group we call NATO. In building these as we have, we cannot forget that, at long last, statesmanship must bring them all into harmony. This is not theory. In Montreal are the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization, a United Nations agency. Because of it a Canadian pilot leaving Móntreal knows he will find the same signals, the same language, the same rules for landing or leaving in Paris or Bombay or Manila that he has in his home airport. This is a measure of real, tangible peace. The time must come when the major human necessities are dealt with in as commonsense cooperation as has been worked out in the air.

Our purpose must be to work toward this goal of world peace and world civilization without war. We know, of course, that this is not wholly our choice. There are situations in which all of us must stand and fight, rather than surrender the principles by which we live. My belief is that general war grows less likely. Modern warfare is too horrible, its results are too unpredictable, for any sane group to adopt war as a policy as Hitler did in 1939. Obviously, between us we must maintain such strength that no one will dare to pick a quarrel or take by force because no counterforce exists. With care, strength, and clear head, I think matters can be managed so that the armed challenges made in Korea and more recently in Indochina will not be tried again. No one can guarantee success in the field of foreign relations; but we shall try. In this task, as an old politician, permit me to suggest that the men running foreign affairs—the men in our State Department and your Department of External Affairs, need all the help and sympathy and support you and I can give them, whether we are of their political faith or not. They are playing with tremendous hazards, and their burden is greater than any in recorded history.

Are we starryeyed in thinking that the vast task of bringing a reasonable measure of peace to the world may be accomplished in the coming generation? Perhaps; but the example of Canada makes me believe it can be done. Your country was born of diverse races with different languages. History insisted they were sworn enemies; and you refused to accept that decree. You had to

build a nation out of different civilizations, customs, and religions. Beyond possible expectation you nobly accomplished that task. In my own time, your great Prime Minister, MacKenzie King, a Scot, steadily worked with Canadians of French ancestry, religion, and custom. I know that his brilliant successor, the Right Honorable Louis St. Laurent, of French-Canadian ancestry, no less carefully works with his countrymen of English stock. With patience, tolerance, and commonsense, you made a union when elsewhere in the world race rivalries, disorder, and hatred were the order of the day. In my own country Irish and English, Italians, Germans, Jews, and Negroes have steadily moved toward union so that today Americans, the most composite population in the world, are also the most unified. We have done in North America what has not been achieved in any other part of the world.

In virtue of these achievements, Canada and America can claim the privileges, as they must assume the burdens of a common mission. We must enter upon it without superiority. And, with faith, we can justifiably draw assurance and strength from awareness of solid results already attained. "To each and all our equal lamp at peril of the sea," wrote Kipling of the English coastwise lights. No less great is the guiding fire of the fellowship of two great nations in a dangerous but splendid time.

Fluoridation of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter addressed to the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., by Miss Vera E. Adams, president of the National Committee Against Fluoridation, Inc., Washington, D. C., protesting the use of public funds for fluoridation of the water supply in the District of Columbia.

Miss Adams' letter is as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST
FLUORIDATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1955.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RABAUT: I am submitting for the record a statement opposing the further use of public funds for fluoridation of the water supply of the District of Columbia. I will summarize this statement here as briefly as possible.

The National Committee Against Fluoridation, representing 38 of our States, also Alaska, and Canada, and about 30 million of our citizens inhabiting some 500 cities, towns, and smaller communities which have rejected mass medication as practiced in the fluoridation of our drinking water, respectfully requests the earnest consideration of your committee for the following recommendation:

"That no further funds be included in the District budget for the fluoridation of the water supply of the District of Columbia, or any communities which may be served by its water system."

At the present time there is a fiscal crisis in the District, and many crying needs must go unmet. The voteless citizens are threatened with new taxes that will almost take the food out of their mouths. We vigorously and righteously oppose the use of taxpayers' money to support the further fluoridation of our drinking water, for the following reasons:

1. The fluoridation program involves tremendous and inexcusable waste of much-needed funds.

By mathematical proof we get the astounding fact that only two hundred and fourteen ten-thousandths of 1 percent of all the money appropriated and spent for this mass medication procedure is accomplishing anything at all, either for good or bad, while the other 99.97 percent of the money is being simply thrown down the drain. This can be specifically proved, but the detail cannot be covered here.

2. Fluoridation is unconstitutional.

The mass prescription and mass medication represented by fluoridation of the total water supply available to our citizens is indisputably unconstitutional. Tooth decay is not a communicable or a contagious disease, nor is it fatal, and the so-called police power which has been applied in the introduction of this system without the consent of the people has been definitely misapplied, as police power of the State, from which public health authority stems, has no place in the prevention or treatment of a disease which harms only the individual victim thereof. According to an eminent authority, Dr. Veikko Hurme, of the Forsyth Dental Infirmary for Children in Boston, "the procedure will be mass medication without parallel in the annals of medicine." On grounds of individual liberty, integrity, and religious freedom, mass medication is evidently unconstitutional.

3. Neither the ultimate possible benefits nor the possible long-range harmful results of fluoridation have been conclusively tested and proved.

Sodium fluoride, or sometimes sodium silicofluoride as used in the District, is a virulent, cumulative poison, 85 times as toxic as the calcium fluoride which occurs naturally in many water sources and is deceptively claimed to be identical in its nature and action. It is a by-product of the aluminum industry, colorless, odorless, and tasteless, and therefore the more dangerous because undetectable. This type of poisoning does not lend itself to ready diagnosis, and usually shows up only in autopsies. Should we not be rather cautious in introducing into our drinking water, which is an element indispensable to life, a chemical so toxic that it has been used for years as a rat and roach poison?

And here let me just call attention to a strange fact. Since November 1952, several months after our water in Washington was fluoridated (2,800 pounds are dumped into our reservoirs every day), 26 Members of our Congress have passed away, and 2 members of our Supreme Court also. This record stands out glaringly as against a former yearly average of two deaths. It may be merely a rather queer coincidence. We cannot prove it one way or another now. It is too late.

The verdict after exhaustive and purposeful investigation by Congress 3 years ago was that fluoridation was at best a calculated risk. But they are now coining money out of the imposition of this calculated risk upon the supposedly free people of this country, who are being subjected to a simultaneous and intensive drive from east to west and north to south. Dr. A. L. MILLER, former public health director in Nebraska, at the Delaney committee hearings in February 1952, made a very illuminating statement which I quote: "It rather shocks me to know what the public health is trying to get A. L. MILLER to do to his people in Nebraska, and thank God the people out there can think for themselves and did not accept all the stuff that someone was trying to push down their necks at that time, including myself, because I thought maybe there was something to it. * * * This frightens me a little when the public health people go so far as to mislead, and distort a national condition in order to put over an objective they might have in mind." Nota bene.

The people all over this country are looking to Washington citizens to get rid of fluoridation, because Washington, the Capital City, is serving as a useful argument by way of example and precedent. They don't seem to be able to realize that we here are nothing but guinea pigs, ready subjects for any experiment our local authorities see fit to perform. So some of us who don't mind hard work, without any pay therefor, are trying to do our bit toward emancipating our Capital City from this incubus, and we don't want any more of our hard-earned money to perpetuate it.

We who want to keep our freedoms under the Constitution, and who are opposing the imposition of this mass medication on moral, ethical, legal, and religious grounds, are being subjected to slander and even threats, and are called crackpots by our more scientific brethren. Let us hope and pray that there are not 30 million crackpots in America.

Sincerely,

VERA E. ADAMS,
President.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE
OF NEW YORK,
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
Albany, October 26, 1954.

Dr. JAMES G. KERWIN,
Department of Health,
Municipal Building, Passaic, N. J.

DEAR DR. KERWIN: Your letter of October 21, 1954, requesting definite information in dental care in two specific communities has been received.

The specific information you desire is herewith itemized in accordance with reports forwarded to us by the two communities.

Kingston:	
Enrollment	5,403
Number of pupils inspected	5,308
Number of pupils with defects	2,209
Number of pupils under treatment for defects	1,551
Newburgh:	
Enrollment	5,119
Number of pupils inspected	4,969
Number of pupils with defects	3,139
Number of pupils under treatment for defects	2,072

If further information is desired, feel free to ask, and we shall try to cooperate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. FORST, M. D.

Above is an authentic reproduction of a letter from one public-health authority to another on the subject of fluoridation. Note that Newburgh, which has fluoridated its water supply for 10 years, showed more tooth decay among schoolchildren than Kingston, the "control" city, whose water was unmedicated in the same period.

Of 5,308 children in fluorine-free Kingston, 41.6 percent had tooth defects with 20.6 percent then under treatment. After a decade of fluoridation, examination of 4,949 school children in Newburgh showed 63.4 percent with decayed teeth and 31.0 percent under treatment.

These data from a New York health official to his New Jersey colleague disprove recent statements that the Newburgh experiment has reduced dental caries more than 57 percent among the schoolchildren of that much-publicized community.

Cleveland's George Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an excellent article by the noted business writer, Larston D. Farrar, relating to Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey. This article appeared in the Clevelander, which is published by the Cleveland (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, and I believe that it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that other friends of Secretary Humphrey might read it.

The article follows:

CLEVELAND'S GEORGE HUMPHREY—HOW'S HE DOING IN WASHINGTON?

(By Larston D. Farrar)

Secretary of the Treasury George Magoffin Humphrey (he gets along without the middle name or initial now, except when formal occasion demands) was in Cleveland from 1917 through 1952. That's 35 years, more or less, spanning three major wars and a depression. He has been in Washington since early 1953, being one of the first members of the new Eisenhower Cabinet to win confirmation by the Senate. That's only a little more than 2 years, although it seems longer to him.

How is he doing—personally—away from his hometown?

SOME ANSWERS

Here's how he answered that question recently:

"I suppose one of the things I miss most by being in Washington is the chance to get outdoors more for such things as riding, hunting, and so forth. Then, of course, I miss not seeing as much of our children and the grandchildren as we used to in Cleveland, although we still can get together occasionally.

"Probably the other biggest difference between Cleveland and Washington is that in Washington one's time is not one's own. There are many people whom you must see when they ask. That is, of course, the way it should be in a democracy. But it is much different than in private business.

"One of the nicest things about Washington is the fine quality of the other people in the Cabinet and their wives. They are a fine lot of people who are given to working for the best interests of the country. There is very little internal bickering around the people in President Eisenhower's official family."

Actually Mr. Humphrey likely stays so busy these days that he could not possibly outline, in a hurried interview, all the really vast differences between his life now and the life he led in Cleveland, where he was top man in the M. A. Hanna Co., one of Cleveland's largest enterprises and not considered small even among the industrial giants of America.

For instance, he soon learned, on coming to Washington, that he had to live in an atmosphere surcharged with publicity. Whether he wished it or not, he had to scan the newspapers closely for references to himself, or to his agency's vast ramifications, every morning. All day, he figuratively has had to stay close to the teletype machine which clatters out news of developments on Capitol Hill, any one of which might alert him, and his associates to the need of issuing a counterblast to some Democratic claim, or correct some erroneous figures given out by a Congressman in error. He early learned in Washington something that never had quite impressed itself upon him in Cleveland—that public officials must have what one politician has called "hides as tough as pachyderms." He has been lampooned in cartoons, held up to sarcastic scorn in the Senate, and even damned with faint praise by some who might be called his friends and supporters.

He wastes little time in "answering" the jibes of his political enemies. He, however, like every member of the Cabinet, watches for references to the Eisenhower tax and monetary program that can be answered seriously and immediately. That is why, in recent months, he has been featured in the headlines more than once, lashing back at the Democrats who were trying to put over the political program of cutting taxes for individuals, in spite of the mountainous and mounting Federal deficit.

Another big difference between his life in Cleveland and his life in Washington—at which he hinted in his interview—is the mobility which he enjoyed in his job in private industry and the lack of mobility under which he now labors. Like any other public servant, he is not his own boss. He must respond to events, and cannot dictate developments, even on a day-to-day basis. Because of the continuing emergency nature of his post—or any high Federal post—in the sense that each week brings new political challenges, either at home or abroad, he has to stay close to home base, except on the brief weekends when he and the President, or some other headline figure, can get away for quail hunting, or go on some official mission for the Government.

George Humphrey's active mind always has made his life full and interesting. But in Washington it is more hurried. Perhaps that is why he has learned even more to smile—and any picture which shows him with a cheerful face is not make-believe with Mr. Humphrey. He does laugh a lot—at himself, and at others. He laughs readily, which may explain why he is a great favorite around the inner circle that encloses President Eisenhower, and also is considered "one of the club" when he is before a Senate committee for one reason or another. Senators, even those of the opposition, make it clear to him and to the public that they like George Humphrey, the man, however much they may poke fun at George Humphrey, the Republican, or George Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury.

GOOD CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

His easy liaison with Congress began, in fact, from the first day he appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance to be examined for confirmation.

When, in an atmosphere that had been made heavy because of the disclosures that some big-business men named to the Cabinet might retain some of their business connections, Mr. Humphrey came to the committee he surprised the Senators by telling them he had resigned all his official positions (which paid him about $300,000 annually) and all of his directorships. He said he would keep his stock in Hanna and affiliates because, if he sold it he would have the problem of where to put the money. If he put it in a bank he could be accused of following policies to influence the bank, since the Treasury, through the Comptroller of the Currency, very definitely has much jurisdiction over banks.

Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, Colorado, the chairman, at one point addressed Humphrey as "Mr. Hanna," which drew general laughter. Mr. Humphrey guffawed, as did Mr. MILLIKIN, who said: "Well, it's a good Republican name."

"That's right and I'm proud of it," Humphrey replied.

Within a week, Life was quoting the new President Eisenhower as saying: "In Cabinet meetings, I always wait for George Humphrey to speak. I sit back and listen to the others talk while he doesn't say anything. But I know that when he speaks up, he will say just what I am thinking."

Easily, naturally, George Humphrey took the new role into which he had been cast by events. He spoke with the same down-to-earth directness with which his Cleveland friends and associates were familiar.

To reporters who wanted to see some overnight miracles, he responded: "You can't set a hen in the morning and have chicken salad for lunch."

Another time, he borrowed from the jargon of the hunter to explain to a reporter how he had to take up one problem at a time, even in an agency with a half-dozen offshoots and a thousand responsibilities: "Get your ducks in a row."

The Reporter, a magazine that has viewed the entire Eisenhower administration with jaundiced eye, early sized up Mr. Humphrey like this—and not yet has changed its opinion: "He is deft in choosing and using men. He has a startling talent—some would say a genius—for getting all relevant information quickly and then making a swift but unhurried decision. And he has a quiet, confident manner that commands the trust of all those who work with him. * * * In the business world, Mr. Humphrey is a natural leader. But his is a leadership wholly without histrionics. He rose to his place of eminence in American business without depending on the modern arts of publicity * * *."

However, there is every reason to believe that Mr. Humphrey has mastered the art of publicity, to a large degree, as evidenced by the solid hold his words have over a large segment of the American people, long after his detractors have striven to tear him down, and, in fact to send him back to Cleveland and retirement.

Secretary Humphrey has a pretty strict regimen, even for Washington. He is at the office by 8:30 or 9 a. m. every morning, eschewing the liveried chauffeur that could be his. He drives a modest 1952 Buick coupe to the Treasury building, except on the mornings—twice a week—when he swings into the White House drive for breakfast with the President. Easily one-third of his time is taken up by visitors who simply must see him, another third is taken up with Congressional demands, and another third in deep study, or conferences with his associates.

In Washington, as in Cleveland, he has won a reputation for getting good men around him, and, so far, there has not been even a breath of personal or political scandal relating to any of the men who work with the Treasury in this administration. Of himself, he once said: "I'm as good at picking partners as any man in the United States." That was referring to his business partners, but it refers as well to his Government partners, ranging from his fellow Cabinet officers to those whom he directly chose to assist him in carrying on the complex affairs of the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Treasury is not one man—he must be many men, at the same desk. He is top boss of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Secret Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Bureau of the Mint, the United States Coast Guard, and the Coast Guard air arm. He presides over a domain of some 88,000 people, has his own flag, serves as trustee for some $18 billion in the social-security funds, and is Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

Mr. Humphrey directs his farflung operations from room 3330 in the Treasury Building, hard by the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue. This building, like many other things, has changed greatly in the past 2 years, for one of the Secretary's first orders was to have it washed. It is no longer Wash-

ington's prize pigeon roost, a fact that George Humphrey smilingly considers one of his minor accomplishments.

Proof of his inevitable good humor was revealed recently to a United Press photographer. Secretary Humphrey was waiting at the airport in San Francisco for his son to arrive when he noticed the photographer fidgeting nearby. Mr. Humphrey asked the photographer why he was waiting around.

"There's an old codger named Humphrey on that plane coming in and he's Secretary of the Treasury. I have to kill my time waiting for the old goat."

The Secretary waited until the plane came in and then watched the minor tragedy unfold. The photographer approached young Humphrey, who had been pointed out among the descending passengers, and remarked: "You can't be the Humphrey I want. He's an old man." At that point, the Secretary disclosed his identity and began to laugh. How genuinely he can laugh is seen in the photograph, now one of his cherished possessions.

The Springfield Girls' Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that this week we are observing National Girls' Club week and the 10th anniversary of the founding of the organization. This is particularly significant to me, and to my fellow Members from the great commonwealth of Massachusetts, because the birthplace of the Girls Clubs of America, Inc., was in my home city of Springfield.

The Springfield Girls' Club was one of the 19 charter members of the corporation founded in 1945. And the Girls Clubs of America, Inc., maintains its national headquarters in Springfield. When one realizes that the purpose of the organization is to provide daily out-of-school activities for young girls, it is easy to understand why the Girls Clubs of America, Inc., has prospered during the last decade. The organization has expanded beyond Springfield, and now maintains 50 clubs located in 16 States and in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that an editorial that appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) Union on May 9, 1955, paying tribute to this great achievement be printed in the RECORD. May I also footnote my remarks with an expression of pride that greater Springfield takes in the fact that the president of the Girls Clubs of America, is Mrs. James A. Seaman of Longmeadow, Mass.

A SPRINGFIELD SPECIAL

Springfield, being the birthplace of the Girls' Clubs of America, Inc., takes special interest in the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the organization this week, which has been designated as National Girls' Club Week. The Springfield Girls' Club was one of the 19 charter members of the corporation when it was founded 10 years ago, and the national headquarters is maintained here.

During the decade the 19 member units have expanded to 50, with clubs located in 16 States and Canada. The Springfield club, which is 56 years old, is junior only to the club in Waterbury, Conn., which is 91, and the one in Greenfield, which has been in existence 60 years.

Girls' Clubs of America, Inc., of which Mrs. James A. Seaman, of Longmeadow, is president, is the only national organization that provides daily out-of-school activities for girls. Its theory is that many of the girls served by such groups need a daily program. Membership dues are nominal, so that any girl can afford to belong, and special attention is given girls in the 6- to 12-year-old group, along with the regular program for teen-agers. Designed to supplement the training and opportunities that often are lacking in the home, the clubs' program places heavy emphasis on training in homemaking skills.

The Springfield Girls' Club, recognized as one of the best in the national organization, features a well-rounded program aimed at personal improvement of the members. For instance, a recent library program was inaugurated, and, in the words of one of the adult officers, "the resulting interest in good literature among youngsters who, possibly, have little exposure to books outside the schoolroom, is amazing."

For healthy growth and constructive work in building the community, the Girls' Clubs of America, Inc., deserves praise and congratulations on reaching its 10th birthday. We in Springfield are especially proud of the part that has been played by the Springfield Girls' Club, both in the national group and in the betterment of our own city for more than a half-century.

One Hundred Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this splendid editorial from the pages of the New Orleans States tells eloquently the enviable century old history of the State board of health of Louisiana.

Several of my colleagues from Louisiana have already taken occasion to pay tribute to the hundredth anniversary of the Louisiana State Board of Health. I join them by way of calling this editorial to your attention:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF SERVICE

Appropriately, doctors, nurses, scientists, engineers, educators, technicians, and administrators attending the joint meeting here of the southern section of the American Public Health Association and the Louisiana Public Health Association are going to use the occasion to pay tribute to the State board of health as it marks its 100th anniversary.

That the State board can boast that with 100 years of service it is the oldest such institution in any of the United States holds some importance. But much more important is the fact that it has used that century of service to transform the State from a disease-ridden swampland to one of the healthiest spots in the nation. The services it has performed and continues to perform have had a very important role in increasing the life, and health, expectancy of every resident of Louisiana.

Wonder drugs which cure disease have captured the medical spotlight through the years. But working unspectacularly outside of the bright light of publicity, the board of health has done even more than the wonder drugs, by using the potent weapon of preventive medicine to eradicate disease by eliminating their causes.

Day in and day out the bulk of the board of health's work is pure drudgery. Immunization shots are provided. Rabies control programs pushed. Disease bearing insects and rodents are targets of continuous battles.

Plans for public buildings, hospitals, schools, and garbage disposal plants are laboriously checked to make sure that their construction is carried out according to best known rules for sanitation. Food production and processing plants and the places which sell food are checked constantly to insure consumers foodstuffs that are safe. Campaigns to search out tuberculosis sufferers are carried out. And there's a continuous educational campaign, through lectures, movies, and pamphlets, to get all the facts of health before the people.

Perhaps these are unspectacular things, but the result of this work has been far from unspectacular.

For with the years—and the incessant campaigns—many of the diseases which formerly were as commonplace as the common cold are all but unknown today. Rare, for example, is the person who suffers from yellow fever, dengue fever, bubonic plague, malaria, hookworm, typhoid, and cholera.

And most spectacular of all the results is the fact that health department figures show the death rate in Louisiana today is 80 percent less than it was 100 years ago when the State board of health began its work.

Whatever accolades the public health associations are inclined to bestow on the board of health would seem to be well merited.

Limiting the Power of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the other day a proposal in Congress to reduce personal taxes by a meager $20 a head was called fiscal irresponsibility. That was true because of worse fiscal irresponsibility by Congress for more than 20 years right up to this minute. It has been making appropriations for grants-in-aid, loans, subsidies, and gifts. It has authorized spending, borrowing, and running deficits that make the proposed reduction in taxes impossible—irresponsible. This costs us more than $10 billion annually. It takes at least 1,400,000 Federal employees to operate our extraneous, unconstitutional functions of government. They cost in salaries and other overhead more than $6 billion. Nine hundred thousand employees could perform all the legitimate constitutional nonmilitary functions of government—and do a better job.

Our dollars are cut in half with fantastic Federal debts and mortgages

amounting to more than half the value of our property. That means that half the value of our private property has been confiscated or transferred to government already. When income is taken up to 92 percent by government that means individual responsibility to manage ourselves and our property is suspended.

Something has to be done about it. Or we shall have unlimited governmental irresponsibility in the management of our affairs permanently fastened upon us.

Indeed, is it not a fact that any people who tolerate mere men exercising unlimited powers over them have become themselves temporarily irresponsible? No sensible organization of men turns loose its officers to do anything they like and spend whatever they please. Their powers are always specified and limited in scope and spending to carry out the stated purposes of the organization. Congress is in that ridiculous position of being unlimited in functions and spending power.

Do we need another decade—even another day—to demonstrate that Congress is incapable of correcting its own helplessness without the people's help.

The simple remedy, then, lies in taking away from Congress the excess power to appropriate the people's property which it now exercises. Limiting its spending power necessarily limits its functions. A first step in that direction has been taken by the introduction of an amendment to the Constitution by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182.

Congressman REED, when he introduced the amendment in the House on January 3, 1955, summarized its provisions as follows:

First. As to income taxes: the amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance, be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate incomes may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes: The amendment gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal recognizes some basic first principles that the Marxian tax system we now have does not. First, there is a point of diminishing returns in the collection of taxes. Low rates may produce more revenue than high rates. Second, the great bulk of income taxes in a progressive rate system is collected from the lowest tax brackets; and third, that as between separate governmental taxing units, the one closest to the people can perform most efficiently and economically.

The first principle is best illustrated by the use of Henry Ford as an example. In 40 years, Mr. Ford's fortune increased from $1,000 to $1 billion. If the Ford Motor Co. had been subjected to a 50-percent income tax during that 40-year period, its net worth would have been only $1,470,000 and would have paid only $1,470,000 in taxes; but with a 20-percent income tax the net worth at the end of 40 years would have been $66,500,000 and taxes collected $16,600,000 or almost 16 times as much as collections from a 50-percent tax. On that principle American mass-production was built. We have proved to the world that mass-produced, low per unit cost products yield more profits and pay more taxes than high per unit costs and high rates of taxes.

To illustrate: During the 1920's the high World War I tax rates were drastically lowered. The following table shows that although maximum rates were lowered and personal exemptions increased the revenue yield was greater:

Year	Total internal-revenue collections	Maximum rate (percent)	Personal exemptions
1925	$2,584,140,000	40	$2,500
1926	2,836,000,000	24	3,000
1927	2,865,863,000	24	3,500
1929	2,939,054,000	20	3,500
1930	3,040,146,000	20	3,500

The reason for this is obvious. The great bulk of revenue comes from the first and lowest bracket of the income taxpayers. For many years about 85 percent of all taxes collected have come from the lowest bracket, viz, being the 20-percent bracket. Only 3 percent, or about $2 billion, is provided by rates in excess of 34 percent.

It is obvious from the foregoing that if the Government continues to require large revenues, the lowest income producers will be required to provide by far the greatest share of taxes. Conversely, tax relief in the lower brackets results in the largest possible reinvestment in production and tends to increase profits and taxes paid to the Government.

So real relief can be effected only by drastically reducing expenditures or by reducing the tax rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. As Congressman REED points out, this would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

The most important effect of the amendment is the restoration to the States of the fiscal ability to meet the needs of their people. The States have lost that power to a great extent and consequently have either been forced to rely on the various grants-in-aid programs, or have surrendered to the Federal Government the responsibility for the performance of services that are primarily of State and local concern. This shift of power and responsibility is in clear violation of our constitutional concept that the unit of government closest to the people can most capably serve them. The Constitution provides for a neat division of powers, reserving to the States the bulk of sovereignty and granting only explicit and very limited powers to the Central Government.

This balance has been upset by reckless use of the unlimited taxing power granted to the Federal Government by the 16th amendment and the court interpretations of it. By preempting the tax sources the Central Government has been successful in arrogating to itself virtual control over the lives and property and liberties of the American people. The States exist too much by sufference and function too often as agents for the distribution of the Federal largesse. The extent of the shift of sovereignty is indicated by the fact that 20 years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all tax revenues in the Nation, while today the Federal Government collects 75 percent.. The pen is indeed mightier than the sword, but the power of the purse is invincible.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal reverses this trend toward centralizing government power by restoring to the States some of the sources of tax revenues. The amendment returns to the States the exclusive power to levy death and gift taxes. These taxes constitute a small item in the Federal tax picture—about 1 percent—but represents a considerable revenue to the States. The right to control the transfer and devolution of property is one of the historical attributes of sovereignty, and clearly belongs to the States. Secondly, the amendment's limitation on confiscatory rates in the higher brackets guarantees to the States that the wealth created within their boundaries will remain there to create more wealth and consequently produce more and greater tax revenues for the States.

The amendment is a compromise, recognizing that in emergency situations the Federal Government must have great fiscal powers. But it also assures the American people of fiscal and, consequently, political sanity in normal times. That is the least we can do for the Nation's 66 million taxpayers.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the House, January 31, 1955, by Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introducing House Joint Resolution 182—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

LIMITING THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Honorable EVERETT W. DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and I introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23. Senator DIRKSEN and I are introducing the same resolution again this year.

The principal provisions of the amendment may be summarized as follows:

First. Income taxes:

The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate, provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate income may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes:

The amendment also gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

It should be observed that the amendment merely limits the degree of tax rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either peace or war, except, of course, with respect to the revenue derived from the estate and gift taxes, which is only about 1½ percent of the total. In other words, the amendment does not limit the amount of revenue that may be raised, but limits merely the manner in which it may be raised.

Its purpose and effect are merely to eliminate in large measure from our system of taxation its socialistic features; namely, first, the heavy progressive feature of the income tax; and, second, the confiscatory death tax, which will eventually dry up the sources of private capital and lead to the establishment of socialism with the accompanying loss of the people's liberty.

In a statement to the Temporary Economic Committee prior to World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, made the following significant prophecy:

"The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be (mean) inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

I am convinced that Mr. Berle's prophecy will come true unless action to prevent it is taken before it is too late.

Legislation by Congress is obviously insufficient; for the work of a good Congress may be easily undone by that of a radical Congress.

The need of reform would seem to be obvious and I know of no way of giving permanence to such reform except through a constitutional amendment.

The ultimate objective of the amendment is a top individual income tax rate of 25 percent and a beginning rate of much less than 10 percent.

In determining whether such an objective is realistic it will be helpful to consider the possible tax effect of a budget of more reasonable proportions than the present one. The budget estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is $63.504 billion. According to the Federal Budget in brief, Government expenditures for the comparatively recent fiscal years of 1948 to 1951, inclusive, were as follows:

	Expenditures (in billions)
1951 (which included a full year of the Korean war)	$44.058
1950	39.606
1949	39.507
1948	33.068

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, the largest expenditure of the Federal Government in any year was $18.4 billion in 1918, which was also a war year.

Let us suppose now the following changes in the budget receipts as estimated for the fiscal year 1955:

First. A reduction in the individual income-tax rataes to 10 percent on incomes up to $10,000 and 25 percent on the amounts in excess of $10,000; and

Second. Elimination of estate and gift taxes.

These changes would reduce the budget receipts to $47 billion, which is $3 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 which included a full year of the Korean war. It is $7.5 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1949.

A beginning rate of 5 percent, instead of 10 percent, on individual incomes would reduce the receipts to $41.5 billion. This is $2 billion above the 1950 and 1949 expenditures, to say nothing of the $33 billion expenditures in 1948.

It would, of course, take some years to secure the adoption of the amendment, since it must be approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

About 85 percent of the estimated revenue from the individual income tax, which produces over half of the total revenue of the Federal Government, is produced by the first bracket rate of 20 percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets. Only 3 percent—about $2 billion—is provided by the rates in excess of 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means. The only possible way to give relief to such persons is either, first, by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures; or, second, by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

Another important effect of the amendment which has not been sufficiently stressed would be to restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination. The Federal Government should not be permitted to hog the revenue and hand back part of it to the States on conditions.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States. The States should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It is too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern and they would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

To summarize, the proposed amendment—

First. Largely eliminates from our Federal system of taxation its socialistic features and thereby puts an end to the use of the taxing power as means of forcing us into socialism;

Second. Does not impair the power of the Federal Government to raise revenue;

Third. Does not shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor;

Fourth. Aims at reducing eventually the taxes of everyone so that the top rate will not exceed 25 percent and the bottom rate will not exceed 10 percent, with the prospect that it will be much less;

Fifth. With lower rates will increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue;

Sixth. Will restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

In the final analysis the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government; or second, socialism. Both reason and the experience of other countries lead to the conclusion that our present system of confiscatory income and taxes, if long continued, will ultimately result in the establishment of socialism in place of our present system.

The changes in the impact of Federal taxes on the great bulk of the taxpayers involved in the proposed amendment are, as I pointed out, comparatively minor. Their beneficial effect, however, would be far reaching and decisive.

The changes in the income-tax provisions proposed in connection with and partially effected by the 1954 Revenue Code, such as reductions in the tax on dividends and increases in certain deductions and exemptions, are costly in revenue and will have only minor effect on the economy. The major evil to be corrected is the one at which the proposed amendment is aimed.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this amendment is vastly different from the amendment which has been going through the State legislatures, an amendment which limits the power of Congress to impose income, death, and gift taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent with no right to suspend the limitation except in time of war. That amendment is altogether too rigid and would seriously impair the Government's power to raise needed revenue from the income tax in time of peace.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the Senate, January 21, 1955, by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, introducing Senate Joint Resolution 23—Reed-Dirksen amendment:

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1953 the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

This amendment would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but would permit Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate at any time without limit. Where the top rate exceeded 25 percent, however, it could be no more than 15 percentage points above the bottom rate. For example, if the bottom rate were 15 percent, the top rate could not exceed 30 percent. If the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate did not exceed 25 percent, however, there would be no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for example, be 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment would also deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes, and would leave these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds.

Representative REED and I are introducing this joint resolution again this year.

The proposed amendment has met with wide approval. Important national organizations have endorsed it, including the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Western Tax Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the

Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, the National Economic Council, and the National Small Business Men's Association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment. Its objective is to save our American incentive system, commonly spoken of as the private-enterprise system, on which our very form of government depends.

Our present system of taxation, with its heavy progressive income and inheritance taxes, will eventually destroy this system and result in the substitution of some form of socialism.

Karl Marx, in his Communist Manifesto of 100 years ago, fully recognized the importance of these taxes as a means of destroying the private-enterprise system by including in the 10 planks in his platform the following:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

For the past two decades the Federal Government has been following the course prescribed by Marx by imposing a heavy progressive or graduated income tax, and while not abolishing the right of inheritance, the Federal Government has been increasing the rates of the death tax until the top rate is now 77 percent.

The progression in income-tax rates from the beginning rate of 20 percent on incomes of $2,000 and under to 91 percent on incomes of more than $200,000 is progression of a most extreme character. It not only confiscates the larger incomes, but it bears most heavily on the middle incomes, the group at which Marx particularly aimed in his advocacy of heavy graduated income taxes.

Reason and the experience of other nations, and most recently that of England, demonstrate beyond all question that unless our policy of taxation is changed, the system of society under which this country has prospered and grown great will come to an end and some form of socialism or communism will supplant it.

How, one may ask, will the proposed amendment keep the rates down? The answer is this: The amendment would make it in the interest of every taxpayer, first to keep the top rate down to 25 percent—as compared with the present rate of 91 percent; and, second, to keep the bottom rate no higher than 10 percent—as compared with the present rate of 20 percent. It is expected that the beginning rate will ultimately be much less than 10 percent.

The proposed amendment is just as important for the small taxpayer as for the large. This united self-interest of all taxpayers is relied on as a force that would keep the tax rates within reasonable bounds. There are 66 million individual income-tax payers in the United States. Most of them vote.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment merely limits the degree of tax-rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either war or peace.

The proposed amendment will reduce the burden of taxation on those with the smaller incomes. A fact not generally realized is that the great bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with large incomes, but from those with small incomes. That is so simply because the small incomes, in the aggregate, constitute the bulk of the national income. For example, only 3 percent—about $2 billion—of the total estimated Federal revenue of about $60 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is produced by the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent, which is 14 percentage points above the present beginning rate of 20 percent.

Contrast these figures with the effect of an increase of only $100 in the present $600 personal exemption and credit for dependents. Such an increased would result in a reduction of 7 million in the number of income-tax payers and a revenue loss of $2.5 billion. This is one-half billion dollars more than the total revenue received from the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means.

The only possible way to give relief to the small-tax payers is either (1) by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures, or (2) by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income, which constitutes the tax base, and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually, the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

That the present confiscatory rates of the individual income tax are not approved by a large majority of the American people is shown by Gallup polls. The vote of those having an opinion was 2 to 1 in favor of a 25-percent top limit in the September 1951 poll, and 3 to 1 in the July 1952 poll.

As I have already stated, the proposed amendment also deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and leaves these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. Under existing laws the tax on the estates of decedents runs to a high of 77 percent, and the tax on gifts to 57.75 percent. These rates are manifestly confiscatory, and they have very harmful economic effects. They not only seriously impair the incentive to work, save, and invest in productive enterprise, but they are extremely destructive of capital and, in the long run, will destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, with the resulting beneficial effects on our economy.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for risky business ventures.

The harm done to the economy by the present high rates of death and gift taxes is out of all proportion to the revenue produced, and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs. Even with the very high rates now in force, the revenue from these taxes is comparatively trivial. In 1953 it was $891 million from the two sources. This was a little over 1 percent of the total budget of $74 billion—enough to pay the Government's expenses for about 4 days. The gift tax is merely auxiliary to the estate tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

Of particular concern is the destructive effect of the heavy estate taxes on small business. The conclusions of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in its report published in June 1953 was that estate taxes often lead to the disappearance of small or medium-sized independent businesses or their merger with the dominant segment of an industry.

Let me add that this statement represents not only my own views but those of Representative REED, who joins me in making the statement.

International House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there are three great institutions in New Orleans—the Mardi Gras, the Sugar Bowl, and International House.

International House is a unique organization which had its beginning some years ago and which has since become one of the most-talked-about institutions in the world.

As an example of the impact which International House has made on the Nation there have been three editorial comments on International House in three scattered sections of the Nation within a week.

In Cincinnati, Charles Nutter, the energetic, able, and farsighted managing director of International House, drew attention from the Cincinnati Enquirer.

In New Orleans the Item commented editorially on the activities of a group of citizens of Cincinnati in organizing an International House of its own.

In Houston, New Orleans' great rival in the South, the Post carried a feature story on International House and told of its history and the important role which one of New Orleans' great civic and business leaders, William G. Zetzmann, played in making it a reality.

Here is the editorial from the Item and the feature story from the Houston Post:

[From the New Orleans Item]

ADOPTS INTERNATIONAL HOUSE PATTERN—CINCINNATI LOOKS SOUTH

Cincinnati is the latest city to awaken to the possibilities of trade with Latin America—the fastest growing area of the world and one of its most attractive markets.

Forty business and civic leaders there have organized the Midwest International Trade Development Center, which they hope will develop into something similar to International House.

The other day they heard an address by Charles Nutter which the newspapers there played on page one. "I hope you go ahead with this project," he encouraged. "Get it underway and it will sell itself."

The Cincinnati Enquirer, commenting editorially, said:

"Some startling facts about the buying potential of our southern continental neighbors were given by an expert, Charles Nutter, managing director of New Orleans' famed International House who has spearheaded the most imposing trade development plan any city in America has instituted.

"He has for more than a decade devoted his energies to a plan which in many ways is similar to Cincinnati's. He has seen his efforts bear great fruit."

Nutter's address typifies the aid International House and other New Orleans agencies have given to cities around the country interested in emulating our programs.

Many cities have sent delegations or individuals to explore our activities on the international scene. These include San Francisco, San Diego, Los Angeles, and Seattle on the Pacific; Boston, Philadelphia, and Miami on the Atlantic; and Houston on the Gulf. At least 25 other major communities have

written for information. All have received full cooperation.

This is evidence of how, more and more, the people of North America are looking south.

The Inter-American Investment Conference was a further big-scale demonstration of this and its impact will be felt for years. (The followup service at International House reports a continuing stream of inquiries from throughout the hemisphere.)

This exchange of information and of ideas is healthy, and so is the competition between our cities. We live in an exapnding economy and we in New Orleans are glad to see other places flourish, too.

We must not conclude, however, because of our headstart at International House and the Trade Mart that we've "got it made." On the contrary, we must strive to extend our front position as an international city. And competitive activity elsewhere should serve as a stimulus to doing just that.

[From the Houston Post]

INTERNATIONAL HOUSE SYMBOL OF A PROFITABLE "SIMPATICO"

(By Jim Mathis)

The city that care forgot.

This is the New Orleans that Texans know. The grand old lady of the yellow, surging Mississippi River.

A city of quaintness, fervent piety, strange sins, joyous laughter, and hep jazz. It has ancient trolley cars, Pat O'Brien's, Gypsy Lou, street peddlers, and Pirate's Alley. A playful place of surface charms.

Don't you believe it.

The New Orleans of today is a rejuvenated giant with one aim—regaining its No. 1 place in the Gulf coast sun. Beneath that wrought iron and magnolia front are steel sinews of commerce and dollars.

For its resurgence, wise Orleanians chose the city's greatest asset and Houston's greatest current weakness—its port and foreign trade, respectively.

While brash, young Houston rests for a time on its turbulent, half-century laurels, New Orleans is quietly and delicately plucking the leaves from the wreath.

In 1954, as in the past 5 years, New Orleans is second only to New York City in the dollar value of water-borne commerce through its miles of docks.

New Orleans is willing to concede that Houston is No. 2 behind New York in tonnage through its port, but officials ask a pointed question:

Which is more desirable, tonnage or dollars?

It's obvious they'll take the cash.

With Houston dropping in tonnage since 1952, even the margin of annual tonnage is now narrow. Houston's 1954 estimated figure is 40,647,159 tons; for New Orleans about 39.5 million tons.

New Orleans is still the only port outside of New York City which operates on the billion dollar level in foreign trade. It has no intention of letting any one else slip up on it in that field.

From a wartime peak of $700 million annually in foreign trade, the city has zoomed to $2 billion. Nothing is likely to halt that climb except a general decline in foreign trade.

A combination of geographical and community spirit, a spirit unmatched in postwar years—have formed the basis for New Orleans' resurgence.

When Jean Baptiste Le Moyne, Sieur de Bienville, chose the site of New Orleans in 1718, he chose as wisely as did the Allen Brothers, who promoted Houston.

New Orleans lies 110 river miles from the sea, inside a crescent bend of the Mississippi, which seldom drops below 150 feet in midstream.

In effect, the city lies squarely at the small end of a mighty funnel through which drains half the Nation's export goods.

When port agents send publicity maps into the hinterlands to promote commerce, the maps do not only lay claim to the natural Mississippi Valley business, however.

The western line of their territory starts at El Paso, runs northward through New Mexico, Colorado, western Wyoming, and into northwestern Montana.

The eastern boundary begins at Savannah, Ga., on the Atlantic Ocean, runs northwestward through South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Chicago, Ill., and Wisconsin.

A network of tributaries, and the Mississippi itself, touch 31 States from Minnesota to Louisiana.

Texas, of course, is only a minute portion of this commercially fertile field, somewhat larger than even the Louisiana Purchase. (Oddly, freight rates from many west and mid-Texas cities on the Texas & Pacific Railroad are less to New Orleans than to Houston.)

The essence of New Orleans' advantages in location, however, is in the tremendous barge traffic plowing down the Mississippi. Tons of bulk commodities such as ore and grain pour into New Orleans by this route for transshipment to foreign destinations.

These unwieldly barges serve a secondary purpose, also. The cheapest transportation known, they force competing railroad lines to keep rates into New Orleans at a minimum.

With all these advantages, New Orleans became the first port of the Nation, even ahead of New York, 100 years ago. At that time the port was already 150 years old: Houston was an infant.

But time was to bring reverses to the city, and the postwar years of World War I found it in 16th position in value of cargo. It became a pawn of political regimes, and at one time 2,000 persons drew checks from the port commission, although few ever reported for work. Docks rotted.

A reform movement ended this deadheading, and a constitutional amendment took the State-owned port out of politics. Now board members serve 5 years, with staggered terms. Candidates are named by the presidents of trade and civic organizations, narrowed down to a list of three, from which the governor must choose one member.

World War II meant a boom to the port, and New Orleans became a major port of embarkation for the armed services. It performed well enough to get the warm praise of Army officials. A survey showed New Orleans could handle cargo cheaper and faster than even New York. The city prospered along with its port.

The years of peace, however, were just ahead, and with them the specter of another lean era. This time merchants and businessmen knew what to expect, however, and they weren't having any of it.

A survey disclosed what most suspected—70 cents of every dollar in the city came directly or indirectly from port activity. Businessmen pondered the future, cast about for possibilities.

William G. Zetzmann, a soft-drink bottler, acted first. He sent letters to 55 businessmen, asking them to a luncheon to discuss ways to promote foreign trade.

"Don't bother to come unless you have a lot of money to invest in the future of your city," Mr. Zetzmann wrote.

Of those invited, 53 came—to pledge $250,000 at that first meeting. This grew to $600,000 within 1 year, and by 1945, the organization—formally labeled International House—had purchased a 10-story building in the center of the city. Three stories were converted into a club, and International House was ready to go.

It began as an organization of 500 members. Each had to furnish bank references, and dedicate a goodly part of his time to the task of making foreigners feel at home in a strange land.

Today, International House has 2,400 members, and more are clamoring for admittance.

It works something like this:

A businessman from Brazil arrives in the city on a definite mission. He is brought immediately to the International House. He gets a membership card, an office and a bilingual secretary within 10 minutes.

Then the World Trade Development Department gets busy, finds out whether the businessman wants to buy or sell. Appointments are made for him, and business contacts furnished. He gets a list of all the suppliers or merchants who sell or buy the merchandise or service he wants.

If he wants to conduct his own research, a fully staffed, fully equipped business library, in many languages, covers one part of the building floor.

An International Relations Department moves in then, to make reservations for plane or train visits to other cities, to round up social entertainment, a bilingual assistant to help the visitor's wife shop, or even a multilingual baby sitter.

All these services are absolutely free. The visitor pays only for his food and drinks, perhaps not even these.

Its services are not confined to the foreign visitor, however. The same help is offered to the American businessman, with special emphasis on assistance to the small manufacturer to whom foreign trade is an unknown field.

The development department's files bulge with records of contacts made and the results.

A manufacturer in an Illinois city who had never exported his farm machinery before, is now routing a major part of his business through New Orleans to ports of South American nations.

A Tampa, Fla., baby stroller builder sold 452 of his strollers within 6 months to Latin American buyers there.

Some $30,000 in leaf tobacco from Kentucky went out to Africa and the Canary Islands through International House contacts.

Not all contacts are small. One multimillion dollar flour deal began from a single contact furnished a Kansas City, Mo., firm.

What New Orleans expects of this service, and is certainly getting, is at least a portion of the shipping generated by the connections it furnishes. In most instances New Orleans gets all of it.

But New Orleans, wisely, has decided that one-way traffic is not the sole answer to foreign trade. Representatives promote imports as avidly as exports.

A direct growth of this effort is the International Trade Mart, a sleek, five-story building a block away from International House.

Here, foreign nations and manufacturers may rent space and display their products. Buyers from New York City or Chicago may come directly to New Orleans, look over items ranging from Belgian handmade shotguns or African patio mats, to Indian embroidery.

Organized in 1945, with 66 percent of its space rented when it opened, the Trade Mart now operates at capacity. It has always been in the black, and is retiring its bonds ahead of schedule.

Its offices now exhibit over 600 items, from all over the world.

Clay Shaw, director of the mart, estimates that $50 million in business is done annually through the mart.

To keep pace with the growing use, the interlocking boards of the two institutions are already negotiating for construction of a new international building, one at least 12

stories and with more space. They expect to have it in operation within 30 months.

Indicative of the long-range approach to foreign trade taken by the city is the International House's devotion to its cultural program—interchange of Latin American and American students.

In 1945 the International Relations Department organized 13 Louisiana and Mississippi colleges into an exchange group, and even pulled scholarships from many of Latin or South American students.

In the last 10 years, over 10,000 Latin or South American youngsters have moved through New Orleans to these colleges. The program became so effective that the Cordell Hull International Foundation asked that the International House take over direction of its exchange efforts.

Today, approximately 6 percent of Louisiana State University's enrollment is Latin American. In New Orleans, there are 25 Latin American interns and nurses doing advanced work in hospitals.

These youngsters, of course, will grow up as the leaders in their country. When someone says United States they will think New Orleans. As their influence spreads, the direct benefit to New Orleans will become incalculable.

In postwar years, New Orleans has also renewed, through the International House, its trade and travel missions. There have been 21 big plane flights, and countless smaller and individual missions. Writers, newsmen, and businessmen from all over the Mississippi Valley have made these forays.

Mayor de Lesseps Morrison, the city's energetic young mayor, has made 12 of these flights.

The mayor is also on call to entertain the visiting Latin American officials, as are other officials and businessmen. It's no trouble at all in New Orleans to whip up a 300-man luncheon or dinner for an important visitor.

Rounding out the port's extracurricular promotional efforts is a free trade zone—a 12-acre area set off in the port in which foreign goods may be kept without custom charges.

Inside this zone, a foreign manufacturer or a New Orleans importer may store and process goods which may be sold in the United States or transshipped to other nations.

If the goods are sold here, the customs levy is made. If they go out again to other nations, no charge is levied.

Since the zone was established, the giant Sears & Roebuck firm has moved all its imports through New Orleans. Sears maintains a huge warehouse, filled with items like Japanese dishes and Italian motor scooters destined for its South American retail outlets.

Importers of Brazil nuts bring shipments into the zone, clean them and dry them before importation to reduce customs cost.

"LOSS LEADER" PAYS OFF ON ITS OWN

Another importer cleans and processes coffee beans. A $75,000 wool and cotton fumigator has been established by the port commission in the zone.

While importers pay no customs in the zone, they do hire New Orleans labor, drayage, and pay warehouse fees. And the zone generates considerable traffic for the port, like a grocer's loss leader.

Despite all these outside community efforts, the visions of developing foreign trade would have been impossible of fulfillment had not the port proper kept abreast with facilities and service.

Shut off from new construction along its 52 miles of waterfront during the war years, the port faced a big overhaul task as restrictions lifted. Luckily, wartime commerce had built up a backlog of funds for changes.

About $16 million has been poured into the reconstruction and replacement of old wooden wharves, some over 50 years old. A number of modern facilities have been built. Over $7 million went into doubling the capacity of the port's grain elevator, which now holds over 5 million bushels.

Present plans call for expenditure of $10.5 million for 1955, and an overall total of $44 million. Port officials publicly say the facelifting can be done in 10 years, port engineers say privately it will take 20 years.

Whatever the time, the money is being plowed into the port. And solely from revenues. The port hasn't issued bonds since 1939.

With the exception of approximately $400,000, all the revenue from a Louisiana gasoline tax goes into servicing bonds issued prior to 1939. The time may come, and soon, when the port must finance part of that $44 million expansion with bonds.

Currently, the port commission has jurisdiction over 77 berths, along 7½ miles of riverside, in the New Orleans Port. Of these, 63 are for general cargo and 14 for special purposes. Two are banana terminals which give New Orleans the edge over all other ports in importation of this fruit.

There are scattered over 5½ miles, 27 private berths in the port, varying from 450 to 500 feet in length. Many of these are for special purposes or are for the United States Navy.

By this November, Port Dircetor W. J. Amoss says, the dredging of the present 5½-mile Industrial Canal linking the river with Lake Pontchartrain to a depth of 30 feet will be completed. This will bring the port some 55 miles nearer to the Gulf of Mexico, at least for the smaller freighters. It will be that much more advantage for the port, even at 30 feet.

Port figures show that 6,342 vessels entered the harbor in 1954. Of these, 3,878 were deep sea craft, and 2,464 inland craft.

Many Orleanians, while fascinated by the continued boom in foreign trade, are happier over the influx of industry in the area. Tremendous strides have been made in recent years.

Some estimate that over $1 billion in permanent industry has moved onto the Mississippi, or the Industrial Canal, since 1950.

The largest single new plant is the Kaiser Aluminum Works, a $145 million plant for production of pig aluminum. Chrysler Corp. converted an unused plane factory into a tank engine installation worth $70 million. The American Cyanamid and Chemical Corp. invested $47.7 million into the production of fertilizer, and Lion Oil put $31 million into an anhydrous ammonia factory.

Shell Oil, an oldtimer at New Orleans, expanded its facilities by $30 million, as did other major plants in the area.

An index of the industrial growth may be seen in the booming annual expansion of the local power companies, Louisiana Power and Light and the New Orleans Public Service Co. Both spend over $10 million annually.

The whole of New Orleans has felt this new blood pumped into old veins, and responds accordingly.

Port Director Amoss calls this response, from the International House to the cabbie who is exceptionally pleasant to a foreign vistor, "a state of mind that we enjoy in New Orleans."

"To put it in a word, we are 'simpatico'," Mr. Amoss continued.

That is a Spanish word which, liberally translated, means "in sympathy with."

"We feel here that Latin Americans and other foreigners, no matter from where, aren't rascals just because they are foreigners," Mr. Amoss said. "It's an outgrowth of long experience in New Orleans, an understanding through our mixture of peoples for centuries.

"It trickles down from the top to the clerks, the police, and all levels.

"Perhaps our efforts are part necessity, and certainly a great many interests aren't unselfish. But I don't think we have to apologize for such unselfishness."

Mr. Amoss credits the International House with crystallizing the "simpatico" feeling already present, and channeling it into a productive force.

But he feels that the credit should be more widespread—all over the community.

He and other port officials point to the long, happy relationship with labor in New Orleans—there hasn't been a strike in decades.

"You can't develop this feeling overnight," Mr. Amoss ended.

So while other gulf coast ports hang on grimly to what business they have—or let it slip gradually—New Orleans holds more promise for the future, and cash for the present.

Right now, 53 percent of the city's total foreign trade is with South or Central American cities.

And 10 percent of the European commerce has been directed to gulf ports through its International Mart, with New Orleans getting the big chunk.

You can still hear the best in jazz on Bourbon Street, sip soup at Antoine's if you want to stand in line, or pay exorbitant prices for antiques—all the modern pleasures of a tourist are still to be found in New Orleans.

But the solid heart and the real color of the city lie in the hoot of steamship whistles and the smudge of factory smoke.

Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the story of the four chaplains who gave their lives that others might live when the *Dorchester* went down during World War II is a story that will thrill and inspire throughout the life of the world.

In order to perpetuate the memory of these brave men, the city of York, Pa., is naming one of its new school buildings after them. This is a particularly apt memorial for one of the chaplains, Rabbi Goode, is from York.

I include as part of my remarks the following poem written by Ira H. Jackson, of York, and dedicated to the four chaplains:

THE FOUR CHAPLAINS

Bound for lands across the sea
To battle the foes of democracy,
A transport became a blazing wreck,
Torpedoes crashed through hull and deck,
Sending heroes to watery graves,
Swallowed up by the ocean waves;
The morbid news brought grief and gloom,
February marked their month of doom.

It's a tragic story to pen,
Four chaplains, served their God and men;
Commandments and cross; the insignia on
their coats;
The chant of prayers, heard from their
throats;
Ministers, priest, and a rabbi.
Stood with hands uplifted to the sky,
In line of duty they choose to die;
Aiding others, with preservers close by.

The Protestant, Catholic, and Jew.
Praying to the one God they knew,
It serves a sermon for the bigot;
That he be ever tolerant, and not forget,
Linked as one; Protestant, Catholic, and Jew,
Went to death and glory; to the one God,
they all knew.

—*Ira H. Jackson.*

Farm Groups Misguided Right-To-Work Backers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith in the RECORD a story from the AFL News-Reporter of February 18, 1955, dealing with right-to-work legislation:

FARM GROUPS MISGUIDED RIGHT-TO-WORK BACKERS

POCATELLO, IDAHO.—Idaho farm organizations, which sponsored "right-to-work" legislation in the State, were told they were misguided sponsors of "disreputable merchandise" by the editor of the Pocatello Enterprise.

The editor, Perry Swisher, Republican member of the Idaho Legislature, said:

"If we were a farmer, we would be outraged if a union man or labor-management specialist started writing laws to govern weed control, irrigation districts, Bangs disease, brand inspection, and seed certification."

MISGUIDED SPONSORSHIP

"Yet today the leaders of two Idaho farm organizations are busy trying to sell Idaho lawmakers on a drastic proposal in the field of labor-management relations. It is the bill so speciously called the right-to-work bill.

"Responsible organizations familiar with industry and organized labor have refused to sponsor the bill in Idaho. A few arch conservatives among management have quietly egged it along but, from embarrassment rather than fear, decline to make their quaint thinking a matter of record.

The Idaho Farm Bureau and the Idaho Farm Grange, whose leaders know a great deal about agriculture and a great little about industry, have misguidedly assumed sponsorship of this disreputable merchandise.

"A 'right-to-work' law has been enacted in several States after strong financial backing by the autocrats of Texas, the screwballs in Los Angeles, and the scattered haters who still believe every workman's lunchbox hides an anarchist's bomb.

"We've been listening to 'right-to-work' lobbyists call the roll of the States who have adopted the law. By and large they are States in the South, where slavery continues to be more popular than anything we have in the 20th century, or States in that area of the Midwest where economic vigor has been lost and the more venturesome people have been moving on."

BARRIER TO EXPANSION

"Idaho's future lies in the direction of the States to the west of us. New enterprise, new industry, new population are in sight. Idaho's agriculture, along with Idaho's cities will gain prosperity unless barriers to expansion are laid by cranks who think more of social vengeance against one class or another than they do of peaceful and energetic development.

"At base, the right-to-work bill destroys the right of wage earners to bargain collectively with management. It is as simple as that. Destroying the balance between management and labor can only reenact, needlessly, the industrial civil war out of which our vigorous modern economy has grown.

"A vital feature of that economy is that a better paid working class has enormously enlarged purchasing power, and agriculture has been a beneficiary of that change. Stated a bit too simply it can nonetheless be said that when purchasing power falls off among the wage-earning millions, farm income drops. And drops faster than could be offset by any minor savings industrial management might pass along if labor's bargaining power were broken."

RELATIONS ARE BETTER

"Relations between management and labor are not ideal in Idaho. They aren't anywhere. They never will be. But they are better than they were 5 years ago, and eminently better than they were 20 years ago. And immeasurably better than they were a half century ago.

"Let's stay sane in Idaho, no matter how far into its sad past the Deep South wants to crawl. Let's have no farm group carrying water for the enemies of the wage earners, nor the workers opposing farm prosperity, nor either group hindering work and investment toward a greater Idaho. In a hundred fields the farmers, the workers, and management have common interests in improving the structure of Idaho law, Idaho government, the Idaho economy, the Idaho tax system. All of us have a right to work, toward greener pastures. But no group among us can claim the right to work toward the destruction of the bargaining or marketing rights of other groups not without doing ultimate damage to us all."

Address by Hon. George M. Leader, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at Dinner in Honor of Genevieve Blatt, Secretary of Internal Affairs, at Zembo Mosque, Harrisburg, May 3, 1935

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address given by our distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable George M. Leader, at the testimonial dinner in honor of Miss Genevieve Blatt, secretary of internal affairs of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, on Tuesday, May 3, 1955:

If betting were not against the law in Pennsylvania, I would make a small wager that the majority of the people in this Mosque tonight cannot remember the names of the Democratic candidates for State treasurer and auditor general in 1952.

I can, rather vividly, and Genevieve Blatt can.

Because, utterly obscured in the Presidential campaign of that year, two young and inconspicuous people ranged up and down this State campaigning for two fiscal offices that interested them very much—but the public not at all.

Those two people were George M. Leader and Genevieve Blatt.

Tonight, we are not quite so young and we are a trifle more conspicuous.

You can imagine, therefore, the pleasure I take in this second inauguration day. The Democratic entry of Blatt and Leader did not do so well in its maiden race, but we sure swept the field in the derby.

The great strength of the Democratic Party lies in the fact that it is never scared, never afraid. We are willing to pioneer, and it was good typical Democratic pioneering which made us the first major party to designate a woman as a candidate for statewide office in Pennsylvania.

We are the party—and it will be long remembered—which first elected a woman to a major office in the State.

And I would make this second wager tonight.

When the day comes—as it some day will—that we elect a woman governor in Pennsylvania, you can be sure that she will campaign and win on the Democratic ticket.

I am not throwing Genevieve's bonnet in the ring.

The point I am making is that the Democratic Party is the party of action, the party of progress, the party of movement with our times.

This day is the last of the ceremonies which go with the changing of the guard in Harrisburg. The baskets of flowers, the congratulatory messages, the jubilation and the hurrahs are now, finally, once and for all behind us. The parties are over; the time of grim and solemn testing is well underway.

All the world, the cynics say, loves a winner.

It takes no special brains, no special courage, to join a victory parade.

And in every group, in every association of men and women, there are those whose reactions in time of stress are obviously those of Robert Burns' field mouse: "the wee sleekit timorous cowerin' beastie, Oh what a panic is in thy breastie."

The great strength of the Democratic Party is that its leaders do not panic. Democrats do not run back and forth, to and fro, with every pressure; Democrats can endure criticism even when it is misrepresentative and unfair; Democrats try to recognize their responsibilities and carry them out in manly, uncomplaining fashion.

The Democratic Party does not breed timorous field mice.

The tenure of this State administration can still be measured in days and weeks. We are still new. We are to a large measure untried. We are going to make our share of mistakes—mistakes in tactics, mistakes in judgment.

But, so far as I am given strength, this administration will never make the one unforgivable mistake—the mistake of losing heart, the mistake of running from a fight, the mistake of losing a sense of purpose and responsibility.

This party of ours, this Democratic Party which we love and serve, has come into majority status in Pennsylvania.

To hold that status, it must act like a majority.

It must be responsible and cohesive—in the Governor's office and in the administrative departments, in the legislature, in the courthouses, and in the city halls, in the State committee, in the county organizations.

A minority party enjoys a kind of luxury which is no longer ours. That is the luxury of avoiding the hard decisions, playing to the galleries, running loose in as many directions as there are party members. Our clear and present danger—our only danger—is that some of us may forget our duties and our obligations as a majority party entrusted with great power; that through forgetfulness, some of us may slip back to the habit patterns of minority irresponsibility.

If that slip occurs in any considerable fraction of our party membership, it should be clear that the entire Democratic Party will be the loser.

It won't take long until we are all of us back in the minority again.

Such a minority psychosis—the against psychology—has plagued the Republican Party nationally and bedeviled and humiliated the Eisenhower administration.

In the behavior of such Republican leaders as Senator KNOWLAND and Senator BRIDGES it even menaces the peace of the United States and brings closer the terrible threat of atomic war.

Here in Pennsylvania we are resolved that this administration will not be so frustrated. In that resolve, I know that I am joined by the tried and forceful senior leaders of our party.

We won a great popular victory last November.

We intend to go on winning them for a long, long time.

Each of you, my fellow Democrats, contributed to our victory. Each of you played a great part, a vital part, in electing me to this governorship.

Tonight, I ask each of you to work as closely with me, as devotedly with me, as you did in the campaign, so that together we can give this State an administration that will merit the continuity of he Democratic Party in the control of our affairs; so that together we can assure the future of Pennsylvania and the place of the Democratic Party as the guardian of that future.

Will you do that with me?

In return, I can only pledge to you the last limits of my strength, every ounce of my being, every nerve and sinew and waking hour of my life in these 4 years of arduous duty.

Now, let us be quite frank and admit the honeymoon is over.

The honeymoon was bound to be over when we came to grips with the problem of financing the government of this State.

The budget I submitted is, within reasonable areas of consideration and adjustment, the proper answer—the only answer—to the demands placed upon us by our laws and by our circumstances in Pennsylvania.

The tax program I submitted, again within reasonable areas of consideration and adjustment, is the proper answer—the only right and fair answer—to our need for adequate revenues to meet the obligations of the State.

I intend to advocate them, fight for them, argue for them, explain them, and see them through the house of representatives of this Commonwealth.

They meet the Democratic platform, the Democratic campaign, the Democratic pledges both of principle and specific action.

I can understand and sympathize with the present circumstances of such Republican leaders as Charley Smith. In 1951, the Legislative Journal is full of Smith's arguments for an income tax, even when it was a very poor and crude unclassified income tax. In 1953, Charley Smith was equally vehement in support of the sales tax. Now, in 1955, Charley Smith has at last reached the politician's heaven on earth—he is against all taxes.

And certainly I bear no resentment against an old pro like Harvey Taylor, or a pitiful front man like Miles Horst.

But, of all the people in Pennsylvania, the one man who should keep as still as a clam in 20 feet of water is our junior Senator and former Governor, JAMES HENDERSON DUFF.

You are not supposed to mention a rope in a house where a man has been hanged.

If that is true, you would think that a man with DUFF's record in the fiscal management of Pennsylvania would observe a decent silence when the men who are the heirs of his bad management are acting as receivers for his bankruptcy.

JAMES H. DUFF was certainly not the man to rock 'em and sock 'em. His play was to hit and run.

Under the Duff administration, the soldiers' bonus was passed with a whoop and holler. It added nearly a half a billion dollars to the State's debt, and the budget I have just submitted requires $63,490,000 to pay the debt service on it during the next 2 years.

DUFF never asked for a tax to pay the bonus.

He got out before the bills came due.

Under the same Duff administration, we began the practice of mandating teachers' salaries with the State paying the bill.

That item has now climbed to $426,840,000 in the current budget estimates.

DUFF never asked for a tax to meet the bill.

He got out before the bills came due.

DUFF preached the good gospel of clean streams.

That item is costing the State $3,200,000 in the current budget estimates.

Again, the Duff formula was to get the credit and fumble the check.

DUFF not only deceived the people of Pennsylvania; he even deceived his running-mate and chosen successor, John Fine.

Now, this man—venerable in his more than three score years and ten—sneers at what he calls a "short-pants" administration.

I seem to be wearing my pants at the normal break above the shoe top, but regardless of such child's play, I am determined to do one thing in complete variation from the venerable Senator.

The Duff administration was a short-change administration—a cold-blooded confidence game which brought our State to its present crisis.

This administration is going to balance out, with its commitments honored and its bills paid and the Republican deficit squared away.

There are two more things that people should remember, if Senator DUFF has the brass to talk taxes again in this Commonwealth.

To evade pressures on the State, he pushed through Act 481—the tax anything law. DUFF is the godfather, the enabler and creator, of every wage tax in this State except Philadelphia's, of every excessive head tax, of every mercantile tax, of every local real estate transfer tax, of every amusement tax, in this Commonwealth.

Finally, and with this we'll have enough of DUFF, as a United States Senator he has been voting the Humphrey-Eisenhower tax policy. That policy is billions in tax reductions for the corporations and the dividend rich fat cats, and not 1 cent for the Senator's boasted "average guy." The $20 per person tax reduction, which the Democrats pressed in Washington and DUFF opposed, would have meant more in tax benefits to the average Pennsylvania family than this hotly disputed State tax program will cost that same "average Pennsylvania family."

I know that to talk taxes at a party is to be a skeleton at a feast.

But this problem is before us, and this Democratic Administration will succeed or fail as we succeed or fail in solving it.

I am quite aware that the tax proposals got off to a bad start, because they were "leaked" incorrectly while discussions were in progress at the Capitol. I know that it has been misrepresented; I know that it is getting a bad press from the same editorialists who were so righteously for fiscal responsibility when Sam Rayburn was trying to reduce the Federal personal income taxes.

But I also am sure that it is substantially right. Being right, it will get its full measure of public support when the public gets honest facts instead of distortions. That's my job, and I hope that you will also make it yours.

Most people have been led to believe that the choice is between the classified income tax and the present 1 percent sales tax with all its exemptions. You and I know that there is no such choice. The choice is between the classified income tax, and a 3 or 4 percent sales tax with no exemptions except take-home food.

The proposed tax program is not a wage tax, nor a flat income tax—and any person who says otherwise is telling a deliberate untruth.

It is a tax program based upon ability to pay.

It distributes the burden fairly between business and the individual.

It is better for the farmer than an increased sales tax.

It is far better for every low and moderate income family than a 3 or 4 percent sales tax.

It will not raise prices; it will not raise rents; it balances the favoritism shown investment capital by the Eisenhower-Humphrey tax policies in Washington.

This tax program should be supported by farm organizations.

It should be supported by intelligent business.

It should have the full support of organized labor.

It should have the full, the willing, the vocal support of every Democrat who campaigned on our party platform and our established party principles.

I search into my heart; I look into my conduct each day and examine my relations with all who work with me, to be sure that this office is not making me—as it may have made others—stubborn, or self-proud, or arrogantly demanding of my colleagues. I pray that I will have the strength to stand for what is right, for the exact discharge of my obligations. I trust that God will give me the wisdom to find the way.

In such searching, in such prayer, in such trust, I have made this vow:

I will not pass this government of Pennsylvania into my successor's hands still weaker than it was given me; I will not pass this government to my successor except as a solvent government, a strong government, a government capable of meeting its obligations.

With your help, and the help of all men and women of good will in this Commonwealth, I mean to keep that vow. When that vow is kept, although the leap into the future is long, I am sure of one thing, because we will have earned the right by our performance:

My successor and his successor will be Democratic Governors of Pennsylvania.

Hurricane Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, it is unquestionably true that during the period of the last dozen years, hurricanes have appeared along the Atlantic coast with a far greater frequency than ever before. We are apparently in the midst of a cycle which appears to have diverted shoreward the course of these storms, and every Member of this House is familiar with the devastating damage they have done to property along the Atlantic seaboard, and what is worse, a substantial loss of life has resulted.

I think it is timely, therefore, to include an editorial from the New York Times of May 9, 1955, referring with favor to the bill now pending introduced

by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

The editorial stresses earlier hurricane warnings, but the purpose of the bill is equally directed to a better study and detection to tornadoes which likewise have done such great damage throughout the Nation.

It is so obvious that the country needs earlier warnings of these windstorms, that there seems to be no sensible argument against the purpose of the Patterson bill. I have no means of knowing whether the proposed appropriation of $5 million is necessary, or whether a lesser amount will do, but I am convinced that the Weather Bureau needs additional stations and additional personnel if the people are to have effective notice, and thereby are to be enabled to minimize their damages and in many instances to save their lives.

The editorial follows:

HURRICANE WARNING

Last summer's hurricanes killed 200 people and caused about $800 million damage to property as they tore into the coasts and back country of our northeastern States. They also confirmed the grim presumption that this part of the country is now definitely in the hurricane zone. Disaster experts, however, estimate that 90 percent of the loss of lives and possibly as much as 25 percent of the property damage from hurricanes could be prevented if the Weather Bureau were able to give more precise and timely warnings broadcast over all our communications media and based on much more knowledge than it has about the air currents far aloft and out to sea.

In view of all this the public has a right to expect an immediate and substantial increase in the Bureau's facilities and personnel. Shocking as it will be to those unfamiliar with the Federal budget now before Congress, nothing of the sort is in sight for the next fiscal year (July 1, 1955–June 30, 1956). In a letter published on this page a well-known meteorologist raises a timely alert as to this dangerous situation. His letter, however, suffers from understatement.

If the appropriations called for in the budget are not increased the Weather Bureau will not, in practical effect, get a cent more for research and its general weather reporting services next year than this. The Bureau itself states in its budget justification that "research in 1956 is planned at about the same level as for 1955," and there will actually be one less staff member assigned to this work.

The overall budget for next year, it is true, is $3 million more than last ($27,850,000) plus a special $5 million extra for equipment to be spent over the next 4 years. But the $3 million is to cover the expenses of taking over observation activities which the Air Force previously carried on, and the $5 million—except for new radar installations—is largely to replace old equipment. No more stations are provided for and no strengthening of the present inadequate and underpaid but expert staff. (The Bureau has lost 1,000 employees since 1949 and the average annual pay of those who remain is $4,864.)

The very least that should be done by Congress is to pass the Patterson bill (H. R. 5260), which provides an additional $5 million above the budget allowances for the Weather Bureau—to be used exclusively "in the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system." But Congress might well look into the adequacy of the Weather Bureau's budget all along the line. As far as hurricanes are concerned, additional expenditures now may well be covered, and many times over, by savings to the public in the long run.

Power Policy Debate Erupts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 4, 1955

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, on May 11, 1955, printed a report on the current hearings by the House Government Operations Committee's Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman EARL CHUDOFF, of Pennsylvania.

The report explains clearly the developments in the hearing so far. Since there has been great interest in this hearing—a hearing which, I believe, will develop many facts in an important field—I wish to bring the report to the attention of the Members.

POWER POLICY DEBATE ERUPTS

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—A full-scale debate on the vexed question of private and public power policy under the GOP administration is on the way.

Public-power advocates opened a major attack here against administration policies as set by Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior. Spokesmen of the Interior Department will reply after the attack has developed.

Mr. McKay is charged with undermining the will of Congress by administrative changes benefiting private utilities.

Simultaneously it is learned that a group of some 80 Representatives, largely from the Pacific Northwest and mostly Democrats, has been formed to give battle to Eisenhower power policies as expressed through the Interior Department.

The long-smouldering clash broke into the open before a House subcommittee.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPEAL?

Leading the attack are former New Deal executives of the Department of the Interior who charge a 20-year program is being scrapped and the "will of Congress" set aside, not through direct repeal of laws but by the oblique approach of financial attrition, and administrative reversals under Mr. McKay's direction.

C. Girard Davidson, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and Walton Seymour, another one-time Interior Department official under Democratic auspices, charged that Secretary McKay quietly dropped, last August, a regulation safeguarding Federal rights in the transmission of public power.

Counsel of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations showed a photostatic letter from James D. Geissinger, representing the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., addressed to the Solicitor of the Interior Department, April 9, 1954, declaring:

"Specific suggestions have been made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. attorneys representing other of the Western States utilities."

SECRECY CHARGED

These "suggestions," witnesses asserted, were in behalf of the policy put into effect by Mr. McKay which reversed the earlier Roosevelt-Truman policy. The change was made, they charged, without newspaper announcement and abandoned "valuable rights of the Government," previously upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In return for the right to build a power line across public lands, witnesses explained, Washington previously required private utilities to allow the Government to employ any free time on these lines to transmit Federal power, upon payment of an equitable share of operation and cost.

This system was embodied in a so-called "wheeling provision" first worked out in 1948. The object was to avoid the waste and duplication of transmission lines. The result was said to have been a mutual advantage to public and private companies.

Private companies, however, in some instances objected to the system, notably the Idaho Power Co. and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. of California.

COORDINATION VITAL

Mr. Seymour, who said he is now a private consultant, argued that in any big interconnected power system like that in the Pacific Northwest the integration and coordination of power transmission is as important in ultimate price to the consumer as the cost of the electricity at the dam. The "wheeling" arrangement was a failure in this coordination.

Mr. Davidson gave a specific example of how the system worked until Mr. McKay reversed it. To promote utilization of rich phosphate deposits in Utah, Wyoming, and Montana, he said, the United States Bureau of Reclamation proposed a transmission line to bring in Bonneville power. The Idaho Power Co. applied for the right to build the line, over public lands. The Interior Department offered to let them build in return for a wheeling arrangement with safeguards for the company.

The Idaho Power Co. refused the arrangement, Mr. Davidson said, although the Supreme Court upheld a similar provision in 1952.

Mr. McKay took over the Interior Department in 1953. According to Mr. Davidson, on August 11, 1954, the wheeling regulation was quietly dropped as an administration policy.

Witnesses Davidson and Seymour charged that this constituted a blow to Federal operation.

RIGHTS RELINQUISHED

"It relinquishes valuable rights of the Government; it makes the sale of Government power more difficult and costly; it tends to permit the monopolization of Government power by limited groups; and it is definitely contrary to the public interest," Mr. Davidson charged.

Messrs. Seymour and Davidson said that this is only one of a variety of administrative reversals made by Mr. McKay designed to undermine the express language of Congress, which grants preference to public bodies and cooperatives to purchase the power generated at Government dams.

It is this latter angle that subsequent testimony will cover.

The preference clause witnesses said, was written into the Reclamation Act as far back as 1906. In the act setting up the Bonneville Dam, Congress wrote authority "to provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric transmission lines * * * as he finds necessary."

Speeches and statements of Mr. McKay and subordinates were put in the record implying opposition to Federal transmission lines and the preference clause to public agencies.

Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary under Mr. McKay, was quoted as saying:

"There are a number of things that can be modified administratively. If we just break away from that concept of a Federal power wholesale monopoly, tied in to local public power * * * we can correct a good many of the evil effects that the Federal power system has brought to our communities during the past year."

The Partnership Program—Eisenhower Reverses Public Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD the first of two articles appearing in the Evening Star which discuss the administration's power policy, or lack thereof.

Written in concise, understandable language, this article by Joseph A. Fox explains why it is that under Mr. Eisenhower, "not a single new Federal hydroelectric project has been started."

The first article appeared in the May 11 issue:

THE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM—EISENHOWER REVERSES PUBLIC-POWER POLICY

(By Joseph A. Fox)

President Truman, speaking at the Hungry Horse power-project dedication in Montana in the late days of the 1952 campaign, showed a flash of grim humor.

With a wave of his hand, he told the audience to take a good look at the dam harnessing the waters of the Flathead.

"It's the last one you'll see for a long time, if the Republicans win next month," he said.

The jibe was prophetic.

The multi-billion-dollar public-power boom of the Roosevelt-Truman era represented by Hungry Horse, has been smothered in the 27 months of the Eisenhower administration.

As a candidate preaching get-the-Government-out-of-business doctrine, Mr. Eisenhower promised that development of natural resources—a euphemism for hydroelectric-power projects—would be a partnership arrangement between the Federal Government on the one hand and private enterprise and local public groups on the other.

The Government would no longer do it all, he said.

That promise became the basis for the Eisenhower administration's policy. How closely the policy has been followed is disclosed by the fact that since Mr. Eisenhower took office, not a single new Federal hydroelectric project has been started.

The private-power industry has made no attempt to conceal the fact that it is happy over this turn of events. It feels that the progress of a Federal juggernaut, which now handles about 20 percent of the Nation's power business, has been stopped.

While the Government's main concern was with hydroelectric-dam projects, which transform the energy of falling water into electricity, there was also Federal expansion into generation by so-called steam plants, which burn coal, oil, and other fuel. Since nonhydro methods of making power now provide all but about one-seventh of all electricity—Federal and private—sold, the industry had cause to fear further Federal expansion beyond the hydro field.

Since the partnership policy went into effect, the Federal Power Commission has been swamped with license applications for dam sites from private companies. The companies, with sales already hitting $7 billion a year, are showing no hesitancy in moving to take on projects of any size if the power involved promises to be a paying proposition.

The net result of all this is the buildup of a red-hot political issue for 1956, particularly in the Northwest. While Democrats have gone along with some of the Eisenhower domestic policies, there has been no meeting of minds on power. The debate on this issue that got into the congressional elections last year was only a pale forerunner of what is to come.

The Republicans as a whole—there are a few exceptions—tag public power with such descriptions as socialism and tax-supported monopoly. Generally speaking, public power rates are about half of those charged by private combines. Foes insist this is only made possible because of lower taxes enjoyed by public power projects, largely, exemption from Federal income tax.

Democrats say the growth of the public power concept was progress, which now has been stalled.

Franklin D. Roosevelt backed the Government into the power business in a big way in the early 1930's by soft-pedaling hydroelectric development as a sort of casual by-product of depression era pump-priming, reclamation, irrigation, and flood control work.

As of today, the Government has the better part of an $11.5 billion investment tied up in power producing facilities at a hundred sites in Bureau of Reclamation, Army Engineers, and Tennessee Valley developments. The Tennessee Valley and Pacific-Northwest States are the big areas of operation. But lesser projects dot the map throughout the country. In the Tennessee Valley, the demand for Government power has outrun the water supply, and steam plants have been added to supplement the dams.

Public agencies are the preference customers of these outlets, with much of the current going to farm cooperatives.

Here is the scoreboard since the Republicans took over:

1. Work on projects underway has been continued, but no new projects have been initiated.

2. Private utilities with administration approval, are reaching for sites the Democrats had planned for Federal development.

3. Farm cooperatives complain bitterly that administration policies are curtailing their supply of Government power and forcing them to depend more on private utilities—at higher rates.

4. President Eisenhower has recommended to Congress but two plans for regional all-Federal waterway development. Those are Frying Pan-Arkansas and the upper Colorado River. Both are of questionable value as power assets.

5. The President has made it clear that his idea of partnership is to let private industry or State or local public agencies take over the revenue-producing power business when multipurpose joint projects are developed. This leaves the Government with the flood control, navigation, and other nonreimbursable phases of development for which the Treasury foots the bill. If power only is involved in a development, the Government steps aside to let private capital do the job.

HAPPY DAYS FOR INDUSTRY

In short, private power finally has found the silver lining in the clouds that hung over the industry through New Deal and Fair Deal. And it is planning new expenditures in the billions.

The administration expresses complete satisfaction with the situation.

Private initiative has gotten a break, it is argued, and the Government has saved money.

The partnership program, say administration officials, has avoided huge Federal outlays, which benefits the taxpayers.

The public power people retort that the whole thing adds up to a sellout to the interests. They say, too, that intrusion of private projects into Government setups means an end to integrated development of the Nation's water resources.

When President Eisenhower took over on January 20, 1953, the proposed budget which President Truman had left behind for the upcoming fiscal year was scrapped and with it went provision for funds for expansion in the two great public power domains—Tennessee Valley and Columbia Basin.

The TVA had been slated to get another steam plant at Fulton Landing, Tenn., to meet increased Atomic Energy Commission demands. Instead, the administration negotiated the controversial Dixon-Yates contract for TVA power, which now is in the courts.

Hells Canyon, in the middle stretch of the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho was the site of a proposed key development for Columbia Basin. The Government stepped aside there, however, and paved the way for the Idaho Power Co. to come in if clearance can be obtained from the Federal Power Commission.

Projects already started by the Democrats ran into reduced appropriations and a consequent slowdown, critics assert, but there were no stoppages.

A few months later, a new statement on policy from the Interior Department, the principal marketing agency for Federal power, brought more bad news to the public power forces.

Essentially, it disclosed a complete reversal of the philosophy of the previous 20 years, setting out bluntly that "it is recognized that the primary responsibility for supplying the power needs of an area rests with the people locally."

In the future, it was made clear, the Government, instead of going all out for power development, would be concerned primarily with reclamation and navigation needs in setting up water resources projects, and think secondly of the power production angle.

The Department also underscored its intention of confining construction of transmission lines between power dams and delivery points to those cases where private industry would not provide such facilities. This was in accord with a principle laid down by Congress a few years previously which rural cooperatives fought because it boosted their power costs. With direct lines to dams, Government customers naturally pay cheaper rates than they would if they had to pay a delivery charge to a middleman.

The new policy directive also served notice that the Interior Department would take another look at Federal rate structures to be sure they protected taxpayers' interests and would provide sufficient revenue to amortize project costs within the standard 50-year liquidation period.

This carried a step further an earlier move by the Budget Bureau to bring Government power rates more in line with those of private concerns by setting up a new yardstick for the allocation of construction costs against the power projects in multi-purpose developments.

HOW IT WORKS

Construction costs figure in the rate base. The larger the construction costs charged against power, the higher the rate.

Public-power foes always have insisted that the cost allocation on Federal power projects has been underestimated, and rates consequently held down because construction charges properly assessible against generating plants have been passed on to flood control, navigation, or other project features.

The new policy did continue a requirement that utilities pass on to consumers any savings made possible by the purchase of Government power. Controls, however, were dropped over the resale rates charged by public agencies. It was felt these were unnecessary.

All these and other changes wrote finish to the Roosevelt-Truman Federal power boom.

Fishers Island Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the bill which I have introduced calling for a full investigation of the problem of protecting the shores of Fishers Island Sound from storm and hurricane tidal floods, H. R. 6093, I wish to bring to the attention of the House today some additional information.

If I were to predict that during the next Atlantic hurricane season millions of dollars in personal property and many entire industries now located on Connecticut shores will be wiped out, I believe that this body would institute some sort of emergency powers to get action in time to prevent such a catastrophe.

Well, after personally inspecting the Fishers Island Sound area lost weekend I do so predict—if last year's violence is repeated. The Stonington area, for example, where one of my Hartford constituent's plant is located, will suffer damage not alone from the extreme violence of a hurricane but even more likely from the lesser furies of Atlantic storms which now sweep in from the east and southeast with increasing regularity.

A native son of Stonington and president of the Stonington Boat Works, Inc., Mr. Henry R. Palmer, Jr., has proposed what appears to be the best defense at the least expense for this extremely vulnerable area. His plan, which suggests a series of breakwters extending on a broken line, following the reefs, from Watch Hill Point, R. I., to the east point of Fishers Island, N. Y., promises protection for the greatest number of people and their properties. I have yet to see a so-called coastal erosion plan by a single construction project which would protect such an extensive area as these shores of Fishers Island Sound in Rhode Island, New York, and Connecticut.

The proposed Palmer breakwaters would restore that line of reefs from Watch Hill Point to East Point, Fishers Island, to its former protective status.

Since those reefs have been flattened, in recent years, and only since then, has Stonington Harbor lost its value as a harbor of refuge. In a strong easterly storm there is no harbor of refuge now between New London, Conn., and Point Judith, R. I. A comparison of older charts with the new will show that Stonington Harbor, for example, has lost its usefulness as such in almost direct ratio with the gradual lowering of those reef barriers.

Consequently, heavy seas now sweep into the Stonington area directly from the Atlantic Ocean and the wave action continues on down the Connecticut shoreline in a westerly direction. This, I say, happens during easterly storms, which occur with increasing regularity. Water damage along this extensive Connecticut coastline is still greater during the hurricane season.

Connecticut, like many other States, is anxiously trying to attract new industry. But many long-established industries along this Connecticut coastline have said they would leave if they must suffer the severe water damage of 1938, of 1944, of 1954; resulting from the cumulative power of Atlantic wave action; if they must be continually threatened by storm-driven seas which now enter Fishers Island Sound over the once-protective reef line between Watch Hill and Fishers Island. Even the Stonington fishing fleet, Connecticut's largest, will have to seek refuge elsewhere unless Federal action is forthcoming soon.

I have therefore introduced a bill asking for authority to investigate and correct this situation by the construction of breakwaters to protect the entire Fishers Island Sound area. Since personally inspecting the reef line between Watch Hill, R. I., and Fishers Island, N. Y., last Friday, I am more convinced than ever that this is our first line of defense. I ask that the provisions of this bill be given immediate consideration by the Secretary of the Army and that he instruct the Chief of Engineers to expedite the necessary survey and immediately to take appropriate action in the most expeditious manner possible toward the construction of those breakwaters.

I am well aware of the hazards of hurricane violence which threaten the entire Atlantic seaboard. However, while I respect the needs of others, I would remind this body that to my knowledge no other such extensive and heavily populated and highly assessed area so threatened can be so readily protected by a single project of breakwaters construction. The need is apparent to those who would study and compare the coastal charts, past and present. It is a need which can be fulfilled, and easily so, whenever authorized by Congress.

I ask that this project be given serious consideration, that it be given the same degree of priority in any overall Atlantic seaboard coastal erosion legislation that the area in question was given by the hurricanes of 1938, of 1944, of 1954.

Shorter Route to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a little news item in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer brings to mind the ancient Chinese saying "A picture is worth 10,000 words." On May 10, 1955, this newspaper described 10 American soldiers with their wives and children at the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport after disembarking from a regularly scheduled commercial flight from the Far East.

This article depicted the fathers wrestling with paperwork in connection with processing by officials of the Seattle port of embarkation, while wives, mothers, and children drank milk, munched cookies, or watched TV. Significant was this statement:

> The group was the first of 357 men and dependents who will make the trip by air during May. The armed services are making use of regularly scheduled commercial flights.

The point is this, and this picture does not require 10,000 words. Whoever is responsible for this travel routing should be commended. Someone has recognized the advantage of the shorter circle route to the Orient, which, according to the Library of Congress, is as follows:

	Miles
By sea:	
From San Francisco to Yokohama (via Honolulu): Actual steaming time (15 days 18 hours and 30 minutes)	5,488
Distance taking great circle route: Actual steaming time (13 days and 45 minutes)	4,536
Difference in miles, 952; difference in time, 2 days 17 hours and 45 minutes.	
By air:	
From Seattle to Tokyo (via Anchorage and Cold Bay): Flying time (10 hours 45 minutes)	4,806
From San Francisco to Tokyo (via Honolulu and Wake Island) (Pan American route): Flying time (17 hours and 15 minutes)	6,256
Difference in miles, 1,450; difference in time, 6 hours and 30 minutes.	

By sea or by air, whether it is personal property, postal mail, or perishable food, there is only one answer—the saving in distance is a saving of time and dollars. All oriental service should be concentrated through the Port of Seattle, even though the Chief Examiner of the Federal Maritime Board classified Seattle as "economically tributary" to San Francisco.

Personal Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 days I have been pretty much flat on my back with a virus that bit me rather severely, and I have been unable to attend the sessions of the House. From the look of the RECORD, it seems as though there have been more rollcalls, quorum calls, and votes than might have occurred normally in the period of a couple of weeks. Since I had no control over the timing when those bugs were going to bite, I was unable to attend the sessions and consequently have no recorded votes on the bills which came up on the floor of the House.

However, had I been present I would have voted for the conference report on the postal pay raise. Although I firmly believe the President will veto the present bill, I nevertheless feel the bill should get before the President for his immediate action so it can become law or be vetoed. Then the Congress can quit playing politics with the purse strings of the postal and civil-service employees of this country and produce legislation

which will put money into their pockets now.

I also would have voted against recommittal of the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, for I believe both Territories are ready for statehood. According to the RECORD, there was a lot of talk about Communist influence and Harry Bridges in the Hawaiian Islands and apparently for that reason, a lot of the Members voted against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. I thought the remarks of Congressman RUSSELL MACK, of Washington, were very pertinent when he stated:

Why should we punish Hawaii by depriving her of statehood for something that we ourselves have not done?

In other words, the United States had been unable to get rid of Harry Bridges during a period of a good many years, yet some would deprive Hawaii of statehood for inability to get rid of him in a comparatively short time. This reasoning seems entirely illogical to me.

Coming from a district which is close to Alaska, I am particularly concerned with statehood for that Territory. I believe the people of Alaska have demonstrated their ability to govern themselves and to become a member of the United States. I therefore would have voted in favor of statehood for both of these Territories.

Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 11, 1955:

POSTAL PAY BILL

Uncle Sam's 500,000 postal workers not only carry the mail. In an election, their votes may carry the precinct. That fact had great weight with the House of Representatives this week when it voted to hike the wages of postal workers by 8.8 percent.

Postmaster General Summerfield predicted that the White House would veto any increase larger than 7.7 percent. But even that threat marked a retreat for the administration. Earlier, its leaders had tried to hold the line at a 6.5 percent pay hike.

When the chips were down, even the GOP Congressmen deserted the Postmaster General. Most of them joined the solid Democratic bloc to approve the higher figure by a landslide vote. Only 66 Congressmen backed up the administration. All of them were Republicans.

The vote in the House, 328 to 66, was big enough to override a veto, if the White House invokes one. Next week the Senate is expected to duplicate the House's stand.

The chief argument against the pay boost was that the Post Office Department is in the red, and can't afford that big a wage increase. The same argument would apply to all branches of the Federal Government, since the entire national budget is running a deficit.

But that didn't stop Congress from voting its members a 50 percent wage hike this month, with the consent of the White House.

Justice, as well as politics, is on the side of the post office employee.

H. R. 4560

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement presented to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by the Honorable William G. Stratton, Governor of Illinois. Governor Stratton has stated clearly and forcefully the interest of the people of Illinois in the passage of H. R. 4560, which would amend the Natural Gas Act to terminate the restrictions imposed as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips Petroleum case. I believe that his remarks merit the thoughtful attention of the Members of this body.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am happy to have an opportunity to appear before your committee. The people of my State have an interest in the proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act equal to those of any other State. First of all, the State of Illinois is itself a producer of petroleum and natural gas. In the second place, Illinois is a large gas consuming State and a large importer of natural gas by interstate pipeline. Thirdly, as chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission I am deeply concerned that the Natural Gas Act as currently interpreted will, if not amended, come into direct conflict with the successful conservation programs set up and administered by our State governments.

As a producer of gas, the State of Illinois is overshadowed by a great many of its sister States. In current production of gas, Illinois ranks 16th among the gas producing States, and in gas reserves it ranks 19th. I feel that the problems of the gas producing States can be better discussed by Governor Kennon of Louisiana. You have had the benefit of a discussion of conservation of this vital natural resources by Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, the dean of conservation under State regulation.

It is Illinois' role as a large consumer of gas that will be of chief interest to your gentlemen. During 1953, the latest year for which Bureau of Mines figures are available, Illinois' oil and gas wells had a total net production of a little less than 33½ billion cubic feet of natural gas. Of this amount, some 24 billion cubic feet did not leave the producing fields. Most of this gas was used to generate power for pumping oil wells, to provide the heat necessary for the operation of oil and water separators on the producing leases, and reinjection into oil producing formations for pressure maintenance purposes. Our marketable gas production came to a little over 9¼ billion cubic feet, which brought the Illinois producer at the wellhead an average price of 16.8 cents per thousand cubic feet.

In the same year, 1953 the State of Illinois imported from States to the southwest of us, chiefly Texas and Kansas, a total of more than 363 billion cubic feet of natural gas. The pipeline companies importing this gas to our State paid in the fields where they purchased it an average of 7.7 cents per thousand cubic feet at the wellhead—less than half the amount realized by producers of gas in our own State. In other words, we imported for our own use in Illinois during 1953 more than 40 times the volume of gas we produced ourselves, and the importing companies paid the southwestern producers for this gas less than half the amount realized by our own producers in the State of Illinois. These facts clearly evidence that economies enter into the price received at the wellhead, including cost of transportation over long distances to the principal consuming areas.

These figures give some idea of the magnitude of the job that the Illinois gas utilities, and the gas pipeline companies which supply them, are doing to provide the people of our State with a large volume of natural gas. They have been public service companies in the full sense of the word.

We in Illinois early enjoyed the benefits of natural gas delivered by long-distance high-pressure pipelines. The Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America, a subsidiary of the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co of Chicago, in 1931 took advantage of high-pressure transmission pipe (then only recently perfected) to build a long-distance interstate pipeline from the gas-producing area of the Texas Panhandle Here long-term contracts for the supply of gas could be secured Here were enormous undeveloped gas reserves in an area far removed from the populous centers of consumption Panhandle gas was literally all dressed up with no place to go, for until the advent of the high-pressure transmission line, gas could not be transported economically over long distances. The high-pressure pipeline, by compressing gas to a fraction of its volume, made possible unit transportation costs low enough to allow natural gas to become a competitive fuel in the Chicago market

Since the end of the war, the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. has begun supplying gas home heat to 140,000 Chicago households that did not have it previously. The Northern Illinois Natural Gas Co., which serves 236 communities in the area adjoining Chicago, was heating 45,000 homes in 1945; today this number has risen to 176,000. Peoples' has a waiting list of 115,000 homes who want gas heat as soon as it can be supplied to them; Northern Illinois Natural Gas Co. has a like waiting list of 113,000 householders, a total in the Chicago area alone of some 228,000 families who want gas heat. Our Illinois Commerce Commission, the regulatory body charged with overseeing utility rates, estimates that in our State at least 300,000 families, or at our family quotient of 3.7, a number of people in excess of one million, more than the total population of several States, are waiting for gas heat.

Some of our utilities now have organized the Natural Gas Storage Co. of Illinois, to develop a large underground storage reservoir at Herscher, 55 miles south of Chicago. Here gas in excess of demand in summer months is stored in underground cavities. Eventually this Herscher storage project will be capable of storing many hundreds of millions of cubic feet of natural gas during the summer months. In winter, the gas will be withdrawn during the periods of peak demand.

But the problem of chief concern today to our public utility gas companies, and to me as governor of one of the largest gas-consuming States, is the finding of additional reserves of gas as a future supply for the pipelines that are already built—and to make possible the construction of additional pipeline facilities so that Illinois may have natural gas for all who want it. The decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips Case last June, and the subsequent restrictive orders which the Federal Power Commission has issued, have endangered the acquisition of additional gas supplies.

The Natural Gas Pipeline Co. has proposed a 350-mile, large-diameter pipeline, costing $32,000,000 to run from its southern terminus in the Texas Panhandle into Oklahoma, to supplement its present facilities. This company has been conducting negotiations for large-scale additional purchases of new gas reserves. The restrictive regulations promulgated by the F. P. C., under the Phillips decision, has materially hampered, and in some cases terminated negotiations for addi-

tional supplies of natural gas, between the pipeline company and producers.

The Texas-Illinois Natural Gas Pipeline Co., which also transports large quantities of gas into our area, has encountered similar experiences. It has endeavored to obtain large new commitments from producers in these fields, but these commitments have not been forthcoming because of the uncertain position in which the natural gas producer finds himself.

I, for one, cannot find it in my heart to blame the producers with whom they are negotiating. The producers are, under current regulations, being asked to sign long-term contracts in the certain knowledge that the terms and prices fixed in these contracts can be changed or abrogated at will by FPC order, making it impossible for either party to fulfill the contractual obligations agreed upon. Such a situation is not in accord with the principles of law or the fundamentals of common sense.

Mr. James F. Oates, chairman of the Peoples Gas System, which owns a controlling interest in both these pipeline companies, expressed the same point of view several weeks ago in a speech he made in Boston: "The Peoples Gas System is not in conflict with the basic attitude of the producers as to amendment of the Natural Gas Act. Fundamentally, we agree that in the long run the public will be best served by keeping the production phase of the business free of Federal regulation. We believe, as a matter of economic principle, that the production of such natural resources as natural gas, in which great business risk is inherent, should be free of regulation particularly since competition is fully operative." And in its annual report for 1954 the same company said further, "As a large-scale purchaser of natural gas from independent producers, the Peoples Gas System wishes to stand by the prices specified in its agreements now or hereafter in effect. It expects those with whom it bargains to do the same."

The Illinois consumer is already protected against overcharges by the rate-regulating authority of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Far from experiencing a sky rocketing increase in rates, the people of my State have enjoyed practically stable gas rates in a time when the cost of nearly everything else has climbed steeply upwards. These rates were not artificially low prices promulgated by regulatory fiat. Our regulatory commission has an obligation to see that the public utility serving the customer makes its expenses and a reasonable percentage of profit. When rates are too low to provide this amount, the commission is empowered to order an increase. When rates provide a yield in excess of the amount which the public utility company is allowed to make, the commission can and does order a rebate to the utility company's customers.

Our continuing low gas rates have, to my mind, been proof of increased operating efficiencies on the part of the companies concerned. As natural gas consumption mounted, and increased the amounts of gas moving through the pipelines, lowered unit costs resulted. The increasing use of high thermal content natural gas in the facilities of the public utility distributing companies allowed them to supply a greatly enlarged volume of business without appreciable expansion of their mains and other facilities. This kind of increased efficiency, rather than arbitrary rate-making, has been responsible for keeping at a low level the price of gas delivered to Illinois householders. In this regard, the cost of living increased 54 percent from 1945 to the end of 1954. In contrast the averages of typical monthly gas bills for five important Illinois cities have changed as follows: Monthly use 10 therms, a decrease of 12 percent; monthly use 25 therms, a decrease of 12 percent; normal monthly space heating use, an increase of 10 percent.

Since 1938, when the Natural Gas Act was enacted for the purpose of regulating the interstate gas transmission lines, the public utility companies have also been protected against overcharges by the pipeline companies who supply them. The Federal Power Commission, which was appointed as the regulatory body under the Natural Gas Act, allows rate increases in approximately the same manner as the commission which regulates public utility rates in my State. The rates that a pipeline company can charge are based upon its operating expenses plus a return on invested capital.

H. R. 4560, which is currently under consideration by this committee, would amend the Natural Gas Act so as to exclude from Federal jurisdiction the local business of producing, gathering, processing, treating, compressing, and delivering gas in or near the field where produced, and so as to eliminate Federal price fixing of this competitively produced product when sold by the producer in or near the field. While the bill will permit interstate pipelines to expense their gas and the gas of their affiliates at the reasonable market field price, yet the bill assures the consume that the pipeline company will not pay or be allowed to expens more than a reasonable market field price for the gas it purchases or produces. Under the bill a pipeline company cannot afford to pay more than a reasonable market field price for gas it purchases because when rate increases or applications for certificates are considered by the Commission, it must consider whether the price paid under new or renegotiated contracts which form the basis of such increase or certificate application are the reasonable market field price for the gas.

The 300,000 families in my State who want gas for heating, and who do not now have it, are under no illusions that additional Government regulation of the producer will give them the gas they need. Quite the contrary. The additional reserves of gas which we need to assure future supplies to our State and make possible increases in our present supply will not be committed by producers signing pig-in-a-poke contracts whose terms the FPC may instruct the pipeline companies to ignore. Nor, if the producing business is to be regulated as if it were a public utility, do we expect the people now in the business of wildcatting for oil and gas to continue active development—if all they can expect, when successful, is a utility type of return on their investment.

There are few businesses in the United States as highly competitive and as heavily laden with risk as exploring for gas and oil. I cannot see how anyone can contend that exploration for and production of gas has any of the characteristics of a utility-type operation. The recent hearings by the Federal Power Commission, in docket R–142, demonstrated, if nothing else, the complete impossibility of attempting utility-style regulation of producers' prices with anything approaching fairness.

At the Interstate Oil Compact Commission meeting held at Omaha, Nebr., September 9–10, 1954, the commission unanimously adopted a resolution from which I now desire to quote, in part, as follows:

"The exercise by the Federal Power Commission of the authority imposed upon it by the decision of the United States Supreme Court aforesaid and Order 174–A will conflict with, impede, burden, and be detrimental to the enforcement by the States and their agencies of regulations for the conservation of oil and gas and necessarily result in decreased supplies of these essential products and in higher prices to the consumer to the great detriment of the Nation, the public, and the consumer, as well as the producer."

As chairman of the commission, I urge that the remedial legislation under consideration by this committee is in accordance with and will meet the fundamental objectives of the resolution and petition of the compact as set forth in its full resolution and petition.

Further, as Governor of the State of Illinois and representative of one of the largest gas-consuming populations of the Nation, it is my belief that these remedial amendments will result in the future discovery, and availability at reasonable prices, of new large reserves of natural gas for the use, benefit, and convenience of all our people. I believe that, for the reasons I have already outlined, the gas-consuming public of my own and other States is already adequately protected against unreasonably high prices, and will be still further safeguarded by the new protective measures contained in H. R. 4560. I therefore earnestly recommend that your committee report favorably on such resolution.

The Influence of Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD for the edification of Congress an editorial which appeared in the Bakersfield Californian under date of February 19, 1955. The article presents some pertinent facts with respect to foreign trade.

THE INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN TRADE

How deeply the congressional debates on foreign trade and the tariff affect the livelihood and welfare of persons residing in the interior States is well demonstrated in a series of studies conducted by major steamship companies and the results may be considered important to all inland cities as well as those who are located on seacoasts.

The development of a healthy merchant marine by the United States has long been termed a consideration of importance, not only for port cities but for communities whose products are transported to foreign countries on the sealanes. The importance of foreign trade has been found to be widespread.

The studies have so far concerned the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri. The findings have implications that affect nearly every other State in the Nation.

The recent summary published by the committee conducting the surveys includes the following points:

The jobs of both skilled and nonskilled workers depend upon imports and exports by ship.

The prices a farmer gets for his crops are sensitive to international trade volumes.

The sales revenue of an industrialist is directly reflected in overseas business, since raw material supplies and prices are affected by imports aboard oceangoing vessels.

The extent of shipping's role in agriculture was best demonstrated by the fact that 40 million acres, or 62,500 square miles of farmland, were required to grow American farm produce exported by ship in 1953.

In the study that concerned itself with the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, and Mis-

souri, the results showed that American merchant ships enabled corn to become the leading export crop for this area, with an annual revenue to farmers from this crop set at $50 million, and every fourth worker in the tractor manufacturing plants in these 3 States owed his job to foreign trade, with $215 million worth of farm machinery being shipped overseas from this area in 1952.

That the trade is two way in its benefits is shown in the instance of Brazil, which shipped $670 million worth of coffee to the United States and spent $35 million for the goods produced in the 3 States covered by the survey. Similar benefits are felt in other areas as well.

California, with its huge cotton crop forming the chief export commodity, has a clear stake in the development of a healthy foreign trade, especially since manufacturing and other industries have taken root in this State.

A strong merchant marine would serve the Nation well both in peace and in war and this should be considered a prime project, now that other countries are busy increasing their activity in this field.

Atom Merchant Ship Should Be Carefully Considered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Worth a Second Thought," which appeared in the May 8, 1955, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

WORTH A SECOND THOUGHT

We are glad that Congress is examining with a critical eye President Eisenhower's plan for an atomic-powered "peace ship." Representative STERLING COLE, New York Republican, thinks the ship would cost too much for a publicity stunt and do little to promote peaceful uses of atomic energy. Representative MELVIN PRICE, of East St. Louis, Democrat, doubts the practicality of the idea.

Both Congressmen, of course, give the President full credit for the best of motives. But it is well to examine such proposals with care. Sometimes what seems at first glance to be a promising stroke in public relations turns out to be quite otherwise.

A merchant ship run by a nuclear reactor would indeed be a dramatic demonstration of atomic energy harnessed to peaceful uses. But as the ship sailed its smokeless course from port to port one conspicuous thing about it would be the American flag flying from the stern.

Naturally, that would not bother Americans. The question is how it would affect the people in foreign lands whom the ship was intended to impress. There is just a chance that they would resent, rather than admire, such a forceful reminder of American wealth, power, and technology. They might put the peace ship in the category of tasteless boasts about our advanced plumbing, high-powered cars and other evidences of a standard of living which other nations have not yet attained.

In these matters there can be no absolute certainty. But before Congress votes $30 million to build the peace ship and $500,000 a year to run it, perhaps some representative foreigners should quietly be asked what they think of the idea as a way of winning friends.

An Analysis of the New Trends in the Russian Propaganda Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I had the privilege to appear on TV station WXEL, Cleveland, on the program, Tell Your Congressman. On this occasion I had as my guest, Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, a longtime student of communism who has served in numerous official capacities here in Washington. Because of the warm response I have had from the people of Cleveland to this program, under unanimous consent, I include the full transcript of that program in the RECORD:

Mr. FEIGHAN. The big news in Washington this week had to do with the question of peace or war—something which is, of course, of keen interest to all Americans.

President Eisenhower sent a message to Congress including recommendations relative to a mutual security program. At the same time, we here in Washington watched with keen interest the Bandung Conference. Then there was the proposal made by Chou En-lai, the Russian stooge in Red China, suggesting the possibility of a peaceful settlement in the Far East. These events were topped by the Russian maneuver on the Austrian peace treaty leading to their independence. Because these were the big events in Washington this week, I have invited a well known and recognized authority on international affairs to be with me today. I would like to introduce Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the United States Government.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, it is a pleasure for me to appear on this program with you. I have followed your work and your keen analysis on these vital problems which affect the security of the American people. You have my congratulations for the principled and courageous stand you have always taken on the fundamental issues.

As you have stated, President Eisenhower has recommended $3½ billion for the mutual-security program in next fiscal year. How do you feel about this proposal?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Well, I think I should point out that of the total amount recommended by the President, $1¾ billion go for military assistance, and the balance for economic development and technical assistance to the free nations of the world—particularly for those nations which recently acquired their national independence in south and southeast Asia.

Dr. O'CONNOR. What do you feel is the best way to evaluate the need for such a program?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Events of the past week indicate the need for a practical and well-administered mutual-security program. For example, the conference of Asian and African nations held at Bandung, Indonesia, last week, very clearly pointed out that the Chinese Reds are bent on bringing all Asia and Africa under Russian slavery. Chou En-lai, a notorious Moscow stooge, tried desperately to turn all the nations of Asia and Africa against us and to brand us as aggressors because we had the moral courage to stand up for the human rights of the Koreans, the free Chinese located on Formosa, as well as the people and nations of Asia.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Mr. FEIGHAN, I followed very closely your analysis of the issues involved in the Bandung conference long before it opened, as well as your evaluation of the conference before it ended. In particular, I feel that your estimate made public a week ago Thursday, to the effect that the newly independent nations of south Asia would not be taken in by the clever propaganda of the Communists, stands as a real tribute to your study and practical knowledge of the methods, tactics, and objectives of the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I appreciate your saying that because I feel that unless we carefully study the enemy, we will never be able to work out plans or programs calculated to bring about his defeat and at the same time prevent war, if possible. Months ago, in a discussion on the subject of communism and its techniques and objectives, I stated that unless we undertake a positive and determined stand against Communist aggression, World War 3 would certainly result. Altogether too many people then took the position that if we stood up for what was right we would offend the Russians and they would consequently start a war. Fortunately, very few today take that point of view and more and more Americans are demanding that we undertake a positive political action program against hte criminal conspiracy of communism.

Dr. O'CONNOR. I presume, Congressman, that you also have reference to the so-called experts who claim that there are only two courses open to the free world—either we accept peaceful coexistence with the Communists or engage in preventive war.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; I do. I oppose both peaceful coexistence and preventive war because as I have so often said neither one serves the interests of the American people. Peaceful coexistence is an old-fashioned Russian bear trap, which is only another phrase for surrender. The phrase "preventive war," in my opinion, was cooked up in the Kremlin in order to prevent red-blooded Americans from standing up for what is right and defending our interests when occasion demands.

Dr. O'CONNOR. You and I would certainly agree that the Communists are just as clever as they are evil. For example, the maneuver of Chou En-lai, over the past weekend in which he expressed a desire to negotiate with the United States in order to prevent war in Asia. That is a maneuver we had better take a couple of good looks at before we begin to move.

Mr. FEIGHAN. To understand the proposal made by Chou En-lai to negotiate with us we first have to remember that his timetable for the conquest of all of Asia and Africa was upset at the Bandung Conference. At that conference the intelligent leaders of the newly independent nations of Asia identified communism as a new type of Russian colonialism, more despotic and tyrannical than any experienced by the people of Asia in the past. These enlightened leaders served notice on Moscow and all others who are attempting to engage in any form of imperialism or colonialism that they are prepared to fight for the sovereign rights of their nations. This display of enlightened statesmanship forced Chou En-lai to make what appeared to be a sensational proposal in order to get his name in the headlines. This is what caused him to propose that the United States and Communist China could settle their differences by peaceful negotiation.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, do you feel that in connection with the so-called proposal by Chou En-lai that some people in Washington spoke out too soon as to whether we should or should not sit down at a conference with Communist China?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I most certainly do. I feel some people here in Washington spoke out before they knew the real contents of the Communists' proposal. To put it bluntly, I think they grabbed the Communist bait, which, of course, was dressed up in pretty ribbons, before they took a real look at the bait itself. It is now obvious that the proposal made by Chou En-lai is in no way

different from that which he has been demanding for a very long time. He now offers, as he has in the past, to sit down with us providing the free Chinese are excluded and at this conference we are to hand over to him the still free Chinese, so that he in turn can put them in Russian slave chains. We must avoid the well-laid Communist trap of surrender by cease-fire. We must never forget that when we entered into what we thought was a cease-fire in Korea, we opened the door to an all-out Communist war in Indochina.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Mr. FEIGHAN, I agree with you that Chou En-lai pulled a very clever stunt at Bandung, but it seems to me that our experience over the years should have taught our leaders to have all the facts at hand before giving a reaction to any proposal made by the Communists. I don't see how it would be possible for us from both the moral and legal point of view to attend any conference with Red China unless the free Chinese are sitting as coequals at the conference table.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; we have made a treaty with free China, which has been ratified by the Senate, and should we sit down with the Russian stooge, Chou En-lai, we will, for all practical purposes, be abrogating that treaty. Also, I couldn't imagine us sitting down at a conference table at which we were going to give away some of the territory of the British or French or Italians without their representatives present. It is preposterous for anyone to propose that the United States give away the territory that belongs to another nation and that is exactly what Chou En-lai is proposing in his latest propaganda statement. To engage in such a conference has the effect of granting de facto recognition and therefore opening the door wide for admission of Red China into the councils of the U. N. I remain convinced that the American people oppose such foolhardy action.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Mr. FEIGHAN, all of us are very much concerned with the latest Communist maneuver on the peace treaty with Austria. Only last week, Chancellor Rabb was summoned to Moscow by the Kremlin leaders to discuss outstanding differences leading to such a treaty. How do you look upon this latest development?

Mr. FEIGHAN. In order to understand the Russian maneuver on the Austrian peace treaty, we have to recall to mind that for the past 9 years the United States has desperately sought to bring about the independence of Austria. The Russians have done everything imaginable in order to obstruct and to make impossible a real and decent treaty of peace with Austria. As you well know, we have had over 100 conferences with the Russians on this subject, none of which bore any fruit which is a good indication of Russian intentions with respect to Austria.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Yes, that's true, but do you think there are some special reasons why the Russians suddenly make what appears to be generous overtures to the Austrians and attempt to propagandize the whole world about their desire to give Austria its independence?

Mr. FEIGHAN. To me it is clear that the latest Russian propaganda maneuver on Austria is calculated to prevent the rearmament of Germany, to prevent the admission of a free Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and finally the destruction of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which we have labored so hard to create as our common defense against the red aggressor. The Russians know that a Germany able to defend itself, a Germany granted its sovereignty and admitted into the great alliance of peace and freedom of the West, will immeasurably strengthen our chances for peace. What the Russians are trying to do by using Austria as a guinea pig, is to convince the German people that they can be free and united only if they will plead their cause in Moscow.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, in light of your practical analysis of this Russian maneuver, do you think that the Western leaders should sit down with the Russians on such a treaty when we know in fact that it is no treaty at all, but merely a propaganda weapon?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I believe that before we sit down either with our Allies or with the Russians, either the President or Secretary of State should, in a public statement, make it clear to the whole world just who has been seeking a treaty of peace and independence for Austria during these past 9 years. The record of events pertaining to the efforts of the United States should be brought out in the public light as well as the Russian obstructionism and Russian thievery of the natural resources of Austria. We should also warn in advance our Allies and our enemy that we will not be a party to any so-called treaty of peace which requires the Austrians to deny the principle of political and religious asylum which is so basic to our civilization.

Dr. O'CONNOR. Congressman, there has been a great deal of talk here in Washington about a clause in the Russian version of the treaty which in effect, would require the Austrians to turn back to the Russians all those freedom-loving people who have managed to escape into Austria from behind the Iron Curtain. I can't help but recall that we got burned very badly before in a deal very much like this, entered into at Yalta, which brought about the forced repatriation of approximately 4 million people to the slavery of communism.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is the very thing we have got to avoid in the future. We will never find the key to peace and freedom unless we get across to all the people enslaved by communism that we in the West will never be a party to turning back those heroic souls who escape from Russian communism. As a special warning to the administration, I would like to point out that if we ever enter into a treaty which requires the Austrians in any way to deny the right of political and religious asylum, the Russians will have scored their greates propaganda victory since World War II. By this maneuver they will be able to convince all the resistance forces behind the Iron Curtain that their cause is hopeless and that the United States is a party to tyranny.

Dr. O'CONNOR. It seems to me that you have presented in our discussion the most convincing arguments I have yet heard on the need for programs and policies which best defend and advance the interest and security of the American people. I can well understand why so many people here at home as well as in other parts of the world have such great admiration for the foresight and leadership you have demonstrated for the cause of human freedom and individual liberty.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Ladies and gentlemen: The issues which we in Washington must resolve in order to preserve our American way of life and to keep the spark of liberty and freedom alive elsewhere in the world require all of us to work together. Thank you, Dr. O'Connor, for appearing with me on this program.

Who Reduced Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 17, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook recently published an interesting editorial on tax cuts and tax increases.

The editorial, which reveals the Democratic Party as the tax-increase party and the Republicans as the only party from which real tax reductions can be expected, follows:

ADLAI, HARRY MUFFED THIS

Some things Messrs. Truman and Stevenson didn't tell the public in their recent addresses, especially about taxes which affect every American's pocketbook:

During the 41-year history of the income-tax laws there have been 13 increases under Democratic administrations, and only 2 under the Republicans.

Of the 10 tax reductions, 9 were made by Republicans and only 1 by the Democrats.

When the Democrats took over in 1933 the exemption for a married couple was $2,500. These exemptions were steadily cut down by Democratic administrations until 1948, to an all-time low of $500 for an individual, $1,000 for a couple.

The Republican 80th Congress increased these exemptions to $600 and $1,200, and had to pass it over a Truman veto to do so. But they balanced the budget then, though only for a short time, and could relieve income-tax payers without adding to inflation.

The Republicans raised the exemption for people over 65 from $500 to $1,200, taking more than 1,400,000 persons off the tax rolls entirely.

During 24 of the 26 years the Democrats had control of Congress they failed to live within their income. In the last 20 years they were in power the Democrats raised the income tax of the lowest income groups from 4 percent to 22 percent.

Messrs. Truman and Stevenson didn't mention these facts, but the people should know and remember them.

The Political Tricksters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper, Labor's Daily, in its issue of February 26, 1955, carried a worthwhile editorial entitled "The Political Tricksters," dealing with income-tax relief. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it in the RECORD as an enlightening treatise on the tax cut controversy:

THE POLITICAL TRICKSTERS

(By Wallace Shelton)

The toughest blow Mr. Eisenhower's one-party press has taken in many a day is the rude shock of the Democratic move to cut every person's income tax by $20 a year. And, one and all, they are echoing the President's charge of "fiscal irresponsibility." The Democrats, they say, are engineering political trickery.

Let's examine this trickery and irresponsibility claim again.

The GOP won the 1952 election by promising, in deluges of speeches and last-minute recorded radio and TV transcriptions, to balance the budget with heavily slashed taxes. Mr. Eisenhower hasn't balanced the budget yet, and he won't balance it during any year of his 4, with or without further tax reductions.

The Republicans last year went about campaigning with a claim they had cut taxes

more than $7 billion in their first 2 years in office—"the biggest tax cut in history."

Well, it was the "biggest tax cut in history," for the simple reason that taxes had never previously been at a level from which reductions would produce such relief. But the GOP made these tax cuts, and the President signed the bills, with his eyes wide open to the red ink on the Federal ledgers.

Democrats lack courage, suggested the President himself, because they decided to try to put through their relief for the little fellow by attaching the proposal as an amendment to other revenue measures Mr. Eisenhower favors.

House Republicans called this amendment proposal a blackjack, and implied that it was an unworthy device. Yet GOP Congressmen themselves last year forced the President to swallow amendments he opposed in order to get an extension of some excise levies.

It is a common, familiar device in American politics, arising from the inevitable occasional conflicts between Executive wishes and legislative desires, for Congress to protect itself by combining two proposals—one which the White House wants, another which Congress wants.

There is nothing indecent or improper about this device. It is simply a practical manifestation of compromise—one of the few genuine essentials of our form of Government—by which Congress makes it harder, rather than easier, for the President to kill something he dislikes by a veto.

But the White House always possesses the ultimate power of veto, and any time a President feels strongly enough about a so-called bad section of a bill, he can veto the whole thing and demand repassage without the offending elements. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman used this power on several occasions, and made the fights that were necessary to rally public opinion to their support.

The use of the power, however, requires courage, and a comprehension of how to compete for public support. The White House can decide for itself whether the President wishes to fight the proposed tax cut to this extent—granting it ever reaches the point of a veto. The congressional device, in any event, is wholly proper.

What is eating the Republicans is that they desperately wanted to advance a tax cut themselves next year, an election year, and had Mr. Eisenhower's half promise of backing. Their complaint is that they are being denied a chance to play their own brand of politics, but they express it by shouting "trickery" and "irresponsibility."

Tax Deductions for Care of Mentally and Physically Handicapped Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide tax deductions for expenses incurred in the care of mentally and physically handicapped dependents. This would amend the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which limit these deductions to a woman or a widower or to a husband who is legally separated from his wife.

Under the present regulation, a man either has to be divorced or legally separated from a mentally or physically disabled wife or else a widower in order to qualify for deductions for expenses incurred in the care of his children. I cannot believe that it was the intent of Congress to discriminate in favor of either death or divorce. A taxpayer having dependents who are mentally or physically incapable of caring for themselves often find it impossible to provide this care personally and maintain his or her employment at the same time. In such a situation, it seems to me that a taxpayer is entitled to relief. By amending section 214 (C) of the Internal Revenue Code, my bill provides this relief not only to women, widowers, and divorcees, but also to those who have maintained their matrimonial ties.

Everyone Is Hard Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with prosperity—if determined by dollars in hand—not just around the corner—not sitting on the doorstep—but inside, right at the elbow, practically everyone is having money trouble. It will increase when money becomes tight.

INDIVIDUALS' TROUBLES

An industrial executive had a yearly salary of $75,000; an annual income of an equal amount from dividends. He did not drink, gamble, entertain socially, nor spend his money foolishly. He had a good but modest home in a comparatively small city. He had a summer place in the West; tried to get a month's annual vacation.

However, the demands made upon him for contributions for charitable and other purposes, and which he felt he could not resist, kept him in a financially tight situation where he had to take a look at his checking account before deciding upon any sizable expenditure. His salary and dividends came from a business which he had created, which gave employment to upward of 3,000 people at above the average wage scale. He was as hard pressed for current funds as the lowest paid employee.

Another acquaintance, a professional man in a small community, makes between 30 and 40 thousand a year and though his tastes are moderate, is always hard up when income tax day rolls around.

Then, I know many conservative, would-be industrious citizens who, because they are past 45, find it difficult to get a job. Others, older—notwithstanding social security or other Government payments, find it extremely difficult to get their hands on funds enough to enable them to live comfortably, even though they have no expensive habits. They suffer more than any other group.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Federal Government, which collects billions of dollars from the taxpayers—it has no other source of revenue—makes no serious effort to live within its income.

The Government on just one item alone—storage of farm surpluses—each day adds $1 million to its national debt—the annual interest charge on which is now upwards of $6.4 billion—but there is still no solution of the farm problem. Farm prices, notwithstanding rigid support, continue to drop.

Municipalities, as well as individuals, seem to have accepted literally the biblical statement "Ask and ye shall receive"—forgotten that the Federal Government, which sometimes collects $2.19 for each dollar it passes out, does not have creative power—forgotten that "The Lord helps those who help themselves."

THE ANSWER?—IT IS OBVIOUS

Our creative and productive ability has increased far beyond our dreams, but we follow the methods of the Prodigal Son; waste our priceless inheritance. Spend beyond our needs—for things desirable but not strictly necessary. Buying but not paying—postponing to future generations whose welfare we seem to have forgotten the day of reckoning.

Unpleasant as it may be, consideration for those we bring into the world demands that as individuals, as government, we limit our spending to the purchase of necessities—to what we earn or have ability to repay—in the near future.

Unless we do, some of us may live to regret it. Certainly those who come after will have cause to condemn us.

Bank Holding Company Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the House Banking and Currency Committee's consideration of H. R. 2674, to regulate bank holding companies, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following two telegrams I have received urging support of this legislation:

MAY 6, 1955.

Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Members of Independent Shoemen, Inc., an organization representing independents in all segments of the shoe industry believe favorable action on H. R. 2674 extremely important not alone to banking business but to all of us who cherish individual freedom. Urge your active support on this much-needed legislation.

SAM SULLIVAN,
President, Independent Shoemen.

MAY 6, 1955.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of 23,000 retail hardware merchant members located in communities throughout the country, we urge your sup-

port of H. R. 2674. Local bankers know local conditions and render service needed by local merchants. Holding companies of banking interests invading local business fields should be governed by same rules applying to these local banks.

RUSSELL R. MUELLER,
Managing Director, National Retail Hardware Association.

More Important Than Cuts Is Ending Tax Inequalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a fine editorial which appeared in the Fresno (Calif.) Bee on February 23, 1955, entitled "More Important Than Cuts Is Ending Tax Inequalities":

MORE IMPORTANT THAN CUTS IS ENDING TAX INEQUALITIES

Congress is going to be the scene of some feuding during this and no doubt several succeeding weeks over the Democratic-sponsored move to put through a $20-income-tax reduction for every taxpayer and each of his dependents.

The Republicans are shouting "irresponsible" and "politics" in describing the Democratic maneuver and in a limited sense of the words they are correct on both counts.

With the administration's budget already $2.4 billion out of balance, this seems an inappropriate time to discuss tax cuts. And insofar as the proposed income-tax reduction is concerned, to suppose there is not politics involved is to play blind to realities.

Yet it is no deep secret the Republicans were looking forward to making tax cuts in 1956, a national election year, and the Democrats merely beat them to the punch. In that respect it is a case of the pot calling the kettle black.

To the criticism by the GOP Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the House Democratic leader, retorted that whenever "anything is done for the average person the Republicans oppose it and cry politics."

Attempts to draw a line between the Democratic and Republican Parties do not hold up completely.

The scandalous 27 percent depletion allowance principally for the benefit of the oil millionaires is kept alive largely by the votes of the Democratic Congressmen and Senators from Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma.

More important than cutting taxes is to correct tax inequities.

The Democratic leaders may claim that is what they are trying to do by the proposed income-tax reduction. But the overall situation is not going to be improved if cuts are made here and there at the cost of a bigger Federal deficit which everyone ultimately will have to make up.

Nor can relief be given to the average taxpayer if the corporation taxes are going to be increased to make up the difference so the housewife will be paying more taxes in the bread she buys at the grocery store, in her utility bills or on the appliances for her kitchen.

Government tax structures at all levels, from Federal to local, have grown haphazard and the permanent solution does not rest with equally haphazard or rule-of-thumb cuts and raises. Correcting one set of inequities can lead to worse ones. A need transcending party lines is that for a courageous and comprehensive overhauling of the whole tax setup.

Hon. James M. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following editorial contained in the issue of the national weekly newspaper, Labor, dated Saturday, May 14, 1955. It refers to our good friend, a distinguished former Member of this House of Representatives and a distinguished former Senator from the State of New York, the Honorable James M. Mead. It reads as follows:

IKE OUSTING ANOTHER FRIEND OF PEOPLE

When voting for a President, it's important to remember that, by his power of appointment, he can enforce or nullify laws passed by Congress to protect the people. He can make those laws serve either the public interest or greedy special interests. No law is any better than the men who administer it. They are picked by the President, and they hold office even after he leaves the White House.

That is strikingly illustrated by what is going on now. As Labor has reported, President Eisenhower has packed the Government regulatory agencies with reactionaries who are undoing great historic reforms. They are giving to the power trust, natural-gas trust, oil trust, and other big business, and Wall Street interests just about everything they have long wanted but couldn't get before. Few regulators are left to protect the public interest, and they are being ousted as fast as possible.

This week, for example, it was announced that Eisenhower will not reappoint Federal Trade Commissioner James M. Mead when his term expires next September. The man picked to replace Mead is William C. Kern. Back of that is this story:

The FTC was created as one of the great reforms of President Woodrow Wilson's time. It is Uncle Sam's business policeman. Its job is to protect both consumers and honest businessmen against business crooks, to enforce some of the laws against monopoly and price fixing, and to keep big business from destroying small businessmen by unfair methods.

The Commission has five members. No more than 3 can be of 1 political party. Three are now Republicans and the other two Democrats. One of the later is "Big Jim" Mead.

He began life as a waterboy on the Lackawanna, worked at other railroad jobs, and still carries his card in the switchmen's union. He became a Democratic Congressman and Senator from New York, was chairman of the FTC under Truman and since then has been a member. Always he stood up for the people and the public interest, and thus incurred the enmity of powerful special interests.

In particular, Mead has proved himself a stanch friend of little and independent businessmen, both as a member of House and Senate small business committees, and on the FTC. That's not the kind of man the present big business administration wants on that or any other commission.

Ike could not replace Mead with a Republican, because the law says "No." Kern wears the Democratic label. Who is he? Why was he picked? Which side will he take as a member of the FTC?

Since 1941, Kern has been an FTC lawyer. About a year ago, he was selected for promotion by the Commission's Chairman, Edward F. Howrey, a Republican corporation lawyer appointed by Eisenhower and applauded by big business interests.

To promote Kern, Howrey demoted Everette MacIntyre, a top FTC lawyer with a long and devoted record of enforcing the antitrust laws for the protection of consumers and small business.

Kern will be an FTC member for 7 years, regardless of who is elected President next year. It seems sure he will follow the policies set by the man who made him, Chairman Howrey.

Experienced Washington observers were struck by the extraordinary fact that, although Mead's term does not expire until September, selection of Kern to replace him was announced way ahead of time, in May, and Howrey apparently began preparing Kern for that spot about a year before it would be available. The administration knew "Big Jim" was not its kind of man, and lost no time in greasing the skids for him.

One of the next regulators to go is Paul R. Rowen, member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He was the only member who dared to vote against approving the financial setup of the scandalous Dixon-Yates deal. Rowen did so on the ground that the deal violates the Utility Holding Company Act, which the SEC is sworn to enforce.

Another slated to be ousted soon is Thomas E. Murray, the only Atomic Energy Commission member who disapproved the Dixon-Yates deal.

Still another is Frieda B. Hennock, the only Federal Communications Commission member who has championed the public interest and small independent radio and television stations against the "giant chains" which seek more and more control of the people's air waves.

And so it goes. Few friends of the people are left in top posts of the regulatory commissions and other Government agencies, and those few are disappearing fast. Think about that, next time you vote for a President.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address Before Cleveland World Trade Association by Director of Export-Import Bank of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Vance Brand, Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, before the Cleveland World Trade Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on April 22, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VANCE BRAND, DIRECTOR, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE CLEVELAND WORLD TRADE ASSOCIATION AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, APRIL 22, 1955

When I spoke at a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland World Trade Association over a year ago, little did I dream that one day I would return as a member of the official family. Nor did I have the slightest anticipation that the first official address I might make would be in the home city of our great Secretary of the Treasury. Cleveland has a right to be justly proud of Secretary Humphrey. He not only has made an indelible mark upon the pages of history but he continues to make a bigger mark every day. Other than our fine President, no man receives higher acclaim than George M. Humphrey in Washington.

Your invitation is very much appreciated by me. As a fellow Ohioan, I am glad to come home to make my first report.

Some of you good friends will recall that when I spoke to you as a member of the Capehart Advisory Committee to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I had before me the biggest crystal ball I could find. Remember I looked into it and predicted that Congress would provide the means for the intensification and expansion of the program of the Export-Import Bank and the results would be very beneficial for our export trade. I told you you could count on some meat and potatoes and not just dressing.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee under the able leadership of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana, made an exhaustive study of the bank's history and of the present world trade conditions. As a part of this study, Senator CAPEHART, accompanied by Senator BRICKER, Senator FREER, Congressman SPENCE, and officials from the Export-Import Bank, spent 52 days in Latin America. During this time they had 163 meetings with the businessmen and officials in the respective countries. It was my privilege to accompany Senator CAPEHART on this trip.

Substantial expansion of the bank's financing of American exports was the congressional mandate. This mandate is expressed in Public Law 570 passed by the 2d session of the 83d Congress in August 1954, as well as in the reports of the Committees of Banking and Currency of both Houses.

This act constitutes an unmistakable congressional determination that American producers are in need of and are to be afforded credit facilities by the Export-Import Bank sufficient to enable them to compete in the present highly competitive world market. The intent of Congress is clearly expressed in one phrase, to be found in the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency:

"The bank should sympathetically consider kinds and types of proper loan applications irrespective of the term which would aid and facilitate in the exports of the United States, maintain our industrial potential, and provide continuing employment in our country."

The expansion and financing of United States exports decreed by the Congress is taking place, as the following data from the records of the bank will disclose.

During the 6 months period immediately preceding the enactment of the new legislation the bank extended credits of approximately $77 million. Between July 1 and December 31, 1954, the bank had extended credits of more than $290 million. During the first 2½ months of 1955 the credits totaled $184 million. Thus you see the total for the first 8½ months of this fiscal year is almost a half billion dollars.

The horizon of the bank is not limited to assisting the financing of exports, thereby facilitating the foreign trade of the United States, but we have learned, as all of you have, that this function is more likely to result in continuing good commercial relations and the further expansion of foreign trade if the exports financed are the type that will produce wealth for the importing country, increase employment and generally improve the standard of living in the foreign country.

I can well remember that as a boy my horizon was limited to Champaign County here in Ohio; then it stretched to Columbus and it was an important day when it included Cleveland to watch Tris Speaker play baseball. As time went on, Washington and New York were included, then Europe and Latin America.

I learned as a boy of 9 that people had to have money or credit to buy the papers I sold and that if I gave credit for one of my papers to a fellow who was already overly extended on the installment plan, I generally did not get paid. As a lawyer, banker, and farmer, I learned in later business life in my own community that my own prosperity was in direct ratio to the prosperity of others with whom I transacted business. As the people with whom I dealt prospered and expanded their operations, I, too, prospered and expanded my operations.

I watched the automobile, the paved street, electricity, and many other luxuries of my boyhood days become the necessities of today. I do not recall a single instance of having seen a salesman try to sell electric appliances in Champaign County prior to the time we had adequate power facilities and distribution of electricity in the county. I saw farmers buy tractors long before they had fine automobiles, a radio, television, and many more of the things we find so necessary in our homes today.

The point is that as a boy and a young man in business I found that we first procured productive goods. We still do. But we now have become so successful in the production of goods and in the handling of our general economy that we can afford to buy almost anything we want. But remember in this country there is always adequate financing for productive and all other goods and there is no question about it.

Thus as my own horizon expanded the fundamental principles remained the same.

Is it surprising to you that the Export-Import Bank follows the same policies? In general, the loans of the Export-Import Bank have been to finance the importation from the United States of materials, equipment, and services required for the establishment or expansion of productive enterprises that will add to the national income of the importing country, increase the standard of living of its people, improve its economy, and expand its production and buying power.

This is borne out by the following examples of exports to Latin America that have been financed by the Export-Import Bank:

Construction machinery and American engineers and contractors' services for the construction or improvement of highways, railways, harbors, and airports that are important to the transportation and introduction into commerce of the country's agricultural, mineral, and fabricated products.

Electric power generating machinery, and related services for the construction and installation of hydroelectric, thermoelectric and diesel powered plans.

Machinery, equipment, and related services for the construction or expansion of steel mills, textile and yarn mills, cement plants, fertilizer plants, chemical plants, sugar mills, and telecommunications systems.

Therefore, the bank has given preference to the financing of those projects and the exports of those products which will assist in the development of the foreign country and will enable it to earn or, in some instances, to save dollars to the mutual advantage of trade between the two countries. There must always be a direct relation between the volume we buy and the amount we can sell. This does not mean that the project or the product must of itself directly produce or save the dollars required to pay for it. It is sufficient that the incorporation of the product in the economy of the other country should contribute to the development of the other country ultimately, even though indirectly, to the improvement of the foreign exchange position of the country.

Such an approach does not admit of hard and fast rules which determine that certain items are always eligible and others never eligible to be financed. The extent, however, to which assistance can be given in the financing of the sale of products which do not make a direct contribution to the dollar position of the importing country or are not of a productive character must be determined on the basis of the facts existing in the country of the prospective buyer at the time of the request. During periods of acute dollar shortage in a particular country, it may be necessary to limit assistance of public funds to the export of those items which will make a direct and early contribution to the country's dollar exchange position.

Our problems, and those of many countries which are our competitors, are vastly different. Great Britain must sell enough abroad to earn foreign exchange with which to purchase food, raw materials, and other products. To the extent the British can promote the sale of consumer goods on relatively short terms, they will more quickly acquire the currency of the countries that can sell them food. The problem of Great Britain is to sell enough abroad so that it may increase its purchases abroad. Our problem is to assist the importing countries to earn the dollars they must have if they are to buy more of our exports.

It is for these reasons that the management of the bank has always questioned the advisability of establishing in the United States a system of export credit insurance which would provide general export financing without adequate regard to the type of goods sold in a particular market.

Where a medium of long-term credit is required, the Export-Import Bank extends assistance at least equal to that offered by any other government under export credit insurance or other plans. We do not, however, offer short-term credit of 30, 60, 90, or up to 180 days. Such credit is available through normal commercial channels. I do not know of a bank with an active foreign department that will not extend such credit in appropriate cases.

The bank is prepared to assist in the field of medium and long-term credit defined generally as credit of 1 year or more. The terms for which credit is to be extended must be appropriate to the type of equipment to be sold. Accordingly, the assistance of the bank is generally extended only in connection with the export of capital equipment as distinguished from so-called consumer-type goods and appliances.

As I stated previously, the position and problems of the United States in foreign trade require that the bank give preference to the financing of that type of capital goods which will improve the exchange position of the importing country and thus serve the interests of all United States exporters. It is important to note that there are limited areas of the world into which practically all types of capital goods may be financed without special concern for the ability of such areas to repay in dollars. There are from time to time other areas into which we must limit the extension of credit only to the sale of equipment that will make a direct contribution to the dollar exchange position of the importing country. Between these two extreme situations are countries into which capital equipment of a productive character such as that required for transportation, power, communications, construction, agriculture, and industrial development may usually be financed in reasonable amount to the mutual advantage of the United States and the importing country.

Loans of the bank are of many types, but for the purposes of this discussion they may be broadly grouped into two classes: First, there are those made by the bank upon application of the United States exporter for assistance in financing a particular sale abroad. Such loans have generally been referred to as exporter credits. These I will presently discuss in some detail.

In addition, loans are made upon the application of the foreign buyer, which may be a private entity or another government. Without exception, however, all loans of the bank have served the interests of our foreign trade and have been designed to assist in creating sound and expanding markets of mutual advantage to the United States and our customers abroad.

There has been some misunderstanding about these loans authorized in favor of the foreign buyer or the foreign government. We hear it said that the Export-Import Bank should finance United States exports but should not finance these government-to-government or, as they are generally called, economic development loans. With only minor exceptions, such loans may be used only to purchase in the United States the machinery, equipment, materials, and services required to carry out abroad a project of sound economic value.

The bank, in its operations covering over 20 years, has experienced varied and rapidly changing conditions. It started its operations in a sellers' market, continued through a worldwide depression, a World War, a period of large-scale reconstruction and development, which consisted of a buyers' market, and finally back into the realm of a sellers' market.

From 1934 until the beginning of the war in 1939, the great majority of the loans of the bank were made at the request of the United States exporter and for the purpose of enabling him to meet competition from abroad. During this period, a relatively small number of loans were extended directly to the foreign purchasers.

With the advent of war in Europe, the United States exporter entered upon a new and, for him, unprecedented era. He had practically no competition and the demand for civilian goods far exceeded the supply. During this period it was not the exporter but the foreign buyer who sought credits from the bank to finance the purchase of United States goods and products. Credits were extended to governments and private entities to assist in financing capital equipment for development programs which would stimulate the production of strategic materials and otherwise aid in the common defense of the war effort.

At the present time, a civilian production has been resumed throughout the world and the United States exporter is again, and for the first time since 1939, faced with active and effective competition in world markets. We have moved again from the sellers' to a buyers' market. In the meantime, the productive capacity of our industry has been greatly expanded so that we are dependent more than in former times upon the retention and expansion of our foreign markets. It is the United States exporter that is again seeking the assistance of the Export-Import Bank.

I have mentioned that loans of the bank may be broadly grouped into two classes: (1) Those considered on application of the United States exporter and known as exporter credits, and (2) those considered on application of the foreign buyer.

The case-by-case or individual transactions—generally referred to as "exporter credits" have proved hlepful for many years and continue to constitute the most active field of the bank's operations. Each prospective sale has been the subject of individual application by the exporter to be approved or disapproved on an ad hoc basis. After consideration of all risks of both a commercial and political nature, the bank in appropriate cases has agreed to purchase from the exporter, or guarantee a portion of the drafts, promissory notes or other obligations of the foreign consumers.

Sales eligible to be financed should provide for payment in cash of at least 20 percent of the invoice value prior to the delivery of the equipment. Of the remainder, or financed portion, the exporter is expected to carry at least one-fourth of the financed portion or 20 percent of the invoice value, with or without the assistance of his commercial bank. The Export-Imports Bank will purchase or guarantee the remaining 75 percent of the obligation or up to 60 percent of the contract price of the equipment, without recourse to the exporter. The obligations or part thereof retained by the exporter should have the same maturities as those purchased or guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank.

The bank always prefers to guarantee the obligations for purchase by a commercial bank or other financial institution selected by the exporter instead of making the purchase with public funds. This procedure is not only convenient for all parties but also continues customary commercial relations between the exporter and his bank.

In addition, however, the bank has recently undertaken to establish lines of credit in favor of individual exporters to assist in financing the sale of productive capital goods. Before adoption, this method of assistance was subject to careful study and discussion between the bank and representatives of numerous trade and financial groups.

The amount of the line of credit is based upon the record of the individual exporter's past operations. The line will not be expected to finance more than a portion of the business of the exporter. Existence of such a line, however, enables him to know the extent of financing he may expect from the bank over a given period and thus enable him to plan the extension, where necessary, of credit terms to foreign dealers or customers. Moreover, a line of credit from the bank can be arranged and used effectively to supplement and complement the exporter's own resources and other public credit available to him.

After approval of a line of credit in his favor, the exporter will make application on a case-by-case basis for assistance under the line on sales in any friendly country. The individual transactions are then carried out as in the case of any exporter credit, the bank assuming the obligations representing up to 60 percent of the sales price of the equipment and the exporter retaining at least 20 percent with 20 percent paid down.

Where the nature of the goods permits of repetitive sales to the same customer abroad, provision can be made for utilization of the line without prior approval by the bank of each transaction. Upon request the bank will designate from time to time the countries in which transactions may be financed automatically and, based upon the average of business previously done by the exporter in a given country, the amount of credit which may be outstanding at any one time. Upon receipt of appropriate credit information regarding a particular customer, the bank will designate the amount of credit which may be outstanding at any one time to that customer.

The bank will not authorize automatic use of the line of credit in a country suffering severe dollar-exchange difficulties. The financing of sales to such a country would not be barred, but each transaction should be subject to careful study and prior approval of the bank.

While the lines of credit are based solely upon the record of the exporter's past operations, it is not true that the bank will assist an exporter only to the extent of his past business. Whenever the exporter presents evidence of additional firm or prospective orders on a case-to-case basis after he has utilized the line of credit, he will receive careful consideration by the bank.

I want to make it plain that exporters without previous records are not barred from the bank's assistance. Such an exporter must apply on a case-by-case basis method for assistance to finance actual or prospective orders. After he has established a position in the market, he may apply for a line of credit.

The bank will consider any bona fide potential transaction as the basis for a credit commitment, but the bank will not set aside funds for the use of a particular exporter on a purely speculative basis.

It is believed that a line of credit can be of value to an exporter even though all transactions thereunder are handled on a case-by-case rather than an automatic basis. The Export-Import Bank will have full information regarding the exporter's past oper-

ations. At the same time, the exporter will be aware of the type of credit information which the bank will require with respect to each transaction. This should expedite the presentation of applications by the exporter and the decision by the bank with respect to each such transaction.

To the extent practicable, actual operations under these lines of credit are to be carried out by commercial banks or other suitable institutions selected by the exporter. On notes guaranteed for retention by the exporter or purchase by a commercial bank, the Export-Import Bank receives 2 percent of the first 5 percent of interest borne by the obligation and at least one-fourth of any interest in excess of 5 percent. On notes which it may be called upon to purchase with its own funds, the Export-Import Bank receives the interest collected. In addition to its share of the interest, the Export-Import Bank receives a commission on obligations purchase or guaranteed by it in the amount of 1½ percent flat on those having a final maturity of 3 years or less. The commission is increased by one-half percent for each year or portion thereof by which the last maturing obligation exceeds 3 years.

Some exporters of capital goods are prepared to assume all commercial risks involved in their sales abroad on credit, but have indicated a desire that the bank issue its guaranty against so-called political risks, such as the risk of inconvertibility, war, cancellation of an import permit, or other act beyond the control of both the exporter and the foreign importer. In any situation in which the bank would be prepared to carry both the commercial and political risk for a transaction, it would be prepared as well to limit its coverage to the so-called political risks involved. The coverage in such cases has extended to 85 percent of the financed portion of the transaction and the cost to the exporters somewhat less than coverage for all risks.

An important point is often raised as to whether the facilities of the Export-Import Bank are designed to assist the small, the medium, and the large exporter. The answer is emphatically "Yes." Many small and medium companies engage successfully in the field of capital goods. We have assisted several companies in the establishment of lines of credit whose annual foreign businesses average less than $200,000. No transaction has ever been rejected because it was too small, provided it was shown that private capital was not available to finance it.

There is a typical illustration right here in Ohio of the availability of the bank's services. One of your fine neighboring manufacturers, the Thew Shovel Co., asked for and received a line of credit. Of the first 16 credit commitments under lines of credit, the Thew Shovel Co. had five commitments. This is really more important when you consider the fact that Thew was among the first 16 when the bank's line of credit activity was not in the category of small or medium business. At the time these five credits were extended to Thew under its line of credit, the total of lines of credit outstanding exceeded $100 million.

Our policy will continue to be that of extending to small, medium, and large exporters and importers—and in similar categories to those abroad—and primarily those engaged in free enterprise—assistance with due regard to sound principles of finance and for the purpose of permitting importing countries to accelerate the development of their resources. Credits so extended can serve as one of the most useful instruments of expanding the world's markets for the mutual benefit of all countries.

It is my firm conviction that by adhering to such a course the Export-Import Bank can best assist the efforts of you who are engaged in foreign trade and in finance to serve well the interests of the United States.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered last night before the convention of the Tax Executives Institute, Inc., at New York City.

There being no objection; the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE TAX EXECUTIVES INSTITUTE, INC., WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1955

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, American foreign policy is the people's business. There is no American man, woman, or child who will not be affected directly or indirectly by the present and future aspects of our foreign policy.

Our basic foreign policy is and should be peace with honor. This is far different from a policy of peace at any price.

As an example of our ultimate objective, I would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north where for a long period of our history neither that country nor ours has found it necessary to have forts or military establishments for the purpose of defending one country against the other along the entire international frontier of 3,000 miles stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

We certainly hope that in our lifetime or the lifetime of our children all other nations not only in the Western Hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, might live together as good neighbors as we do with Canada.

If we are half as prudent as those who gave us this Republic and later ones who preserved the Union or helped to win and develop the great West, we will continue to work, hope, and pray for peace but we will keep our powder dry.

A climate is being promoted—in the Communist propaganda broadcasts, by party-line followers overseas and within the United States and by many good people who may honestly believe that even a survival under Communist tyranny would be preferable to the risk of no survival at all in the event of World War II—that anyone who questions Soviet good intentions is a warmonger.

According to this line of reasoning, George Washington would be considered a warmonger for having joined our other Founding Fathers in striking a blow for freedom.

Abraham Lincoln would fall into the same category for having taken the provocative step of supplying the Federal garrison at Fort Sumter.

And as for Patrick Henry—he, too, would be muzzled for his speech wherein he said:

"Is life so sweet and peace so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, almighty God. I care not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

On Wednesday, May 11, the Soviet Union proposed three resolutions in order to retain the initiative in carrying out their long-term policies.

When the veneer of propaganda and doubletalk is removed we can see the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and obstruct rather than to clarify and expedite. The Soviet proposal is a fraud.

Let us examine their so-called disarmament proposal:

1. It would destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world relating to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world as they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information they have nothing to lose.

2. The proposal claims a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. It provides for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces in Germany back across the Atlantic Ocean to the United States (approximately 3,600 miles), whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement (it would be the first time in a quarter of a century that they would have) their forces would only be approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would at first also contemplate two Germanys—like divided Korea and Vietnam—each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the Western NATO defense alliance.

4. Our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a requisite for discontinuing the arms race. We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

5. Our industrial and scientific atomic know-how to be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

6. The proposal contemplates yielding to Chinese Communist demands for Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations and removal of the provocative 7th Fleet from the Far East, all of which contribute in Communist eyes to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

7. It would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

8. All the above steps to be carried out prior to getting down to the problems of an effective disarmament with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations "agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954."

Since the free-world forces as of that date are known and the Communist forces are not, it sets as the starting point for future moves a topheavy Communist base.

In free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations is subject to debate and vote in parliament and congress and can be readily checked now.

In the Communist world this is not t[he] case and we would have to rely on th[e] official figures 1 month after the Conventio[n] enters into force.

Unless and until Communist China becomes a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Since without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon communism could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this

weapon and the testing of the same works to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5 wherein it states "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces • • • the states • • • assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

In the first phase of 1956, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad and return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic, and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific, whereas the Soviet Union pulls back 600 miles at the most.

The production of all atomic weapons to cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities are known and the Soviet locations are not known, and there is no adequate inspection system provided, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

The subsequent assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals of the United States in the atomic- and conventional-weapon field is still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then sets up a limited type of inspection and control similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since this system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now advises it in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, to Yalta, and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China, and to Geneva and its impact upon Vietnam.

The heads of the free governments will be accountable and responsible to their people and to their Parliaments or Congress.

To whom will Bulganin be accountable? To the presidium or to Khrushchev? If Bulganin is indeed himself at the summit today, will he be there when the Big Four meet in June or July?

Are our western allies prepared to stand against a condemnation to perpetual slavery behind the Iron Curtain of the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, North Korea, and China?

Are we to insist on previous agreements being honored before we take the Soviet's word on a new scrap of paper?

Will plans for the Republic of Germany's part in a western defense be scrapped to placate the Russian bear?

We might recall Kipling's The Truce of the Bear. While this was written concerning the Imperial Russia of the Czar, it is more applicable to Soviet Russia today.

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near;
"When he stands up as pleading in wavering, man-brute guise,
"When he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes;
"When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer;
"That is the time of peril—the time of the truce of the bear."

Will we insist on the Soviet Union withdrawing, as pledged, their troops from Rumania and Hungary when the Austrian Treaty is signed? Their only excuse for being in those two countries was to keep open lines of communication to their troops in Austria. Or will this promise also be overlooked in order not to offend the Muscovites?

There is no real reliable evidence to date that would warrant a prudent person in believing that the Soviet Union or international communism have changed their basic long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom. In discussing American foreign policy before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D. C., on April 22, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, said:

"The Communist enemy, regardless of any momentary change of tactics, regardless of any treaty the Kremlin may sign, is bent on conquering the entire world—the United States not excluded—and remolding it in the form of the totalitarian dictatorship and slave economy imposed on the people behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia, Rumania, Outer Mongolia, and on the Chinese mainland. American labor never can be, and never will, be submissive or neutral toward such a total menace."

Certainly, American businessmen and the public generally should be no less alert to the dangers of communism than is the American Federation of Labor, as so ably and courageously expressed by the president of that great organization.

International treachery, individual and collective deception, high-level assassination, and rank and file cold-blooded murder have been, and are, today accepted Communist doctrine. The Communist leopard has not changed its spots, because Chou En-lai and Molotov happen to smile rather than to frown on any given day.

Our foreign policy should be based on human freedom. What advances it we should support, and what retards it we should oppose.

The age of colonialism in Asia is dead. The people in that part of the world want no part of it. Any American policy in that part of the world will suffer a handicap if it is tied directly or indirectly to European colonialism.

Nowhere in the long history of Russia under the Czars or under the Commissars is there anything equal to the United States establishing the free and independent Philippine Republic nor, for that matter, is there anything equal to Great Britain setting up a free and independent India, Pakistan, and Burma.

To the contrary, during the same period the Soviet Union was destroying the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, though they had signed treaties of friendship and nonaggression with all three of those Baltic Republics.

Americans must never lose sight of the fact that ours—at the time of our independence and today—is the authentic revolution. It not only freed us from colonial rule, but it developed a charter of liberty which established a constitutional form of government to serve us for all time to come.

Other nations have had their revolutions, but either immediately or in the not distant future the people found they had supplanted one ruler for an even more despotic one.

We should be proud of our revolutionary past and help to encourage in the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain the revolutionary zeal for freedom which won us a nation.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the agressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties, including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

How can our associates even consider compromising principle and honor to that extent? What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

How long is the United Nations going to pussyfoot on this question of American prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice? Of the 15 the Chinese Communists admit holding, 11 have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years.

These men were shot down in January of 1953. Last fall it was suggested in Government quarters than public discussion be held down until Mr. Hammarskjold had completed his mission to Peiping.

He came back in January and held a press conference in New York on January 14 in which he admitted that the prisoners had not been released nor did he have any firm commitment as to when they would be released.

It was suggested again in Government and United Nations quarters that the American Congress and the American people be patient and that perhaps Chou En-lai would release them prior to the Bandung Conference.

The Bandung Conference has now come and gone and the prisoners have not been released.

Are we expected to wait until these prisoners have been completely brainwashed and then released to serve the Communist propaganda purposes as has been the case of some of the civilians?

It is time for Mr. Hammarskjold to make his report to the United Nations and to the people of America.

What is intended to be done about Communist failure to comply with the terms of the Korean armistice?

If the United Nations as an organization is paralyzed from taking action, then the Government of the United States has an obligation to men wearing the uniform of this country to take some effective steps in getting our men released.

There was a time at the turn of the century when a single American civilian held as a captive brought from President Theodore Roosevelt the effective ultimatum: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Now our associates want to reward the Communists with membership in the United Nations.

Have we forgotten the bibilical injunction in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has lgiht with darkness?"

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long-established

technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu and admission into the United Nations. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and the Pescadores.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist-pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou en-lai.

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American's.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

Delays in Processing Patent Applications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Inventors Face 3-Year Wait for Patents, Watson Reports," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 1, 1955. This article deals with delays incident to the processing of applications for patents.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVENTORS FACE 3-YEAR WAIT FOR PATENTS, WATSON REPORTS

CINCINNATI, April 1.—If you've invented that "better mousetrap"—or anything else for that matter—you'd better plan on a wait of over 3 years before receiving a patent on it.

That was the word today from Robert C. Watson, United States Commissioner of Patents, who told the 127th national meeting of the American Chemical Society:

"The average time during which an application remains pending in the Patent Office before issuance of a patent is today in the neighborhood of 3½ years."

Lack of a sufficiently large staff at the Patent Office—together with an ever-growing library of existing patents through which searches must be made when a new application comes up—are among reasons for such slow handling, Mr. Watson asserted.

He called for a comprehensive, factual study of the United States patent system to determine its full impact on the Nation's economy.

Mr. Watson declared the Patent Office has an "overall backlog of 210,000 applications," and that this has recently been increasing at the rate of about 10,000 applications per year.

Also, new applications are pouring in at the rate of 75,000 a year.

He told the chemists that in the chemical divisions of the Patent Office, new applications must now remain pending nearly 10 months in most cases before action is even started on them.

Abundant Reasonable Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Abundant Reasonable Land," published in the Columbia State, under date of May 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABUNDANT REASONABLE LAND

A survey by Government agencies shows that if and when additional cropland is needed to produce field, truck and pasture land for feed, food, beef, milk and vegetables, South Carolina has 400,000 acres of coastal marshes alone that could be reclaimed and put to work for these purposes along with improved wildlife habitat, which likewise has a considerable economic value.

As we understand it the survey covered only the fresh and salt water marshes of the coast. It did not include the upland areas of fertile lands on our sea islands and in adjacent territory which is so fertile it grows up in jungle when not cultivated or planted in forest trees.

This information is particularly pertinent at a time when certain elements are seeking to spend billions of taxpayer dollars to water 200,000 arid western acres, at over $900 an acre, which would produce farm land worth only $150 an acre.

The cost of reclaiming the South Carolina land would be $100 an acre if prepared for farm crops or $25 an acre for intensive wildlife management.

Some research remains to be done to determine the capabilities and salinity hazards of each particular tract, the engineering needs for establishing adequate water control systems, the agronomic considerations for establishing and maintaining adapted crops and the requirements for establishing and maintaining wet areas for waterfowl, fur-bearers, fish and other esthetic wildlife. But technicians have learned enough to indicate the possibilities.

Since 1947 soil conservation districts, with technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, have given planning and other assistance to 81 district cooperators who own 85,000 acres of marshland. Of this total, 25,000 acres of marsh will be managed for wildlife, and 18,000 acres developed for crops and pastures. The estimated cost will be $2,500,000.

Although it is found that soil types in marshlands are generally favorable for agricultural crops in wide variety, the salinity of the soil and the pH content are limiting factors. The necessary water control involves diking, installing gates, internal drainage and pumps. Much the same type of preparation is required for development of marshlands for wildlife, along with control of undesirable vegetation and the establishment of high-yielding food plants.

The plans that are now being made are based on the land capabilities as determined by soil surveys. The farm plan, worked out with the farmer, establishes how each acre is to be used for best results. Engineering assistance for determining feasibility and approximate cost of proposed projects is provided by Soil Conservation Service engineers. If the farmer decides the costs are within reach and worthwhile, detailed plans and specifications are prepared, and, SCS technicians help plan and manage crops for maximum production, without cost.

Already practical solutions to many problems have been worked out through these operations and further research is expected to provide additional informatoin on the salinity tolerance of various crops, control of vegetation in canals, drainage coefficients for proper root development and specialized equipment for land development.

It has also been found that after construction work is completed salt can be leached from the soil of salt marshes by repeated flooding and draining. The pH of such lands is usually low especially where organic matter is heavy, as is available phosphate, but the potash content is moderate to high, especially on salt marsh. Infiltration and permeability are high on newly developed lands, but decrease as the organic content is reduced. This might be remedied, when necessary, by the use of cover crops, and by a modification of the water-control system.

This system must also provide protection for growing crops against storm tides, high river stages and excessive rains, all of which often come at once. The old rice-field system of perimeter dikes give protection against 9-foot tides and provide roadways on top. Material excavated for the dikes is usually taken from the fieldside to form a large canal in which runoff water from rains is stored.

Much more information has been learned about our available marshlands, but this is enough for the present to give a sample of what can be done in the South to provide additional food and fiber for the Nation without investing $15 million of South Carolinians' taxes in crackpot schemes for "making the desert bloom."

Fifty Years of Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STAT.,
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most timely editorial entitled "Fifty Years of Forestry," published in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star of May 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF FORESTRY

The United States Forest Service is celebrating its golden anniversary this year and now, the start of the growing season, is a good time to extend congratulations.

Some people wonder why a National Forest Service is needed when the States have their own forest services. There is a strong movement in some places to move out the national service, or to curtail its activities.

That would be a tragedy for conservation. For the Federal Government in general has greater determination to preserve natural resources such as trees than have State governments. Interests which would exploit all resources, regardless of their scenic and recreational values, seem to have more success dealing with State agencies.

Guarding the roadless wilderness area of northern Minnesota has been easier because it is part of a national forest. If the United States Forest Service were to withdraw from some Western States much of the acreage now in national forests would receive less protection.

In Minnesota the Federal and State Forest Services perform similar duties—fire protection, planting, and so forth. But they cooperate wholeheartedly, supplement each other splendidly with a minimum of overlapping of functions.

All America can be thankful that 50 years ago President Theodore Roosevelt and his chief forestry aid, Gifford Pinchot, had the foresight to get the Forest Service underway.

Increased Labor-Farmer Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news column from the April 18, 1955, issue of the Trainman News, the organ of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

It is a column which reports an address made by a distinguished Minnesotan, my good friend the president of the brotherhood, Mr. W. P. Kennedy, in support of increased labor-farmer cooperation. I am convinced that the best interests of both labor and agriculture depend upon mutual association and cooperation. The farmers are major consumers of industrial goods, and the industrial and commercial workers are, after all, the major consumers of what the farmer produces. High wages and high farm prices are essential to the prosperity and well-being of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRMER FARMER-LABOR TIE SEEN—KENNEDY AVERS EACH DEPENDS ON THE OTHER—HE EXPRESSES HIGH HOPES FOR UNITY ON THE LEGISLATIVE FRONT

President W. P. Kennedy told a Nebraska brotherhood audience last Thursday that he had high hopes for enhanced labor-farmer cooperation on Federal legislation designed to promote national prosperity.

The brotherhood chieftain, addressing the Nebraska State Association of the BRT and Ladies Auxiliary at Hastings, revealed that an increasing number of Senators and Congressmen from agricultural areas was beginning to realize that liberal labor policies "are vital to farm prosperity" and had indicated their intention to support some union-sponsored legislation.

He pointed out that organized labor is solidly behind a liberal price-support program for the farmers and emphasized that "farm prosperity makes more and better jobs for city workers and for railroadmen."

President Kennedy called upon Nebraska members "to appoint themselves as ambassadors of good will from labor to the farmers to help promote an intelligent common attack on economic factors which jeopardize national well-being."

"If the city worker doesn't make enough money to feed and clothe his family adequately," he maintained, obviously the farmer feels the pinch in lessened demand for his products."

"Farmers," Mr. Kennedy continued, "are major consumers of industrial goods which keeps our railroadmen working. They buy 12.7 percent of all rubber products, 16.6 percent of all petroleum products, 10 percent of all chemicals, and 9 percent of all steel products. With the drop in farm income, such as has occurred since 1952, every production and transportation worker in the Nation feels the effect."

President Kennedy declared that "by now the farm interests should understand that the unions are their real friends if only because the workers' welfare is so dependent upon how their country cousins are faring.

"High wages mean more farm products sold in the cities, and high farm income means more city products sold in the country. It's that simple, although some of the big city corporate interests, with only selfish motives and no vision, continue to sow seeds of mistrust and resentment between farmer and worker."

Mr. Kennedy said he expected many farm district Congressman to back a substantial boost in the minimum-wage law and to "lose misguided enthusiasm for legislation aimed against the unions." Labor is seeking a minimum wage of $1.25.

Labor's Daily reported recently that labor backing of the farmers' rigid price-support program reflects the long-standing contention of union leaders that there is a direct relationship between prosperity for farmers and industrial workers.

But this year is the first time that labor's top brass has gone before congressional committees in support of this theory. CIO president Walter Reuther made a personal appearance before a House committee to urge rigid supports. AFL president George Meany has also thrown his hat directly into the scrap.

In turn, there are indications that the traditionally antilabor farm bloc will give its support in the fight for a higher minimum wage. This is one of the big labor issues before the present Congress.

NATO Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "NATO Versus Communism," published in the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar of May 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO VERSUS COMMUNISM

Communism's aim is domination of the world. Communism expects an ultimate showdown with capitalism—but not necessarily in a hot war. The Kremlin knows its victory could be just as great and complete by winning the cold war.

The framers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization foresaw this nonmilitary threat from communism as well as the military one. They provided for a military alliance—an attack on one is an attack on all. But they also provided for collaboration in the cold war.

Article two of the NATO treaty, pieces signatories to develop peaceful and friendly relations by strengthening their free institutions by bringing about better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being.

Little has been done to use that article. Our Canadian friends, led by Foreign Minister Lester B. Pearson, have tried at each NATO meeting to get action in nonmilitary fields.

Now, under Norwegian initiative, a first step is to be taken. A parliamentary conference of NATO countries will meet in Paris in July. Representatives of parliaments from 15 countries will discuss common problems.

This will be a big step toward better understanding. Without the goals listed in article 2 of the NATO Treaty it may not matter in the long run—how many divisions, tanks, airplanes, or nuclear weapons we have.

Better understanding among NATO nations can help win the cold war against communism. Lack of understanding could bring cold war defeat and make our weapons worthless.

Resolutions calling for participation of Members of the United States Senate and House are pending and, we trust, will get early approval. May we express the hope that when the 14 American Senators and Congressmen are selected, they will be chosen primarily because of what they can contribute to understanding and not because it will be a nice junket to Paris in July.

Cadet-Midshipman Service Should Be Credited for Longevity Pay Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cadet-Midshipman Service Should Be Credited for Longevity Pay Purposes," which was published in the March-April 1955 issue of the Retired Officer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CADET-MIDSHIPMAN SERVICE SHOULD BE CREDITED FOR LONGEVITY PAY PURPOSES

From all indications an error of 13 years' standing may be rectified during this session of Congress.

The introduction of H. R. 2213, by Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, suggests that equal credit be granted for cadet-midshipman service. This is an executive measure, sponsored by the Defense Department, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. A companion bill, S. 1201, was

introduced in the Senate February 23 by Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, and was referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee. The enactment of either of these bills will accomplish this just objective.

Since 1942, when the Career Compensation Act became law, full-time credit for longevity pay purposes has been awarded for the following types of service (many of which do not require active duty for such credit):

1. For all periods of active service as commissioned officer, commissioned warrant officer, warrant officer, Army field clerk, flight officer, and enlisted person in any Regular or Reserve component of any of the uniformed services.

2. For all periods during which members were enlisted or held appointments as commissioned officers, commissioned warrant officers, warrant officers, Army field clerks, or flight officers, in any of the Regular companents of the uniformed services, the Regular Army Reserve, the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, the National Guard, the National Guard Reserve, the National Guard of the United States, the Organized Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve Corps, the Medical Reserve Corps, the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy, the Dental Reserve Corps of the Navy, the Navy Militia, the National Naval Volunteers, the Naval Reserve Force, the Naval Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, the Air Force Reserve, the officers' section of the Air Force Reserve, the enlisted section of the Air Force Reserve, the Air Corps Reserve, the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, the Marine Corps Reserve Force, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Coast Guard Reserve, the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Constabulary.

3. For periods during which members held appointments as nurses, reserve nurses, or commissioned officers in the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Nurse Corps of the Public Health Service, or the reserve components thereof.

4. For periods served as deck officers or junior engineers in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

This is not the first time that the matter of giving the same credit for cadet-midshipman service as has been given for the abovementioned services has been under consideration in the Congress. In 1948 a bill (S. 657) was passed by the Senate and favorably reported by the House Committee on Armed Services, but failed of enactment in the closing days of the 80th Congress.

General Paul, at that time the Army's personnel chief, testified before the Senate committee:

"Cadets and midshipmen are members of their respective services and are at all times on actual active duty. Their training is rigorous and they are subject to military discipline and control throughout such service. Accordingly it is believed that service as cadets and midshipmen should be credited for pay purposes and that the existing denial thereof constitutes an unwarranted discrimination."

During the same hearing, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Denfeld, told the committee:

"Both justice and a healthy state of morale require that the treatment of all personnel, as determined by the governing laws and regulations, be on a fair and equiable basis."

On behalf of the Coast Guard, Admiral Farley, then Commandant, testified as follows:

"Insofar as counting of cadet service itself is concerned, the Coast Guard sees no justification for failing to include such service for the purpose of longevity, particularly in view of the fact that the Pay Act of 1942 liberalized the law with respect to those types of military service which can be counted for longevity and pay.

"In fact, as has been indicated by previous witnesses, time at our service Academies, whether Annapolis, West Point, or the Coast Guard Academy, is practically the only military service now excluded for computational purposes."

There was a day when the crediting of this service might well have been questionable. By the Joint Service Pay Act of 1922, Congress required that officers thereafter appointed could count only active commissioned service for pay purposes. Therefore, until 1942, there was no question of the congressional intent to count only active commissioned service.

That concept was entirely altered by the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, when Congress provided that all prior and subsequent periods of active or inactive service, including that in any of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces and in either enlisted or commissioned status, could be counted in computing service for pay purposes. But it failed to include active service performed by cadets and midshipmen.

Thus, all service performed in either an active or an inactive status by both active and Reserve components, prior to or subsequent to 1942, was authorized by the 1942 act to be credited for pay purposes and in many cases for retirement purposes as well.

Two sidelights indicating how far discrimination can go, which will surprise even those familiar with the problem, are that (1) service as a cadet or as a midshipman is credited to one who later becomes an enlisted man (and there are examples) and (2) these services are creditable for both pay and retirement to civil-service employees. Thus, we have the astounding situation that such service is creditable to everyone except those for whom the military status of cadet and midshipman exists.

Contrast to these phenomena the fact that the service of cadets and midshipmen cannot be credited to officers, even for pay purposes—service which is in fact full-time, day to day, exacting military service, so recognized judicially and administratively throughout our history and, until comparatively recent times, by Congress itself.

The bill as written contemplates allowing credit only for the service performed by cadets and midshipmen. It does not allow credit for service training in the ROTC program. We believe the bill should be amended to include an appropriate credit for this service as well. This would provide additional incentives for young men to prepare for commissions in the armed services. Under present circumstances these young men, for the most part, do not decide to make military service a career. This, after all, is one of the aims of the ROTC program.

At long last the compelling reasons for the enactment of appropriate legislation to rectify the existing undesirable situation are clear to all who are aware of it. The legislation should, of course, be forthwith amended to include the service of cadets of the Air Force and ROTC service and be speedily enacted.

"Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political."—Thomas Jefferson.

Microwave Radio Relay Experiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story about results of microwave radio relay experiments which appeared in the March-April issue of Television Opportunities Newsletter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RCA SENDS LOW-POWER UHF SIGNAL 290 MILES—NEW MICROWAVE RADIO RELAY DEVELOPMENTS THE FIRST PRACTICAL STEP TO NORTH AMERICA-EUROPE LINKUP FOR TV AND GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS—NEW COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM NOW IN USE IN COLOMBIA, THE AMERICAS—SIMILAR OPERATIONS PLANNED IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD

(By Lawrence Levey)

NEW YORK.—The United States and Europe are being brought closer for purposes of improved telecommunications as a result of microwave radio relay experiments conducted by the David Sarnoff Research Laboratories of the Radio Corporation of America and RCA-Victor Co., Ltd., Montreal, Canada, it was recently revealed.

Following more than two decades of experimentation and testing, RCA, by means of low-power ultra high frequency, has succeeded in transmitting the signal 290 miles between Riverhead, Long Island, N. Y., and Covey Hill, Quebec, Canada. The distance covered is equivalent to the greatest water hop between the Faeroe Islands and the Shetlands. While range and mileage are coincidental, the experiments have overcome the widest water gap.

The successful experiments also mean that many of the terrain and geographic obstacles have been surmounted, also the elimination of innumerable, hops with subsequent reduction in costs of relay towers and equipment. It means paving the way to practical fulfillments of greatly improved communications between the Western Hemisphere and all European countries and eventually those in the Near East.

LOW-POWER TRANSMISSION

The RCA radio relay system uses a parabolic antenna reflector, 40 feet in diameter, mounted on short towers about 100 feet high. The transmitter power is 1 kilowatt. The apparatus was constructed and made with the objective of establishing operating conditions similar to those required for commercial operations in all branches of microwave radio relay.

Success of the experiments resulted in constructing a multihop microwave radio relay in Colombia, South America, with multiple telephone and telegraph channels. It is now operating commercially. Similar construction and operations are being planned in other parts of the world.

The radio-relay system also includes channels for black-white and color television, facsimile, teletype, FM and AM, and other forms of broadcasting now in operation in the United States.

GLOBAL ELECTRONIC MISSION

The United States-Western Europe linkup by radio relay, was first promulgated by Maj. Henry F. Holthusen, veteran international electronics consultant, diplomat, and presently consultant to the United States Senate Committee Studying the Technical Cooperation Program for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

During the past 5 years, Holthusen headed electronic missions throughout the world, at times accompanied by William S. Halstead, electronics engineer, who envisioned the communications route across the North Atlantic to Europe.

Holthusen's mission also stressed the need for uniform transmission standards along United States lines, because of its tried and efficient operation in the Americas. As a result of these efforts, which involved convincing foreign government top officials, leaders of industry, and electronic engineer-

ing experts, three countries in the Far East—Japan, Thailand, Philippines—adopted United States technical standards for television and auxiliary services, and it is believed that countries in the Middle East will do likewise.

(Reports of the results of the electronic mission were first published by Television Opportunities about 4 years ago; and progress of international TV and general communications has been published exclusively in all subsequent issues, circulated throughout the world, and translated into many languages.)

POWER NEEDED

The RCA microwave radio relay experiments also mean that TV and telecom linkup of all countries in the Caribbean and the rest of the Americas is approaching realization.

Recently, Major Holthusen returned from an extensive survey of all Latin American countries to determine their present and future power resources and requirements. Obviously, without increased power, there can be no expansion of telecommunications, nor improvements in existing facilities. This tends to impair closer contacts with our neighbors.

Also, expansion of power facilities would enable every country in the Americas to expand its economy, raise standards of living, and quell subversion. It would percolate through all levels of society, to the mutual economic and political advantages of all neighbor countries.

PIONEERING EFFORTS

In being the first to pioneer transatlantic microwave radio relay, the RCA experiments indicate a gradual technological crystalization of the electronic crusading efforts and plans projected by the Holthusen global missions, and the eventual fulfillment of what has long been the dream of electronic engineers, communications authorities, and many countries.

Interconnecting all countries of the free world by means of the latest and farthest advanced forms of communications, embodying all the electronic developments, from sound to sight broadcasting, is future bound to show beneficial impacts of tremendous import in the social, economic, and political lives of nations.

Further, it means that all free peoples of Europe will have access to the benefits of electronics and improved communications.

Television alone, has unlimited potentials for carrying democracy's pictorial language showing how a free people live in a free hemisphere, under a free system of government.

Farm Support Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram regarding farm support prices, signed by Martin Byrne, president, and other officers of the Kansas State Farmers Union.

This telegram is timely, in that we are approaching the annual election on wheat quotas. The telegram reads in part as follows:

Unless the sliding scale the same pattern will undoubtedly unfold as regards wheat. The application of the sliding scale on this year's crop may cause farmers to ditch marketing quotas and take the gamble on all-out production at a lower price in the hope of maintaining their level of income.

In Kansas we have reduced our wheat acreage from 17 to 18 million acres of a few years ago to the 1954 planting of 11 million acres. This is a serious reduction in acreage and one that is causing farmers much concern.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *May 10, 1955.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Last week's House action to reenact high level supports on basic crops and milk is a clearcut reflection of the concern of Congressmen over the drastic curtailment of farm income and the continuing high level of farm living and production costs.

Evidence is continuing to appear that farm production volume and oversupply cannot be managed by the reduction in price levels. The individual farmer's only alternative in anticipation of lower commodity prices and inflexible high level production costs is to do a maximum job of production in the hope of maintaining his level of income.

The fallacy of the theory that reduction of price will cut production in agriculture is readily apparent in the handling of the dairy problem during the past year.

Price reductions given dairy farmers a year ago have served only to reduce the farmers' income by millions of dollars. Consumers have received little or no reduction in retail prices. The processor has been the benefactor. Additionally our past year's dairy production is the largest in history, consumption has increased very little, and our dairy herd has been increased by one-half million cows.

Unless the sliding scale, the same pattern will undoubtedly unfold as regards wheat. The application of the sliding scale on this year's crop may cause farmers to ditch marketing quotas and take the gamble on all-out production at a lower price in the hope of maintaining their level of income.

Wheat production, unshackled by acreage controls and without price supports, will drive the price down and drag all farm prices with it as wheat is channeled into feed use. The whole farm economy will rock to its foundations, forcing thousands from the land.

Farmers are willing to accept acreage controls in line with consumer demand provided price at near parity levels is assured.

We insist farmers are entitled to fair and equitable prices. The full parity price concept for farm commodities has on many occasions attracted the endorsement of both major political parties as being fair and just. Supports at the 90-percent level are reasonable and justified when coupled with production controls.

We wish to emphasize that full parity prices are flexible in that they rise and fall as items used in farm production rise and fall.

Unless the flexible price sliding scale program is abandoned and 90-percent supports reinstated thousands of Kansas farmers will suffer income losses from which they cannot recover.

As the board of directors and as officers of the Kansas Farmers' Union, it is our firm belief that Kansas farmers generally are in accord and heartily applaud the action of 5 of their 6 Congressmen in voting for House Resolution 12, to restore 90-percent supports to the 6 basic crops and the increased level of support for the dairy industry.

We appeal to you now to use your great influence to secure favorable action on the provisions of House Resolution 12 is passed by the House in the Senate Agriculture Committee and to bring the proposal before the full Senate at the earliest possible moment. We urge that you work and vote for reenactment of the 90-percent supports on basics and be counted among those realistically advocating full parity of income for farmers.

Respectfully submitted.

MARTIN BYRNE,
President, Topeka, Kans.
FRED MEE,
Vice President, Idana, Kans.
GEORGE REINHART,
Secretary, Parsons, Kans.
LUD STRAND,
Board Chairman, Brewster, Kans.
RAY ORTE,
Board Member, Centralia, Kans.
CECIL JONES,
Board Member, Hanover, Kans.
ALVIN ATZENMEIER,
Board Member, Ellsworth, Kans.

Address by Director of Export-Import Bank of Washington Before Association of Bankers of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Vance Brand, Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, before the Association of Bankers of Mexico, in Torreon, State of Coahuila, Mexico, on April 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VANCE BRAND, DIRECTOR, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE ASSOCIATION OF BANKERS OF MEXICO, IN TORREON, STATE OF COAHUILA, MEXICO, ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1955

When I crossed the Rio Grande, it was not with a feeling of mixed emotions. On the contrary, I experienced a feeling of great expectancy, that of renewing my friendship with many of you fine people. I regret very much that I do not speak your language. But what we say and think is well understood by both of us because we speak an international language, the language of sincere friendship. I welcome the opportunity and appreciate the invitation to return to your great country.

You and I as individuals have a common interest in the development of Mexico. Both of us—Mexican Bankers and the Export-Import Bank—are influenced by reasons of good sound business. You want financially strong responsible customers at home. We need strong neighbors and customers. Only if the development of Mexico is to your best advantage, can it also be to our advantage.

I have engaged in private banking for 20 years and in Government finance for 6 months. For 20 years I learned by experience that the success of my private bank was in direct ratio to the prosperity of the people who dealt with the bank. The horizon of the bank was limited to the immediate territory but as all the people of that territory prospered, the bank enlarged and expanded and grew healthier. As a private banker and a public banker I know now full well that as the horizons of Mexico and the United

States expand, and our people in both countries become more prosperous, the trade between us will continue to expand and grow in a very healthy manner.

The prime requisite of economic growth and development is adequate credit on reasonable terms. This is the field in which we each must function and will cooperate.

A policy of cooperation must be embraced by joint action before such policy can really become effective. What is the joint action which is so necessary to make effective our friendship and cooperation? I refer to both of us—the Mexican bankers and the Export-Import Bank.

Let us discuss for a moment the types of loans made by the Export-Import Bank and how the Mexican bankers may facilitate by their action and cooperation not only the extension of these loans but the operation of the loans.

The Export-Import Bank generally and broadly extends two types of loans: (1) loans made upon application of the buyer abroad, (2) loans made upon the application of the United States exporter to assist him to extend credit in connection with a single transaction. This latter type of loan is especially helpful to the individual buyer abroad and particularly to the smaller businesses. It may aid the foreign business to expand its plant or may replace old equipment. It may make it possible for the farmer to obtain new and improved machinery for the development of your agriculture. Many other examples are applicable. In such cases—although the Export-Import Bank acts upon the application of the United States exporter—it is in reality extending credits to the purchaser in Mexico.

Our greatest problem is to obtain adequate credit information concerning the purchasers. Whether the loan is made upon the application of the buyer abroad or upon the application of the United States exporter, we have exactly the same problem of obtaining credit information concerning the ultimate purchaser abroad. In this respect you may be of great assistance both to your customers and to the Export-Import Bank. We are located thousands of miles away from the purchaser in Mexico. On the other hand, he is your next-door neighbor. You are not solely confronted with the problem of looking at information on a piece of paper and making a determination as to the credit risk involved. You know intimately all the facts. In business I have found when you have all the facts it is sometimes quite difficult to make the correct decision, but when you have only part of the facts, it is almost impossible.

Furthermore, in many cases the Mexican buyer may become a good risk by pledging security or giving liens on existing and new equipment imported. It is often difficult for the Export-Import Bank to rely on such security in another country and given by a customer many thousands of miles away. To the extent that Mexican banks can adequately secure themselves and therefore guarantee the obligations of the Mexican purchaser at a reasonable charge, you will be helping yourselves by making it possible for us to assist in the development and growth of your customers, your community, and your country.

In adidtion, such activity on your part helps you to maintain good customer relationship and may from time to time add good local loans to your portfolio. It is not uncommon for the purchaser abroad to need financing for local costs, as well as for imports from the United States.

One of the greatest assurances for the success of the program is being constantly alert to keep the rates reasonable. The bank fixes its interest rates on the basis of the cost of the money, plus a reasonable sum for maintenance of a proper reserve and the cost of operation of the bank. This policy in itself facilitates the flow of trade because the financing is not expensive. I am confident that if you maintain low rates for your guaranties it will soon be evident that you can render greater assistance to the businessmen here in Mexico. You will not only influence the increase in the flow of exports which you need in the capital-goods field, but this policy will be most beneficial to general business conditions in your communities because as the capital goods go to work for you, all business in your community will be benefited by the resultant increases.

We look upon ourselves as your partners in the growth of Mexico and all of Latin America.

Our bank has demonstrated its great faith in Mexico and in Latin America. During the past two decades the bank has loaned more than $1.7 billion in Latin America. Certainly the influx of private capital in Latin America has been a major factor, but $1.7 billion, principally in capital goods, is also an important contributing factor.

Our faith in Latin America has been fully justified. Let us examine a few co[illegible]isons. Per capita consumption in Latin [illegible]rica increased 26 percent from 1945 [illegible] 1953. Telephones in use in Latin America as a whole more than doubled from 1940 to 1954, as did automobiles.

Truck and bus registrations tripled and the number of tractors on the farms rose five times.

United States cement production went from 24 million tons in 1939 to 47 million tons in 1952—an increase of 96 percent. But in the same period, cement production in just 1 country in Latin America increased 2,088 percent.

In the postwar period Latin America's gross product—measured in constant prices—has increased from 27.3 billion to 41.6 billion, or 52 percent. In this same period the United States gross product increased from 263 billion to 307 billion, also measured in constant prices, or by 17 percent.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey announced at Rio that the partnership policy between the Latin Americas and the United States would be implemented by the intensification and expansion of the Export-Import Bank. Let us examine the record. In the first 6 months of 1954 this bank extended approximately $77 million in credits. During the last 6 months of 1954 the Congress of the United States made the bank an independent agency and expanded its borrowing power. During the 6 months from July 1 to December 31, 1954, the credits of the bank exceeded $290 million. In the first 2½ months of operations in 1955 the bank extended over $184 million in credit, and I want to point out that all but $17 million of those credits were in Latin America. Thus, during the first 8½ months of the United States Government's fiscal year the bank has extended credits approximating one-half billion dollars.

Latin America is on the march. It is the responsibility of the bankers to keep in step.

I am convinced that by adhering to such a course those of us engaged in finance will serve well the interests of our respective countries.

The Indian Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials from the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal regarding the Indian problem.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal of March 22, 1955]

INDIAN SCHOOL THREATENED

Apologists for the Bureau of Indian Affairs may deny it, but a great danger still exists that Fort Totten Indians may lose their school.

The Bureau allegedly has been working undercover to close the school and it was only by accident that money was made available last year to continue classes.

Bureau of Indian Affairs officials contacted groups at Bismarck to say that it would be impossible to continue operating the school because of a lack of funds. When the matter was finally investigated, it was found that no request had ever been made to Congress for the money.

That is the story told by a responsible official.

By the convenient method of failing to ask for an appropriation, the Bureau was trying to strangle the school on the Fort Totten reservation.

North Dakota would be willing to take over operation of Indian schools, providing the Federal Government would reimburse the State on a cost-per-pupil basis. So far, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has refused to do that in North Dakota, although it was borne out in a recent Senate hearing that such an arrangement has been made in other States.

If the Bureau of Indian Affairs will shell out funds to run Indian schools in one part of the country, there is no reason why North Dakota Indians should not receive equal treatment. Now that the matter has been bared in Congress, it may be that something will be done to correct the situation.

Until the Federal Government agrees to reimburse the States for Indian education, however, it will be necessary for State officials to keep a close watch on the Indian Bureau. North Dakotans will want to urge their Senators and Representatives to carefully examine each budget which the Indian Bureau submits to make sure that provision is made for operation of the Fort Totten school.

Few persons would question but what North Dakota could do a better job of operating the Fort Totten school, but the State first wants assurances that it will receive financial repayment from the Federal Government, which has responsibility for the Indian.

Unaware of the policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, people of the Devils Lake area watched as the hospital was closed over the objections of the Fort Totten Indians. Similar action can be expected in the case of the Fort Totten school, unless the people wake up to what the Bureau is trying to do.

Because they fail to ask for money to operate the school, the Bureau has shown again that it wants to divest itself of further Indian responsibilities. It's about time that the American people set up a few roadblocks, or they will find a bureau in operation without any Indian affairs.

[From the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal of March 23, 1955]

AGENCY MAY GET LAW'S HELP

Law enforcement on the neighboring Fort Totten Indian Reservation may be forthcoming, according to a spokesman for the Department of the Interior.

The Federal Government, seeking to justify itself in the matter, maintains that it was caught off guard by the action of Benson

County in appealing a case to the State supreme court for settlement of a dispute over jurisdiction.

Since the supreme court ruled, by a margin of 3 to 2 that Benson County lacks jurisdiction over the reservation, there has been no law enforcement for anyone, white or Indian, who happens to live in that area.

Recognizing the serious nature of the problem, the North Dakota Legislature passed a resolution to place the question of jurisdiction over Indians on reservations before voters in the 1956 primary election.

Glenn Emmons, United States Indian commissioner, said that if action was taken by the legislature to put up a constitutional amendment, permitting the State to assume jurisdiction over Indians, at the next election, he would recommend that money be appropriated to take care of the problem.

Inasmuch as an election is more than a year away, the next move must be made by the Federal Government. It may be that the stalemate will be broken soon and that the amenities of civilization will again return to the reservation.

From all appearances, it would seem that it is the white persons on the reservation who are in most serious jeopardy because of the squabble. The Federal Government can be expected to take some action in the case of the 10 major crimes, where they involve Indians, but who is going to act to insure protection for the other residents?

Since the dispute apparently concerns only Indians, it would seem that Benson County should at least take over responsibility for its own non-Indian residents.

Fort Totten officials maintain that non-Indians pay real-estate taxes to Benson County, so it would seem that they are entitled to the services which accrue to those who may happen to live off the reservation.

At any rate, it is time that steps were taken to return law enforcement to the reservation. Benson County probably weakened its case when it assumed jurisdiction in 1946, but it has finally brought the issue to the fore.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has anything but a good record as far as treatment of the Indian is concerned, but it is hopeful that the Department of the Interior may be at least partially alerted to the deterioration which has occurred south of Devils Lake.

It will take a lot of doing to restore confidence in the bureaucrats who have made such a mess of Indian affairs, but one foot forward is better than many steps backward which have been taken in recent months on the Fort Totten Reservation.

[From the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal of March 24, 1955]

LAW ENFORCEMENT BUDGET FOR INDIAN AGENCIES IS BOOSTED

During recent discussions before the Senate subcommittee on appropriations in Washington, D. C., the Bureau of Indian Affairs presented a revised proposed budget calling for about $120,000 expenditure for law enforcement among North Dakota Indians as compared with $15,000 spent last year.

The information was given in a report on the discussions by John B. Hart, executive director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission.

Sufficient money would be available under the proposed budget for construction of a jail on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation and for sufficient personnel to give adequate law enforcement to all reservations in North Dakota, including supervision for juvenile work, Hart said.

Since a Supreme Court decision that North Dakota lacks jurisdiction over Indians on the Fort Totten Reservation, it has been without law enforcement. Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, indicated the Federal Government would take over law enforcement for the time being, but no arrangements have been reported as yet from the reservation.

"We supported the position that law and order would be most effective if transferred to the State and local political subdivisions with adequate guarantees for financial reimbursement until such time as the Indian people, as a race, did not constitute a financial burden on the community greater than the non-Indian people of the same community," Hart said.

He pointed out that the Bureau of Indian Affairs does not have authority at present to contract for reimbursement of political subdivisions which would be willing to render services to reservation Indian people in the field of law enforcement.

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, suggested that the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs should explore the question and probably recommend legislation to permit the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make provisions for reimbursement, Hart reported.

[From the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal of March 25, 1955]

NAME POLICEMAN FOR FORT TOTTEN

Law enforcement will return to the Fort Totten Indian Recreation Monday with the arrival of a policeman from Belcourt, it was announced today by Harold Schunk, superintendent of the Turtle Mountain Consolidated Indian Agency.

Lee Gourneau will arrive at Fort Totten over the weekend with his family to assume responsibilities for law enforcement. His services are being provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Fort Totten Reservation has had no enforcement since a State supreme court decision that Benson County lacks jurisdiction over Indians.

Schunk said that Eli Morin, who serves as judge for the Turtle Mountain Reservation, will act in a similar capacity at Fort Totten, until a permanent judge has been appointed.

Morin, who has been a judge on the Belcourt Reservation for 15 years, was appointed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to serve the Belcourt Indians.

Gourneau, who has eight children, will live in Government quarters at Fort Totten. He was one of two policemen at Belcourt, the other being Theodore (Red) Tibbits. Gourneau's title at Belcourt will be chief of police, and he will headquarter at the subagency office, Schunk said.

Salaries of the policeman and judge will be paid by the Bureau. Funds are lacking to set up a tribal council at Fort Totten to handle law enforcement, Schunk explained.

Non-Indians on the Fort Totten Reservation remain under the jurisdiction of Benson County, according to Schunk.

Action by the Bureau of Indian Affairs follows a recent announcement in Washington by Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, that the Federal Government would take over responsibility for law and order. He made the statement at a recent hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency in Washington, D. C.

Lewis claimed there is a serious legal question whether or not the Federal Government can take over jurisdiction on the reservation, but said he had decided that the responsibility for enforcement should be assumed until the issue has been decided in court.

Benson County had assumed jurisdiction in 1946 after Congress had ceded it to the State.

[From the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal of March 25, 1955]

THE LAKE LOOKOUT

Devils Lake may have set some kind of a record Tuesday night in the amount of snow to fall during a 1-hour period. One inch of new snow fell during the hour before midnight as the spring's first snowstorm invaded the lake region. Remarking that the fall was unusually heavy, Earl Hoffman, the local weatherman, said he didn't recall that it had ever snowed any harder here.

Not only law enforcement, but almost every other phase of Indian service, has been the subject of argument between the State of North Dakota and Uncle Sam. The North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission recommended that the State legislature investigate the possibility of excluding from the State-aid-to-dependent-children program persons who reside in an area not subject to State jurisdiction, which would include the Indians. In Arizona and New Mexico, home of the Navaho-Hopi Indians, 92 percent of such aid is borne by the Federal Social Security Administration, which may be in violation of the Social Security Act. Now the attorney general's office at Bismarck has been asked for the legal position of North Dakota on the matter.

Some States also have been receiving per pupil payments from Uncle Sam for Indian children attending the public schools. John Hart, of Rolla, in his recent visit to Washington, found considerable support among United States Senators for the idea that the Federal Government should pay the per pupil cost of Indian children in public schools. It was not without some embarrassment to the Bureau of Indian Affairs that it was revealed that Uncle Sam already was discriminating between States on the question of per capita cost payments. This was being done while the Bureau of Indian Affairs was seeking to close the Fort Totten school and making no provision for education of the Indian children. By failing to ask for the necessary appropriations to run the school, the Bureau was seeking to transfer the burden to the State.

Persons close to the Indian problem in North Dakota, and that includes every resident of Devils Lake, can hope that justice will be forthcoming with regard to reimbursement to the State in the matter of Indian services.

Today's Challenge to Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the role of public power agencies in maintaining an adequate supply of electricity to meet our Nation's energy requirements was never greater than it is today. The leadership of these agencies, which are owned by the people they serve, in bringing the benefits of low-cost power to the farms, homes, and business life of the Nation, are well known.

But the present administration's power policies have presented publicly owned agencies with new challenges. At a recent meeting of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association, outlined some of the past accomplishments of public power agencies. He also discussed the problems of the future. I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD portions of the able speech delivered by Mr. Radin.

There being no objection, the portions of the spech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO PUBLIC POWER

(Address by Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association, Washington, D. C., presented April 25, 1955, at annual convention of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Memphis, Tenn.)

* * * * *

Although we are all impressed with the statistics showing the increase in employment opportunities, the expansion of industries, the higher standard of living, the better farm practices, the greater use of electric power, and many other benefits of TVA, only those who have lived through the TVA experience can, I believe, really appreciate what this agency has meant to the people of the Tennessee Valley. To us, TVA has been more than a means for providing a better standard of living. TVA lifted the gloom and depressed attitude from the people of this area, and has projected on the horizon a new hope for the future. It is in this transformation of the spirit of a region that the real significance of TVA lies. And it is for this reason that the people of this area fight with such bitter determination whenever TVA is attacked. Such deep-seated loyalty to a concept is something which other people of other areas often find difficult to understand. But we who have lived through the TVA experience can well appreciate why we must fight to the end for an agency which has brought new life and hope to the people of the valley.

In view of this experience, is there any wonder why the people of the Tennessee Valley have become so aroused against the Dixon-Yates contract? For you well know that Dixon-Yates is more than a plan which ultimately would bring higher electric rates to the TVA area. The far greater danger from Dixon-Yates is that it is the plan which, carried to its ultimate conclusion, would plunge a dagger in the heart of TVA.

* * * * *

What I would like to discuss with you this afternoon is some of the reasons why Dixon-Yates is a matter of such national concern; how the philosophy inherent in Dixon-Yates is pervading so many other spheres within the field of development of our natural resources, and how this Dixon-Yates philosophy presents such a challenge today to our national welfare.

During the past few months I have had the occasion to speak in the States of California, Missouri, and Nebraska, and everywhere I have gone there has been a keen interest in the Dixon-Yates contract.

Why this interest in sections so removed from TVA? First, I believe, because TVA itself is a symbol dear to people all over the country, and the many admirers of TVA see Dixon-Yates as an opening wedge to the destruction of TVA.

A second reason why I believe Dixon-Yates has become a national issue is that it is representative of evil principles of Government. The people of the Nation not only are rightly suspicious of the secretive manner in which this contract was negotiated, but they also don't like the fact that the execution of this contract has been ordered over the objections of independent boards such as the TVA and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Moreover, it is bad administrative policy to have the Atomic Energy Commission involved in the first instance in this nefarious affair. The Atomic Energy Commission was established to build nuclear weapons, promote the peacetime utilization of atomic energy and to conduct research in the field of atomic energy. The Dixon-Yates contract does not contribute one iota to the advancement of any of these purposes. In fact, it is destructive and disruptive of the work of the Commission.

A third reason, in my opinion, why the people of America have become so concerned about this contract is that the American people don't like monopolies, or great concentrations of power in any form. As a result of the revelations of the Federal Trade Commission and congressional investigations, the American people got their fill of monopoly abuses in the late twenties and early thirties, and as a result Congress adopted the Holding Company Act in 1935.

* * * * *

I will not go further into the evils of the Dixon-Yates contract, for I know that I am covering ground that is all too familiar to you. But I would like to discuss what I would refer to as the Dixon-Yates philosophy, or, in the context of these times, Dixon-Yatesism. For Dixon-Yates is not only bad within itself; it is not only a threat to the entire TVA area; it is a prototype for arrangements which are being proposed in many other sections of the country.

I have referred to Dixon-Yates as a philosophy. What is this underlying philosophy? Basically, it is that the national debt can be reduced and that it is to the Government's advantage if the Government does not supply some of its own needs, or the needs of the people of the Nation, and instead fills those needs by contracting with private companies.

Applied on the local level, the Dixon-Yates philosophy would work something like this: A city needs an expensive new fire engine for its municipal fire department. But the city council decides that it could spare itself the large expenditure for this piece of equipment by hiring a private company to come in and supply its own fire engine, with its own crew, and with the city paying the fire company an annual rental. I don't have to cover the obvious and tell you what is wrong with this proposition. Certainly no well-managed municipal government would ever think of entering into such an arrangement.

Yet, on a larger scale, that is precisely the same principle involved in the Dixon-Yates contract: The Government avoids the expenditure of about $90 million for the Fulton steam plant, and instead contracts with private power companies for an equivalent amount of power.

On the face of it, the argument may sound appealing. All of us want lower taxes; all of us want a lower national debt. But the argument in favor of the Dixon-Yates concept falls down in that it is based upon certain fallacious assumptions: (1) It doesn't recognize that expenditures for power projects are returned in full to the Federal Treasury; (2) that Government investments in sound natural resource developments create new wealth both for a broad base of private citizens as well as for the Government itself; and (3) that over the life of the contract the costs to the Government far exceed those which the Government would bear if it built the project in the first instance.

I have said that the Dixon-Yates philosophy has pervaded the thinking behind projects proposed in other sections of the country. Let us examine some specific examples of this.

First, there is the shining example in the Pacific Northwest, where the Idaho Power Co. has proposed a plan for three small dams as a substitute for the Hells Canyon Dam. The argument there is that local private enterprise is willing to build these dams, so why should the Federal Government make this expenditure. A familiar argument, for it is basically the same as that used in justifying Dixon-Yates.

But let us see how it works in reality. Yes, the Idaho Power Co. does propose to build three small dams. But the Idaho Power Co. plan would add prime power at site and at downstream projects of only 680,000 kilowatts, as compared with 1,124,000 kilowatts of prime power that would be added by construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam.

We talk in such big figures these days that we might tend to minimize the 444,000 kilowatt differential in these two projects. But remember, these 444,000 kilowatts are roughly equivalent to the installed capacity of Kentucky, Chickamunga, Norris and Douglas Dams. And this loss in power will be felt year after year, for many scores of years into the future.

And, of course, the Government would not lose if it invested money in the high Hells Canyon Dam. To the contrary, the funds would be repaid in full to the Federal Treasury, many new jobs would be created and the economy of the entire area would be improved.

High Hells Canyon Dam also would provide more flood storage, and additional benefits. But, under the Dixon-Yates philosophy, we could forget about this; after all, see how much the Government would save by not having to build this project in the first instance.

We find this same Dixon-Yates philosophy expressed in the Trinity River project in California. There, the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed a project which would have an installed generating capacity of 233,000 kilowatts. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. steps forward, though, and says, in effect: "We'll be generous. We will save the Government $64,876,000 by installing the power features of this project. Then the Government only has to spend the money to build the dam itself."

Sounds like a great scheme. The Government saves money and the national debt is reduced. In fact, it is a great scheme—for P. G. & E., but not for the Government, and not for all the people of the United States—for under this bit of Dixon-Yates philosophy the Government is left holding the bag with the non-profit-making features of the project while P. G. & E. takes the cash register. This scheme also provides a neat device for circumventing the preference clause—a fundamental part of our Federal power marketing program which has resulted in bringing the benefits of public power to the largest number of people.

We find the Dixon-Yates philosophy being expressed in many other sections of the country—in connection with the Niagara project, for example—but I will not belabor the point by going into the details of these projects.

I do believe it is noteworthy, though, to observe that this frame of mind also is prevalent in connection with the development of atomic power for peacetime utilization. The philosophy of the present Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and other officials is that the Federal Government should get out of this field as rapidly as possible and that the initiative should now be taken by private enterprise.

No one will quarrel with the fact that atomic energy should not be a Government monopoly; nor will we argue that private enterprise should not be permitted to assist in the development and to share in the benefits of this new resource.

But the fact of the matter is that, in our eagerness to delegate the responsibility for this development to private enterprise, we are prematurely trying to ease the Government out of responsibilities it rightfully owes to the American people. For it was the Federal Government, through the expenditure of about $13 billion of tax funds, which brought into being the peaceful, as well as the wartime uses of atomic energy, and the Government therefore has an obligation not only to bring about the full development of this resource for its peacetime utilization but to safeguard its investment and prevent

the creation of private monopolies upon the basis of Government expenditures.

Is the Government adequately discharging these responsibilities? I do not believe so. It has been almost a year now since the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was drastically revamped upon the pleas of private industrial groups that they would carry forward the progress in this field if some of the restrictions were removed. But now that the door has been opened to private enterprise, has there been any rush through this door?

• • • • •

Having seen some of the problems confronting us in the publicly owned portion of the electric industry, I would like to turn now to the challenges which lie ahead—for all of these problems present challenges for the future.

1. Abundant supply for the future: In my estimation, the most important challenge facing us in the future is to continue to provide more power at lower rates. Providing leadership in this regard represents one of the great contributions of TVA and public power generally to American life, and maintaining this leadership is a goal for which all of us in public power must continually strive.

• • • • •

As we face the future, public power must continue to show the way to imaginative, aggressive planning that will not only anticipate electric power needs, but will provide a reservoir of power that will encourage the expanded use of electricity in the home, on the farm, in commercial establishments, for municipal use, and in the Nation's factories. With a constantly expanding population, and having our eyes fixed on the goal of a constantly rising standard of living, we cannot afford to stand still.

2. Atomic energy: Earlier, I have related how the Dixon-Yates philosophy has pervaded the development of atomic energy for peacetime production of electric power. Just as we must break the Dixon-Yates contract itself, so also must we break through the Dixon-Yates philosophy in developing peacetime utilization of atomic power. Only several weeks ago an official of the Atomic Energy Commission admitted that, proportionately, our program of developing atomic power producing facilities is not proceeding as rapidly as the British program.

• • • • •

Nothing would be more fitting than to have the Government construct, at the site of the Nation's first atomic energy plant, a demonstration power reactor which would serve as an electric power yardstick in an area which is most notable for serving this function.

3. Development of natural resources: Public power has led the way in providing comprehensive, multi-purpose development of our natural resources, and one of the challenges facing us in the future is to continue to provide leadership in this field.

• • • • •

The problem facing all Americans in the future is not only one of developing these resources as rapidly as possible, but insuring that such development is not piece-meal. This means that we have an obligation to prevent the Dixon-Yates philosophy from being followed in Hells Canyon, in the Trinity River, in the Niagara Falls redevelopment, and in all other water resource projects.

We have no right to short-change future generations by permitting short-sighted North ng or selfish actions today.

veni) • • • • •

The record today is clear that the very existence of public power is being threatened in many sections of the country, and the Dixon-Yates contract is but one example and a symbol of a nationwide campaign which is being waged by private power interests to cripple or eliminate many public power systems. Though the private interests contend that their campaign is directed only against the Federal power program, the evidence is abundant that the municipally owned systems, public-utility districts, State-owned utilities, and rural electric cooperatives likewise are being subjected to this attack.

The fact that all levels of public power in all sections of the country are being subjected to this attack makes it more imperative than ever before that all of us in public power—in the Tennessee Valley, in the Pacific Northwest, in the Northeast, in the Southwest, and other sections of the Nation—work together to protect our common interests.

We must meet this challenge not only by constantly improving our own utilities so that they are not vulnerable to attack but also by exposing this campaign for what it is—an effort to destroy the competitive force of the publicly and cooperatively owned electric utilities.

Proposed Change in the American Electoral System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles and an editorial, published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times of March 31, 1955, relating to a proposal to change the American electoral system.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIMPLICITY OF PLANS TO ALTER VOTING SYSTEM IS DECEIVING

WASHINGTON, March 29.—The presidential election system, under which the Republic has chosen its leaders for 155 years, is again a target in the Congress. At the last count, 13 proposed amendments to the Constitution calling for a change in the election procedure had been submitted to the House and Senate.

The proposals have a deceptively simple appeal. In few words, they suggest replacing the present method with "direct election by the people," or "division of the electoral votes in accordance with the popular vote," or "dividing the electoral vote according to the popular vote in each congressional district."

IS NOT SPELLED OUT

The simplicity of the language conceals probable far-reaching changes in the election procedure, however, and almost certain dilution of the intent of the Constitution. The present election system is not spelled out in the Constitution. It has developed through usage, has been hammered out by experience, and follows the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution.

The Constitution provides that the President and Vice President will be named by the members of the electoral college, the electors. The latter are to be chosen in such manner as the legislatures of the various States may decide. Each State is given a number of electors equal to the total of its Representatives and Senators in Congress.

Beginning in 1800, States adopted the method of having a slate of electors for each accredited presidential candidate, with the people of the State to elect one slate of electors by a statewide plurality vote. To simplify the ballot, certain States print the names of the presidential and vice presidential candidates on the ballot, and not the names of the electors representing them. Other States have continued printing the names of the full slates of electors with party designated, and not the names of the candidates for President and Vice President.

In any event, the presidential candidate winning a plurality of the popular vote in a State—under his own name or through a slate of electors representing him—is given all of the State's votes in the electoral college. Every State follows this practice, which has become known as the unit rule, or all-or-nothing system, of allocating electoral votes.

UNIT RULE IS TAUGHT

Most efforts at constitutional amendment of the election system have sought to end the unit rule. It has been claimed that giving all of a State's electoral votes to one candidate disfranchises the persons who voted for the loser, because their candidate had nothing to show for his popular votes.

This argument ignores, of course, the fact that in any Presidential election, regardless of what system is employed, the persons voting for the loser are eventually disfranchised.

It also has been argued that under the unit-rule system a man can be elected President with fewer popular votes than his opponent. This has happened three times in the Nation's history, but not since 1888. It should be remembered, moreover, that such a situation is possible under any election procedure except direct voting for President.

A direct election system is 1 of the 3 major election changes proposed in the legislation before Congress. It has little chance of approval, however, because by abolishing the electoral system entirely, it favors populous States.

SECOND MAJOR CHANGE

Under the present system, Nevada has 3 electoral votes for its 2 Senators and 1 Congressman, giving it one-fifteenth the influence of New York, which has 45 electoral votes. In a direct popular vote election, New York's population would give it approximately 80 times the influence of Nevada.

A second major change proposed would divide a State's electoral votes in proportion to the popular vote received by the Presidential candidate in that State. This change, known as the Lodge-Gossett plan, would dissolve the physical being of the electoral college but retain the present electoral vote rating of the States.

The Lodge-Gossett plan was approved by the Senate in 1950, but was overwhelmingly rejected by the House. The then Republican minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, led the opposition, calling the proposal a political Pandora's box that would encourage splinter parties and could lead to the loss of our two-party system of Government.

The third major change proposed in current legislation is embodied in the Mundt-Coudert plan. No proposal uses fewer words for what would be a complete facelifting on the election system.

The language of the Mundt-Coudert bill says that a State's "electors * * * shall be chosen * * * in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives (for Congress) are nominated and elected."

IT SEEMS EASY

Superficially it all seems so easy, and in accord with democratic processes, even in accord with the Constitution, itself. The electoral college and the electoral vote system would not be abolished. The only change, it would seem, would be to elect the electors just as the people elect their Congressmen and Senators.

Prof. Ruth C. Silva, of the department of political science, Pennsylvania State University, in a report on the Mundt-Coudert plan last year, said the "formula would not have

changed the outcome of a single election since 1916. In every case, the Mundt-Coudert plan would have given the victorious candidate at least the necessary 266 electoral votes."

She added that it would make the presidential elections closer by enlarging the electoral vote of the defeated candidate.

Yet the change would be far reaching. The Mundt-Coudert plan means that a presidential candidate would receive an electoral vote for each congressional district he carried. The unit rule would be abolished. The only advantage in winning a statewide plurality would be to obtain the two electoral votes represented by the State's Senators.

VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE

In order to receive all of a State's electoral votes, a candidate would have to carry every congressional district, a virtual impossibility except in the solid South.

Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., (Republican, New York), the principal sponsor, has been offering his amendment since 1949. Since 1953, Senator KARL MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota) has submitted a companion bill in the Senate.

The so-called district system, which the Coudert plan proposes, was considered by Congress four times in the early 1800's. Four times it was rejected. The original States voluntarily tried, then abandoned, this system.

Since those early years there have been many changes in the voting habits of the American people. The Civil War has brought a one-party voting tradition to a large area of the Nation, the solid South.

Today, the Mundt-Coudert district system would threaten the strong two-party tradition, the majority vote and the State autonomy which are the basic characteristics of the form of government that makes this Nation a republic.

MUNDT-COUDERT PLAN SEEN BLOW TO TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Few will deny that, on the whole, the election process in the United States has been a model for the world. There have been troubles, of course. Three times Presidents have been elected with fewer popular votes than their opponents. But the last such occasion was more than 75 years ago.

The electoral college, men who cast their electoral votes in accord with a decision already determined by the people, seems an outmoded institution. Some States have had more "native son" Presidents than others, demonstrating, it is said, that some States have more than their share of influence in the election process.

SYSTEM SURVIVES

Minority parties have risen. But they have gone, leaving no permanent footprint.

Despite frailties, the system of 48 State contests in the presidential election, with all of a State's electoral votes going to the popular vote winner in the State, has survived many bitter campaigns and many unexpected developments, such as the growth and preeminence of one party in a large section of the Nation, the solid South.

Nobody has suggested substituting any other country's election system for that in the United States. But there have been changes proposed from the Congress, all of which have been put aside after study.

The Mundt-Coudert plan would supplant the present unit rule by allocating a State's electoral votes under a method known as the district system. A candidate for President would receive an electoral vote for each congressional district in which he obtained a popular vote plurality. The only reward for statewide popular vote victory would be the 2 electoral votes allotted a State for its 2 Senators.

SEEKS EQUALITY

The district system would, in effect, replace a 48-State election with four-hundred-odd contests, 1 for each congressional district in the Nation.

Congressman FREDERICK R. COUDERT, JR., Republican, of New York, has said his plan would "restore the system as designed by the Constitution," citing Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison to the effect that the district system is what the founding fathers had in mind.

"At present, the center of political gravity rests with the big metropolitan centers," COUDERT has stated, "whereas my plan would reinstitute equality of election power all over the country."

The Coudert plan would lessen indeed, the impact of metropolitan centers by confining their influence to a district or two, and a corresponding number of electoral votes, instead of letting their weight be felt in the statewide, all-or-nothing procedure.

LIABILITIES LISTED

In exchange for this improvement, the Mundt-Coudert plan offers these liabilities:

It would encourage one-party voting in the South by increasing that section's influence on national elections.

It would diminish the influence of States where there is a balance of political sentiment by dividing their electoral votes.

It would arbitrarily balance one congressional district against another, despite great disparity in population.

It would arbitrarily balance one electoral vote against another, although one may represent four times the popular votes of the other.

It would permit States which elect their Congressmen at large to continue the all-or-nothing system, while other States changed to a district system.

It would offer minority parties a chance to obtain electoral vote recognition, an inducement to their growth.

SOUTH BROKE RANKS

An estimate of the effect of the Mundt-Coudert district system on the solid South, as contrasted with its effect elsewhere, may be had from examining the two most recent elections.

In 1952, the solid South broke ranks as never before, except in the campaign of 1928, and 4 of the 11 States of that region gave popular vote pluralities to Eisenhower. This gave the Republican 57 electoral votes, to 71 for his Democratic opponent, Adlai Stevenson, under the present unit rule system.

In congressional district voting for Members of Congress, the one-party tradition had a strong hold in 1952, however. The solid South elected only 6 Republicans among its 104 Congressmen.

In Texas, for instance, where the Republican presidential candidate received all 24 electoral votes on the basis of a statewide victory, no Republican was elected to Congress in the 21 districts.

Prof. Ruth C. Silva, of the department of political science, Pennsylvania State University, writing on the Mundt-Coudert plan last year said.

OTHER EXAMPLES

"It would tend to favor the party which failed to carry the State in the popular election. For example: In 1952, the GOP carried Tennessee but the Democrats would have had a margin of one electoral vote. In 1948, the Democrats carried California and Ohio; but the Republicans would have captured more electoral votes in each of these States.

"Application of the Mundt-Coudert formula to the statistics for the last 10 elections produces dozens of anomalies similar to these examples."

The Mundt-Coudert plan would relegate the presidential contest to the district basis.

Outside the solid South it was another story in 1952.

Three States, Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania, having a more balanced political sentiment and with a total electoral vote approximately equal to that of the 11 States of the solid South, gave statewide pluralities to the Republican candidate for President. He received all of the electoral votes, 104.

In their congressional elections, however, the three States chose 36 Democrats among their 98 Congressmen.

The 1954 congressional election again demonstrated that the South is strongly one-party on a district basis, while elsewhere support is more evenly divided. The 11 Southern States elected 7 Republicans of 106 Congressmen; the three Northern States of Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania chose 43 Democrats in 98 contests.

WOULD DIVIDE NORTH

The net result of the district system would be to encourage 1-party domination in the South, while emphasizing 2-party division in the North. The political advantage of one-party unity in the South, while the rest of the Nation divided its support, would be enormous.

The present unit rule, using blocs of electoral votes by States, has enabled the 2-party system to withstand the effect of 1-party voting as practiced in some sections of the country.

The Mundt-Coudert plan arbitrarily gives each district, regardless of voter turnout or population, equal voice in the Presidency.

In some areas, approximately 40,000 persons go to the polls for each electoral vote to which the State is entitled. In Illinois, an electoral vote represents approximately 140,000 popular votes. The Mundt-Coudert district system permits the 40,000 to cancel the wishes of the 140,000.

Populationwise, the district system balances one district against another in the presidential election scales, even though a congressional district in New York, or some other populous area, may contain 20 times the population of a district in a sparsely-settled area of the Nation.

DISPARITY IN STATE

In Massachusetts, there is disparity; the 10th district, for instance, contains 106,000 more persons than the seventh.

Under the Mundt-Coudert plan, however, the 1 electoral vote of the seventh district would have exactly the influence of the 1 electoral vote of the 10th district.

The present unit rule method is not affected by this unbalance. The vote of one person counts no more than the vote of any other person in a statewide tabulation.

There is no provision in the Mundt-Coudert plan for applying the district system to the six States that have no congressional districts. These States elect their Congressmen at large—by statewide vote.

Three other States choose one or more of their Congressmen by the at-large method.

WOULD DIVIDE 39 STATES

Under the present unit rule method, each of the six States that have no congressional districts gives all its electoral votes to the presidential candidate winning a statewide plurality. Under the district system, they would continue to do so, but 39 other States would be dividing their influence and voting by districts.

The 3 States which elect 1 or more Congressmen by the at-large method would be forced to operate with two methods—electing by districts and at large.

Congressman COUDERT has claimed the district plan would minimize the influence of splinter parties. He has cited the 1948 election in New York, where Henry Wallace's Progressive Party took enough popular votes

from Truman to enable Governor Dewey to gain a plurality and all the State's electoral votes.

However, under the unit rule system, the record shows that splinter parties do not gain a permanent foothold, their real threat. The same Progressive Party received 500,000 votes in New York, alone, in 1948; yet in 1952 it received fewer than 135,000 votes in the entire Nation.

The Mundt-Coudert plan offers a minority or splinter party a chance for electoral vote stature, virtually impossible under the present system. By concentrating in a district or districts, the Progressives, Socialists, or even the Communists might obtain district electoral votes.

ASSUMES CHANGE IN HABITS

In essence, the Mundt-Coudert plan, like the earlier Lodge-Gossett proposal, is based on an assumption that American voting habits will change. It offers no guaranty they will change and no inducement for their changing.

Meanwhile, the effect of the district system advocated by this proposal would be to discourage two-party voting. The 16 million voters of Illinois, Pennsylvania, and New York would see their influence canceled out in a division of political support; while a candidate would come from the 9,000,000-vote Solid South with a one-sided electoral vote advantage gained with far fewer popular votes.

Under the present system, the possibility exists that a President could be elected with fewer popular votes than an opponent. Under the proposed district system, as embodied in the Mundt-Coudert method and with the present voting habits, such a possibility becomes almost a certainty. With the Mundt-Coudert system in effect, it is doubtful that the two-party plan of Government in the United States would continue to exist.

AN UNSOUND PROPOSAL

For more than a century and a half, the two-party political system has given the Government of the United States strength and stability unequaled by any in the world.

Yet this system has been under continuous attack by lawmakers who, in an effort to correct minor defects in the American electoral plan, have proposed constitutional amendments that would destroy it.

In the present Congress, 13 amendments have been filed calling for a change in the system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States.

One of these, the Lodge-Gossett plan, would divide the electoral votes of each State in proportion to the popular votes received by the candidates in the State. In the 1950 session of Congress, the Lodge-Gossett bill was overwhelmingly defeated in the House, but it is back again for consideration this year.

The amendment receiving the most serious attention in the present Congress is the Mundt-Coudert bill. This would abolish the unit system under which all of the electoral votes of a State are given to the presidential candidate who wins a Statewide plurality. It would substitute for the present system a plan that would treat each congressional district as a separate voting unit. It would give a presidential candidate an electoral vote for each congressional district in which he won the popular vote. Only two electoral votes in each State would be awarded on the basis of a statewide plurality, except in the nine States which have congressmen-at-large.

Adoption of this proposal would give an advantage to one-party States, and it could eliminate Republican Party candidates as serious contenders for national elective office. The "solid South" would continue to give virtually all of its electoral votes to the Democratic Party. In the big-population States of the Northeast and Midwest, where Republicans have much of their strength, the electoral votes would be divided.

For example, it is inconceivable that either party, under the Mundt-Coudert plan, could win all the electoral votes in any of the heavily-populated States where Republicans and Democrats are almost equal in strength, such as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and Massachusetts, to mention only a few. Under the district system, candidates of both parties would get a large number of electoral votes in each of these States and the margin of victory always would be relatively small. Only in the one-party Southern States, where the voters are overwhelmingly Democratic, would there be large electoral margins in favor of one candidate.

It should be emphasized, however, that the Mundt-Coudert proposal is not a sectional issue, for its adoption would be equally disastrous to all parts of the country. One-party control of the executive branch of the Federal Government would shake the foundations of the Republic. State and individual rights would be seriously endangered because a one-party system tends to produce a more dominant national leadership, less responsive to trends in public opinion.

There are many more inequities in the Mundt-Coudert plan. It would arbitrarily assign one electoral vote to every congressional district, although there is wide divergence in their populations. States in which all Congressmen are elected at-large would retain the unit system because they have no congressional districts and their electoral votes consequently could not be divided under the Mundt-Coudert proposal. This amendment also would encourage the formation of minority or "splinter" parties by increasing their chance to win electoral votes.

These and other undesirable features of the Mundt-Coudert plan would weaken, rather than strengthen, the national election system. The unit electoral method now in effect is time-tested and has proved to be a fair means of electing a President. It is the electoral college, not the electoral system, which has become obsolete.

Congress well might consider an amendment which would eliminate presidential electors, since their formal election of the President merely records a decision already made by the people. But there should be no tampering with the unit electoral system. National elections should be decided wholly on the basis of statewide pluralities, with the winner in each State receiving electoral votes equal in number to the State's congressional delegation.

Under the unit electoral system the United States has grown and prospered, and the rights of free men have been preserved. Two-party Government must be continued if our great national heritage is to survive. It is to the best interests of every American, wherever he may live or whatever his party preference, that the Mundt-Coudert proposal be defeated and the unit electoral system retained.

To Save the Constitution, Pass the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Broadcast No. 17 by Dean Clarence E. Manion entitled "To Save the Constitution, Pass the Bricker Amendment."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO SAVE THE CONSTITUTION, PASS THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

What is the most important material thing in the world today? Electrical energy? Medical science? Uranium? More important to the world than all or any of these is the Constitution of the United States. Splitting and harnessing the atom was a breathtaking turning point in the history of physical science, but dividing and harnessing man's civil government into the effective checks and restraints of the American constitutional system was, and still remains, the most serviceable and revolutionary achievement ever recorded.

The Constitution of the United States is the highest peak of human accomplishment. When it is destroyed, the cause of human freedom will be set back 5,000 years. The Constitution is the first and only man-made establishment in human history which has effectively checked and limited man's government in the interest of man's God-given freedom. Under its protection the free American people quickly developed the greatest material civilization that the world has ever seen. Its beneficial effects were so obvious that the Constitution was revered and venerated by each succeeding American generation.

Nevertheless, the very effectiveness of these constitutional restraints upon governmental power was a sharp thorn in the side of ambitious political demagogs. It was in their political interest to widen the area of governmental activity so that voters could be bought with the taxpayers' money. As one of them later expressed it, they wished "to tax and tax and spend and spend and elect and elect." Such political opportunists build up pressures against the firmness of constitutional restraints. In time these pressures drastically reduced the strength and dimensions of constitutional protections against governmental excesses.

But extensive and dangerous as it undoubtedly is, this erosion of the Constitution by misconstruction and misrepresentation is a gradual process. It is far too slow to satisfy those who are now determined to merge all mankind into that giant monopoly of absolute power known as world government. Even a mangled and misconstrued Constitution of the United States is a barrier to the complete execution of this treasonable design. Consequently, the one-worlders demand quick and conclusive action for the complete removal of our Constitution as the supreme law of the United States. They confidently plan to supplant our Constitution with some sort of world charter under which we, along with all other people of other countries, will be brought into a direct line of firm allegiance and complete obedience. For convenience, the one-worlders propose to approach their ultimate goal through preliminary, regional mergers of separate nations beginning in the Atlantic area.

Here is a news dispatch from Ottawa, Canada, as it appeared in the Kansas City Star last December 13th. Here is the quotation: "Creation of a super Atlantic community agency to merge the economic, defense, and foreign policies of the United States with other countries, will be recommended to members of the North Atlantic Treaty Council in Paris this week." Says the recommendation: "This is no time for half-hearted measures; while welcoming the progress made toward European union, we believe that nothing less than an effectively integrated Atlantic community will in the end,

adequately meet the challenge of the times. Defense in today's terms extends beyond military requirements and into the political, economic, and cultural aspect of our lives." It calls for "the development of NATO as a central agency to coordinate the political trade and defense policies of the member nations. NATO already has authority to adopt the proposed program under article 2, commonly called the Canadian clause, which provides for economic development of the member countries." The dispatch concludes: "Among prominent Americans endorsing the idea are Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, Gen. George C. Marshall, Norman Cousins, Owen J. Roberts, Will L. Clayton, Clarence K. Streit, Chester Bowles, Senator Humphrey, Senator Kefauver, Senator Lehman, William V. Griffin, Edward Murrow, and Elmer Davis."

Observe that the proposal for this international merger of our political, economic defense and foreign policies was to be made, not to the American people, or to their Congress, or to their President, but to the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Council in Paris. It is contended that the North Atlantic Treaty to which the United States is a party, now authorizes the adoption of such a program without further reference to the constituent individual nations.

If this interpretation is correct, then the fate of the Constitution of the United States no longer rests with the people of this country or with their Supreme Court but with the North Atlantic Treaty Council. This situation underscores the seriousness of the prevailing legal theory that a treaty between the United States and foreign nations supersedes the Constitution and thus becomes the supreme law of the land.

Please recall that the basic purpose of our Constitution is to preserve the sovereign independence of these United States and to provide for their common defense. The Constitution delicately balances the governmental relationships and obligations of American citizens between the State of their residence and the Federal Government. Under the Constitution, we are thus primarily responsible to our State governments for the observance of general laws protecting life, property, and privacy. We are protected in all contacts with both State and Federal Government by separate, detailed Bills of Rights and numerous other State and Federal constitutional provisions. Above all, and against both State and Federal Governments, we are constitutionally protected against violation, by arbitrary governmental action, of our liberty and property. This is the finely balanced reciprocating area of our protection and allegiance that is now alleged to have been transferred lock, stock, and barrel to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Does it sound somewhat fantastic that this radical shift in the area of your personal rights and responsibilities could have taken place without your prior knowledge and consent? The people of the Thirteen Original American States were asked to approve, and the people in each State, one after another, did approve of our present responsibility to State and Federal Government respectively. This was accomplished, according to the direction of the Constitution itself, by the ratification of the Constitution by conventions of the people in each of the new "United States."

If transfer of part of our allegiance from one sovereign to another required such specific, separate approval of the American people in 1789, what has happened since which enables the President, with the approval of two-thirds of the Senators who happen to be present and voting, to make you a subject of France, England, Italy, and other countries in an international combination known as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

If such a transfer of your allegiance and duty of obedience has been so accomplished—and there is a formidable body of law and fact to support the foregoing published contention that it has been, then the Constitution of the United States has not merely been bypassed, it has been destroyed. The one worlders are confidently relying upon this alleged treaty supremacy principle to sell out our national sovereignty behind your back.

A year ago, I left my post in Washington as Chairman of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in a snowstorm of publicity concerning the then pending Bricker amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Unofficially, I was told repeatedly that my advocacy of the Bricker amendment was embarrassing the Presidential administration. What I was told officially was shorter and more pointed.

Subsequently, the Bricker amendment which was originally coauthored with Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, and two-thirds of the Senate membership, was amended and later defeated by the narrow margin of one Senate vote. All of the sustained, and sometimes frantic opposition of the high Presidential office against this proposal was able to produce but one vote more than a mere third of the United States Senate. Among those who voted to defeat this necessary reinforcement of our national independence and constitutional integrity were Senators who were persuaded to stultify their previously expressed approval of its principle and purpose.

Why did the Bricker amendment generate such bitter opposition? It was a simply stated direction that treaties between the United States and foreign nations could not override the Constitution of the United States; that treaties could not automatically change the internal law of the United States, our labor laws, property laws, game laws, education laws, traffic laws, crime laws, and criminal procedures. The Bricker amendment only reaffirmed what the average American feels and believes our constitutional law to be. Unfortunately, that feeling and belief has recently been shattered by decisions of our courts.

Nobody has stated the present situation more clearly than John Foster Dulles, who said: "The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the State and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

Why should the President and Mr. Dulles now fight so hard to retain this power to cut across the Bill of Rights? Why do they wish supreme authority to take powers from the States and give them to some international body? Specifically, what is it that the President and Mr. Dulles plan to do that the Bricker amendment will prevent them from doing? What undisclosed emergency now requires us, in their judgment, to scrap the greatest discovery of all history, the Constitution of the United States?

Have we already surrendered our sovereignty in the 10,000 unpublished international agreements to which Mr. Dulles says we are now a party? The President and Mr. Dulles must answer these questions now because Senator BRICKER has reintroduced his proposed amendment in the present Congress. If we are to regain our national independence, retain our sovereignty and preserve our constitutional freedom, there is a critical necessity for the immediate passage of this new Bricker amendment.

From 1789 until 1953 no President of the United States has ever actively interferred with a proposal to amend the Constitution, a procedure which under the Constitution itself, is the exclusive concern of Congress and the States. Will the President now respect this long established precedent or will he renew his bitter fight to keep all present and future international agreements above the restraints of the Constitution? We shall soon know the answer.

Arrest of Polish Underground Leaders 10 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, Dr. Jerzy J. Lerski, editorial director of the Polish Daily News, a very old newspaper printed in Detroit, has sent me 2 tearsheets from his newspaper containing a recital of the facts connected with the seizure and imprisonment of 16 Polish underground leaders by the Communists. These Polish patriots were enticed to a meeting with their Communist captors 10 years ago to discuss the future of a free Poland. Representations looking to the liberation of these men have been made by our own State Department without avail. Because I believe these 2 articles will be of interest to all Members of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS' BROKEN PROMISES, TRICKERY LED TO ARREST OF UNDERGROUND LEADERS IN POLAND 10 YEARS AGO

(This is the first part of a two-part article giving all the details on the arrest and imprisonment of 16 Polish underground leaders by the Communists in Russia 10 years ago.)

On March 29, 1945, the Polish Government in London received the following radio message from its plenipotentiary in Poland:

"On March 28, three ministers and the representatives of political parties proceeded to a place fixed for their meeting with General Ivanow.

"No one of these 15 persons has returned, and until today none has given a sign of life either to us or to their families.

"Probably they left Pruszkow by cars on the 29th of March. We presume that they went either to London or to Moscow. It may well be that their further negotiations are proceeding under duress, or that they have been treacherously arrested. We request an immediate intervention with the allied governments."

The intervention was made. The governments of Great Britain and United States addressed questions to Moscow and received no reply. On April 11, the British Parliament gave expression of its anxiety in a public debate. On May 2, a spokesman of the foreign office informed Parliament that no explanation from the Soviet Union had yet been received.

A peace conference was opened in San Francisco.

During this conference, Minister Molotov dropped a by-the-way remark that the Polish leaders had been arrested on a charge of subversive activities against the Red army.

After this statement which caused general indignation among the delegates, Ministers Eden and Stettinius at once interrupted discussions on Poland's future with the Soviet delegation and demanded a full explanation.

On May 11, Mr. Eden made the following statement to the press:

"The list of 16 Poles who were reported missing and about whom we made inquiries with the Soviet Government over a month ago, comprises nearly all leading personalities of the Polish underground movement.

"These men have an excellent record in anti-German resistance throughout the war. Most of them are just the sort of people who in our opinion should be consulted on the matter of a new government of Poland."

On 18th of May, Mr. Stalin stated in his interview with a reporter of the London Times that the 16 Poles had been arrested by Soviet military authorities for subversive activity in the rear of the army, and the information that they had been invited to talks with Soviet representatives, was quite untrue.

Soon afterwards, Tass agency announced that the trial of the 16 Poles would be held before a military court in Moscow.

The 16 men captured were:

1. Leopold Okulicki, brigadier general, born 1898, Commander in Chief of the Polish Home Army.

2. Jan Stanislaw Jankowski, born 1882, Vice Premier of the Polish Government, former parliament deputy and former minister.

3. Adam Bien, born 1899, member of the Home Council of Ministers, former judge, leader of the Peasant Party.

4. Stanislaw Jasiukowicz, born 1882, member of the Home Council of Ministers, former parliament deputy, member of the Executive of the National Party.

5. Kazimierz Puzak, born 1883, chairman of the Council of National Unity, former parliament deputy, member of the authorities of the Polish Socialist Party.

6. Aleksander Zwierzynski, born 1880, former chairman of the Council of National Unity, former deputy speaker of the parliament, member of the Executive of the National Party.

7. Kazimierz Baginski, born 1890, former chairman of the Council of National Unity, former parliament deputy, delegate of the Peasant Party.

8. Stanislaw Mierzwa, born 1905, delegate of the Peasant Party.

9. Zbigniew Stypulkowski, born 1904, former parliament deputy, delegate of the National Party.

10. Eugeniusz Czarnowski, born 1904, delegate of the Democratic Party.

11. Jozef Chacinski, born 1889, former parliament deputy, delegate of the Christian Labor Party.

12. Franciszek Urbanski, born 1891, secretary of the Council of National Unity, delegate of the Christian Labor Party.

13. Stanislaw Michalowski, born 1903, former vice mayor of the town of Grudziadz, delegate of the Democratic Party.

14. Kazimierz Kobylanski, born 1892, delegate of the National Party.

15. Antoni Pajdak, member of the Home Council of Ministers, delegate of Polish Socialist Party.

16. Jozek Stemmler, born 1892, chairman of a Polish educational organization, interpreter of the delegation.

What were the circumstances of the arrest of the 16 Polish leaders?

At the time when the Soviet troops entered Poland, the Polish Government in London was still recognized by all the Allies, with the exception of the Soviet Union.

While those troops were moving deeper into Polish territory, the agreement at Yalta was signed. This, however, was not immediately followed by a withdrawal of official recognition from the Polish Government by Great Britain, the United States, and other Western countries.

The act of withdrawal took place in July, 1. e., not only after the arrest but also after the trial of the 16 Polish leaders.

In the second phase of the war, the Polish Government was only partially resident in London. A vice premier and several ministers, constituting the so-called Home Council of Ministers, worked on Polish territory.

Although they had received their nominations from London, they acted under democratic control in the form of the Council of National Unity, composed of representatives of all Polish political parties of the underground.

The members of the Home Council of Ministers and of the Council of National Unity were therefore recognized as legal authorities of Poland, not only by the Polish nation but also by Poland's Western allies.

The Soviet Union refused them recognition, since she had already prepared a puppet body of her own for taking over the rule of Poland.

Having thus no direct relations with the Soviet Union, the authorities of Underground Poland, in accordance with the point of view of the Polish Government in London, looked upon the Soviets as "allies of our allies."

As long as the Polish territories were under German occupation, the Polish Underground was giving most useful assistance to the Soviet military campaign by sabotage activities in the rear of the German armies and impeding German operations on the eastern front.

As the Soviet troops progressed towards the west, units of the Polish Home Army joined forces with them. Such for instance was the position during the storming of the Polish cities Lwow and Wilno.

As soon as the cities were taken, however, the Soviet army disarmed Polish units, shot their commanders, and sent most of the soldiers to the depths of Russia, to concentration camps from which many of them have not yet returned.

The officials of underground administration, in charge of counties and districts, were instructed by the Home Council of Ministers to reveal their identity to the entering Soviet troops and to strive toward establishing some forms of cooperation with Soviet commanders. All who obeyed the instructions were arrested.

Agents of Soviet intelligence who had penetrated the organization of the Polish underground administration and army had prepared lists of names of underground politicians, functionaries, and officers.

According to these lists, the Soviet authorities carried out a wide campaign of arrests and deportations.

This action was conducted under the orders of the MVD General Ivanov-Sierov—a fact still unknown in Poland at that time. He is at present chief of security in the Soviet Union, appointed Minister after Malenkov's downfall.

The behavior of the Soviet armies in Poland was like that of an army occupying enemy territory.

Mass looting, not only of industrial equipment but also of private property of the population, and—in the western Polish territories—mass raping of women, marked the Soviet progress.

When the Warsaw uprising fell, bringing about a complete destruction of the capital and the death in action of many of the most active underground fighters, the authorities of the underground Polish state did not interrupt their activities, though these became extremely difficult.

The Home Council of Ministers and the Council of National Unity deemed it to be their most urgent duty to alleviate the tragic misery of the nation and to work out some directives with regard to the international situation. They were practically cut off from the outside world, and radio communication with London did not suffice.

It was absolutely necessary to talk over the problems of future activities and to seek the intermediary of the Western Allies for an approach to the Soviets.

It was equally important to protect the Polish population and, by means of some agreement with the Soviet military authorities, to obtain for it at least a minimum of security.

Even though the bad will of the Soviets was perfectly obvious, and the possible effect of an intervention most doubtful, the authorities of the Polish underground deemed it their duty to undertake a last endeavor of arranging Polish-Soviet relations on the spot and of making the situation clear to the outside world. They felt responsible for the fate of Poland and of the Poles.

In these circumstances, the Soviets took initiative. On March 6, 1945, a Guard Colonel Pimonov wrote to Vice Premier Jankowski, proposing talks with Colonel-General Ivanov as a representative of the Soviet command of the front.

The talks were to be held "in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust, which would permit taking decisions on most important matters and prevent a sharper conflict."

World Awaits Information on 16 Imprisoned Poles

(This is the second of a two-part article dealing with the arrest and imprisonment of 16 Polish underground leaders 10 years ago. Last week the United States Government sent Russia a note requesting information on the 16 men. The Russians have as yet failed to answer the note.)

After unofficial negotiations conducted by Mr. Jozef Stemmler on the Polish side, and a certain Chodkiewicz on the Soviet side, Colonel Pimonov for the second time gave his word of honor as an officer that the Polish negotiators would be completely safe.

Between March 17 and 27, Pimonov had further conversations with Vice Premier Jankowski and prominent leaders of the Polish parties. He declared that he spoke on behalf of Marshal Zhukov, commander of the front. The main topic was the security of the rear of the Soviet armies.

Pimonov stated that the Soviet-promoted puppet government in the form of the so-called Lublin Committee was unable to guarantee this security, having no support at all in the country. He also promised that previously arrested leaders of the Polish underground would be released, and that a Soviet plane would be provided to take eight authorized Polish representatives to London to meet the Polish Government.

Before that, however, an official meeting with Marshal Zhukov must be arranged, and the marshal would invite the Poles to a luncheon. General Okulicki, commander of the Polish Home Army, should also attend this lunch.

Considering the great unrest among the Polish population—the Russians said—it was absolutely necessary to demonstrate the good will of both parties.

On March 28, 1945, 16 representatives of underground Poland arrived in the headquarters of the Soviet high command near Pruszkow.

They were greeted in a most friendly way by a large group of higher Soviet officers, and for a long time awaited Marshal Zhukov's arrival.

Finally they were informed that the marshal was expecting them in another nearby locality. They were driven to a building in Wlochy, occupied by the Soviet MVD.

There, they were told again that the marshal apologized for a further delay, but was yet unable to leave the front.

On the following morning, a Soviet general declared that Marshal Zhukov could not come, but had sent his private plane to fetch the Poles.

They were taken to the airfield of Okecie; Soviet generals and colonels bid them a hearty farewell.

The plane landed near the town Ivanovo, east of Moscow. From that place, the Polish delegates were taken by railway and by cars directly to the notorious prison at Lubianka.

In his press interview on May 18, 1945, Stalin stated: "It is not true that the arrested Poles were invited to negotiate with Soviet authorities."

During the trial of the 16 men, 1 of the accused argued that he had made the journey on Marshal Zhukov's invitation.

The president of the court, Colonel General Ulrych, exclaimed: "You have simply fallen for an MVD trick," and burst in jovial laughter.

The Poles imprisoned in the Lubianka were subjected to a Soviet investigation lasting 70 days. During that period every one of them was subjected to more than a hundred questionings and to psychological, and even physical, tortures.

They were accused of most improbable crimes, blackmailed with the situation of their families; attempts to bribe them with promises of wonderful careers were followed by threats of death or of life imprisonment in a labor camp.

Details of this investigation were described by Zbigniew Stypulkows—one of the prisoners who later succeeded in escaping to the West (invitation to Moscow).

What legal basis did the Soviet law provide for the arrest and accusation of the kidnaped Poles?

Article 58 of the Soviet penal code begins with the following words:

"A counterrevolutionary act is an act directed toward overthrowing, undermining, or weakening the authority of the Soviets of Workers and Peasants, of the Governments of Workers and Peasants of the U. S. S. R., or toward undermining or weakening the external security of the U. S. S. R. and of the basic economic, political, and national achievements of the proletarian revolution.

"On the grounds of the international solidarity of interests of all working people, such acts are also recognized as counterrevolutionary if they are directed against any other state of the working people, even if this state does not belong to the Union of Soviet Socialists Republics."

And article 16 of the same code says: "If a specific, socially dangerous, act is not directly covered by this code, then the basis and extent of responsibility arising from it shall be determined in a proper way in accordance with the articles of this code which concern a crime most similar to it in its kind."

On the grounds of these two articles, every act committed anywhere on earth, at any time, by a citizen of any country of the world, may be recognized by a Soviet court of justice as a crime, and may be judged and punished even by the "highest measure of social defense," with death.

A Soviet court of justice, holding such power in its hands, does not have to prove any real crimes; it only seeks for some additional accusations which may be of greatest propaganda value at a given moment.

Following this interpretation of the law, the Soviet indictment drawn against the leader of underground Poland we based on the factual state of affairs described in the following way:

"During the German occupation of the territories of Poland, Lithuania and of western districts of Ukraine and Byelorussia, the Polish emigre government formed an underground military organization named the Home Army. * * *

"The activities of this illegal organization were conducted by the accused Okulicki, together with Jankowski using the title of a president of the underground Council of Ministers, and with its ministers.

"Simultaneously, an illegal organization under the name of Council of National Unity was set up and acted on the Polish territory; this was headed by Puzak, general secretary of the Polish Socialist Party."

Thus, the Russians who during the years 1941–43 had recognized the Polish Government in London, now came to consider the activity of the part of this government residing in Poland, as criminal—even though it had place under German occupation.

This was the third occasion on which they accepted a point of view fully concordant with that of the Nazis. The first occasion had been in 1939, when they joined in the German aggression of Poland, by an attack from the east, and later partitioned Polish territories in full agreement with the Nazis.

The second time came in 1944 when they made it impossible for the Western Allies to succour the Warsaw rising and thus helped the Germans to squash it.

Now, on the third occasion, they publicly endorsed the Hitlerite conception of legality and illegality with regard to Poland.

Having recognized the activity of the Polish underground state as criminal, the Soviet prosecution did not have to add much to its accusation.

Some charges were added, however: that of sabotage in the rear of the Soviet Army, and even of the intention to oppose the Soviets in complicity with the Germans.

The case was tried by the military collegium of the highest court of justice of the U. S. S. R. presided over by Colonel General Ulrych who had gained a wide reputation in the prewar show trials connected with mass purges within the Soviet Communist Party.

Major General Afanasiev, military prosecutor general, and the prosecutor, Rudenko, at present attorney general of the U. S. S. R., acted for the prosecution.

A large number of arrested Polish people were brought from Soviet prisons to testify as witnesses. Testimony of witnesses called by some of the accused, was not admitted.

The trial was conducted in the usual atmosphere of Soviet court procedure, with prosecutors using offensive and malicious language, and official witnesses giving damning evidence against the accused.

A certain snag in the traditional routine was, that one of the accused (Stypulkowski) refused to plead guilty; it is doubtful, however, if this was of any consequence, since the sentence had bee determined beforehand.

As the trial of 16 Poles provoked a great stir everywhere in the world, and was taking place in a period when negotiations with the Western Allies had not yet been concluded, it was decided to impose European penalties, which would be considered as rather mild in Soviet conditions. Prosecutor Afanasiev explained this decision in the following way:

"Since we have victoriously completed the most just of all just wars, and the enemy has been trampled in the dust, people like these criminals here are no longer so dangerous that a penalty of shooting would have to be imposed on them."

The court issued its sentence after 3 days' procedure. Four of the accused were pronounced guilty of inimical activity in the rear of the Soviet Army, of planning to form a Polish-German military bloc against the Soviet Union, and of spying for foreign powers.

Eight were pronounced guilty of having failed to report these inimical activities to the Soviet authorities.

Three of the accused, who had pleaded guilty under the threat of a death sentence were released. The case of one who had fallen seriously ill under investigation was executed.

Individual sentences were: Gen. L. Okulicki, 10 years imprisonment; Vice Premier A. S. Jankowski, 8 years; ministers: A. Bien and S. Jasiukowicz, each 5 years; Chairman A. Puzak, 18 months; Deputy Speaker A. Zwierzynski, 8 months; Parliament Deputy K. Baginski, 18 months; Deputies I. Chacinski, A. Czarnowski, S. Mierzwa, S. Stypulkowski, and F. Urbanski, each to 4 months; K. Kobylanski, S. Michalowski, and J. Stemmler were released.

The period of sentence ran from the day of the arrests.

A. Pajdak who was tried separately out of court was sentenced to 3 years.

The sentences indicate that General Okulicki, whose sentence was the longest should have been free the 28th of March, 1955, and all others should have regained their freedom much earlier. What is the real state of affairs?

Okulicki, Jankowski, Jasiukowicz, and Pajdak have not returned to Poland and their fate is unknown. Their families have no news from them and do not even know whether the men are still alive.

Bien, allegedly, came back to Poland a short time ago.

Puzak and Mierzwa were released, but after their return to Poland they were again arrested and sentenced to long-term imprisonment. Both have since died in prison.

Czarnowski, Urbanski, and Chacinski all died after returning to Poland, in consequence of the sufferings they had undergone while in Soviet hands.

Michalowski and Kobylanski, after returning to Poland, were arrested and sentenced to long terms in prison.

Baginski, after serving several years' prison in Poland and Stypulkowski, succeeded in escaping to the West.

Zwierzynski and Stemmler (interpreter of the Polish delegation) live in Poland and probably are free.

In short, out of the 16 arrested Poles, 5 are dead, the fate of 4 is unknown, 2 are in prison, 3 are free in Poland, and 2 in the West.

Such was the practical result of an attempt at arranging relationships with the Soviet Union in an atmosphere "of mutual understanding and trust" to which the Poles were so warmly encouraged by their Western Allies.

On the 10th anniversary of the arrest of 16 leaders of underground Poland, the Polish people request that the Governments and nations of the free world give their full support to the following demands:

1. That the present fate of Okulicki, Jankowski, Jasiukowicz, and Pajdak, missing somewhere in the Soviet Union, be made known;

2. That those among them who are still alive be set free without delay;

3. That Kobylanski and Michalowski, imprisoned in Poland, be released.

General Okulicki, Ministers Jankowski, Jasiukowicz, and Padjak, and all others were either members of the recognized Allied Government of Poland or fought under its orders in the time when the entire free world was engaged in a deadly struggle with nazism.

If Allied nations were unable to bring them a political support, let them now extend a purely humanitarian help to prevent at least further sufferings.

This is a moral obligation, for the execution of which existing international law provides a formal basis.

To Restore Home Rule in America, Pass the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Broadcast No. 18 in the series of weekly radio programs of Dean Clarence E. Manion. The title of the broadcast is "To Restore Home Rule to America, Pass the Bricker Amendment."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO RESTORE HOME RULE TO AMERICA, PASS THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Have you ever read this provision in the Constitution of the United States? Listen to it: "Any power which is not conferred upon the President by this Constitution, or which this Constitution denies to him, may, nevertheless, be freely exercised by the President if the exercise of such power is authorized by the terms of any international agreement to which the United States is a party." By this provision the President of the United States is given power to do anything which any international agreement directs him to do, Constitutional restraints to the contrary notwithstanding.

Are you startled? You have never seen this provision in our Constitution? Of course you haven't seen it because it isn't there. The inclusion of such language by the Founding Fathers would have made ridiculous shambles of their whole historic, carefully contrived effort. Their purpose was strictly to limit the power of every officer, department, and division of Government, in the overall interest of your personal liberty. The Constitution does not give the President the power to do whatever an international agreement directs him to do—far from it. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the President has that power now. Furthermore, pursuant to the direction of international agreements, President Eisenhower and his immediate predecessors have acted upon the authority of international agreements to do what the Constitution forbids.

Last April, on the floor of the British House of Commons, Mr. Churchill disclosed that President Roosevelt had entered into a secret, but nevertheless binding agreement with Great Britain, whereby that country was given a continuing veto over the use of our atomic weapons in the execution of our international policies. Mr. Churchill insists that the agreement is still binding. In the Korean War, pursuant to international agreements, President Truman put American forces into battle at the disposal and direction of an international authority which included Soviet Russia, in spite of the fact that Congress had not then and has not yet exercised its exclusive Constitutional power to declare war in Korea.

At a press conference last March 16, Mr. John Foster Dulles stated that under the North Atlantic Alliance, as well as under the Rio Pact, President Eisenhower now has the right to put the country into war without consulting Congress.

Pursuant to the NATO Status of Forces Treaty, ratified during the first year of President Eisenhower's administration (July 15, 1953), American military servicemen now stationed in foreign countries are stripped of their established American constitutional and legal rights. By the terms of this vicious and unprecedented agreement, these soldiers are subjected to the laws of France, Turkey, Japan, or of any one of a score of countries in which American boys are now stationed around the world. Uncounted numbers of them are presently languishing in foreign jails, after conviction in unfamiliar foreign tribunals of violating curious and often cruel laws of the faraway places that Uncle Sam drafted these American youngsters to defend. Under this treaty the soldier's only recourse is a difficult diplomatic appeal through the American State Department, whose Foreign Service civilian employees, by the way, still enjoy all the constitutional protections which have been taken away from our soldiers.

How did the President acquire this treaty power which the Constitution denies to him? Years ago Justice Charles Evans Hughes truly said that, in the last analysis, "The Constitution is what the Judges say it is." Fifteen years ago the Supreme Court Judges said, in effect (*U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304)), that the treaty power is separate, apart, and above the Constitution; that the treaty power of the United States was inherited from the King of England and may be exercised to the same extent that it is exercised by other governments of the world. In this spirit the Supreme Court has never declared a treaty to be unconstitutional.

A college professor who is reliably reputed to be President Eisenhower's top adviser on constitutional procedures, has written this: "The question whether the United States should enter an international organization • • • and of what pledges it should give • • • is one which the appropriate agencies of the National Government are free to decide • • • substantially unfettered by constitutional limitations of any kind." (Edward S. Corwin, the Constitution and World Organization, 1944, p. 30.)

The Supreme Court has decided that the doctrine of treaty supremacy over the Constitution applies equally to private agreements between the President and foreign nations. Such binding agreements may be entirely secret, like Churchill's agreement with President Roosevelt giving Britain a veto on the use of our atomic weapons (*United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203)).

This brings us back to where we started. Thus, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding, treaties, and/or secret international agreements, can and do give the President the power to do things which the Constitution forbids him to do. Let us take a practical example. Even in a war emergency, no President may constitutionally establish price, rent, manpower, and wage controls throughout the United States. In normal times these matters are within the area of powers reserved to the individual States under the 10th article of the Bill of Rights. These subjects are brought within the war powers of Congress; however, when the Nation is engaged in, or threatened with, hostilities. In such a war emergency Congress may confer upon the President power to control these things within congressionally prescribed limitations.

But let us suppose that in time of peace, the President agrees with Canada that he will immediately impose such economic controls throughout the United States. Such an agreement automatically becomes binding upon every employer, employee, landlord, producer, and merchant throughout this country, war or no war, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding. In the same way, by international agreement, the President could outlaw ownership of certain types of property, atomic materials, for instance, and authorize an international police force to search for them in your home without a warrant. In like manner, the President, in concert with some foreign government or governments, could establish uniform game laws, labor laws (including the closed or open union shop), crop controls, fluoridation of all drinking water, a common educational curriculum, speed and weight limits on the highways or anything else that he and the foreign ministers thought good for you and the country.

If, as the courts now declare, our Presidents have always had this extraordinary treaty power, why have we waited so long to get excited about it? The answer is the United Nations Charter.

At the time the Constitution was written, and for much more than 100 years thereafter, treaties were simply contracts between nations concerning international matters, such as war, peace, boundary lines, oceanic fishing rights, navy ratios and so forth. In our generation however, treaties began to be used to arrange the relationships, not from government to government merely, but between a government and its own subjects.

Treaties, in other words, became the instruments by which one country reformed the economic, political or social conditions within another country. Treaties thus began to be used to modify the internal laws of a country, including the internal laws of the United States. This drive for internal reform through treaties, is a prime principle of the United Nations Charter and the execution of that principle has been the chief, if not the exclusive accomplishment of the United Nations organization since its inception.

For instance there is now a treaty, signed by many countries, including the United States, and pending ratification by the United States Senate, which is known as the Genocide Pact. This treaty coins an entirely new international crime called genocide, that is group-killing. But, according to this pending treaty, it is not necessary to kill a group of people in order to be guilty of genocide. You may be guilty if you cause serious mental or bodily harm to members or a member of a national, racial or religious group—; or if you conspier with others to do so; or attempt to do so even if you fail. Persons charged with genocide may be tried by such international penal tribunal as may have been accepted by the nations who are parties to the agreement.

Now stop and think for a moment. Every injured party in every criminal proceeding in the United States is certainly a member of some national, racial, or religious group. Thus, if we adopt the Genocide Pact, practically every criminal case now on the court dockets in this country becomes automatically transferable to an international tribunal. There, like our soldiers under the NATO Forces Treaty, the accused could be tried without a jury or any of the safeguards with which our Federal and State constitutions now protect every person accused of crime within the limits of the United States.

Stripped to its revealing bones, the Genocide Pact is disclosed as a scheme to liquidate our Bill of Rights, along with the inherent jurisdiction of our American courts, in any case where racial or religious prejudice or Communist-inspired class hatred moves into an American legal proceeding. At the present time the Genocide Pact is in the files of the Senate Judiciary Committee. By Senate ratification or Executive action it may become the supreme law of the land before you know it.

Another sideshow of the U. N. is the International Labor Organization, which has ground out more than 100 socialistic conventions which would radically change our labor, insurance, agricultural, and other American laws the minute they are ratified by the United States Senate. Discussion of the revolutionary United Nations Covenant on Human Rights, paraphrased from the so-called constitution of Soviet Russia, will have to be deferred until another time.

What does all this add up to? It adds up to a critical, urgent need for a positive corrective, constitutional amendment. Aided by the American Bar Association and encouraged by the repeated approving resolutions of the American Legion and more than 100 other patriotic organizations, Senator JOHN BRICKER, of Ohio, has been pushing for such a corrective amendment for years. The principle of his reform was defeated by the narrow margin of one vote short of the necessary two-thirds in the United States Senate last year. Only the shameless unprecedented pressure of the White House, brandishing the power and prestige of a then new and popular President prevented the Bricker amendment from sweeping through both Houses of Congress and from there to certain and prompt ratification by the States of the Union.

Why should any President of the United States, by agreement with a foreign government, acquire power over you which the Constitution forbids the President to exercise by himself? In effect, this subjects you to the control of unconstitutional legislation passed by foreign governments. All provisions of the pending Bricker amendment are vitally important but here is the section necessary to restore home rule to America:

SECTION 2: "A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreements."

In the critical interest of our national independence and your time-honored constitutional rights this langauge must be added to the Constitution right now. Don't permit any internationalist to doubletalk you out of it.

Export of Scrap Iron and Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, whatever may be the intentions, some of our shortsighted policies are actually helping Soviet Russia. There seems to be considerable confusion between the Department of Commerce and the Department of State over the matter of the export of scrap iron from the United States. I do not think it is too much to ask that the Department of Commerce and the Department of State pass 1 or 2 resolutions, first, that they are part of the same Government; and, second, that it might be well, since they might agree that they are part of the same Government, to have a uniform policy on a matter which affects our foreign trade and foreign policy.

Our domestic steel industry is trying to compel Western Europe to buy semi-finished steel or finished steel. They are trying to prohibit export of scrap iron and seem to have the blessing of the Department of Commerce in doing so. As a result, they are unknowingly or otherwise providing Russia with a powerful lever to force Western Europe to ship copper to them, despite the free world shortage of copper and the fact that it is a strategic material badly needed in Russia.

I respectfully suggest it is time for the White House to take a look at conflicting viewpoints between the Department of State and the Department of Commerce on this issue, and establish an American policy that takes into account what Russia is doing to take advantage of the present situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix, an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Wednesday, April 13, telling of a talk on this situation by Eliot Janeway, a recognized authority on economic research.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRAP EXPORT IMPASSE SEEN AIDING RUSSIA—REDS GETTING COPPER IN DEAL WITH BRITAIN, ECONOMIST REPORTS

The problem of export of scrap iron and steel to Europe is tied in with Russian procurement of copper and presents a knotty problem to the administration in Washington, in the opinion of a New York economist.

Eliot Janeway, of New York, editor of Janeway's Memos, an economic service to business, was in Pittsburgh last night to address the advance management group of the School of Industrial Administration of Carnegie Institute of Technology in Webster Hall Hotel.

DECISION UP TO WHITE HOUSE

Many of the ideas discussed with a reporter were touched upon in the economist's address.

It is his opinion that the White House will have to decide the question of whether unrestricted scrap exports to Europe shall be permitted. At present, there is a trickle of scrap exports under license.

The State Department has decided there is no scrap shortage in the United States, while the Commerce Department is in the corner of steel producers, who wish scrap exports to be prohibited. The steel industry says, in effect, that if Europe needs metals, it should buy semi-finished or finished steel.

RUSSIA SHIPPING TO ENGLAND

During the impasse, according to Janeway, Russia is shipping pig iron to England at a delivered price slightly under the delivered price of American steel scrap there. As part of the pig iron deal, there is a reciprocity arrangement, he said, whereby England supplies Russia with badly needed copper.

Janeway said that the decision on larger scrap steel exports should be made on a basis of the least cost to the American economy. In any event, he is in favor of permitting scrap exports only if the steel made from it is used by Western Europe for defense purposes.

The Bill of Rights and the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD broadcast No. 19 in Dean Manion's series of weekly radio programs. The title of the broadcast is "To Protect the Bill of Rights, Pass the Bricker Amendment."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO PROTECT THE BILL OF RIGHTS, PASS THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

In one respect, Mr. John Foster Dulles was wrong when he said that treaties between the United States and foreign nations can cut across the rights given to the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights. In this statement Mr. Dulles was correct about the devastating effect of treaties, but he was wrong about the Bill of Rights. In the United States, rights are not given to the people by our constitutional Bill of Rights. Neither the Constitution of the United States in general, nor its Bill of Rights in particular, gives us any right whatsoever. Our Constitution is not a giver of rights. It is merely a protection for those natural rights which come to each man from his Creator.

With the first heart-beat of the new American Republic, our Declaration of Independence proclaimed that to secure, that is, to protect and safeguard these God-given rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Thus the entire constitutional structure of American Government is merely the people's agent—or their servant in other words—for the protection of God's gifts. In it's origin, operation, and object our American constitutional system is not the source, but the shield of our rights.

From other things that he has said and written, I am sure that Mr. John Foster Dulles appreciates this distinction. I am therefore confident that his characterization of the Bill of Rights in his now famous quotation was a mere slip of tongue, pen, or both. Nevertheless, it was and is a very important slip. It is particularly important in a discussion concerning the effect of international treaties upon the internal law of the United States.

Ours is now one of the very few servant governments in the world. Elsewhere, government is not the servant but the master of its citizens. Outside of the United States, both east and west of the Iron Curtain, a personal right is something that government grants, but always subject to immediate withdrawal at the government's supreme will.

Let us take personal liberty as an instance. Philosophically, personal liberty is your right to do what you ought to do. Like all other rights, liberty is a moral claim. Thus, morally, you are never at liberty to perform any act which would violate the moral rights of your neighbor, whether the Government prohibits such an act or not. But only incidentally are treaties moral or immoral. For practical purposes, they are binding, legal obligations. If a treaty affects your personal conduct, you must obey it or go to jail. Let us therefore consider liberty in its practical aspect, with conscience, philosophy and theology to one side. Hereafter when I refer to liberty, I am talking about things you may do without violating valid, criminal laws.

Practically everywhere outside of the United States, personal liberty is merely what the government permits the citizens to do. In this country, on the contrary, liberty is something that the Constitution prevents government from doing to the citizen. Here, liberty takes the form of a positive enforceable limitation upon government. Elsewhere in the world, liberty, like other personal rights and immunities, is a grant or permission which the subject gets from his government. It is obvious therefore,

that when the United States makes treaties with foreign governments on the subject of personal liberty and other human rights, the United States and the involved foreign governments are not talking the same political or legal language. Mr. Dulles truly said that such treaties may cut across our Bill of Rights. In doing so, they would effectively turn our time-honored concept of liberty inside out, and release American Government thereafter to do whatever it pleases.

A graphic example of this danger to our liberty-protecting constitutional system is the so-called International Covenant on Human Rights. For the past 7 years in more than 450 meetings, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights has been debating and drafting this involved piece of international legislation. When and if it is accepted as a treaty by the United States, this covenant, so-called, will affect every citizen of this country as directly as a stop-light at his local street intersection. To supplant our constitutional Bill of Rights, which is concisely expressed in just 462 words, the pending international covenant now employs approximately 10,000 words. Here are some of its provisions:

"The states parties to the Covenant recognize: * * * the fundamental right of everyone to the opportunity, if he so desires, to gain his living by work which he fully accepts" (A, pt. 3, art. 6); "the right of everyone to social security" (A, pt. 3, art 9); "the right of everyone to adequate food, clothing, and housing" (A, pt. 3, art 11); the right "to the highest attainable standard of health" (A pt. 3, art. 13); the right "to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion" but, note this, "freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject to such limitations as are prescribed by law" (B, pt. 3, art. 18).

The right to "hold opinions" and the right to "freedom of expression" are also recognized but, as is the case with all rights described in the Covenant, opinion and free expression are subject to such restrictions "as are provided by law" (B, pt. 3, art. 19). Freedom of association in trade unions is recognized too, but this, says the Covenant, "shall not prevent the imposition of lawful restrictions on the exercise of this right by members of the armed forces or the police" (B, pt. 3, art. 21).

These quotations are typical of the whole involved and bulky document. They illustrate the international, as distinguished from the American concept of human rights, namely, that these international rights are bestowed by the respective governments and that in every instance they are subject to restriction or extinction by governmental regulations.

The difference between this international concept and our tried and true American formula can be seen by a glance at standard provisions of our own Federal Bill of Rights. Listen to our article 1, for instance: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble" (amendment 1, Constitution of the United States). Observe that these important rights are not simply "declared," but are spelled out in terms of restrictions upon governmental action.

Now from article IV: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or thing to be seized" (amendment IV, Constitution of the United States). Here is no mere declaration of the right of privacy, but a positive restraint upon the power of the police, the courts, and the legislatures.

Listen to this typical companion piece from the Bill of Rights in the Indiana constitution: "No law shall, in any case whatsoever, control the free exercise and enjoyment of religious opinions or interfere with the rights of conscience" (art. 1, sec. 3, Indiana constitution). Here is another Indiana provision: "No man's particular services shall be demanded without just compensation. No man's property shall be taken by law without just compensation" (art. 1, sec. 1, Indiana constitution).

These citations illustrate the pattern of all American constitutions, State and Federal. Everywhere our rights are set forth in terms of specific firm restrictions upon the government, which every American can personally enforce in the courts. American history demonstrates that such unequivocal restrictions upon government are the only practical definitions of human rights.

Blasting the internationalist concept of government as the giver of rights is this article IX of our Federal Bill of Rights: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people" (amendment IX, Constitution of the United States).

Then finally comes article X. As a protection for these retained and reserved rights against possible concentration of governmental power, this is the most important section of the entire Bill of Rights: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people" (amendment X, Constitution of the United States).

Against this effective protection for human rights in terms of strictly limited government, the international covenant now looms up as a dangerous and threatening menace. The covenant is a vital part of a well-financed, diabolically determined drive to sink our singular constitutional system in a mad merger with Old World despotism. The genocide pact, bad as it undoubtedly is, becomes relatively harmless when compared with the despotic ramifications of this 10,000-word International Covenant on Human Rights. The genocide pact would change our constitutional system in a limited number of instances, but our adoption of the international covenant would destroy our basic constitutional concept of unalienable God-given liberty.

In direct defiance of our own States rights article which was my last quotation, the Human Rights Commission has recently inserted this in their covenant: "The provisions of the covenant shall extend to all parts of federal states without any limitations or exceptions" (B. art. 52). And, during March of 1954, after years of consideration, the international Commission, by a vote of 12 to 2, defeated a motion by the United States representative that the covenant recognize the right of an individual to own property.

What is the sense of our lavish outlays of men and money to stop the spread of communism in Europe and Asia if we are to permit our Constitution to be rewritten by a commission which votes 12 to 2 against the right to private property? This international body refuses to recognize your personal ownership of your home or your automobile. Once it is ratified, this vicious treaty will transform our land of the free into a home for the slave. And make no mistake about it, this treaty will be ratified unless you wake up and act. Because of prevailing judicial constructions by which treaties supercede the Constitution, the whole flank of our time-honored American freedom is now exposed to imminent destruction. Not merely the International Covenant and the Genocide Pact but literally thousands of international agreements now in effect, in the works, or awaiting ratification by the Senate will wreck our form of government and wipe out the last shred of protection for your God-given liberty.

To protect our constitutional system against existing and pending treaties we need the Bricker amendment now. That necessary protection was denied us last year because the internationalists and one-worlders were more active and influential in Washington than you were. It will be defeated again unless you decide to pass it.

Two hundred dedicated patriots in every congressional district of the United States can push this protection through the present Congress and insure its prompt ratification by the States. Are there 200 patriots in your congressional district who are willing to band together and stand together until this constitutional loophole is properly plugged? Get on the telephone now and find out.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article and an editorial from the St. Paul (Minn.) Catholic Bulletin of March 19, 1955, dealing with the subject of juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME BLIGHTED BY SECULARISM, DELEGATES HERE TOLD—ARCHBISHOP CITES WANE OF RELIGION IN FAMILY CIRCLE—CHILD DELINQUENCY IS LAID TO BREAKDOWN OF CHRISTIAN HOUSEHOLD

There has been a progressive decline of religious influence in the American home, Archbishop Alter, of Cincinnati, said Wednesday at the opening of the 23d annual National Catholic Conference on Family Life in St. Paul.

The chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference preached the keynote sermon at a solemn mass celebrated in the cathedral by Archbishop Murray.

"Whether we realize it or not," said Archbishop Alter, "all of us in some measure have become victims of the secularist viewpoint current in the world about us.

"Without denying outright the existence of God and His plan of salvation, society at large has come to regard religion as irrelevant in the practical business of daily life."

Setting forth the object and purpose of the conference, which brought to the city delegates from all sections of the country, Archbishop Alter recalled that in the days before the factory system replaced the family workshop, the home was the place where children received their vocational training, were prepared by imitating the examples of their parents for mature adult life.

The home was the recreational center, where parents and children with neighboring families gathered for relaxation and entertainment.

"Today many mothers have joined the ranks of wage earners," the archbishop said.

"Homes have grown smaller or have been replaced by efficiency apartments. Children in consequence are left more and more to their own devices, without adequate direction or supervision.

"The automobile has increased the range of movement of all members of the family. * * * In a word, the home has been frequently disrupted by centrifugal forces which break up its cohesion, its unity and stability.

"The school, the factory, the office, the community recreation center have tended to supplant the home as a center and focus of life and its activities."

A century ago, when schools were removed from the direction and care of the church and placed under the patronage of the State, the disastrous results were not apparent immediately, but now in the fifth generation since the change occurred religion almost is eliminated from daily life, the prelate said.

The archbishop pointed, too, to the problem of juvenile delinquency as a consequence of family life's breakdown.

He recalled that a United States Senate committee investigating youth delinquency reported that despite the expenditure of millions of dollars and the multiplication of child guidance clinics and other social agencies, the ratio of juvenile delinquency in the last 5 years had increased 45 percent.

"The chief cause," Archbishop Alter said, "is found to be the broken homes—broken by divorce, separation, desertion, physical, mental, and moral disabilities. This is not a new discovery."

Several practical recommendations were made by Archbishop Alter to cope with the situation. He reminded that from its earliest days the church has impressed upon the faithful the value of family prayer.

"Children will never forget the example of their parents kneeling with them in prayer."

He urged that the home be used to introduce children to a knowledge and love of the sacred liturgy and that Catholic families celebrate the anniversaries of children's baptisms, the feast days of the church, make the advent wreath familiar to children, and in other ways dramatize the role of religion in the minds of the children.

"If parents will see to it that religious events are made an occasion of joy in the home; if they will help the children to understand the mass, the sacraments, the ritual feasts, by active and intelligent participation; if they will decorate their homes with objects of sacred art and place books and magazines breathing a Christian culture on the shelves of their libraries—they will have done much to remove the drab and dreary touch of secularism from their homes and will brighten the lives of their children as well as their own," he said.

"The position of the church is that of patron and protector of family life," he concluded.

"It is the champion of authority in the home, but it is also the champion of freedom as against the state. It is the champion of morality in public life and the best guarantee of national stability.

"Its only aim and purpose is to see each new generation grow in age, and grace, and wisdom before God and men."

In an address at the opening general session of the convention, Dr. Edward A. Huth, of Dayton, NCCFL president, said:

"The very existence of this Nation or any nation depends upon how all the Christian way of life is protected, defended, and promoted. * * *

"Of all the factors which lead to successful family life, religion, and morality are indispensable elements.

"Reason and experience indicate that national morality cannot prevail when religious principles are excluded from family life."

Mrs. August G. Desch, of Chicago, National Council of Catholic Women president, told the convention:

"From a better understanding of the sacrament of matrimony and of the church's teaching on Christian marriage will come a greater participation in the life of the church and an increase in the blessings that flow from closer union with God.

"As this family life centers more and more at the altar, the family will tend to become in itself a closer-knit unit.

"The holy family will become its ideal and life with the home will assume those characteristics which marked the little home at Nazareth."

A message from Archbishop Cicognani, apostolic delegate, imparted a special apostolic blessing from Pope Pius XII to "be shared by everyone participating in this year's conference."

A message from President Eisenhower lauding the aims of the convention also was read.

Msgr. Howard Carroll, Washington, general secretary of the NCWC, was Archbishop Murray's assistant priest at the opening mass.

Other officers were Msgr. John J. Cullinan, St. Paul, and Msgr. James Moynihan, Minneapolis, deacons of honor; Father Bernard C. Cronin, San Francisco, deacon of the mass; Father Maurice Mueller, Fargo, subdeacon; Father George Ziskovsky of the St. Paul Seminary and Father John Brandes of the Cathedral, masters of ceremonies.

Members of the hierarchy scheduled to be present at functions of the convention included Archbishop Binz of Dubuque, Bishop Peter Bartholome of St. Cloud, Auxiliary Bishop Leo Byrne of St. Louis, Auxiliary Bishop Leo Dworschak of Fargo, Bishop Joseph Annabring of Superior, Bishop Lambert Hoch of Bismarck, Bishop William T. McCarty of Rapid City, Bishop Joseph M. Mueller of Sioux City, Bishop Francis J. Schenk of Crookston, Bishop Thomas A. Welch of Duluth, Bishop Joseph C. Willging of Pueblo.

Bishop William T. Mulloy of Covington was to preach at the concluding family holy hour conducted by Bishop James J. Byrne of St. Paul in the Cathedral Friday evening.

General sessions were held in the municipal auditorium Wednesday and Thursday evenings.

Wednesday afternoon, all day Thursday, and all day Friday were occupied by 26 sectional meetings at the Hotel St. Paul.

President Eisenhower's message, sent to Father Edgar Schmiedeler, OSB, director of the NCWC Family Life Bureau, sponsoring the conference, said:

"The theme of your convention, The Family Together, suggests that you will consider ways to further happiness and unity within the family group—in play, in work, in social and religious life.

"The importance of such considerations becomes immediately clear when we remember that family environment is the first and most important influence in the formation of the character of our people.

"It is in the homes of the Nation that loyalty and integrity and devotion to the truth can first be taught to the young.

"Such ethical and spiritual qualities in individual Americans are fundamental to our continued progress as a nation."

WHO'S DELINQUENT?

(By Joseph Breig)

I grow weary of the everlasting talk about juvenile delinquency.

If there is one fact that is as plain as the nose on my face, it is this: the cure for juvenile delinquency lies in the home.

Good, happy family life can prevent juvenile delinquency. Nothing else can prevent it.

But does this country do the things that ought to be done to help parents? No.

Almost it seems that we do the opposite. Almost we seem sometimes to be plotting against the family.

Take a case in point—the income tax. In Washington, our representatives vie with one another in offering suggestions for tax reductions.

But does anybody propose increasing the exemptions for children? Does anybody say that we ought to grant progressively larger exemptions for, say, the third, the fourth, the fifth child?

Take another example—family allowances. In this matter, the United States today ranks as a backward country. More than 40 nations, including Canada and Australia, have family allowance systems.

Family allowances have proved invaluable. They have been magnificently successful in Canada, on our very doorstep. But all you hear about them in this country is an elaborate silence.

Family allowances work like this. A monthly sum, to help meet family expenses, is paid to the parents of, say, more than two children.

Let's suppose we instituted an allowance of $12 for the third child, $10 for the fourth, and $8 for each additional child.

What would that cost? Less than $2 billions annually.

Is that a lot of money? Well, Americans spend more than $9 billions annually for alcoholic beverages. And for juke-boxe music—if you can call it music—we spend $300 millions a year.

As for what we spend trying to combat juvenile delinquency—which family allowances would go a long way to prevent—well, your guess is as good as mine.

Why are family allowances needed?

Here are some statistics, compiled by Robert Cissell, director, Family Life Institute, Xavier University, Cincinnati.

In 1952, the median income for two-child families in the United States was $4,268.

For families with six or more children, it was only $3,045. And nearly one-third of the families with six or more children had yearly incomes under $2,000.

In the light of such facts, is juvenile delinquency surprising?

The best preventives for juvenile delinquency are decent, adequate housing, good food and clothing, home recreation, and the like—plus a religious, God-centered home atmosphere.

On $2,000 a year, how can parents provide the right home conditions for six or more children?

Is it any wonder that youthful energy bursts forth from crowded, squalid, depressing surroundings, and runs riot in misbehavior?

As for that vital matter of religious atmosphere in homes—

Well, there is a tremendous rising tide of demand for a return to America's religious roots. Organizations like the American Legion and the junior chamber of commerce are sponsoring "back to God" movements. President Eisenhower, in talk after talk, urges that we recover our religious heritage.

But when an administration bill is introduced in Congress for Federal aid to education, religious schools are carefully excluded. Religious parents are carefully discriminated against.

The very fathers and mothers who take the most effective step against juvenile delinquency by insisting that their children's education be God-centered, are consistently refused any share in the educational taxes they pay.

We cry out "back to God," but we penalize those who try hardest to rear future citizens whose lives will be motivated by obedience to God.

Isn't it all rather preposterous?

What's the PTA Fight About?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the Editor's Notes by Walter Leckrone appearing in the May 8, 1955 edition of the Indianapolis Times:

EDITOR'S NOTES
(By Walter Leckrone)
WHAT'S THE PTA FIGHT ABOUT?

Parent-teacher associations are essentially private clubs, serving many good and useful purposes, but with no official public status.

So long as they remain that, it is clearly pretty much their own private business how they run their own affairs.

When, however, they constitute themselves a political lobby and align their mass membership behind demands for fundamental change in national policies that affect everybody, it seems to me they waive this privilege of privacy, and invite public inspection of the influence they assert.

Just now they are the principal citizen organization fighting for Federal aid to education—in fact, the only organization with any important membership. Quite a considerable number of these members, however, contend that they themselves are not for Federal aid—but on the contrary vigorously oppose it—although they are counted as part of the organization support. They charge, furthermore, that the membership has never been asked which side of this controversial issue it wishes to take, but has simply been herded into line.

That is the basis of the long-smoldering fight that flared up in Broad Ripple last week, and again in the State PTA convention—a dispute that gets no less bitter because of the presence of a good many fine, sincere, well-meaning people on both sides of it.

Ostensibly it's over the hot Federal-aid issue. But basically it is about how democratic—or undemocratic—PTA procedure is.

The question at hand is how many of the several million PTA members—who are also, of course, voters much respected by Congressmen—are actually in accord with the ardent campaign of their national organization for Federal aid, and ultimate Federal control, of local public schools.

The truth is—no members' vote on the issue, at any time. There has been indication of obvious effort, indeed, to prevent any membership vote on it, on either local, State, or National levels.

The National Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations insists that most of the State associations, of which it is composed, have indorsed the proposal, although it has firmly refused to reveal which States, or how many, or how they did it.

The indorsement was just renewed this week by Indiana, however, in an interesting manner. The convention was informed that local PTA units in the State had indorsed the national Federal-aid policy by a vote of 350 to 72. A motion for a convention vote of delegates present was then ruled out of order.

There are more than 1,100 local PTA units in Indina. So that fewer than one-third of them actually had indorsed Federal aid by this poll—although the entire State organization was thus considered bound to that policy. Even in those units, there had been no real vote on it by members. Ballots—one to each unit—had been sent to local secretaries to be acted upon at local PTA meetings.

The ballots—which were complicated multipage affairs containing 70 or 80 or 90 different questions and requiring reference to unavailable documents for intelligent understanding—provided no place where any member or any unit could vote for or against Federal aid. So far as these ballots were concerned that issue already had been settled and closed. The vote was only on how it was to be distributed.

Members were expected to act on it, nevertheless, at one unit meeting, along with whatever other business was current. The fact that even so 72 local units succeeded somehow in expressing disapproval seems significant of considerable active sentiment against the whole thing.

The conclusion is inescapable that PTA policies are determined by its officers, rather than by its members.

Even that could be somewhat representative if those officers were themselves freely elected by the members and responsible to them. They are not.

In Indiana's State organization no one is eligible for election to office except members of the board of directors.

Members of the board are appointed by the officers.

Thus no one can be elected to office except those chosen and appointed by incumbent officers, and the members have no voice in their selection.

Motions in the convention to elect, rather than appoint, nominating committees and to require more than one nominee for each office in elections, were defeated.

As the week ended members of the Broad Ripple PTA had voted overwhelmingly to withdraw from State and National associations—as several others previously have done. Under its rules, strengthened at this convention, however, the State association can still claim Broad Ripple as a member unit, without regard to this action.

All this is of any public concern only because of the pressure now being exerted on the Congress of the United States to enact legislation with the representation that it is backed by the several millions of individual Americans who are PTA members.

Until there has been a fair, free, open vote on the clear-cut issue involved by the membership represented as supporting it, this claim is entitled to no serious consideration by any Member of Congress.

Trade, Aid, and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the April 22, 1955, issue of the Commonweal there was published an excellent article entitled "Trade, Aid, and the Farmer." With the understanding that my asking that the article be inserted in the RECORD does not mean I endorse every word of it, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE, AID, AND THE FARMER
(By Martin E. Schirber and Emerson Hynes)

The contrast between the policies of the past decade and those of the 10 years following World War I is most striking. The twenties saw the rejection of the League of Nations in a wave of shallow isolationism, the pious faith in paper disarmament and pacts of peace, the hard-boiled "they-hired-the-money-didn't-they?" international monetary policy and enthusiastic support for ever higher tariffs.

In comparison with that era of unenlightened nationalism, the past decade has been one of economic maturity. Historians will be hard-pressed to find a parallel of a victorious nation which engineered reconstruction so efficiently and generously for both her allies and conquered enemy as has the United States. Despite some blunders and hurried improvisations, the international policy turned out to be imaginative and canny. It worked. Our prodigious productive power and organizational ability were unleashed for the relief and rebuilding of other nations; full employment was maintained at home; communism was contained, and our military power strengthened.

It is true that some of the military and diplomatic endeavors were reluctantly undertaken, but in the field of economic policy the record is one of positive and sustained leadership. Either alone or in conjunction with the U. N. we initiated UNRRA, FAO, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Marshall plan, Point 4, ECA, and similar programs, to say nothing of private relief efforts such as CARE and the NCWC War Relief Services. From 1946 to 1953 the net economic aid given to foreign countries by our Government totaled $33 billion, while military aid amounted to another $8 billion; and expenditures for the Mutual Security program for 1954 and 1955 will add another $9 billion. These grants, appropriated with only minor dissent, stand in marked contrast with the mere $11 billion of war debts which became the subject of such acrid controversy in the thirties.

Moreover, as a result of the continued reduction in duties and the general rise in prices, the average level of our tariff is now so low that other countries would profit less by further reduction than they would from simplification of our customs procedure and from assurance that we will not invoke the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act against imports which show signs of becoming competitive. We have also sought to conduct our foreign trade relations in an orderly and efficient manner by cooperating with the 34 nations which are participating in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Although Congress has not yet given formal approval to the GATT, American delegates took part in drafting the original agreement and have made use of the organization provided by GATT for the orderly negotiation of trade agreements with other countries.

It is true that it has been relatively easy for the United States to show such magnanimity in international affairs. Our countryside and cities escaped the devastation of war, and our problem today is one of overproduction and abundance. In 1954 our agricultural surpluses increased by $1.3 billion to an all-time high of $7.4 billion.

But now that the free world has reached and surpassed its prewar level of production, the time for outright grants has come to an end. To foreign producers who are back on their feet, such generosity is hardly distinguishable from dumping. Thus the National Cattle Breeding Association in Spain and its associated industries have branded the donation of powdered milk to Spanish children as disastrous to the sale of their milk products. And the recent offer of 10 million pounds of butter (out of our present hoard of butter—255 million pounds) on a competitive-bid basis brought howls of protest from butter-exporting countries. Meanwhile, many other countries are holding their breaths for fear that the competitive-bid idea

will spread to the remaining $7 billion worth of surplus commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Even the more orderly methods of surplus disposal exemplified by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act have brought protests from competing exporters and from producers in importing countries. This act, which was passed in 1954 with the unanimous support of all farm groups, renews and extends the authority of the Mutual Security Act to permit the sale of a maximum of $700 million wort of surplus agricultural commodities abroad for foreign currencies over the next 3 years, and the outright donation of up to $300 million worth of commodities for famine or other emergency relief, and similar purposes.

While such sales are made only under agreement with the governments of importing countries and care is taken not to disrupt the ordinary channels of trade, the program has been branded as dumping by some exporting nations and accepted with obvious lack of enthusiasm by others. Thus Burma and Thailand have complained that our newfound method of scattering largesse abroad is raising havoc with their export markets for rice; and the subcommittee on trade of the U. N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, while expressing appreciation for economic aid, has gently suggested that the normal flow of trade between countries in that part of the world could be seriously disturbed.

Thus the United States is clearly at the crossroads as regards foreign economic policy. The postwar decade of reconstruction is over, and we are now called upon for a new type of world leadership. That this is recognized by the President is evident from his January 10 message to Congress: "The Nation's enlightened self-interest and sense of responsibility as a leader among the free nations require a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for the fuller operaton of the forces of free enterprise and competitive markets."

The most direct and obvious way in which we can at this stage help to increase the economic strength of the free world is by stepping up the productivity of all countries falling under this designation. This can be accomplished most effectively by furnishing them with the modern tools of production and technical know-how. In some areas the greatest need may be for an all-steel plow; other countries may require textile machinery, mining equipment, or a cement plant. In any case, increasing productivity abroad means increased foreign investment and expansion of our technical-assistance program. That private investment is seeking outlets abroad is evident from the interest shown at the recent Inter-American Investment Conference at New Orleans. On the other hand, greater investment in foreign countries will entail the admission of a growing volume of imports with which debtor nations will wish to pay the interest and principal of their loans.

More imperative at the present time is the need of reversing the worldwide trend toward subsidization of exports and quantitive restrictions on imports. Almost every country has a number of pampered industries which they try to protect. For instance, in the case of wheat alone, with the world price (without allowing for transportation) about $1.70, the support price in Chile is $4.50; in Uruguay, $2.96; in France, $2.64; in the United States, $2.25; while England pays a producer subsidy of 60 cents per bushel. When prices are supported at such artificial levels nations are obliged to impose quotas and other restrictions on competitively priced imports. The next step is to push surpluses into world markets by means of export subsidies. The competition in granting "artificial aids to exports" has become so intense that it resembles in many ways the competitive devaluation of currency in the 1930's, and is equally self-defeating.

If we are sincere in our proposal to strengthen the free world by means of foreign investment, technical assistance, and other ways, it is highly inconsistent to weaken it by encouraging such beggar-my-neighbor policies as these. Yet it is just in this area that our failure in world leadership is most conspicuous. As a consequence of supporting the prices of agricultural commodities at levels entirely unrelated to costs of production, and the realities of world markets, we have not only accumulated the surpluses described earlier, but we have been forced to impose quotas on imports of wheat, dairy products, cotton, peanuts, barley, oats, rye, and other commodities, and to pay subsidies on the export of wheat. Wheat subsidies under the International Wheat Agreement totaled nearly $600 million from 1949 to 1953, and we are still paying over 60 cents a bushel on every bushel exported. This represents the amount by which our domestic price exceeds the world price.

That the world is looking for leadership out of this suicidal race is evident from the fact that three Cabinet Ministers from Canada flew to Washington in January to urge that we modify section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This section authorizes the imposition of quotas to exclude imports which compete with commodities under control or disposal programs. And since the United States is the world's largest exporter and importer, the GATT agreement will amount to very little unless we join up. Nevertheless, we were unable to offer any assurances to the Canadian officials, and our delegates at Geneva had no alternative but to insist that the revised agreement contain loopholes large enough to accommodate our quota system and some type of subsidization of exports. In fact, so inhospitable is the climate in this country to such concessions, that the Trade Agreements Extension Act which barely squeaked by the House contains a clause declaring any action or agreement which conflicts with laws like section 22 will be without effect.

While it is true that we have used import restrictions and subsidies with restraint, it is difficult to induce smaller and industrially weaker nations to agree to banning such practices when they see the most powerful nation in the world insisting upon them whenever it seems convenient to do so.

Another example of the temptation to economic nationalism which is endangering our foreign economic leadership is the two-price system. A two-price system for wheat was written into the Agricultural Act of 1954 but was removed in conference with the Senate. It has again been included in the 1955 Agricultural Act now before the House, and a similar plan has been proposed for cotton and rice.

A two-price plan is a seductively simple way out of our difficulties. Under such a plan as it appears in the House draft of the 1955 Agricultural Act, the Secretary of Agriculture would, before planting time, determine the quantity of wheat which will be consumed as food in the United States during the coming marketing year. For the past 10 years domestic consumption has been highly stable and has averaged about 500 million bushels a year, or, roughly, half the annual output. This domestic food quota would be apportioned among the States, counties, and farms in accordance with their production in the preceding 5 years.

The Secretary would issue marketing certificates aggregating the total domestic food quota, e. g., 500 million bushels. He would then determine the value of the certificates as equal to the difference between 100 percent of parity and the estimated actual farm price per bushel. Each farmer would receive certificates in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for his farm. The farmer would harvest his crop and sell it at the going market price. He would then sell his marketing certificates to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to a wheat processor, or to some intermediary. The proceeds therefrom, when added to the market price for the wheat sold for food, would result in full parity price on his share of the domestic food quota.

Flour millers and other processors would be obliged to purchase enough certificates to equal the volume of wheat processed for food for domestic consumption. The resulting increase in their costs of production would presumably be passed on in whole or in part to the consumer in the form of higher prices. Wheat produced in excess of the domestic food quota would not entitle the grower to wheat certificates but could be sold for feed or export at the going world price.

Space does not permit an extended discussion of the pros and cons of the two-price system. It is essentially a form of dumping, which is defined as selling abroad at prices below the domestic price. Secondly, if the blended price received by the farmer is anywhere near present levels, it will result in a continuation of the present high levels of production (unless acreage controls, even more drastic than those now in effect, are forced upon farmers), and a large proportion of that supply will seek foreign outlets. Here it will run up against the traditionally inelastic import demand of deficit countries and the typically inelastic supply of other exporting countries. The increased exports will therefore tend to force down world prices, and will be met by antidumping measures on the part of importing countries, and by various countermeasures, ranging from multiple exchange rates to outright price war on the part of exporting countries in whose balance of trade wheat is an important item.

If we wish to do our part in eliminating such cutthroat policies, the course to be followed is obvious. The first step will be to retain the agricultural act of 1954, which permits considerable flexibility in support prices, and return as soon as feasible to the full flexibility originally provided for in the act of 1949. Then as conditions permit, supports can be removed altogether. Taken in conjunction with measures to be suggested below, this will be a benefit to farmers and to society as a whole, because support prices tied to an arbitrary level like parity are a most capricious way to redistribute income. They take no account of reductions in cost due to technological improvements or of differences in costs in different parts of the country. Thus horses today are selling at 13 percent of parity, while citrus growers are doing nicely with grapefruit selling at 22 percent of parity and oranges at 40 to 60 percent. Likewise, the support price for wheat is now about $2.26 but the estimated costs of production range from 80 cents in western Kansas to $1.76 in Indiana and Michigan.

Moreover, it has been demonstrated that the lion's share of the alleged benefits of the program go to a minority of high-income farmers. This fact was brought out in a different way recently by Prof. D. Gale Johnson, of the University of Chicago. He has shown that the net income of the 1.23 million farmers who sold 73 percent of all farm products in 1940 averaged $6,350, as compared with an average of $5,100 for nonfarm families. Thus our price-support program tends to take income from the lower-income groups and distribute it to an aristocracy of farmers. In fact, although there may be some indirect benefits to low-income farmers, the disparity of direct benefits is most glaring. For instance, the average wheat loan for the State of North Dakota in 1953 was $2,890, while the average for the 5 highest was $71,253. The proportions were roughly similar for corn loans in Iowa, but in

Mississippi the average cotton loan for the State was $372, while the average of the 5 highest loans was $479,535.

If in the interest of an enlightened foreign-economic policy it will be necessary to abandon or modify our present price-support program, what can we put in its place? In a previous article on agricultural policy (the Commonweal, November 27, 1953), we outlined various constructive proposals which have been advanced from time to time by students of the farm problem. Three of them are particularly applicable to the present discussion. However, a basic prerequisite for the success of any plan for improving farm welfare is the maintenance of a high level of employment in the economy as a whole. It is worth repeating that the farmer will be better off with 90 percent of full employment in the economy as a whole than with price supports at 90 percent of parity on a few of his products.

Since the farmer is so exposed to the impact of economic forces, he quite properly has a deep-seated fear of depression. One of the reasons he clings so relentlessly to a patently ineffective price-support program is that it seems to offer one element of stability in a situation of constant and unpredictable change. Understandably enough, he will not let go of what he has unless he is offered a better insurance against catastrophic price declines such as he experienced in the 1930's. So if, despite all efforts to the contrary, a real depression does develop, it would simply be the part of wisdom to have ready a variety of specially designed measures to meet it on all fronts. Such an antidepression measure on the farm front would be supplementary income payments, which could be considered as a reward to the farmer for maintaining production as he typically does during depressions.

Various methods have been suggested for putting such a plan into operation. The one essential is that the payments should not be tied to a rigid standard like parity prices as in the case of the wool program; rather they should be designed to offset the difference between depression prices and the normal price of a given number of predepression years. Once the depression is over, the payments should cease.

A second hazard inherent in farming is uncertainty. Not only does the farmer have no control over total output or price, but he is subject to all the vagaries of weather and pests and the uninformed guesses of several million other farmers. Therefore, to take some of the guesswork out of farming and to make it easier to plan production wisely, many economists advocate shifting some of the uncertainty to society through forward prices. Under such a plan, a Government agency would forecast future demand and supply conditions and estimate the equilibrium price which would result from the free play of economic forces. Then a few months before farmers make their production plans for the coming year the agency would announce this price for each product as a minimum to be maintained or changed gradually throughout the production and marketing period. Each farm would then be able to compare alternatives with complete security and produce the combination of crops and animal products which in view of the relative prices would be most suited to the resources at his command. Thus, society would gain through more efficient production and lower costs, which would be reflected in lower prices.

Thirdly, as indicated earlier, there are many low-income farm groups which receive almost no benefit from the present price-support program because of the meagerness of the resources at their command. For instance, price support at even 200 percent of parity would be of little value to the cotton farmers in the Southern Piedmont, where despite a good crop in 1953, the average labor return per family was $459, or 17 cents an hour. The figures for 1954 would undoubtedly be even lower. That similar conditions exist in other areas is evident from the fact that the 1950 census revealed that there are 1,500,000 farmers (28 percent) who receive incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

A program designed to help low-income farmers is now under study by the President's Advisory Commission on Agriculture. Such a program will have to take account of the surplus farm population in many areas, while the solution will lie along lines of providing employment opportunities in industry and in reorganizing uneconomic farming units into genuine family-sized farms which will make full use of the family labor at satisfactory rates of return.

To fit farm people for jobs in industry may require a system of vocational education in depressed rural areas, together with low-cost loans to cover expenses of migrating to places where jobs are available. Similarly, low-cost loans and farm management assistance will be necessary to enable farmers who remain on farms to bring their farms up to the size and efficiency comparable to that attained in more progressive areas. A solution of this sort merely recognizes that in view of the constant advance in productivity, our food and fiber can be produced with a constantly smaller number of farmers. This has been going on for over a century. The net migration from farms in the United States since 1945 has totaled over 8 million and the farm population now comprises only 13.8 percent of the total population, as compared with 23.2 percent in 1940. And there are still millions of farm people whose level of living could be improved if they could secure off-the-farm employment. It must be noted, however, that moving from an underemployed position on an undersized farm does not necessarily imply abandoning rural living. It is now well established that with modern means of transportation and a 40-hour week, or less, a rural home, complete with smokehouse and cow, is entirely compatible with a full-time urban job.

Role Played by Linfield College (Oregon) in Natural Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Linfield College, at McMinnville, Oreg., is one of the outstanding small colleges of the United States, and is playing an important part in advancing the frontiers of science.

Linfield College is conducting the largest physics research program being carried on in any small United States college, and is receiving wide scientific notice, as well as doing important work for the Office of Naval Research and the Air Force. Linfield College is exploring new electronic frontiers.

Under the able presidency of Dr. Harry Dillin, Linfield College is playing a significant role in the educational and cultural development of Oregon and the United States. Dr. Walter P. Dyke is well qualified to direct the important research being conducted at Linfield.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Harold Hughes, paying tribute to Linfield College, published in the Sunday Oregonian of May 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLORING ELECTRONIC FRONTIERS

(By Harold Hughes)

It's no longer a Defense Department secret—the coldest spot in Oregon (minus 454° F.) has got plenty of nothing and is busily turning out the sharpest needles in this or any other State.

These seemingly unrelated phenomena are among the least amazing things that now can be revealed at McMinnville by the Linfield College department of physics.

For centuries, the sport of philosophers and theologians was to argue about the number of angels that could be crowded on the point of a needle.

The question was never settled, but at Linfield the physics research staff has succeeded in producing, in a square centimeter space, over the tip of a needle, 100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 electrons.

This is a solid scientific accomplishment in the field of electron emissions. It puts little Linfield (about 500 students) at the threshold of revolutionary developments in television, radar, radio, high-fidelity record players and in hundreds of other electronic devices, most of which are vital to the national defense.

It is the largest physics research program being carried on in any small United States college, and one of which a major institution could well be proud. It appears certain that the program, which soon will have 17 people on its research staff, will continue to expand, bringing wide scientific fame and acclaim to the small private school.

When the Defense Department recently reclassified many of the mysterious electronics capers being cut at Linfield, it made possible a public report of 9 years of work directed by Dr. Walter P. Dkye, a 1938 graduate of the McMinnville College.

Back in 1946, Dr. Dyke's ability to make electrons behave attracted funds from the Research Corp., a nonprofit firm founded on money made from smoke eliminators and used to help small colleges get into the rarefied research air formerly enjoyed only by large and wealthy institutions.

The electrons danced so well at Linfield that the Office of Naval Research and the Air Force got excited and began emitting money for equipment and staff expansions.

Soon, chunks of air were floating around the Linfield laboratory like icebergs, frozen by the 454-degrees-below-zero temperatures created by liquid helium in an expensive rig provided by the federals.

A device that produces nothing but nothing, but does it better than any in the entire State, arrived and was soon producing vacuums that approach the best man has been able to create.

The department is now bulging with a maze of glass-blowing equipment, meters, wires, flashing lights, and tiny electrodes sealed inside glass tubes, and all presided over by an electron microscope which sees things down to atomic size.

The electron eye is needed to inspect the supersharp needles—needles so sharp that the best lens powered microscope will hardly pick up their points.

It is from these little needles that many electrons grow. They are the cathodes that are used in a new type electron tube developed at Linfield, which appear to have wide applications in radio, television, and countless related fields. Patents are being obtained on it.

Except for the tiny transistors, which the Linfield tube can rival in size and far exceed in the handling of high voltages, the average

radio tube emits electrons from the application of heat, or added energy.

This new tube, called a thermal field emission tube, operates when an electrical field causes the electrons to hop off the tiny needle of tungsten in high concentrations.

It is the stabilization of these electron emissions which has brought Linfield wide scientific notice and promises to revolutionize electronic devices.

The supersensitivity of the Linfield tube may well provide far better thermostats for home heating. It could solve the problem of maintaining a more uniformly bright picture on TV sets. It might make possible better seismographs for recording earthquakes. It could well reduce the size and weight of all types of electronic devices.

It is theoretically possible that some day its principle might eliminate the need for a heavy amplifier in a radio-phonograph or public address system.

In the realm of medicine, it may be possible to swallow the tiny tube and get X-ray pictures of the inside of the stomach.

Due to its unique properties, it can be used to take fast-action X-ray pictures, perhaps someday giving doctors moving X-ray pictures of various organs, such as the heart and lungs.

It can provide frequencies above the ultra-high frequencies now being used in television.

The device has military uses that can't be discussed because of security rules, but its value in cutting weight and size of electronic devices is an apparent asset in missile and rocket work, this reporter believes.

A similar emitter is used in the electron microscope, which was invented by Dr. E. W. Mueller, a German scientist now doing work in this country.

What Linfield physicists have done is take Mueller's device and apply its principles in new directions. In fact, one of the major Linfield accomplishments has been to prove a Mueller theory that a layer of atomic atoms can be seen with the Mueller scope.

ATOM MAY BE VISIBLE

Mueller went further, and said it is possible to see an atom, which would be the smallest thing man has ever seen electrically. Linfield's Dr. Dyke believes "we have the techniques for eventually proving this also."

Hundreds of thousands of dollars have gone into the Linfield laboratory since 1946, allowing men like Dr. Kenneth Trolan, assistant director, to help Dr. Dyke keep the projects pulsating.

The program has drawn in Dr. W. W. Dolan, mathematics departmental head, to direct calculations; Dr. John Boling, head of the biology department, to direct operations of the electron microscope, and Dr. George Barnes, who is currently examining a new wire made of rhenium, with an eye to using it as a needle cathode.

Students, even entering freshmen, are given a chance to take part in the complicated research, which deals at times with problems on the frontiers of science—and the sharpening of needles.

This tedious job is done with a common household bleach—sodium hydroxide. You hook a potential needle, a tungsten wire in most cases, to a battery, wire the other battery terminal to a piece of nickel, dip both tungsten and nickel into the sodium hydroxide solution. The etching away of the tungsten by electrolysis produces a needle, the point of which is so sharp that the electron microscope is needed to inspect it closely.

An important part of the job of inspecting needle points is done by photography, an operation that Dr. Dyke is well qualified to direct.

The Linfield electron master is so good at color photography that he has sold many of his pictures to national publications and to this magazine.

The friendly, easy-going Dr. Dyke, who worked on radar electronics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, built his own parabolic TV antenna in order to get the ultra-high-frequency channel in Portland.

But what does this electronic scientist do when his own television set fails to keep the electrons dancing happily?

"I call in a television repairman," he explains.

The Partnership Policy—Power Issue Proves Political Powerhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD the second of two articles by Joseph A. Fox on the administration's so-called partnership policy for power development. This article appeared in the May 12 issue of the Evening Star:

THE PARTNERSHIP POLICY—POWER ISSUE PROVES POLITICAL POWERHOUSE

(By Joseph A. Fox)

John Q. Public is going to learn some more geography when the congressional battle over the Eisenhower power-partnership program warms up.

Such unfamiliar names as Green Peter, Priest Rapids, John Day and Cougar, for example, will be bobbing up in the news along with the better-known Hells Canyon.

They represent a controversial lineup of hydroelectric dam sites in the Columbia River Basin, over which public power forces and administration-supported advocates of private power development are warring.

The Columbia Basin, however, will not be the only battleground.

The fencing-in process to which the Republicans have subjected, the Tennessee Valley Authority already has stirred trouble in the Southeast. And other sore spots can be expected to develop wherever President Eisenhower's opposition to public-power expansion continues to interfere with the ambitious plans of its disciples.

SHARP CLEAVAGE

The great debate, however, will swirl around the Pacific-Northwest. That region contains 40 percent of the hydroelectric resources of the country and is feeling the full impact of the Eisenhower power policy. The issue has produced the sharpest cleavage between Democrats and Republicans.

The Democrats want water-power development left up to the Government as it was during the New Deal-Fair Deal days, because it means cheap rates to consumers. The GOP slogan is let business do it.

The big stake is Hells Canyon on Snake River, principal tributary of the Columbia. Forming a part of the Idaho-Oregon boundary, this 7,000-foot chasm is the deepest gorge on the continent. It is bounded on the West by the 10,000-foot Wallowa Mountains, and on the East by the forbidding Devil peaks comprising the Seven Devils Mountains.

The Democrats—with an insurgent or so from the opposition—had this one staked out as part of the Columbia Basin development. The Republicans, however, have given a big private utility—Idaho Power—an opportunity to take it over. Some lesser hydro sites formerly included in the Columbia Basin also are headed for private operation if the administration view prevails.

DEMOCRATS FIGHT POLICY

Democrats are sparing no efforts to block such an eventuality.

Hells Canyon has been a fighting phrase in the Northwest for years as public and private power interests sought a foothold there. Both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers recommended in 1947 that this valuable site be meshed into the Columbia Basin power system. But Congress never got around to recommending that, and Idaho Power tried to cut in.

The Truman administration fought the private concern, and in his last budget message—which the Republicans junked—President Truman asked for funds to start the project, provided enabling legislation were obtained.

Then the Eisenhower administration adopted a hands-off policy. It left it up to the Federal Power Commission either to grant the license sought by Idaho Power, or, as an alternative, recommend Government development.

The Commission now is studying a report by an examiner who conducted a year-long inquiry and recommended private development, but with modifications in the Idaho Power proposal. Public power advocates insist that the Commission has been "packed" and will grant the license.

CONGRESS ACTS

In the meantime, however, 30 Senators and 4 House Members are backing legislation for Federal construction without regard to what the Power Commission might decide.

Proponents of the Federal dam, which would be the keystone in a half-billion-dollar Columbia Basin development, say that a single 720-foot concrete structure is needed to take full advantage of the Snake River's resources.

They contend it would add 1,124,000 kilowatts of capacity to the Columbia Basin system—enough for the maximum needs of a community of 2,250,000 people. They argue it would shore up downstream flood control in Idaho and Oregon, improve navigation possibilities, create a huge recreational area and furnish funds for irrigation projects in Idaho that would not pay out without subsidization.

As a clincher, public-power advocates hold out the lure of low-cost power in a growing country.

IDAHO POWER'S ANSWER

Idaho Power counters by arguing that the three small dams it proposes, while short of the generating capacity of the Federal plan, would accomplish everything that high-dam advocates talk about—without costing the Government a dime.

Idaho Power says, too, that the 3 dams can be built for $133 million—less than a third of the proposed Federal outlay. And it promises that consumers would get their power for less than the national-average cost.

The administration's indirect espousal of Idaho Power's proposal has caused critics to ask pointedly why the President is willing to let private industry have the Hells Canyon site but wants to commit the Government to a billion-dollar expenditure in the upper Colorado. They point out that power can be produced at Hells Canyon for about 2.5 mills per kilowatt, while the cost in the upper Colorado will range as high as 6 mills a kilowatt. And the market for the Government to sell the power will be a poor one.

Administration spokesmen rationalize this apparent paradox by explaining that the Colorado Basin project, which the Senate has approved and sent to the House, is essentially for water storage and irrigation, which are of prime interest to the Government. The power phase is incidental, they say.

Hells Canyon, to the contrary, they contend, is largely a power-generating undertaking which the President feels should be in private hands.

SIMILAR SITUATION

A situation akin to that in the upper Colorado prevails in the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas River development on the eastern slope of the Continental Divide, the only other all-Federal project endorsed by the administration.

There, too, power production is rated of secondary importance to the control of the waterways at which the Government aims.

While Hells Canyon is stirring the biggest fight, a half dozen other scraps are brewing on the westernmost reaches of the Columbia and its tributaries, where private utilities want in on partnership deals. Public power forces have been fighting this war for years, and they now are digging in against a new assault.

One utilities group is trying to cut in on the John Day dam side in Oregon, located strategically in the stretch of the Columbia which contains such big Federal operations as McNary, The Dalles, and Bonneville.

John Day has been authorized for Federal development, but the administration has sought no funds to start construction. Republican-sponsored legislation has been introduced to "deauthorize" the project so the utilities can move in.

DEMOCRATIC LOSS

The Priest Rapids project in Washington, also designed formerly as a Federal undertaking was "deauthorized" last year, and Democrats in the Senate lost their battle to have public agencies get preference in buying the power there when the generators begin turning.

A Grant County power unit wants the site.

When the deauthorization legislation was passed, Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon denounced it as a "stick of dynamite" under the whole Federal power program.

President Eisenhower has estimated that the partnership program contemplated right now will cost the Government about $200 million. He has said that private investors will put some $800 million into the half-dozen projects of which John Day and Priest Rapids are most important.

Under the Eisenhower plan the Government also has given up on a Coosa River project in Alabama, turning it over to the Alabama Power Co., which spearheaded the fight against the TVA.

Under the administration's policy, Federal power development is in a dead-end street, but the Democrats are operating on such a narrow majority in Senate and House that there is little chance they can do anything about it.

Whether the situation can be translated into an effective issue in next year's political campaign is a guess. Some Democrats are convinced it can. Republicans dissent.

From Amherst to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article entitled "From Amherst to Korea," written by Eugene G. Wanger, and published in the Amherst Alumni News of October 1954. The article describes a trip with a group of students putting on theatricals and entertainment in Korea last summer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM AMHERST TO KOREA: THE KIDS FROM HOME ON ORIENTAL TOUR

(By Eugene G. Wanger, 1955)

The Kids From Home, a college variety show of which I was lucky to be a member, flew over 30,000 miles this summer covering one-third of the United States Far East Command. In less than 50 performances we entertained nearly 100,000 American servicemen in Korea and Japan. But these figures are a very small part of the story. The most interesting part is written in our memories: How we lived, whom we met, and what we encountered there.

It was April 7 when Amherst's band director, Dr. J. Clement Schuler, phoned me at Theta Xi to ask if I would be interested in spending my vacation without pay by entertaining American troops in the Far East. Would I be interested? Ten weeks later, after much planning, the 17 college and high-school students invited to participate in Dr. Schuler's fourth Kids From Home variety show arrived at College Hall to rehearse. Amherst could claim all but 2 of the 8 men chosen, while the girls, who, like most of us, had participated in at least 1 of our 3 previous tours, came from various schools in the South, East, and Middle West.

Irv Milheim, 1956, from Sharon, Pa., played string bass and was once again managing the moving and staging of our 2 tons of show equipment and baggage. Our pianist, Stan Ginsberg, 1955, from Far Rockaway, N. Y., shared Irv's job of manager and assisted Dr. Schuler with the financial details involved in obtaining equipment and travel. Charles Pease, 1957, from Hartford, Conn., held down lead tenor sax and oboe, while Bill Cole, 1955, an Amherst resident, specialized in baritone sax and clarinet. An Amherst High School junior played lead trumpet. He was Tom Sullivan, Jr., whose grandfather was a member of the class of 1884. There was an alumnus along too: trombonist Rudy von Unruh, 1949, from Lakewood, Ohio, who was chosen to be assistant director. I was given the job of master of ceremonies.

At Amherst the show had 2 weeks of writing, rehearsing, and testing under the able direction of Dr. Schuler and with the invaluable assistance of Jack Dolph, chief producer for Fred Waring.

On July 7 we flew from Hartford and arrived that night at Travis Air Force Base in Calif., where we played the first show of the tour 48 hours later and took off immediately thereafter in a Stratocruiser for Tokyo, Japan.

Having lost a day at the international dateline, we arrived at Tokyo International Airport on the 12th. The fueling stops at Hawaii and Wake Island afforded little time to wash or rest, so it was 65 hours since we had bathed or slept in a bed when we gathered in the billiard room of the Dai Iti Hotel to begin the briefings which were to prepare us for Korea.

Four days later we had been processed, decked out in insecticide-impregnated GI uniforms, and loaded aboard a C–124 Globemaster which was to fly past Mount Fujiyama, across the Sea of Japan, over the mountains of South Korea and land us at Seoul City Air Base just 19 miles from the wstrn end of the demilitarized truce zone established at the end of the fighting in 1953.

For the next 2 weeks our itinerary would lead us 300 miles south and east to the city of Pusan before making a 3-week sweep across the Eighth Army area which extended above the 38th parallel.

Although our Army and Air Force audiences were the largest, noisiest, and most enthusiastic we had ever seen, the United States Marines at K–6 made one of the most heart-warming impressions of all. Their hospitality was boundless from the very beginning as they provided for all our needs and toured us through their installation. After our performance on their outdoor stage for an audience of over 3,000, the base commander came back and gave Dr. Schuler a copy of the letter he had written to Far East Headquarters requesting that we return to his installation before our tour was over. Even though the schedule could not be changed to permit our return, several of his officers obtained permission to follow our tour by jet. They met us at Taegu, Seoul, and even Tokyo, giving us dozens of pictures from our visit and extending their aid in every way.

We will always remember our performance given in the small assembly room of the Christian orphanage which those Marines helped maintain. When we had finished, all the orphans rose—80 tiny children whose poor homes, families, and identities had been destroyed by war—and sang for us, raising their small Korean voices in the unmistakable notes of "Jesus Loves Me."

Since we traveled mostly by plane and train during the southeastward swing of the tour, we got an extensive birdseye impression of the land our troops had so recently fought over. When open trucks and ambulances became our mode of transportation with the Eighth Army—and we saw much of this rugged terrain at close hand—it was easy to see why the endless rocky mountains and foul-smelling rice paddies made fighting so difficult. We moved from day to day along narrow dirt roads so dusty that we were given gauze face masks to keep from choking.

By the first of August advance word of the show was preceding us by the grapevine wherever we went. Consequently we met men from our home towns and from Amherst at almost every installation. We would often see them first when they came backstage as we were packing after the show. It was thus that we renewed our acquaintance with George Hibbard, 1952, and John Snell, 1951. When the commander of the 25th infantry division entertained us at tea on August 1, we found Pfc. Mike Palmer, 1951, who was the general's personal secretary. Frank Mainzer, 1952, and Fred Luddy, 1951, were also on hand to greet us during the next 2 days before we moved north to perform at the 7th division in the Chorwan valley above the 38th parallel. It was there that Maj. Gen. E. B. Seebree and his staff royally treated us to a champagne supper, so excellently prepared and served that it would surpass all but the most exclusive American restaurants. To top it all off, the general made all our troupe honorary members of his division, giving each an engraved cigarette lighter and shoulder patches as mementos of the occasion. When we forded a nearby stream to return to our tents that night we found that Joe Knight, 1954, had heard about the show and had come over to welcome us.

After our usual two performances the next morning and afternoon, the division provost marshal provided an armed escort to take us in jeeps through the frontlines to a forward outpost where we could watch the Chinese Communist forces across the demilitarized zone. Dr. Schuler, who was given the general's helicopter for the afternoon, had some of our cameras aloft and took some of our most treasured snapshots of the summer.

The most exciting and truly remarkable welcome of the tour occurred when we worked our way to the 2d Infantry Division some days later. As we came jolting over the dusty roads into division headquarters we were amazed to hear the rousing music of Lord Jeffrey Amherst not far

away. When we climbed out of our assorted ambulances and trucks there was a 40-piece brass band playing every college song in the books. Smoke bombs suddenly went off around us and through a purple and white haze we saw Somers White, 1953, leading six cheerleaders in plaid jackets and beanies as they gave us a hearty "Jeff! Rah! Rah! Kids From Home!" A group of GI's waving flash cards, "Welcome College Show," appeared on one side of us, while on the other the division special services officer, complete with mortarboard and tassel, made a short speech of welcome from a specially constructed "football rally" platform. He was cut short as a helicopter landed noisely behind him and commanding general, "Big Jeff" Seitz, climbed out, stepped to the microphone, and presented each of us with the honorary membership of the 2d Division. As jets swept back and forth overhead, Howie Ziff, 1952, led us across the dirt road to our "campus" of five canvas quonset huts, each bearing the name of a fraternity or sorority. A sign dominating the scene reassured the girls that there were "positively no pantie raids allowed."

Following our performance the next afternoon, Howie Ziff arranged for us to visit a detachment of United Nations troops from Thailand. Here the tables were turned as they performed for us, demonstrating amazing grace, strength, and coordination in the execution of a ceremonial fencing match. When each of the fencers had laid his two heavy swords aside, he returned to give an exhibition of Siamese boxing in which his bare feet proved as potent a weapon as his fists. If you've ever seen a cross to the body quickly returned by a staggering kick to the side of the head you have a fair idea of how rough that sport is.

When we finished performing at the central front we were shuttled east by 6 passenger aircraft to the 24th Division headquarters at Yanggu. Here, for the first time in the tour, the commanding general of the division attended the performance with his entire staff. He sat on a hillside with 5,000 of his men while we presented our 2-hour show of music and variety acts from a covered wooden platform under the usual illumination of truck headlights and a few very scarce 100-watt bulbs powered by a temperamental gasoline generator. Such conditions were typical.

After finishing with the eastern front, we flew west, back to the capital city of Seoul, to wind up our Korean tour and be flown to the northern island of Hokkaido, Japan. While at Seoul several of us had the pleasure of visiting the home of Kong-Ki Min, 1957.

Our final performance in Korea was broadcast over the Armed Forces Korea Network from Seoul military post. On coming offstage after introducing our Glenn Miller band arrangement of Little Brown Jug, I was enthusiastically greeted by Lt. Col. Hartwell C. Lancaster, the former head of Amherst's Air Force ROTC program. Having driven by jeep all the way from his squadron command at Kimpo, he arrived late and came backstage because there were no more seats or standing room left in the quonset theater's auditorum. Before he left the colonel asked us to take his very best wishes back to the men at Amherst.

We arrived in Hokkaido on August 19 and found that a less strenuous schedule made it possible to relax and do a little sightseeing between performances. Before moving south we ran into Lt. Sandy Lobrano, 1951, who was the first to inform us that our troops were pulling out of Hokkaido to leave the protection of that large island to the Japanese.

Another C–47 flew us back to Tokyo where we turned in the GI clothes, were at last able to have our perspiration-soaked costumes cleaned for the first time in 4 weeks, and gave our farewell performance on August 23 to a capacity house in the famous Ernie Pyle theater. At a farewell banquet the general in charge of Far East Special Services gave us engraved gold and silver medals of appreciation. We were also presented with engraved statues from the K–6 Marines.

A week of sightseeing followed before our plane left for home and our friends in Tokyo helped us take every advantage of it. Our scrapbooks are filled with postcards and snapshots of the magnificant shrines at Nikko and Kamakura, the quiet majesty of Mount Fuji, and the beautiful simplicity of Japanese art and architecture. We also have many treasured pictures and memories of the Japanese people. While we knew that they could not help but resent us as conquerors, they were polite and made no outward show of the resentment they must feel.

At our departure from Tokyo International Airport the marines were once again on hand—this time with bouquets, leis, and a huge wreath of flowers to wish us farewell and bon voyage.

It was hard to realize that the tour had ended. We were weary at times but the genuine applause, the helpfulness of both the GI's and the generals was ample reward for what fun and entertainment we were able to bring to a grand bunch of men who are doing all they can to prepare the Koreans and the Japanese to defend themselves.

Among our mementos is a letter from a marine private. He wrote: "This was the finest show I've seen since I arrived here. I can't get home, but for 2 hours tonight you brought home to me." What more could The Kids From Home have asked?

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Since his return, Dr. Schuler has received many letters of thanks from Japan and Korea. Excerpts from a few of these notes follow:

"The reception given the show was more enthusiastic and spontaneous than that accorded any group of entertainers it has been my pleasure to observe during my 12 months in Korea. The behavior of the cast as individuals and as a group deserves much applause on their outstanding performance." (An infantry officer.)

"We wish to express our heartfelt appreciation of, and gratitude for, the musical entertainment you gave the patients and personnel of this hospital." (Six hospital patients.)

"I personally thank you and all those involved for a truly wonderful show. It was the best I've ever seen, the very thing we've been yearning for." (A soldier in Korea.)

"On behalf of the officers and men of this command, I want to thank you for providing us with such clean, refreshing entertainment. During my 11 months in Korea I have seen many shows. Even the better of them can't compete with your contingent. The troupe conducted itself in a way that reflects the highest standards of college training and your supervision." (A group chaplain.)

"It was terrific, outstanding, the greatest, and all the other descriptive words that could be used. You and your troupe have done an outstanding job for the morale of the men in Korea." (A soldier in Korea.)

Letters of praise were also received from Thomas H. Wyman, 1951; Roger Marshall, 1953; and Michael C. Palmer, 1953, who saw the Kids in Korea.

Repair the Broken Chain, Pass the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on February 13 last Dean Clarence E. Manion made his 20th broadcast in his series of weekly radio programs. The title of the broadcast was "Repair the Broken Chain, Pass the Bricker Amendment."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPAIR THE BROKEN CHAIN, PASS THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

For a final analysis of our critical need for the Bricker amendment we must now back away from it and get perspective. Momentarily, let us forget laws, executive agreements, states' rights, and international covenants. Why do we need any part or provision of the Constitution at all? Great Britain gets along without a constitution and is therefore untroubled by controversy over proposed constitutional amendments. How do we happen to have Federal and State constitutions? What is the scope, purpose and justification for our peculiar unprecedented constitutional system?

When we view it as a whole, we see that constitutional government in the United States is rooted in the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence. As the very predicate of our revolution we declared that government is man's agent for the protection of God's inalienable gifts of life, liberty, and the right to pursue happiness. Then and there, for the first time in human history, government was logically and definitely reduced from its traditional role of tyrannical mastery, to the simple service and deliberate will of human nature. Then and there, we tied the governmental tyrant down with constitutional chains of checks, balances, divisions, and enforceable restraints. This achievement is the climax of American history. It is the basic cause of all of our subsequent power, achievement, and material prosperity.

From immediate, practical experience, our revolutionary forefathers verified the historical fact that government, although useful and necessary, is perpetually dangerous, and the most difficult force on earth to harness and control. In a healthy, understandable spirit of fear the Founding Fathers cut American Government up into pieces and copperriveted each part of it down with positive, enforcible restraints. They understood what Woodrow Wilson so well said more than a hundred years later, namely, that "the history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power."

Every line of every State and Federal Constitution that the Founding Fathers made, was a limitation—a strong restraining chain upon the power of some part of American Government. Seeing that constitutional system in perspective, we observe it as a balanced pattern of restrictions upon every officer and department of American Government. When he takes his constitutional oath of office, every governmental official in this land puts on his own particular consti-

tutional ball and chain. This goes for, and from, the traffic cop on the corner, on up to and including the President of the United States.

Our constitutional system gives no State or Federal official a free, roving commission to wander at will over the field of American Government. Such a license would condemn to death the very personal liberty which it is the dedicated object of American Government to preserve.

So much for the general, overall view. Now let us step up close and take a good look at article VI of the Constitution which the Bricker proposal is designed to amend. First of all, this article reminds us that our present Constitution did not create the United States of America. Our present Constitution was drafted in 1787 and became effective in 1789. The United States was created by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Our first Federal Constitution was called the Articles of Confederation, which became effective in 1781. When our present Constitution began to operate with the first inauguration of President George Washington, our national history was nearly 13 years old. This being so, article VI begins this way: "All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the Confederation." Observe that the obligations of existing private and public debts are made to carry over without any attempt at repudation.

Now watch this next sentence: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." Observe that legislation is now valid as the law of the land only when it conforms to the Constitution, but that treaties, in existence when the Constitution was adopted or to be made thereafter, are the supreme law of the land when made merely, under the authority of the United States."

Now, it doesn't take a constitutional lawyer to see the explosive nature of this distinction between the requirement for supreme laws on the one hand and for supreme treaties on the other. Why didn't the framers say that laws and treaties shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution? One reason is obvious. In our then 13-year-old national history, we had already made a number of treaties with France, Spain, Holland, and finally an involved peace treaty with England. The framers wished to reaffirm the binding quality of these existing treaties. They could not be made pursuant to the Constitution because they were made before the Constitution existed. (As was the case with existing debt obligations.)

But whatever their motive for the distinction, it is inconceivable that the framers intended to lift treaties above the very Constitution which made the negotiation of those treaties possible. When the Constitution was written, a treaty was merely a contract between sovereign governments. Treaties were not then, as they are now, a regulation to be enforced by government against the citizen. (Alexander Hamilton, Federalist 75.) This constitutional provision was adequate for the old-fashioned 18th century type of treaty, but it is woefully inadequate protection against the modern type—the United Nations type of treaty, which now threatens to destroy the Constitution altogether.

The pending Bricker amendment will protect the Constitution as a whole by the following language:

Section 1: "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect."

Ask the opponents of the Bricker amendment to explain why they object to that simple protection for the Constitution.

Setcion 2. "A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement."

This is the section which protects the American home rule. Why should our internal law (of the United States) be made at London, Paris, or Geneva instead of at Washington, Indianapolis, or Austin, Tex.? What is the alternative to the Bricker amendment? What, in other words, do we have now?

Modern writers, including some present Supreme Court Justices, tell us in substance that the existing treaty power in the Constitution amounts to a separate, superior governmental agency that can accomplish anything, including the things which the Constitution forbids. The possibility for such a construction was suggested to Jefferson when the Constitution was up for ratification. He laughed it off as fantastic saying, "If the treaty power is unlimited, then we don't have any Constitution." "Surely," he wrote, "the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way." (Jefferson Manual of Parliamentary Practice.) But Jefferson did not envision articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter—now binding upon us a duly ratified treaty.

Listen to these provisions:

Article 55: "The United Nations shall promote, (a) higher standard of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development; (b) Solutions of international, economic social health and related problems and international cultural and educational cooperation; and (c), universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Article 56: "All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action (in cooperation with the organization) for the achievement of these purposes set forth in article 55."

Under our Constitution, the achievement of these purposes is left to the individual citizen or to State action under the 9th and 10th article of the Bill of Rights. Have these reservations now been lost by our ratification of the United Nations Charter? Years ago Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Douglas of the United States Supreme Court joined in this expression: "There are additional reasons now why that (State of California) law stands as an obstacle to the free accomplishment of our policy in the international field. One of these reasons is that we have recently pledged ourselves to cooperate with the United Nations to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. How can this Nation be faithful to this international pledge, if State laws, which bar land ownership and occupancy by aliens on account of race, are permitted to be enforced?" (*Oyama* v. *California* (332 U. S. 633).)

This was in 1948. Incidentally, in a Supreme Court case decided the same year (*Shelly* v. *Kramer* (344 U. S. 1)) exactly the same argument was made. It appeared in a brief filed by the American Association for the United Nations and it was signed by Alger Hiss. It should be easy to guess where Justices Black and Douglas stood in the recent case of Rice versus Sioux City Memorial Park, in which the Supreme Court recently announced itself deadlocked 4 to 4. In that case the United Nations Charter was invoked to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court of Iowa, in a suit for damages because of alleged racial discrimination against an Indian.

The Iowa court held that under Iowa law and the 10th article of the Bill of Rights, there was no cause of action. The plaintiff appealed to the Supreme Court on the ground, that there was racial discrimination and for that reason the United Nations Charter superceded Federal and State constitutions. From the Supreme Court's announcement that it was divided evenly, we may assume that four of its Justices think that the plaintiff is correct. At the moment therefore, we may be just one Supreme Court Justice short of substituting the United Nations Charter for the sovereignty, independence and constitutional government of the United States.

During his United Nations "police action" in Korea, President Truman seized the steel mills. When the case reached the Supreme Court, 3 Justices joined in a dissenting opinion which upheld the presidential seizure under the provisions of the United Nations Charter (*Sawyer* v. *Youngstown etc.* (343 U. S. 479)). In that case the Constitution survived its test with the U. N. Charter with 2 votes to spare. The margin of victory is now down to 1.

At the moment Justice Douglas makes no attempt to disguise his predilection for a constitutional world order. According to their college newspaper (Law Association News, December 1954, Notre Dame Law Association), he recently told a group of law students: that "The Communist press has long advocated world government." "They have done," he continues, "what we should have done years ago, the single, most important thing, improving understanding between different peoples."

Apparently, according to Justice Douglas, perfect understanding will come only when we have drowned the Constitution in a world charter. According to prevailing law, which Justice Douglas' decisions have helped to make, the process is ready-made for us. It was Justice Douglas who gave us the famous Pink decision (*U. S.* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203, 1942)) wherein he said: "A treaty is a 'law of the land' under the supremacy clause (art. VI, clause 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity." And again in the same opinion, "State law must yield when it is inconsistent with, or impairs the policy provisions of a treaty or of an international compact or agreement. Then the power of a State to refuse enforcement of rights based on foreign law, which runs counter to the public policy of the former, must give way before the superior Federal policy evidenced by a treaty or international compact or agreement."

Notice that the Senate need not even be consulted. According to this decision, the President can amputate the Bill of Rights all by himself. But you can trust our great President not to do it, you say? Thomas Jefferson was also a great President. He told us this: "In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." Good advice.

The pending Bricker amendment well may be your last chance to mend the broken chain.

Power Document Disclosed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the power policies of this administration are of major economic concern to the people

of the Pacific Northwest who for years have been working partners with the Federal Government in multipurpose development of our vital water resources.

During the past 2 years, these policies have been changed. They are being changed away from the historic partnership with the people—the public-utility districts and the Rural Electrification Administrative cooperatives—toward a partnership with big, big business—the commercial power companies.

That far-reaching changes have been made with a minimum of publicity and apparently without consulting interested parties is pointed out in the following article by Staff Correspondent Richard L. Strout in the May 12 issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

POWER DOCUMENT DISCLOSED

WASHINGTON.—Photostatic copies of a hitherto unpublished letter in the files of the Department of the Interior indicate that officials of the Department first solicited, and then followed, the recommendations of big private utilities of the Pacific Northwest as to changes in power policies.

The letter was written by James D. Geissinger, special assistant to the Solicitor of the Interior Department, April 9, 1954. Mr. Geissinger is now regional solicitor of the Department at Denver.

Mr. Geissinger speaks of recommendations for major policy changes by the Department confidentially submitted by "the utilities," and he gives his own support for most of the changes which are recommended.

Subsequent developments indicate that out of 1 batch of 13 recommendations from spokesmen of the utilities, 10 were adopted verbatim by the Department of the Interior.

HEARINGS HELD

A Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee is now holding public hearings on the matter.

Presumably, the Geissinger letter, whose existence was determined by a correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, will figure in the development of the House inquiry.

The Interior Department's power policies are of major economic and political concern to the Pacific Northwest. In fiscal year 1954, the Department sold over 46.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power from its dams, with sales revenues of $108,722,975.

The policy changes adopted by Douglas McKay's Department of the Interior were made with a minimum of publicity and apparently without consulting other interested parties in the Federal power system, such as farm cooperatives and individual localities buying and distributing Government-produced power.

Mr. Geissinger informed the Solicitor of the Interior Department, in his April 9, 1954, letter:

"For some time the Department has been considering the possibility of amending or eliminating some of the present right-of-way regulations governing electric transmission lines.

"Informal requests have been made of the various utilities in the Western States to make suggestions concerning such changes. Of the controversial regulations, the utilities have suggested modifications as to paragraphs (1) of 244.9 and (B) of 244.44, and elimination of paragraphs (M) of 244.9 and (D) of 244.44."

SUGGESTED CHANGES

"Changes have been suggested in other regulations to negative possible arbitrary action and to remove language which has become obsolete.

"Special suggestions have been made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. attorneys, and I am advised these suggestions have the approval of attorneys representing other of the Western States utilities."

Mr. Geissinger sets forth the regulations as they then existed, followed by changes recommended allegedly by the big utility companies, and followed in turn by his own recommendations, most of which approve the proposed changes.

"The suggested changes," he wrote, "have been considered in the order and manner presented. The company quotes the regulation, crosses out objectionable language, and underlines new language. This is followed by comment by the utility counsel. For easy reference, I will first set forth each section; this will be followed by the company's comments and finally by my comments * * *."

What is now one of the most controversial of the changes reportedly recommended by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and subsequently adopted by the Interior Department, dealt with the question of private company transmission lines crossing Government-owned land.

The department had demanded for such privileges that a system of interconnection of powerlines, known as "wheeling," be set up for joint use of facilities to avoid the cost of duplications.

DELETION FAVORED

This policy, put into effect in 1948, was carried to the courts by the Idaho Power Co., where it lost.

Mr. Geissinger's statement on this as prompted by the private utilities, apparently became the basis for the Department's subsequent reversal of policy:

"It would appear that the regulation is not in harmony with the present power policy, and in view of the fact that it is being avoided anyway, I would recommend its deletion."

At a later point Mr. Geissinger wrote:

"Generally, and with the exception of paragraph (M), which must be retained in its present form because of Federal statutes, it is my opinion that the suggested changes, with the exceptions noted, would be in the public interest.

"If the changes are made, then the legal questions raised in the pending cases would become academic and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would undoubtedly withdraw its present appeals and make new applications for rights-of-way in accordance with the amended regulations."

ASSAILED BY DEMOCRATS

Democrats on the House subcommittee attack the Department's reversal of the wheeling arrangement.

Chairman EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, charged: "The abolished regulations afforded a means whereby the Government could utilize the idle, unused capacity of privately owned powerlines crossing public lands to bring cheap Government power to statutory preference-right customers.

"The regulation was designed to carry out the policies established by Congress without a wasteful and expensive duplication of facilities."

So far as is known here, the Department's reversal of policy, following consultation with private-utility representatives, received no publicity at the time other than publication of the little-read Federal Register.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).